

- 3 Buribaeva M.A. *Tyurkizmy v russkom yazyke: ot variantov k norme* [Turkisms in the Russian language: from variants to the norm] (Moscow, 2014). [in Russian]
- 4 Eker, S. *Çağdaş Türk Dili* [Contemporary Turkic Language] (Ankara, 2021) [in Turkish]
- 5 Miklosich F. (1884) *Die tiirkischen Elemente in der siidost-und osteuro- paischen Sprachen* (Griechisch, Albanisch, Rumanisch, Bulgarisch, Serbisch, Kleinrussisch, Grossrussisch, Polnisch), [The Turkish elements in the Southeast and Eastern European languages (Greek, Albanian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Little Russian, Great Russian, Polish)] I. - *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe*, Bd 34. Wien, 1884; II. - Bd 35; Wien, 1885; Nachtrag I. - Bd 37. Wien, 1889; Nachtrag II. - Bd 38. Wien, 1890]. [in German]
- 6 Karaağaç, G. *Türkçe Verintiler Sözlüğü* [Dictionary of Turkic Words] (Ankara, 2008) [in Turkish]
- 7 Malcolm, N. (2002), *Bosnia a Short History*, Pan Book, London. [in English]
- 8 Qalnazarov A. «Baluan» sözi qajdan shyqqan? (I bөlim) [Where does the word "baluan" come from? (Part I)]. Available at: <https://silteme.kz/index.php/baska/netokratiya/item/4063-baluan-s-zi-ajdan-shy-an-i-b-lim?fbclid=IwAR0pPsLYvWECQ4kUQ2fAhGSTByfPME9gFtcFihs8sGURY3Mi-Q7Qbofnslw> [in Kazakh] (accessed 08.11.2023)
- Ysqakov A., Syzdykova R., Sarybaev SH. *Qazaq tiliningysqasha etimologiyalyq sözdigi*. [Brief etymological dictionary of the Kazakh language] Gylym. (Almaty, 1966). [in Kazakh]

Received: 04.06.2024

MPHTI 16.31.41

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2024/iss2pp20-31](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss2pp20-31)

**A.A. Aldabergenova<sup>1</sup>, G.G. Gizdatov<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, 050000, Republic of Kazakhstan

### **CULTURAL TRANSFER IN SEMIOTIC MODEL OF TRANSLATION (ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE LITERARY TEXT OF J. HELLER)**

*The goal of the work is to identify the influence of temporary discursive practices on specific translation decisions. From this goal follow specific tasks in this work: to present discursive and interpretive models of translation; correlate the provisions of these concepts with real translation practice; use factual material to show translation decisions determined by temporary discursive practice. The article also explores ways to convey culturally significant information, provides successful and controversial cases of solving translation tasks through linguistic means. Translation problems, including literary translation, in contemporary philological and cultural studies are interdisciplinary. Only at the intersection of semiotic concepts and literary approaches it is possible to determine the accuracy and completeness of translation decisions in the practice of literary translation. In turn, the study of the issue of cultural transfer in this case, based on various translations of J. Heller's novel, allows us to overcome the limiting framework of purely philological approach in translation studies. Comparing the work of translators with respect to the same text - in our case, "Catch-22" fills the-abstract concept of the "translator's figure" with real content, especially when considering the socio-cultural environment that influenced the specificity of translation decisions. The article represents an analysis of current issues in the theory and practice of literary translation. The work offers a review of modern translation models, primarily a discursive model of translation, interpretative concept and the perception of translation as an interpretation of the source text in the existing discursive practice.*

*This research is funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP23485752).*

*Key words: cultural transfer, discourse, interpretation, J. Heller, literary translation, methods of translation, semiotics.*

## MAIN PROVISIONS

The study of translation as a social activity involves an appeal to established traditions in humanitarian paradigms. At the outset, it is essential to underscore the importance of examining the presence of a literary text and its translation in the cultural context through the lens of cultural turns theory. Within this framework, the semiotic theory of text perception by Yu.M. Lotman [1] serves as a fundamental theory in our context. Additionally, N.S. Avtonomova's concept [2] of the culturological intersection in translation emerged as a derivative of this theory, forming the basis for the author's "second-order" decision theory. Consequently, the field of literary translation studies, encompassing both its theoretical and practical dimensions, should encompass an exploration of cultural memory, as well as the theory and application of mediological analysis and cultural transfer. This includes a comprehensive examination of the lexical, stylistic, syntactic, and textual elements in the practice of translating absurdity in literature.

Furthermore, making specific translation decisions necessitates an understanding of the core translation codes by the translator. These codes can be categorized as general memory, informativeness, identity, truth, and the completeness or incompleteness of the description, all contributing to the semantic coherence of the translation process.

This article attempts to compare two translations of a famous novel by Joseph Heller (1923-1999) – "Catch-22" [3], made by translators with a difference of twenty years [4; 5]. The first edition was reprinted only once in 1992; however, the novel in the translation by Andrey Kistyakovskiy, has been published to date in 12 editions (from 1988 to 2022). It is advisable to give a brief description of the original literary work, which influenced the post-war generation of Americans.

Published for the first time in the United States in 1961, "Catch-22" is a satirical novel centered around the experiences of US Air Force pilots during World War II. The narrative showcases a plethora of eccentric personalities and illogical predicaments linked to the concept of "Catch-22" within the military regulations. It does not exist on paper, but from this it is no less effective. It states that anyone who evades a combat mission is normal and, therefore, fit for military. The time of the novel's release coincided with the Vietnam War, height of the Cold War, formation of the pacifist movement significantly influenced its perception. The main character of the novel Yossarian, at every opportunity convenient for him, tries to evade further sorties, but in accordance with the notorious amendment he is always recognized as healthy.

