

Қыз атаулымен байланыстыра қолданылған айқындаулар көптеп саналады, мысалы Бұқар жырауда «Оң бармағы қыналы. Омырауы жұпарлы» жолдарында, Шал ақынның «Дегдар қыз екенсің бір алма мойын, Ұрмақтан жаратылған жұпар қойын» немесе «Екінші әйел - қыналы бармақ дейтін» деген жолдарында ару саусақтарының жіңішкелігін - қыналы, омырауының әсемдігі мен хош иісін жұпарлы деген сөздерімен тіркестіре көрсетеді, сонымен қатар мойындарының әсемдігіне жоғарыда аталып өткен «алма» сөзімен қоса «талма» мойын деген эпитетті де қолданады, Шал ақын «Қыз он беске келгенде талма мойын, Он алтыда қыздардың қылса тойын», «тал» сөзінің өзі тал шыбық деген тіркестен алынған, оның негізгі мағынасы жіңішке, түзу, соған орай «тал» сөзі дене бітімінің басқа да мүшелерімен бірге тіркесіп келеді, мысалы Шал ақын «Жығып сап тал төсінді уаласам» деген жолы. Бәдәуилердің арасынан әл-Иашқаридің тамаша қасыдасының бәйіт жолдарын мысал ретінде алуымызға болады. Шайыр арудың көйлегін таза жібектен жасалынған деп мақтай отырып, оның жүрісін нәзік қозғалған құрмен, демін ару ғазел демімен теңдестіреді:

الكاعب الحسناء تر فل الدمقس وفي الحرير
فدفعتها فتدافعت مشى القطة الى الغدير
ولتمتها فتتفتست كتفتس الطيبي البهير

Көкірегі тамаша, ол сұлу да жас өзі,
Таза жібек көйлегі етегімен жерге түседі.

Мен оны жай итердім, ол нәзік қозғалды,
Бұлаққа бара жатқан құрға ұқсайды ол.

Мен оны сүйгенде, ол жай күрсінді,
Демін оның ару ғазел деміне ұқсаттым мен /4, 214/.

Ақын, жырау және бәдәуи шайырлары мұрасында өмірдегі әр алуан заттар мен құбылыстардың айрықша сипаты мен сапасын анықтан, хәм нақтылап, ерекше ажар беретін айқындаулардың (эпитеттердің) небір түрі кездесетінін көрдік. Қазақ ақын, жыраулары мен бәдәуи ақындарының эпитеттерді қолдану аясының кендігі таңғаларлық, олар сөзді айқындап қана қоймай, ерекше мазмұн сыйлаған.

1. Қасқабасов С.А. Қазақтың халық прозасы, -Алматы: Ғылым, 1984.

2. Мең К. Мусульманский ренессанс, -М: «Наука» 1973.

3. Веселовский А.Н. Историческая поэтика, -Л. 1940.

4. خ الادب الالف دكتور شوقي صيفي تاري العصر الجاهلي. الناشر: القاهرة 1993. ص. 173. 1-العربي

5. Мағауин М. Қазақ хандығы дәуіріндегі әдебиет /XV-XVIII ғғ./, хрестоматия, - Алматы: Ана тілі. 1993.

6. М. Мағауин Ғасырлар бедері (әдеби зерттеулер) – Алматы: Жазушы, 1991.

7. Х. Сүйіншиалиев VIII-XVIII ғасырлардағы қазақ әдебиеті -Алматы: Мектеп, 1989.

8. Бес ғасыр жырлайды -Алматы: Жазушы, 1989.

9. М. Жармұхамедов Көненің көзі (XI-XVIII ғғ. қазақ әдебиеті), - Алматы: Санат, 1991.

Данная статья посвящена сравнительно-сопоставительной устной поэзии арабов (доисламская поэзия) и казахов (жырау). В ней рассмотрены вопросы касающиеся эпитетов и их месту, которое они занимают в поэзии двух кочевых народов.

