TRANSLATION AND CODIFICATION OF THE LANGUAGE

Mykhailo Boichenko

(MA in Philology, Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy, Kyiv, Ukraine)

The translation is closely interwoven with the codification of the language, since the translator has to rely on the normative dictionary, adheres to it (with rare exceptions), whereas the codification of the language should be the result of the consolidation of normative dictionaries available in a particular language: the literary norm, the specialized dictionaries of various sciences and professions, as well as even some informal linguistic communities (for example, literary circles, political clubs, artistic associations and other cultural communities). The codification, however, is opposed to the koiné, whereas the translation, especially the literary, must take it into account and, to a certain extent, involve it, even if it contradicts the literary norm.

In general, the descriptive and normative dictionaries should be clearly distinguished: the first one is closer to the living language with all its variations, is constantly replenished and enriched, the second – fixes a certain degree of perfection of the natural language at a sufficiently high level of its evolution at a certain historical moment, fixes this perfection as a certain self-sufficiency of a linguistic form that has internal criteria of completeness as an organized symbolic system. Therefore normative dictionary in its essence expresses not only the dependence on the language that gave it birth, rather itself puts certain structures into this language and limits what is permitted and recommended for use. My experience of translating Nicklas Luhmann's works "The notion of purpose and systemic rationality" [2, p. 293] and "Social systems" (in the stage of completion) shows that the peculiarities of the conceptual-normative dictionary of Nicklas Luhmann's theory of social systems somewhat change the habitual usage of the German language and introduce semantic invariants there, where they are usually absent. This brings a clear benefit to the Luhmann's conception and makes easy successful translation – due to the semantic reconstruction of these invariants. However, this subsequently also contributes to the evolution of the German language as a whole –

while Luhmann's ideas extend in the field of public administration, management, the field of social communication, and through them throughout the German society.

The vocabulary of any natural language is good example of descriptive dictionary, whereas normative dictionaries are mostly specialized dictionaries of certain professions and special sciences. A certain element of structuring is inherent in the natural language, and the elements of the normative vocabulary are present in any natural language: from the universal structures of the organization of language (which were explored, for example, by Noam Chomsky's generative grammar) up to the specifics of the syntax, semantics etc of each of the natural languages. Natalia Kudriavtseva explored the cognitive structures that are common and specific to the different Indo-European languages, and these common features greatly simplify an adequate translation [1, p. 50-63]. Philosophical studies and especially philosophical translations help to identify and to conceptualize the cognitive structures common to different natural languages. The pliability of natural languages is not only the elasticity of constructing variations on a single and immutable (although specific to each language) basis, it is always the pliability of language creation as a whole. This plasticity is noticeable in poetic art, especially in visual poetry.

The pliability of the natural language is only at first glance and formally opposes codification – in fact, the codification appears as one of the means to use this elasticity; moreover, the codification of the language itself opens new directions for language creation due to the systematic extension of the formal characteristics of the language to those spheres where spontaneously they have not previously been used by native speakers.

References:

1. Кудрявцева Н. Лінгвістична відносність і проблеми перекладу філософської термінології. Лінгвокогнітивний підхід: Монографія. К.: Вид. дім Дмитра Бураго, 2017. 460 с.

2. Бойченко М. Ніклас Луман – титан сучасної соціальної думки // Луман Н. *Поняття цілі і системна раціональність: щодо функції цілей у соціальних*

системах / пер. з нім. М. Бойченка та В. Кебуладзе. К.: Дух і Літера, 2011. С. 289-294.