The sense of helplessness and harassment in front of the omnipotent state bureaucratic machine, which determined the conceptual content of the novel, made this text close to both the American and Russian, especially post-Soviet Russian-speaking readers.

## INTRODUCTION

Semiotic forms of conveying the source text include reception, interpretation, cultural transfer, and/or literary translation, which are always interconnected and interdependent. The theoretical and practical dimensions of translating literary texts, including works in the genre of absurd literature, remain inadequately explored, yet they hold significance within the contemporary philological framework. These facets carry methodological importance for the ongoing processes of intercultural communication. Hence, the relevance of this article lies in its engagement with a fundamental issue within the realm of humanitarian knowledge – the interplay between the challenges of comprehension and translation, and the role of translation discourse in representing the author's text. The article delves into a pertinent matter in Translation Studies, namely, the intricacies of translating fictional texts and the delicate balance between preserving the author's original intent and accommodating the target language. The research focuses on the translation practices applied to American absurdity literature. The subject of the investigation revolves around the functional and linguocultural facets

associated with translations of Joseph Heller's novel "Catch-22," particularly within the context of discursive practice. The primary objective of this paper is to scrutinize the functional and linguocultural characteristics evident in the translations of J. Heller's novel, with a specific focus on the influence of temporary discursive practices.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The German researcher Doris Bachmann-Medick identifies seven turns that determined the state of modern cultural sciences: interpretative, performative, reflective, postcolonial, translational, spatial and pictorial / iconic [6]. Only in such a context translation appears for research as an author's linguacreative activity carried out in specific temporary discursive practices. A similar approach also allows us to explain the occurrence or rejection of a foreign text in another culture.

It is noteworthy to highlight that, until recently, the comparison of linguistic analysis primarily indicated a formal level of semantic and stylistic similarity between source and translated texts. Presently, there is a shift from philological-linguistic translation studies towards the concept of "cultural translation," which introduces well-defined categories and assessment criteria. Traditional literary translation concepts, such as originality, equivalence, and "fidelity," have gradually been complemented or even substituted by emerging central categories of cultural translation, including cultural representation and transformation, foreignness and dissimilarity, transposition, cultural disparities, and influence [6, 285].

These overarching theoretical principles align with the viewpoints of Russian philosopher and translator N. S. Avtonomova. According to her interpretation, translation always entails the crossing of boundaries, not solely linguistic (which is taken for granted), but also cultural, social, historical, and other dimensions [2]. In the context of this article, this concept functions as a second-order theory that deals with specific derivatives of ideal concepts. Finally, the most important thing for further exposition is that translation always involves a number of interconnected operations, but the most important of them is this or that form of interpretation. The last statement does not contradict the standard postulates that have been established in translation studies: In the process of translation, two texts are combined into a single communicative whole [7, 10].

The methodology of the study includes both classical approaches of translation theory [7] and the latest concepts that develop classical approaches [2; 8]. In this case, the identified methods of translation solutions receive additional understanding using new previously unstudied material.

Translation is inherently reliant on the interpretation of the text, serving as a central procedure in all forms of translation, including literary translation. In accordance with Yu. M. Lotman's perspective, a literary text can be regarded as a meticulously structured mechanism capable of containing exceptionally dense and concentrated information [1, 360]. The choice of specific translation decisions is influenced by the principles of determinism stated in the theory of semiotics: 1) common memory; 2) the same forecasting of the future; 3) informational content; 4) identity; 5) truth; 6) incomplete description; 7) semantic connectivity [9, 232-236]. This is the case when the reader is interested not so much in the language of translation as in the attitude that this language conveys.

These principles serve as objective guidelines for interpreting texts during translation practice. In author's approach we acknowledge that translated texts are products of foreign cultures, encompassing social, aesthetic, and axiological dimensions [10, 11]. As a follower of Yu. M. Lotman, Russian cultural scientist V. Rudnev writes: [...] the participants of communication – the sender, addressee, channel of information, should be immersed in semiotic space, that is, have previous semiotic cultural experience [12, 588-559].

By applying these principles and insights, we aim to facilitate accurate and culturally resonant translations that effectively convey the intended meanings and nuances of the original text.

## RESULTS

It is advisable to highlight that the analysis of translations of J. Heller's novel has not been the subject of separate scientific consideration, except for the article by M. Lorie. In turn, a comparative analysis of two translations of a single text by an American novelist was also conducted for the first time [13].

It is worth to mention, that any comments, memoirs, reviews of the translators themselves: Mark Vilensky, Vladimir Titov (translation of 1967) and Andrei Kistyakovskiy (translation of 1988) about these texts did not survive. In the realm of applied works, it is imperative to highlight the singular commentary by M.F. Lorie dedicated to the errors present in the 1967 translation [14]. Undoubtedly, American studies are also significant, in general terms affecting the literary aspects of Joseph Heller's work, including those relating to the *school of black humor* [15]. The writer's comments on his work provide a more accurate understanding of his main ideas. The most important and timeless thing in it is that the anti-war installations of the book are simultaneously anti-government.

According to the main idea, the main character and the literary techniques used in the work it is most accurate to attribute the work of J. Heller to the "rebellious" novel. In his interview in 1976, the writer just spoke of the symbolic application of his satirical fervor to all structures of the state: Almost all the psychological settings of the book, suspicion and distrust of government officials, the feeling that you are a helpless victim, an understanding of that most government agencies are simply lying to you — were determined by the experience I gained during World War II when I served as a scorer [16, 387].