This article focuses on the comparative oral poetry of the Arabs (pre-Islamic poetry) and Kazakhs (zhyrau). It examines issues relating to the epithets and the place they occupy in the poetry of two nomadic peoples/

Б. Үсен

THEORY OF EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION: HISTORICAL REVIEW

Translation has been researched by many scholars from different notions of view. Some of translation scholars defined their theories a source-oriented theory, others regarded the target-oriented theories. There are also theorists who chose a place in between; however, all translation theories are related to the notion of equivalence in one way or another. Therefore, equivalence plays a crucial role in translation. In fact, both source and target languages include ranges of equivalents from the least meaningful level of a language, namely, morpheme to the big levels like sentence. In the process of translation these levels of language appear to be equivalence levels between source

language and target language. For example, if there is a word in the S.L, it must be translated into T.L at the word level usually. Accordingly, translation is the matter of establishing equivalence between S.L and T.L.

Translation developed mainly in the second half of the 20th century. Therefore, theory of equivalence has been studied scientifically from the beginning of the second half of the 20th century up to now.

The aim of this article is to review the theory of equivalence as interpreted by some of the most innovative American and European theorists in this field—Vinay and Darbelnet, Jakobson, Nida and

Taber, Komissarov, Fedorov. These theorists have studied equivalence in relation to the translation process, using different approaches, and have provided fruitful ideas for further study on this topic. Their theories will be analyzed in chronological order so that it will be easier to follow the evolution of this concept.

Vinay and Darbelnet and their definition of equivalence in translation.

Vinay and Darbelnet view equivalence-oriented translation as a procedure which 'reflects the same situation as in the original, but using completely different words'. They also suggest that, if this procedure is applied during the translation process, it can maintain the stylistic impact of the SL text in the TL text. According to them, equivalence is therefore the ideal method when the translator has to deal with proverbs, idioms, clichés, nominal or adjectival phrases and the onomatopoeia of animal sounds /1/.

With regard to equivalent expressions between language pairs, Vinay and Darbelnet claim that they are acceptable as long as they are listed in a bilingual dictionary as 'full equivalents'. However, later they note that glossaries and collections of idiomatic expressions 'can never be exhaustive'. They conclude by saying that 'the need for creating equivalences arises from the situation, and it is in the situation of the SL text that translators have to look for a solution'. Indeed, they argue that even if the semantic equivalent of an expression in the SL text is quoted in a dictionary or a glossary, it is not enough, and it does not guarantee a successful translation.

Jakobson and the concept of equivalence in difference. Roman Jakobson's study of equivalence gave new incentive to the theoretical analysis of translation since he introduced the notion of 'equivalence in difference'. He suggests three kinds of translation:

Intralingual (within one language, i.e. rewording or paraphrase) Interlingual (between two languages)

Intersemiotic (between sign systems)

Jakobson claims that, in the case of interlingual translation, the translator makes use of synonyms in order to get the ST message across. This means that in interlingual translations there is no full equivalence between code units. According to his theory, 'translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes'[2]. Jakobson goes on to say that from a grammatical point of view languages may differ from one another to a greater or lesser degree, but this does not mean that a translation cannot be possible, in other words, that the translator may face the problem of not finding a translation equivalent. He acknowledges that

'whenever there is deficiency, terminology may be qualified and developed by loanwords or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocutions'. Jakobson provides a number of examples by comparing English and Russian language structures and explains that in such cases where there is no a literal equivalent for a particular ST word or sentence, then it is up to the translator to choose the most suitable way to render it in the TT.

There seems to be some similarity between Vinay and Darbelnet's theory of translation procedures and Jakobson's theory of translation. Both theories stress the fact that, whenever a linguistic approach is no longer suitable to carry out a translation, the translator can rely on other procedures such as loan-translations, neologisms and the like. Both theories recognize the limitations of a linguistic theory and argue that a translation can never be impossible since there are several methods that the translator can choose. The role of the translator as the person who decides how to carry out the translation is emphasized in both theories. Both Vinay and Darbelnet as well as Jakobson consider the translation task as something which can always be carried out from one language to another, regardless of the cultural or grammatical differences between ST and TT.

It can be concluded that Jakobson's theory is essentially based on his semiotic approach to translation according to which the translator has to recode the ST message first and then she has to transmit it into an equivalent message for the TC.

Nida and Taber: Formal correspondence and dynamic equivalence. Nida argued that there are two different types of equivalence, namely *formal correspondence* and *dynamic equivalence*. Formal equivalence 'focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content', unlike dynamic equivalence which is based upon 'the principle of equivalent effect' /3/.

