

## Comparison to translation ЛЕКСИЯ И 3

Despite being used in a non-technical sense as interchangeable, *interpreting* and *translation* are not synonymous. *Interpreting* takes a message from a source language and renders that message into a **different** target language (ex: English into French). In interpreting, the interpreter will take in a complex concept from one language, choose the most appropriate vocabulary in the target language to faithfully render the message in a linguistically, emotionally, tonally, and culturally equivalent message. *Translation* is the transference of meaning from *text to text* (*written* or recorded), with the translator having time and access to resources (*dictionaries*, *glossaries*, (толковый словарь etc.) to produce an accurate document or verbal artifact. Lesser known is "*transliteration*," used within sign language interpreting, takes one form of a language and transfer those **same words** into another form (ex: spoken English into a signed form of English, Signed Exact English, not ASL).american sign language

In court interpreting, it is not acceptable to omit anything from the source, no matter how quickly the source speaks, since not only is accuracy a principal canon for interpreters, but mandatoryобязательный,. The inaccurate interpretation of even a single word in a material can totally mislead the triers of fact. The most important factor for this level of accuracy is the use of a team of two or more interpreters during a lengthy process, with one actively interpreting and the second monitoring for greater accuracy, although there are many different opinions in the industry on to how to deliver the most accuracy in stressful situations.

Translators have time to consider and revise each word and sentence before delivering their product to the client. While live interpretation's goal is to achieve total accuracy at all times, details of the original (source) speech can be missed and interpreters can ask for clarification from the speaker. In any language, including sign languages, when a word is used for which there is no exact match, expansion may be necessary in order to fully interpret the intended meaning of the word (ex: the English word "hospitable" may require several words or phrases to encompass its complex meaning). Another unique situation is when an interpreted message appears much shorter or longer than the original message. The message may appear shorter at times because of unique efficiencies within a certain language.

English to Spanish is a prime example: Spanish uses gender specific nouns, not used in English, which convey information in a more condensed package thus requiring more words and time in an English interpretation to provide the same plethora of information. Because of situations like these, interpreting often requires a "lag" or "processing" time. This time allows the interpreter to take in subjects and verbs in order to rearrange grammar appropriately while picking accurate vocabulary before starting the message. While working with interpreters, it is important to remember lag time in order to avoid accidentally interrupting one

another and to receive the entire message.(Mill, 1884, p. 607), have accelerated this narrow view of hermeneutics. Hence the concern of hermeneutics has tended to be restricted to the development of the methodological principle or technique which will assure the exact interpretation of the text. Today this view of hermeneutics seems to be prevailing not only in ordinary usage but also in the academic area. For example, the lexical meaning of hermeneutics, as “the study of the methodological principles of interpretation” (*Webster’s New*

*Collegiate Dictionary*) expresses this tendency. Howard pointed out this tendency in the

academic area as follows:

Hermeneutics will not appear as a typical listing in a catalog of university studies. The field is usually thought as a subdiscipline for theology, where it covers the study of methods for the authentication and interpretation of text. (1982, p. 1)

Modern hermeneutics has come into being as a self-reflective counteraction to this dominant tendency of the so called “culture of positivism” (Whitty, 1974), especially in the field of the social sciences. This aporia which spurred the birth of modern hermeneutics is expressed by Dilthey’s characterization of human science as “understanding” instead of “explanation” in the natural sciences as a reaction to Kantian epistemology in the human sciences. Gadamer (1982) expressed this aporia in his attempt to unfold the meaning of hermeneutics, not as a methodology of human sciences, but as an effort to seek out what the human sciences truly are.

He elucidated that hermeneutics

starts with the resistance within modern science against the universal claim of scientific method. It is concerned to seek that experience of truth that transcends the sphere of the control of scientific method wherever it is to be found, and to inquire with modes of experience which lie outside science: with the experience of philosophy, of art, of history itself. These are all modes of experience in which a truth is communicated that cannot be verified by the methodological means proper to science, (p. xii)

In the development of modern hermeneutics, there have been many efforts to inquire into and to enrich the complex and dynamic dimensions of our interpretative acts. There have also been a variety of exchanges of ideas and debates among the conflicting insights, not only within hermeneutic tradition but also within other newly emerging intellectual traditions such as phenomenology, critical social theory, existentialism, and structuralism. To understand modern hermeneutics, we need to understand its history. But, within the hermeneutic point

of view, to understand history is, as Gadamer pointed out, neither to put the past into the past itself nor to reduce it to causal regularity, but to overtake it in our present situation. What is it that the history of modern hermeneutics speaks to us for self-understanding of our interpretative act of the text? In particular, what is it that the modern hermeneutics speaks to us concerning the way of dealing with texts in pedagogical practice? In this paper, I attempt to unfold some fundamental insights elaborated during the development of the modern hermeneutic enterprises, especially those of Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, Gadamer, and Ricoeur. With relation to the pedagogical situation for communication of meaning, some relevant points of these insights will also be scrutinized.

#### A. Initial Projects of Modern Hermeneutics:

**Projects**- проект, замысел, план, программа

**Initial**—начальный

**Trace**- находить, усматривать-нигох кардан

'dominant]-главный, основной,

Theological- теологический-теологи, теология или илохиёт, фикс

metaphysical-метафизический,

When we trace the history of modern hermeneutics, we can see that there has been a continuous self-reflective reaction against the dominant theological, epistemological, and metaphysical presuppositions which limit our understanding of human life in its full sense. This hermeneutical project to restore the understanding of the fullness of human life, especially in the social sciences, was launched ~~начинать~~ in the nineteenth century by Schleiermacher, the acclaimed 2) ~~заявлять, объявлять~~ father ~~создатель, основатель~~ of modern hermeneutics. Before Schleiermacher, there existed a philology of classical texts and an exegesis [eksI'dʒisIs] (interpretation of a text) of sacred (священный; святой) texts, but in these traditions the work of interpretation had been understood and practiced in different ways.