The main idea of the book is the meaninglessness of any war. This is really a look at the war of an individual, for whom the enemies are all those who want to kill him and / or send him to certain death.

In relation to these two interpretations of the same novel, one can speak of two different levels of equivalence in translation, conditioned and reflecting the discursive practice of their time. Further, it is advisable to mention the terms of Yu. M. Lotman about general and different codes [1] to two translations. In our opinion, the 1967 translation refers to the type when a different code emerged as an outcome of the translation process, when the receptor - in our case, translators (M. Vilensky and V. Titov) impose their own literary language on the text, and to the reader their own ideological and moral vision, as a result, the author's text is transcoded. In turn, the second translation (A. Kistyakovskiy) builds a common code between the author and his reader.

The novel was printed in the USSR in the 1960s. It was published for the sole reason that it seemed exclusively anti-American then, which the first translators tried to convey, imposing their vision on the original. In a manner peculiar only to the Soviet writer, the author of the preface of the first translation wrote about this attitude: Joseph Heller's novel is a work of great revealing power that deeply shows all the falsity, rot and viciousness of the so-called *free world*, the notorious *American democracy* [4, 5].

According to the first translation, the very proximity of the Soviet simulated reality to the absurd reality embodied in the American novel, simply cannot be understood by the reader. Perhaps this explains the practical absence of traces of the first translation of the novel in the Soviet sociocultural space.

Different translations of one novel received different names. M. Vilensky and V. Titov called it "Ulovka - 22", and A. Kistyakovskiy – "Popravka - 22". "Catch" in the English language has two meanings: first is *trick*, and the second is *amendment, reservation*. The author of the novel himself works with both contexts of the use of the word, while the meaning of the word grows in front of the reader. At first glance, it seems that the early translation correctly conveys the essence of the bureaucratic conflict, but this option only simplifies the reader immediately with the assessment and conclusion that he himself must come while reading the text. In the end, Catch - 22 turned into law: they can do with us whatever they want, and we cannot interfere "them" from doing this [16, 387]. Then "Catch" is no longer a loophole in the law, but the law itself, and translating the name as "Catch - 22" conveys the key idea of the novel. It is no coincidence that one of the first critics of the novel

A.M. Zverev, long before the second translation appeared, proposed to name the novel “Point - 22” [17, 186]. The Russian version of the film (1970) and the series (2019) also preserved a simplifying translation of the name “Ulovka - 22”. From this title of the novel, and then the contextual use of the word, the main idea of the novelist is lost.

## DISCUSSION

In our opinion, literary translation, as one of the forms of cultural transfer, is impossible without the interpretation of the text - this is its main procedure. Among those close to this stated position, concepts stand out in which translation practice is presented from the standpoint of discursive semiotics [18]. In many cases, in the early translation of the novel, also as in the case of translation of the title, translation decisions are inaccurate, and sometimes they miss the main idea of the literary work. We can compare it, for example, with the title of a famous film which was relatively recently transformed “Lost in translation” – “Difficulties in translation”, when translated into Russian box office. Although it was obvious that we are talking about losses (lost) in the translation.

In general, each of the translated versions of the book reflected its discursive practice and era: the first is the end of the 60s, when the snow break is already leaving, the era of hypocrisy and formal censorship sets in; the second is the beginning of the 90s with faith in a living word then, the first discovered liberal values of another world. However, the translation of the novel itself began in the era of “conserved space and time”. As a result, only the second translation of the novel, together with the long-standing film and TV series of 2019, beneath our very eyes begin to enter the cultural field of the Russian reader.

At the same time, undoubtedly, translators demonstrate different strategies of linguistic (functional) translation techniques. The most apparent distinction lies in the following aspects. M. Vilensky and V. Titov employ sentence partitioning and integration techniques, thereby formally retaining the author’s style of succinctness, lucidity, and concision. Conversely, A. Kistyakovsky largely disregards these methods, yet his translation doesn’t appear cumbersome, as he adeptly employs the compensation approach. Methodically, A. Kistyakovsky delves into specifics and strives for textual concretization. Let’s examine the subsequent example. The sentence “The silence seemed bottomless when he stopped talking” [3, 126] in the translation of A. Kistyakovsky sounds clearly: *Kogda on umolk, vocarilas’ pochti bezdonnaja tishina* [5, 158]. However, the translation of M. Vilensky and V. Titov inaccurately conveys the situation itself and transfers silence as an action from listeners to the speakers, casually pointing them in plural form: *Oni zamolchali. So storony kazalos’, chto oni nikogda uzhe bol’she ne raskrojut rta* [4, 128].

M. Vilensky and V. Titov adhere closely to the original narrative, aiming for maximal fidelity, whereas A. Kistyakovsky offers a more distant rendition to the reader. Simultaneously, M. Vilensky and V. Titov occasionally omit the translation of specific elements of American life, whereas A. Kistyakovsky, in contrast, endeavors to depict them with utmost precision. It is interesting to cite the cultural transformations and representations that translators turn to. The first translation was not without blunders. In the original text there is a question about communion: *Did you have a priest?* [3, 183]. In the first translation, this question sounds incomprehensible to the reader at all: *U tebja est’ svjashhennik?* [4, 205]. Although in reality it was assumed otherwise, which is given in the second translation: *Svjashhennik u tebja byl? – osvedomilsja brat* [5, 266].