Formal equivalence consists of a TL item which represents the closest equivalent of a SL word or phrase. Nida and Taber make it clear that there are not always formal equivalents between language pairs. They therefore suggest that these formal equivalents should be used wherever possible if the translation aims at achieving formal rather than dynamic equivalence. The use of formal equivalents might at times have serious implications in the TL since the translation will not be easily understood by the target audience /4/. Nida and Taber themselves assert that typically, formal equivalence distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and therefore distorts the message, so as to cause the receptor to misunderstand or to labor unduly hard.

Dynamic equivalence is defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original in such a way that the TL wording will make the same impact on the TC audience as the original wording did upon the ST audience. They argue that 'Frequently, the form of the original text is changed; but as long as the change follows the rules of back transformation in the source language, of contextual consistency in the transfer, and of transformation in the receptor language, the message is preserved and the translation is faithful' /5/. One can easily see that Nida is in favour of the application of dynamic equivalence, as a more effective translation procedure. This is perfectly understandable if we take into account the context of the situation in which Nida was dealing with the translation phenomenon, that is to say, his translation of the Bible. Thus, the product of the translation process, that is the text in the TL, must have the same impact on the different readers it was addressing. Only in Nida and Taber's edition is it clearly stated that 'dynamic equivalence in translation is far more than mere correct communication of information'.

Despite using a linguistic approach to translation, Nida is much more interested in the message of the text or, in other words, in its semantic quality. He therefore strives to make sure that this message remains clear in the target text.

As translation theory developed mainly in 20th century, it is said to be young field of science for Russian scholars as well. As for equivalence, several scholars formed their own theories while using different approaches. Mainly Russian scholars refer to 3 different approaches, when researching the equivalence.

1. Equivalence is the identity. According to this approach the main purpose of translator is to transmit SL text to TL as accurate as possible. In the other words TL text must content all the grammar and stylistic peculiarities of SL text. But taking into consideration of languages' difference in grammar and vocabulary some scholars like Fedorov and Barkhudarov claim that "It is impossible to make SL and TL texts absolutely identical, and accurate translation may be considered as a relative conception" /6/. As a matter of fact, this approach was a basis for "The theory of untranslatability". According to this theory there are many words and expressions which cannot be translated from one language to another. Therefore, in case of untranslatable words, special ways (adaptation, borrowing, calque, compensation, paraphrase, translator's note) should be used in order to translate to TL.

2. Main part to be transmitted. According to the second approach, equivalence may be reached

by transmitting only the main part of SL text. Usually the main part of text is considered to be communication aim or described situation of SL text. In the other words, if TL text has the same communication aim or the same situation described in TL text, then translator is supposed to reach equivalence.

3. Empirical approach. The aim of this approach is to make comparative analysis of translations and original texts and to research what is the basis of their equivalence. Having made such experiment, Komissarov concluded that equivalence of various translations differs one from another, and equivalence is based on transmitting the various parts of texts.

Komissarov and his 5 levels of equivalence.

Russian scholar Komissarov offered his own "Theory of Equivalence", and it was published in 1990 in his book "Translation Theory (Linguistic aspects)". According to his theory, different relations and various levels between SL and TL text appear while translation process. Komissarov underlined the following 5 levels of equivalence:

1. Level of communication aim;
2. Level of situation description;
3. Level of expression;
4. Level of message;
5. Level of language units.

Komissarov claims, translation's equivalence is reached when all the levels are identical in both SL and TL texts /7/.

Language units of both SL and TL texts may be identical in all 5 levels or only several levels may appear. It is translator, who must decide what level to use, accounting on her knowledge, creativity and ability to estimate all the extra-linguistic aspects. Translator solves a difficult task of finding and using the right elements of equivalent units, on the basis of which both SL and TL texts will reach the same communicate purpose.

Vinogradov: Equivalence and types of translation. Another Russian scholar Vinogradov claimed, that each type of translation may have different equivalence. As we know the main 2 type of translation is Oral and Written translation. Oral translation itself has consecutive and synchronic types. In both types of oral translation low level of equivalence appears. The main factor in achieving the equivalence is the time. As in oral translation translator is practically short of time, she has to make changes in Speaker's speech, to cut some sentences and to use one word instead of idioms in order to finish speech at the same time with Speaker. In the other words oral translation's equivalence is called *reduced comparative equivalence* /8/.

