Гумбатова Айтен Шакир

д-р филос. наук, преподаватель

Бакинский государственный университет

г. Баку, Республика Азербайджан

THE MAIN TYPES OF TRANSFORMATION

Аннотация: *в статье рассмотрены переводческие трансформации как средство обеспечения эквивалентности текстов. Автор отмечает, что переводчику необходимо понимать и учитывать многие аспекты: структуру и текстовый корпус, подтекст и авторский замысел, средства их экспликации, время создания произведения и т. д. Все они влияют на перевод, его адекватность и эквивалентность. Под адекватностью понимается связь между средствами и целью, и, следовательно, она ориентирована на процесс. Эквивалентность, с другой стороны, представляет собой связь между двумя продуктами, источником и целевым текстом. Наиболее часто переводчик прибегает к следующим трансформациям на синтаксическом уровне: 1) опущение; 2) добавление; 3) транспозиция; 4) изменение грамматических форм; 5) компенсация; 6) конкретизация; 7) обобщение; 8) антонимический перевод; 9) смысловое развитие; 10) метонимический перевод; 11) объединение предложений; и 12) членение предложений. Эти трансформации обусловлены различиями в грамматическом и лексическом строе в исходном (ИЯ) и переводящем (ПЯ) языках. Для обеспечения адекватности перевода необходимо использовать грамматические трансформации. Таким образом, буквальный перевод адаптируется к стандартам ПЯ и становится адекватным.*

Ключевые слова: *трансформация, интерлингвистика, перевод, транспозиция, замена, добавление, опущение, исходный язык, переводящий язык.*

Abstract: *in this article, translation transformations as a means of ensuring the equivalence of texts. It is necessary to understand and take into account many different aspects: structure and text case, intentions and implications of the author and ways to express them, the time of writing, etc. All these issues affect the translation,*

its adequacy and equivalence. Adequacy is thus a relation between means and purpose, and is thereby process-oriented. Equivalence, on the other hand, is a relation between two products, the source and the receptor texts. At the sentence level, the most common transformations every translator makes are 1) omission, 2) addition, 3) transposition, 4) change of grammatical forms, 5) loss compensation, 6) concretization, 7) generalization 8) antonymic translation, 9) meaning extension, 10) metonymic translation, 11) sentence integration, and 12) sentence fragmentation. These transformations are caused by differences in the grammar and vocabulary of the source language (SL) and target language (TL). In order to avoid an inadequate translation, it is necessary to apply translating grammatical transformations. As a result, a literal translation is adapted to the standards of the language of translation and becomes adequate.

***Keywords**: transformation, interlinguistics, translation, transposition, replacement, addition, omission, source language, target language.*

Introduction

The term *transformation* is polysemantic and there are at least 6 meanings that are associated with this word in translation studies including intralinguistic translation [Нелюбин 2003]. One of the most popular classifications of transformations offered by V.N. Komissarov takes into account the character of modifications and singles out lexical, grammatical and lexica-grammatical transformations [Комиссаров 1999].

Despite the differences in the formal and semantic system of the two languages, equivalency in translation requires a number of interlinguistic transformations – the so-called translation transformations, in order to convey the information contained in the source text to the target text as completely as possible by observing the norms of the TL. The following types of transformation are frequent in the process of translation. A few examples:

1) transposition;

2) replacement;

3) addition;

4) omission.

Such classification of the types of transformation is conditional and approximate, because we may encounter lots of cases where one and the same transformation is explained differently. For example, a typical case is the replacement of combining of sentences with conjunctions by the omission of conjunctions in translation from English into Russian which on the same grounds may be defined as replacement and as omission. Secondly, the four types of transformation are seldom encountered in practice in a pure form, as a rule, the often function together assuming the forms of complicated and complex transformations.

Transposition as a type of transformation is the extensional replacement of the elements of the SL in the text of the TL. The elements, which are usually transposed in translation, are words, word combinations, clauses and independent sentences. The most ordinary case of transposition is the inversion of the order of words combinations in the sentence. We know that the word order in English and Russian are not alike which, naturally, influences the process of translation. The order of words of these two sentences is quite opposite. The common case in translation is explained by the fact the English word order is determined by the rules of syntax – that is, the subject is followed by the predicate which is also followed by the object, then adverbial modifier and so on. But in the Russian language the word order is determined not by the syntactical function of the word, but by the actual or communicative segmentation of the sentence. According to the theory of communicative segmentation of the sentence the words which are the carriers of the new information, are placed at the end of the sentence, but the secondary parts at the beginning with an exception when they turn to be carriers of the new information.