In any translation, in addition to semantic accuracy and adequacy, the linguistic correlation of the translation constructions with the original is also significant. We cannot pass by the incorrect transfer of time in the translation of M. Vilensky and V. Titov. So, in the original “I used to get a big kick out of saving people’s lives” [3, 126], the action is given in the past tense. Then the next sentence begins with “now”, in the translation of 1967 given in the present tense “*Znaete, bol’she vsego ja radujus’, kogda spasaju cheloveku zhizn*” [4, 128], and the significant difference for the author between the hero’s past and present habit simply disappears. In the translation of A. Kistyakovsky, this sentence according to the tense are transmitted correctly: *Ran’she ja s ogromnoj radost’ju spasal ljudjam zhizn’* [5, 158].

Linguistic mistakes in the first translation led to a conceptual discrepancy. So, the general conclusion reached by the well-known translator M. F. Lorie: Gradually, almost imperceptibly, one novel from page to page is actually replaced by another – with other characters, different intonation, different meaning [14, 350]. We think that we can and should agree with this, but it still needs to be proved, as by the time of analyzing of mistakes of the first translation there was no new interpretation of the book. Moreover, in our opinion, we need to remember the external and internal conditions of translation, the time of its creation, the context in which it was read or is being read, and, as a result, always indicate the inevitable manipulative translation strategies.

A very unsteady concept in the theory of literary translation from culture to culture can be traced from translations of descriptive fragments and dialogues in the novel. Moreover, in the original text play of words is not as important as the play with meaning. Which also exists. The latter is always difficult to convey in translation. There is an absurd dialogue in Chapter 2:

I'm a real, slam-bang, honest-to-goodness, three-fisted humdinger. I'm a bona fide supraman.  
Superman? Clevinger cried.

Superman?

Supraman, Yossarian corrected.

Hey, fellas, cut it out, Nately begged with embarrassment.

Everybody's looking at us.

You're crazy, Clevinger" [3, 22].

Ja – podlinnyj, gromopodobnyj, chistejšij dushoj mnogorukij Vishnu. Ja verh cheloveka. – Chto? – zakrichal Klevindzher. – Sverhchelovek? – Verh cheloveka, – popravil Jossarian. – Slushajte, rebjata, prekratite, – vzmolilsja vstrevozhennyj Nejtli. – Na nas vse smotrjat. – Ty rehnulsja! [4, 27].

[...] velichajšij iz velichajših. Groznyj, neistovyj, samyj-raspresamyj trehkulachnyj pobedimchel'. Ja sverhchelooverh.

Ty? Sverhchelovek? – vskinulsja Klevindzher.

Sverhchelooverh, – popravil ego Jossarian. – Da prekratite vy, radi boga, – prositel'no zabormotal Netli.

Vse i tak uzhe na nas pjaljatsja. – Ty psih! [5, 27].

In this instance, J. Heller employs wordplay and puns, and culminates the dialogue with an allusion, effectively conveying the dialogue's inherent absurdity between the characters. N. S. Avtonomova, in her work, underscores the central challenge of translating a literary text, positing it as a matter of prioritizing the primary and secondary aspects. In every translation, the translator is compelled to relinquish specifics to safeguard the entirety, sacrificing secondary elements to uphold the core essence [2, 609]. How did the translators try to keep this most important thing? Translators M. Vilensky, V. Titov and A. Kistyakovsky replay with letters, swap places and try to play upon words. The words *superman* and *supraman* in the early translation of the text do not even turn into *sverhcheloveka*, but *verh chelovek*, and in the version of A. Kistyakovsky turned into *Sverhchelooverh*. We think the last option is the most ridiculous and accurate in meaning. A. Kistyakovsky's translation can be characterized as fundamentally "recipient-adequate," encompassing the dual role of impacting both the recipient and the original text. It conveys the author's aesthetic intentions within the literary text and preserves its communicative and functional impact. In these cases, we observe not only patterns of translation plurality. The second translation simultaneously conveys the surreal humor of the novel and sad, and rollicking gaiety, insanity, severity and melancholy of the author's style, which cannot be said about the fragment of the first translation, which simultaneously introduces cultural information (multi-armed Vishnu), which is completely absent in the original.

Translation of the 60s obviously represents that discursive situation when public discourse is monopolized, and therefore the translation vocabulary is limited and stereotyped. Certainly, in any translation, you always have to refuse something in the original text and, in certain cases, turn to adaptation or retelling. However, in Soviet translation practice, the following methods of translation solutions are found that are close to the propaganda methods: automatic censorship of the original, cultural transformations and representations, omissions, united, in our opinion, by the general concept

of the silence policy. In the same row there are the impoverishment of the language, the elements of bureaucratic language, the craving for generally accepted stereotypes that distinguished the linguistic style prevalent during the Soviet era as a whole.

In translation practice, this is manifested even in that Puritan self-censorship, which abounds in the early translation, which creates, as a result, ambiguities and inaccuracies in the perception of the plot and ideas of the novel.

From a logical standpoint, it is more effective to demonstrate this in different translations of names of the chapters (42 chapters in total), indicated by the names of those heroes that are discussed in a particular chapter. The system of images that stand behind them is very important. The basic idea of the novel at the same time receives confirmation and development behind the chaos of names, random appearances of characters, its own system. The novel's characters possess names and surnames that are indicative of their nature, and their physical attributes and personality traits are portrayed in a grotesque manner. Each character holds significance for the author, not merely as a socio-psychological archetype, but as a conveyer of a distinct worldview. In this scenario, what holds significance is not solely comprehending and conveying American realities, but what kind of translation solution the translator finds to preserve the reader's attitude to what the writer is talking about (1 – first translation; 2 – second translation):

Chapter 6. Hungry Joe. 1. Zamorysh Dzho. 2. Obzhora Dzho.