Written translation has the following types:

formal and business texts, mass media texts, scientific texts, literary texts. Each type of written translation has different equivalence levels.

While translating official and business texts, translator's aim is to preserve SL text content as much as possible, and make TL text content identical. Mostly, the structure of business and official texts are defined. Sequence of sentences, introductions and conclusions, clauses and content are written according to special rules and samples. In other words, while translating official documents, translator must take into consideration every word, and try to translate each word, without making an interpretation, because addition of extra-words may cause misunderstanding and damage diplomatic relations.

While translation of mass media: newspaper or magazine articles, translator may face slangs, newspaper expressions, political and social untranslatable words, which are used by SL author, in order to express more bright any topical problem. In this case, translator aims at translation of social and political sense of articles and their social purpose. Therefore, in some cases, translator has to correct SL text's style in accordance with TL style. Hence, translator must find equivalent expressions or slangs of TL, in order to reach the same communication purpose. In such translations, equivalence is comparative, but it is higher than in oral translation.

In case of scientific articles, equivalence may be different, depending on field of science. It is explained, that the more scientific text is formalized, the higher is equivalence between SL and TL. Mostly, it takes place, in translation of mathematics, chemistry and biology texts, because that kind of texts are formed by general expressions, which related to formulas. Generally, while translation of scientific texts, translator aims at expressing an idea, logic of idea and sense of scientific doctrine, sequence of reasons. Therefore, higher level of equivalence takes place, because scientific language is general in all the languages.

Literary translation is the most complicated type of translation and it has peculiar type of equivalence. The main purpose of translator is to reach communication aim, by using literary content. TL literary text is depended on SL text but at the same time it has own peculiarities and literary description tools in the framework of TL. While translation of literary texts equivalence appears to be comparative, and translator's main purpose is to express SL author's communication aim and social content of that composition. Also translator do not have right to change stylistic structure and description tools, otherwise such translation will be considered as incompetent. To sum up, even

translator aims at keeping content's emotional, expressive and esthetical features, and even translator reaches the same affect on reader, equivalence will be comparative, moreover the level of equivalence may become lower than in the other types of translation.

The notion of equivalence is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation theory. The term has caused, and it seems quite probable that it will continue to cause, heated debates within the field of translation studies. This term has been analyzed, evaluated and extensively discussed from different points of view and has been approached from many different perspectives. The first discussions of the notion of equivalence in translation initiated the further elaboration of the term by contemporary theorists. Even the brief outline of the issue given above indicates its importance within the framework of the theoretical reflection on translation. The difficulty in defining equivalence seems to result in the impossibility of having a universal approach to this notion.

1. Vinay J.P. and Darbelnet J. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: a Methodology for Translation*, translated by J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel.- Amsterdam, 1995.
2. Jakobson R. *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*.- London, 1959.
3. Nida, Eugene A. *Towards a Science of Translating*.- London, 1964.
4. Nida, Eugene A., Taber C.R. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*.-London, 1969.
5. Nida, Eugene A. *Towards a Science of Translating*.- London, 1964.
6. Бархударов Л. С. *Язык и перевод (Вопросы общей и частной теории перевода)*.-М., 1975.
7. Комиссаров В.Н. *Теория перевода*.- М., 1990.
8. Виноградов В. С. *Перевод. Общие и лексические вопросы*.-М., 2004.

Аударманың эквиваленттік теориясының негізгі сипаттары және түпнұсқа мен аударма арасындағы эквиваленттіктің түрлері тілаларлық коммуникация аймағында орын алатын аударма спецификасымен анықталады. Екі тілдік жүйенің арақатынасы ретінде аударманың жалпы сипаттамасы және осы ұғымнан пайда болатын барлық қорытындылар аударма эквиваленттігіне байланысты болады.

Характерные черты теории эквивалентности перевода и типы эквивалентных отношений между исходным и конечным текстом обусловлены спецификой перевода как лингвистического явления, происходящего в рамках межъязыковой коммуникации. Общая характеристика перевода, определяющая перевод как соотнесенное функционирование двух языковых систем, и вытекающие из этого определения выводы распространяются на любой акт эквивалентности перевода.