Communicative segmentation of the sentence is not the only reason, which determiners the choice in word order. For example: the places of subordinate clauses in the sentences of English and Russian are a good example to it.

Replacement is a widely spread type of transformation. Any language unit may be replaced by other in the process of translation. We may speak of grammatical and

lexical replacements. Grammatical forms, for example: number of nouns, tenses of verbs may be replaced by others: 1) oats – *овес*; potatoes – *картофель*; onions – *лук*; 2) every Saturday he went to the cinema – *Каждую субботу он идет в кино пошел* is wrong *потому что совершенности вида*.

Parts of speech may be replaced by each other. The simple type of it is the re-placement of noun by pronouns:

Сначала он висел в комнате деда, но скоро дед изгнал его к нам в чердак, потому что скворец научился, дразнит дедушки.

At first the bird hung in my grandfathers' room, but soon he outlawed it to the attic, because it began to imitate him.

We may observe the reverse:

I took possession of his effects after his death, – I explained. They were done up in a parcel and I was directed to give them to you. *Все что осталось от него после смерти, отдали мне, – объяснил я. Письма и портсигар были связаны в пакет. На нем было написано передать леди Кастеллан, личном.*

A typical transformation is the replacement of a verbal noun by a verb: He had one of the very piercing whistles that were practically never in tune. *Свистел он ужасно пронзительно и всегда фальшиво.*

Parts of the sentence may be replaced: his sister met him. *Его встретила сестра.*

He was given money. *Ему дали денег.*

Replacement of simple sentence by a complex one: I like watching her dance. *Я люблю смотреть, как она танцует.*

Replacement of a complex sentence by a simple one: I figured I probably wouldn't see him again till Christmas vacation started. *Я сообразил, что до начала рождественских каникул я его не увижу.*

Replacement of subordination by coordination: He had a new father, whose picture was enclosed. *У него новый папа – это он сияет на карточке.*

Replacement of polysyndetonic relations with asydenotic relations: So I opened my suitcase and took out a clear shirt, and then I went into the bathroom and

washed and changed my shirt. *Я открыл чемодан. Вынул чистую рубашку, пошел в ванную, вымылся и переоделся* (Salinger).

In lexical replacement separate lexical units of the SL are substituted by the lexical units of the TL which are not their dictionary equivalent, i.e. if taken in isolation they have quite different referential meanings. There are generally three types of lexical replacements – concretization, generalization and replacement of case by effect and vice-versa.

Concretization of the SL with a broad referential meaning by a word or word combination in the TL with more narrow meaning. We may have language concretization and contextual concretization. In language concretization the replacement of a word with broad meaning by a word with less broader meaning is conditioned by differences in the structure of languages – either by the absence of an identical unit in the TL with the same broad meaning, or by the difference in their stylistic values, or by the requirements of the grammatical structure. For example: the English word thing is defined by the Oxford dictionary as an entity of any kind, which is or may be in any way an object of perception, knowledge, or thought is translated into Russian by concretization as *вещь, предмет, дело, факт. случай, обстоятельство, произведение, существо и др.*

Generalization is the reverse of concretization, opposite to it. It is the replacement of the unit of the SL with narrow meaning by a unit of the TL with broad meaning. For example: Then the girl gets killed, because she is always speeding. *А потом девушка гибнет, потому что она вечно нарушает правила.*

Replacement of cause by effect and vice versa. In the process of translation there are lots of cases of lexical replacement based on the effect and cause relations between the notions. Words and word combinations of the SL may be replaced by words and word-combinations of the TL in translation which logically express the cause of the action. For example: I don`t blame them. *Я их понимаю.*

Literature review

Adequacy is a category that has quite a different ontological status. In most cases it is based on the real translation experience in presentation of the whole commu-

nicative-functional content of the original; translator`s decision often has the character of concession. Translation requires sacrifice and translator often accepts certain loss in order to give the main and important moments, functional dominants of the original text during translation. The conclusion is that adequacy has a maximum character, not optimal; translation is to correspond with certain conditions and tasks in an optimal form. In other words, translation, final text can be adequate to the original only in one of the semiotic levels or functional measures. There may be cases where some parts of the text are not equivalent to one another but at the same time translation has been made in an appropriate form as a whole. A criterion of adequacy is that evolving beyond equivalence must be linked to translator`s subjective approach, not objective necessity. Equivalence, generally, is regular accordance with the same meaning regardless of context.” The terms equivalence and adequacy of translation have both been used in translation studies for a long time, yet the borderline between the two is not always clear-cut. Not infrequently the notion of translation equivalence is treated as the adequacy of translation. In view of such a discrepancy, it is necessary to consider each term separately first. Equivalence is considered by many scholars as one of the most important ontological features of translation, and yet its proper definition is still a matter of debate. There are several reasons for it. The first cause is connected with its polyfunctional character when it is used in the translation theory, therefore it is necessary to specify what equivalence is really meant in each particular case. According to L.L. Nelyubin [Нелюбин 2003, pp. 253–255], it can be used in a most general sense as a sense proximity of any two elements which are equated with each other, as well as in more narrow senses it is common to speak about (a) equivalence of a SLT and a TLT; (b) equivalence as a type of lexical correspondence between SLT units and TLT correspondences; (c) equivalence of translation which presupposes identity of all levels of a SLT and a TLT content and (d) equivalent translation.