Chapter 11. Captain Black. 1. Kapitan Bljek. 2. Kapitan Gnus.

Chapter 14. Kid Sampson. 1. Malysh Sjempson. 2. Kroha Sjempson.

Chapter 15 Piltchard & Wren. 1. Piltchard i Ren. 2. Ptichkard i Krabbs.

Chapter 22. Nately's Old Man. 1. Starik lejtenanta Nejtli. 2. Otec Netli.

Chapter 28. Peckem. 1. Pekkem. 2. Dolbing.

Chapter 34. Milo the Militant. 1. Milou rvetsja v boj. 2. Milo-voitel'.

Chapter 35. The Cellar. 1. Podval. 2. Kazemat.

Chapter 40. 1. Snowden. 1. Snouden. 2. Sneggi.

As you can see, the differences are not related to stylistic distinctions or shades of meaning: in the first version, there is either an inaccurate characterization of the character (chapter 6), or you can observe a not very successful character designation (chapters 14, 22, 34). All the military in the novel are divided into two worlds: scoundrels and their victims. That is why Andrei Kistyakovsky refuses to transliterate “kapitan Bljek” (chapter 11), because *black*, in addition to the main meaning *black*, also means *dirty, gloomy, dull, ugly, evil, vicious*. Summing up all these meanings, he continues the synonymous series and finds the meaning *gnusnyj* (chapter 11). “To peck” in English means *pilit', dolbit', klevat' kogo-libo*. All these values correspond to the true essence of the general. A. Kistyakovsky likens the meaning of the Russian language word *dolbit'* into the English language system, and in translation appears *general Dolbing* (chapter 28). The transfer of grotesque characters in this way needs to be recognized as justified.

With a shift of emphasis in translation the conceptual ideas that are conveyed by linguistic means are also important. Through the translation equivalents created by A. A. Kistyakovsky, a deliberate effort can be discerned in actively engaging readers in foreign modes of thought and cultural symbolization practices. Effectively, this translation serves as a pertinent cultural practice for our contemporary era.

The gaps, the misunderstandings are set already from the first pages of the 1967 translation. The playful-epic preface to it, significant for the general understanding of the novel, is simply omitted in the first translation, but it precisely conveys the author's rival attitude to the events described. Only excessive caution can explain the omission of the first sentences of the first chapter on Yossarian's affection for the chaplain, and not an abridged version of the translation. Possible worlds for understanding by the Soviet reader diverge. The cultural-value and emotional assessment from the translator in relation to the original text appears either blurred or truncated. The craving for generally accepted stereotypes is the “manner of understanding things”, which consequently results in many words and language formulas of the first translation are no longer able to evoke images. The discursive practice of the first translation offers the reader only work with worn-out images, in

contrast to the second translation, in which the author's vision was painstakingly preserved, and the chaplain's figure is remembered immediately by readers.

In the early translation, there are completely inexplicable and unacceptable reductions. Following the 1967 translation to the realistic translation settings played a cruel joke. The difference is in how phrases are built and what they keep from the original. If in the first translation the neutral cautious "Ja budu derzhat' uho vostro", in the 1988 translation more rebellious "Ja im ne damsja". The tragedy of the existence of the hero in this bureaucratic and absurd world is transmitted only in a late translation.

## CONCLUSION

Every translator is guided by their intended reader, for whom the text must not only be engaging but also comprehensible. The influence of temporary discursive practice on specific translation decisions was revealed in the functional aspect. In this regard, such translation decisions in the translation of M.Vilensky and V.Titov are defined as: a) ideological censoring of the original; b) cultural transformations and representations; c) omissions; d) change in meaning and other translation transformations implemented in the first translation as a description of a different social and cultural experience through empty or incomplete templates.

The translation of 1967's belongs to the type when, as a result of the translation, a different code was formed, when the perceiver – in our case, the translators (M.Vilensky and V.Titov) impose their literary language on the text, and their ideological and moral vision to the reader, as a result, the author's text is recoded. The translation practice of the 1960's obviously represents a discursive situation, when public discourse is monopolized, and accordingly, the translation lexicon is limited and stereotyped. In our opinion, the influence of dominant ideologies on the practice of literary translation, especially in the English-Russian pair, should, in the future, become the subject of independent scientific consideration.

In turn, the translation of A.Kistyakovsky builds a common code between the author and the reader. Actually, this translation is a topical cultural practice for our time. The translation by A.Kistyakovsky (1988) is essentially a "receptively-adequate translation", in other words, it affects the recipient in the same way as the original text, evokes the same emotions and conveys the aesthetic intentions of the author and the communicative-functional effect of his text. The translation of A.Kistyakovsky turns out to be equivalent to the original due to: a) the preservation and recreation of a single semantic space (the conceptual idea of the novel, the language practice of symbolization) presented in the interpretive activity of the translator, and also b) common cultural codes presented in the original and translated texts; c) translation solutions are equivalent to the author's intention.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Lotman, Yu. M. (1970), *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta* [The Structure of literary text]. – M.: Iskusstvo.
- 2 Avtonomova, N.S. (2017), *Poznaniye i perevod. Opyty filosofii yazyka* [Cognition and Translation. Experiences of the philosophy of language]. – M.: Sankt-Peterburg, Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ.
- 3 Heller, J. (1994), *Catch-22*. – London, Vintage books.
- 4 Heller, J. (1967), *Ulovka-22* [Catch-22] / trans. by. M. Vilenskii, V. Titov. – M.: Voennoe izdatel'stvo.
- 5 Heller, J. (2015), *Popravka-22* [Catch-22] / trans. by A. Kistyakovski. – M.: AST.
- 6 Bakhmann-Medik, D. (2017), *Kul'turnye povoroty. Novye orientiry v naukakh o kul'ture* [Cultural Turns. New Landmarks in the Cultural Science]. – M.: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.
- 7 Komissarov, V. N. (2019), *Oppozitsiya "bukval'nyi" i "svobodnyi (vol'nyi)" perevod v sovremennom perevodovedenii* [The Opposition "Literal" and "Free (Unbound)" Translation in Modern Translation Studies]. – M.: Mosty. Zhurnal perevodchikov, vol. 3, pp.3-12.



