

*Dr. Viktor Kabakchi,
Dr. Angelique Antonova*



IS IT REALLY
A NEW TYPE
OF TRANSLATION?

Introduction

Hughes L. thus describes the position of women of the pre-Petrine Russia:

Women of the street-trading, artisan, and peasant classes — *baby*, *zhenki* and *devki*, as opposed to *damy* and *devitsy* — had never been confined to the *terem*. (Hughes L. 1990: 195)

This short sentence which contains a number of Russian cultural terms — *baby*, *zhenki*, *devki*; *damy*, *devitsy*; *terem* — could be viewed as an example of poor translation. However, regardless of sort of criticism we could level against such texts, one thing is obvious: it is not a sample of traditional translation, because this sentence is taken from an original book.

Although oral translation (interpreting) has existed since time immemorial, translation theory is a comparatively young discipline. One of Russia's most authoritative linguists of the time wrote in the 1970s: "The linguistic science of translation is still very young. So far we have not yet even found a common name for it", adding that as an autonomous discipline it emerged only in the second half of the 20th century (Комиссаров, 1973: 4). It is not surprising therefore that the existence of an independent type of translation, what we call '**internal translation**', has been overlooked.

Globalization and the need for a 'second communicative string'

Globalization made it necessary for all nations to master international, and therefore intercultural, communication. In trying to reach a