Methodology

Any highly developed language is powerful enough to give unity of form and content by means of the other language. At that moment stylistic means of the trans-

lated language don`t repeat peculiarities of the original language, they often present the stylistic functions of the original elements [15]. A.V. Fyodrov notes the importance of the linguistic analysis of the translation activity in his book *Introduction to the theory of translation* and distinguishes theory of translation that describes equivalence between two and more languages [3]. When translating a word, combination of words or grammatical moments the main challenge is to determine their connection with feelings and emotional meaning.

There is emotional stylistic meaning in any translation, because any word or grammatical moment is neutrally emotional and this neutral emotionality must be preserved. It is known that adequate translation reflects not only exact meaning of the original but also its expressive-stylistic peculiarities. So, the problem of presentation of stylistic peculiarities of lexical and grammatical cases is considered together with the different lexical and grammatical problems of translation.

Results and conclusion

The article deals with the main types of transformation. In our globalized world, to choose and make the right transformation is one of the translator's main professional skills, one that requires exercise in imagination, intuition, and cultural outlook. Literary talent may also help. A successful translation is largely comprised of successful transformations. Achieving equivalence in translation is connected with the ability to identify a translational problem correctly and to make a suitable translational transformation for any given situation. This paper's goal is to research translational transformations in the translation of an official document. The main tasks used to achieve this goal in the current paper include the following: to identify translational transformations in the text; to determine the reasons for using the transformations; to analyze the grammatical transformations. Generally speaking, translation of specifically English grammatical constructions consists of two stages: first it is necessary to understand their meaning and then find a corresponding way of expressing it in Russian. For the purpose of translation, grammar does not exist separately. It is not the grammatical form but the grammatical meaning that is of primary concern for a translator or an interpreter. A mistake in grammar (whether it is a misunderstood construc-

tion of SL or a wrong variant in TL) always tells on the sense and logic of the text. As soon as the sense and logic of a sentence stop to be transparent it is necessary to stop and look for a mistake in the translation.

Список литературы

1. Andrew Donald Booth, Leonard Forster. 1958. Aspects of translation. London: Secker and Warburg, 1958, 145 p.

2. Andrei Fedorov. 2002. The fundamentals of the general theory of translation: Publishing House Philology Three. 2002, 416 p.

3. Andrei Fedorov. 2010. Introduction to the theory of translation: Voronezh, Publishing-Polygraphic centre of Voronezh State University. 2010, 51 p.

4. Arnold Irina Vladimirovna. 2012. Modern English Lexicology. Moscow, Flinta. Nauka. 2012, 376 p.

5. Charleston Britta M. 1960. Studies in the Emotional and Affective Means of Expression in Modern English – In: Swiss Studies in English, 46 Band, Bern, Francke Verlag. 1960, 357 p.

6. David Crystal. 2003. A dictionary of linguistics and cornwall. Phonetics lackwell Publishing. 2003, 503 p.

7. Ghelly Chernov. 1987. Theory and practice of simultaneous interpreting: Moscow. 1987, 267 p.

8. Ilya Romanovich Galperin. 2007. Text as an object of the linguistic research, 5th edition. Stereotype. Moscow. 2007, Komkniga, 144 p.

9. Irina Vladimirovna Arnold. 1986. The English Word. M., 1986, 296 p.

10. John Cunnison Catford. 1965. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London. 1965, 103 p.

11. Lev Konstantinovich Latishev. 2005. Technology of translation Moscow, Publishing House «Academy». 2005, 320 p.

12. Newmark, P., 1988. A Textbook of Translation, New York, Prentice Hall,1988.

13. Nida, Eugene, A. and Taber Charles R., 1976. A Framework for the Analysis and Evaluation of the Work of Translation, Richard W. Brislain (ed.):Translation: Application and Research, Paris, University of America Press, 1976.

14. Retsker Y.I. 2010. Theory of translation and translation practice: Moscow. 2010, 244 p.

15. Retsker Y.I. 1950. Regular conformity in translation into the native language: Moscow. 1950, 158 p.