- 8 Garbovskij N. K., Kostikova O. I. Perevod i obshhestvo // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Ser. 22: Teorija perevoda. 2018. № 1. S. 17-40.
- 9 Revzina, O. G. and Revzin, I. I. (1971), Semioticheskii eksperiment na stsene [Semiotic experiment on stage]. Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo universiteta. Trudy po znakovym sistemam. – Tartu, Vypusk V. pp.232-254.
- 10 Gizdatov, G. and Sopiaeva, B. (2018), Discourse and Identity in the Medial Space of Kazakhstan. Media Education (Mediaobrazovanie), vol. 4, 29-38. DOI: 10.13187/me.2018.4.29
- 11 Murašov, J. (2016), Das unheimliche Auge der Schrift. Mediologische Analysen zu Literatur, film und Kunst in Russland. – München, WilhelmFink.
- 12 Rudnev, V. (2017), Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' kul'tury XX veka [Encyclopedic Dictionary of Culture of the XX Century]. – Sankt-Peterburg: Azbuka, Azbuka-Attikus.
- 13 Gizdatov G.G., Aldabergenova A.A. (2021), Diskursivnye interpretacii romana Dzh. Hellera «Popravka-22» v perevodcheskoj praktike». Kritika i semiotika. Scopus. – № 2. str. 160–177. DOI 10.25205/2307-1737-2021-2-160-177 ISSN 2307-1737
- 14 Lorie, M. F. (1970), Ulovki perevodchikov [Translator Tricks]. – M.: Sovetskii pisatel'. Masterstvo perevoda, pp.334-358.
- 15 Seed, D. (1989), The Fiction of Joseph Heller: Against the Grain. – Hampshire, Macmillan press.
- 16 Heller, J. (2013), Popravka-22 nachinaetsya [Catch-22 Begins]. Heller Joseph. Popravka za popravkoi. – M.: AST, pp.386-389.
- 17 Zverev, A. M. (1968), Malen'kii chelovek i bezumnyi mir [Little Man and Crazy World]. Inostrannaya literature, vol. 2, pp.180-188.
- 18 Gizdatov, G. G., Kim, S. K. (2024) Translation of the absurdist literature as an example of cultural transfer (“Cases” by Daniil Kharmis in Korean translations), Slovo.ru: Baltic accent, Vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 158-171. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2024-1-9.

Received: 13.06.2024

### **Аударманың семиотикалық моделіндегі мәдени трансфер (дж.хеллердің көркем әдеби мәтіні мысалында)**

А.А. Алдабергенова<sup>1</sup>, Г.Г. Гиздатов<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті, Алматы, 050000, Қазақстан Республикасы

*Бұл жұмыстың мақсаты – уақыттық дискурсивтік тәжірибелердің нақты аударма шешімдеріне әсерін анықтау. Осы мақсаттан келесідей нақты міндеттер туындайды: аударманың дискурсивті және интерпретациялық үлгілерін ұсыну; осы ұғымдардың ережелерін нақты аударма тәжірибесімен салыстыру; уақытша дискурсивтік тәжірибемен анықталған аударма шешімдерін көрсету үшін фактілік материалдарды пайдалану. Мақалада мәдени маңызды ақпаратты беру жолдары қарастырылып, лингвистикалық құралдарды қолдану арқылы аударма мәселелерін шешудің сәтті және даулы жағдайлары қарастырылған. Қазіргі филология және мәдениеттану зерттеулерінде аударма мәселелері, оның ішінде көркем аударма пәнаралық болып табылады. Көркем аударма тәжірибесінде аударма шешімдерінің дәлдігі мен толықтығын семиотикалық ұғымдар мен әдеби тәсілдер тоғысқан жерінде ғана анықтауға болады. Өз кезегінде, бұл жағдайда мәдени трансфер мәселесін Дж.Хеллер романының аударма материалы бойынша зерттеу аударматанудағы таза филологиялық көзқарастың шектеуші шеңберін еңсеруге мүмкіндік береді. Аудармашылардың жұмысын бір мәтінге қатысты салыстыру – біздің жағдайда «Catch-22» – әсіресе аударма шешімдерінің ерекшеліктеріне әсер еткен әлеуметтік-мәдени ортаға сілтеме жасағанда «аудармашы тұлғасы» деген абстрактілі ұғымды нақты мазмұнмен толтырады. Мақалада көркем аударма теориясы мен тәжірибесінің өзекті мәселелеріне талдау жасалған. Сонымен қатар, аударманың қазіргі үлгілеріне шолу жасалып, бірінші*

*кезекте аударманың дискурсивті моделі, әрі интерпретациялық концепциясы да талдауға алынды, дискурсивті тәжірибеде аударманы бастапқы мәтінді интерпретациялау ретінде қабылдау ұсынылады.*

*Зерттеуді Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігінің ғылым комитеті (грант № AP23485752) қаржыландырады.*

*Кілт сөздер: мәдени трансфер, дискурс, интерпретация, Дж. Хеллер, көркем аударма, аударма әдістері, семиотика.*

## ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

- 1 Лотман Ю.М. Көркем мәтіннің құрылымы. – М.: Искусство, 1970.
- 2 Автономова Н.С. Таным және аударма. Тіл философиясындағы тәжірибелер. – М.: Санкт-Петербург: Гуманитарлық бастамалар орталығы, 2017. – 736 б.
- 3 Heller, J. (1994), Catch-22. – London, Vintage books.
- 4 Хеллер Дж. Айла – 22 / ағыл. тілінен аударған М. Виленский және В. Титов. – М.: Әскери баспахана, 1967. – 488 б.
- 5 Хеллер Дж. Түзету – 22 / ағыл. тілінен аударған А. Кистяковский. – М.: АСТ, 2015. – 672 б.
- 6 Бахман-Медик Д. Мәдени бетбұрыстар. Мәдениет ғылымындағы жаңа нұсқаулар. – М.: Жаңа әдеби шолу, 2017. – 504 б.
- 7 Комиссаров В.Н. Қазіргі аударматанудағы «сөзбе-сөз» және «еркін (еркін)» аударманың қарама-қайшылығы // Мосты. – М.: Р.Валент, 2019. – No3 (63). – 3-12 бб.
- 8 Гарбовский Н. К., Костикова О. И. Аударма және қоғам // Мәскеу университетінің хабаршысы. Сер. 22: Аударма теориясы. 2018. – № 1. 17-40бб.
- 9 Ревзина О.Г., Ревзин И.И. Сахнадағы семиотикалық эксперимент // Тарту университетінің ғылыми жазбалары. Белгі жүйелеріндегі еңбектер. - Тарту. Т. V. 1971. – 232-254 б.
- 10 Gizdatov, G. and Sopiaeva, B. (2018), Discourse and Identity in the Medial Space of Kazakhstan. Media Education (Mediaobrazovanie), vol. 4, 29-38. DOI: 10.13187/me.2018.4.29
- 11 Murašov, J. (2016), Das unheimliche Auge der Schrift. Mediologische Analysen zu Literatur, film und Kunst in Russland. – München, WilhelmFink.
- 12 Руднев В. 20 ғасыр мәдениетінің энциклопедиялық сөздігі. – Петербург: Азбука, Азбука-Аттикус, 2017. – 864 б.
- 13 Гиздатов Г.Г., Алдабергенова А.А. (2021), Аударма тәжірибесінде Дж.Хеллердің «Попраавка-22» романының дискурсивті интерпретациялары. Критика және семиотика. Скопус. – № 2. 160–177бб. DOI 10.25205/2307-1737-2021-2-160-177 ISSN 2307-1737
- 14 Лорие М. Аудармашы айлалары // Аударма шеберлігі. – М.: Совет жазушысы, 1970. – 334-358 бб.
- 15 Seed, D. (1989), The Fiction of Joseph Heller: Against the Grain. – Hampshire, Macmillan press.
- 16 Хеллер Дж. Түзетуден кейінгі түзету /ағыл. тілінен аударған С.Б. Ильин. – М.: АСТ, 2013. – 412б.
- 17 Зверев А. М. Кішкентай адам және ессіз әлем // Шетел әдебиеті. – 1968. №2. – 180-188 бб.
- 18 Gizdatov, G. G., Kim, S. K. (2024) Translation of the absurdist literature as an example of cultural transfer (“Cases” by Daniil Kharms in Korean translations), Slovo.ru: Baltic accent, Vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 158-171. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2024-1-9.

Материал 13.06.2024 баспаға түсті

**Культурный трансфер в семиотической модели перевода (на примере художественного текста Дж. Хеллера)**

А.А. Алдабергенова<sup>1</sup>, Г.Г. Гиздатов<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, 050000, Республика Казахстан

*Цель работы – выявить влияние временных дискурсивных практик на конкретные переводческие решения. Из этой цели следуют конкретные задачи в данной работе: представить дискурсивные и интерпретативные модели перевода; соотнести положения этих концепций в реальной переводческой практикой; на фактическом материале показать переводческие решения, обусловленные временной дискурсивной практикой. Также в статье исследуются способы передачи культурно значимой информации, приводятся успешные и спорные случаи решения переводческих задач лингвистическими средствами. Проблемы перевода, в том числе художественного, в современных филологических и культурологических исследованиях являются междисциплинарными. Только на стыке семиотических концепций и литературоведческих подходов оказывается возможным определить точность и полноту переводческих решений в практике художественного перевода. В свою очередь изучение проблемы культурного трансфера в этом случае на материале разновременных переводов романа Дж. Хеллера позволяет преодолеть ограничительные рамки сугубо филологического подхода в переводоведении. Сопоставление работы переводчиков по отношению к одному и тому же тексту – в нашем случае «Catch-22» – наполняет часто абстрагированное понятие «фигура переводчика» реальным содержанием, в особенности при обращении к той социокультурной среде, которая повлияла на специфику переводческих решений. Статья представляет собой анализ актуальных проблем теории и практики художественного перевода. В работе предлагается обзор современных моделей перевода, в первую очередь дискурсивная модель перевода, однако проанализирована также интерпретативная концепция и восприятия перевода как интерпретации исходного текста в существующей дискурсивной практике.*

*Исследование финансируется Комитетом науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан (грант № AP23485752).*

*Ключевые слова: культурный трансфер, дискурс, интерпретация, Дж. Хеллер, художественный перевод, приемы перевода, семиотика.*

#### СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- 1 Лотман Ю.М. Структура художественного текста. – М.: Искусство, 1970.
- 2 Автономова Н.С. Познание и перевод. Опыты философии языка. – М.: СПб.: Центр гуманитарных инициатив, 2017. – 736 с.
- 3 Heller, J. (1994), Catch-22. – London, Vintage books.
- 4 Хеллер Дж. Уловка – 22 / пер. с англ. М. Виленского и В. Титова. – М.: Военное издательство, 1967. – 488 с.
- 5 Хеллер Дж. Поправка – 22 / пер. с англ. А. Кистяковского. – М.: Изд-во АСТ, 2015. – 672 с.
- 6 Бахманн-Медик Д. Культурные повороты. Новые ориентиры в науках о культуре. – М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2017. – 504 с.
- 7 Комиссаров В. Н. Оппозиция «буквальный» и «свободный (вольный)» перевод в современном переводоведении // Мосты. – М.: Р.Валент, 2019. – №3 (63). – С. 3-12.
- 8 Гарбовский Н. К., Костикова О. И. Перевод и общество // Вестник Московского университета. Сер. 22: Теория перевода. 2018. № 1. С. 17-40.
- 9 Ревзина О. Г., Ревзин И. И. Семиотический эксперимент на сцене // Ученые записки Тартуского университета. Труды по знаковым системам. – Тарту. Вып. V. 1971. – С. 232-254.
- 10 Gizdatov, G. and Sopiaeva, B. (2018), Discourse and Identity in the Medial Space of Kazakhstan. Media Education (Mediaobrazovanie), vol. 4, 29-38. DOI: 10.13187/me.2018.4.29

- 11 Murašov, J. (2016), *Das unheimliche Auge der Schrift. Mediologische Analysen zu Literatur, film und Kunst in Russland.* – München, WilhelmFink.
- 12 Руднев В. Энциклопедический словарь культуры XX века. – СПб.: Азбука, Азбука-Аттикус, 2017. – 864 с.
- 13 Гиздатов Г.Г., Алдабергенова А.А. (2021), Дискурсивные интерпретации романа Дж. Хеллера «Поправка-22» в переводческой практике». Критика и семиотика. Scopus. – № 2. стр. 160–177. DOI 10.25205/2307-1737-2021-2-160-177 ISSN 2307-1737
- 14 Лорие М. Уловки переводчиков // Мастерство перевода. – М.: Советский писатель, 1970. – С.334-358.
- 15 Seed, D. (1989), *The Fiction of Joseph Heller: Against the Grain.* – Hampshire, Macmillan press.
- 16 Хеллер Дж. Поправка за поправкой/пер. с англ. С.Б. Ильина. – М.: АСТ, 2013. – 412с.
- 17 Зверев А. М. Маленький человек и безумный мир // Иностранная литература. – 1968. №2. – С.180-188.
- 18 Gizdatov, G. G., Kim, S. K. (2024) Translation of the absurdist literature as an example of cultural transfer (“Cases” by Daniil Kharmis in Korean translations), Slovo.ru: Baltic accent, Vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 158-171. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2024-1-9.

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 13.06.2024

МФТАР 16.21.61

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2024/iss2pp31-42](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss2pp31-42)

**М.С. Ауғанбаева<sup>1</sup>, Г.Б. Мамаева<sup>1</sup>, Г.А. Тусупбекова<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, 010000, Қазақстан Республикасы

<sup>2</sup>«Шәкәрім университеті» КеАҚ, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей, 071400, Қазақстан Республикасы

## **ЖАСТАР ТІЛІНДЕГІ СЛЕНГТЕР МЕН ЖАРГОНДАР**

*Мақалада қазақ тіл біліміндегі күрделі мәселелерге жататын тіл экологиясы, тіл тазалығы қарастырылады. Әлеуметтік топтар қолданатын тіл нормаларын бұзушы сөздерді зерттеу мәселенің өзектілігін көрсетеді. Тіл білімі тілді тек қарым-қатынас құралы ғана емес, әр түрлі коммуникативті салалардағы қызметін таным өзегі ретінде қарастырады. Ұлттық тіл арқылы сол халықтың тарихымен, мәдениетімен, өмір сүру салтымен, ортасымен танысамыз. Тіл мамандары тілді қоғаммен бірлікте қарастырады. Қоғамда орын алып жатқан ахуалдар тілде көрініс табумен қатар, оған өз ықпалын тигізеді.*

*Тіл тазалығын сақтау – өзге тілдің сөздерін, яғни кірме сөздерді бейберекет қолданбау. Тіл білімінде тіл мәдениеті басты назарда болады. Ол әр халықтың мәдени, рухани байлығымен қоса әдеби тілінің деңгейімен байланысты. Тіл мәдениетін дамыту үшін тіл тазалығын, көрнекілігін, дәлдігін басты назарға алу керек. Яғни сөйлеу тілін әдеби нормаға жатпайтын жаргон, сленг, диалект, қарапайым сөздерден тазартуымыз қажет. Сленг және жаргон сөздерді күнделікті өмірде жиі қолданудың әсерінен тіл білімінде өзекті мәселеге айналды. Тіл білімінде бұл мәселені эколлингвистика саласы қарастырады.*

*Кілт сөздер: ана тілі, тіл тазалығы, ауызекі сөйлеу тілі, жаргон, сленг, социолект, арго.*

## **НЕГІЗГІ ЕРЕЖЕЛЕР**

Тіл – халықтың және әр адамның тіршілік ету ортасы. Тіл экологиясы өткір мәселелердің бірі. Тіл экологиясының өзектілігі қоғамның даму тенденцияларына байланысты. Оған