

ознак усного повідомлення, що можуть впливати на адекватність і достовірність перекладу.

Література:

1. Бацевич Ф. С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики. Київ : Видавничий центр «Академія», 2004. 344 с.
2. Androutsopoulos J. Medienlinguistik. Beitrag für den Deutschen Fachjournalisten-Verband, 2003. URL: <https://jannisandroutsopoulos.files.wordpress.com/2009/09/medienlinguistik.pdf>
3. Koller W. Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft. Wiebelsheim : Quelle und Meyer Verlag, 2004. 324 s.
4. Nord Ch. Textanalyse und Übersetzen. Theoretische Grundlage, Methode und Didaktik einer übersetzungsrelevanten Textanalyse. Tübingen : Groos, 2009. 293 s.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-624-9-30>

AT THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN DOMESTICATION AND FORENIZATION : TRIGGERS OF CHOICE

НА МЕЖІ МІЖ ОДОМАШНЕННЯМ ТА ВІДЧУЖЕННЯМ : ТРИГЕРИ ВИБОРУ

Shama I. M.

*Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department
of English Philology
and Linguodidactics,
Zaporizhzhia National University
Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine*

Шама І. М.

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської філології
та лінгводидактики,
Запорізький національний
університет
м. Запоріжжя, Україна*

When we read works of fiction written by authors who belong to our native culture, we hardly ever experience difficulties when encountering allusions, quotations, hints, puns, and other manifestations of intertextuality. These elements are perceived and decoded almost automatically, because they are part of the culture in which we grew up. We live within this cultural framework.

The situation is quite different with literature from foreign countries. Here, such nuances (culturally or intertextually marked words, character speech patterns, plot lines) become obstacles on the path to understanding the work and the author's intention. As T. Akhter and M. Lamba figuratively describe the situation, these nuances are unseen until we drift away from them. "Culture is like gravity", they say [6, p. 1], "we do not know about it except when we jump two meters into the air".

The task facing the translators of literary works is even more complicated in this respect, as they must 'transplant' all the cultural exponents of the original into the soil of another, target culture without losing the uniqueness of the source text, thereby producing a translation that can be considered 'adequate'.

If we try to briefly formulate what an "adequate translation" is, we can use the definition provided by O. I. Cherednichenko: it is "functional identity with the original, which takes into account the reception of discourse" [5, p. 153]. This interpretation is close to that proposed by O. V. Rebriy. "An adequate translation", he writes [2, p. 57], "requires the reproduction of the text by means that are equal in value, and equality here is understood not as formal and semantic similarity, but functional equivalence, i.e. the use of linguistic means in translation that are functionally identical to those in the source text".

In other words, if we try to view the essence of an adequate translation through the reader's eyes, it is obvious that the recipient's reactions and the depth of their understanding – not only of surface-level meanings but also those hidden beyond the text lines, contributing to its multidimensionality – should ideally coincide with those that arise (again, effortlessly) in the original's reader. But here emerges the traditional question for anyone who delves into translation criticism and compares the source and target texts: is it possible to attain complete adequacy when it concerns the nationally and culturally specific elements of the original text? After all, according to V. Hrytsenko and T. Yasinska [1, p. 107], "the reality of one culture is in fact not represented by the reality of another culture".

The answer to this question in contemporary translation studies is affirmative: yes, it is indeed possible to reproduce cultural specificity in translation, albeit not without some loss, although this is perhaps the most challenging and demanding part of the translation process. If we summarise the main ways of solving this task, they can be reduced to two: either the translator (and consequently the reader of the target text) goes to the author of the original (and then we talk about foreignisation), or the translator remains within their own culture and adapts the original to their audience without adding 'foreign' knowledge and features of 'foreign' culture to their product (and then we talk about domestication).

Tactical decisions within each of these two strategies may vary, but each possesses both distinct advantages and drawbacks. For example, an undeniable advantage of the domestication strategy is that it awakens the necessary emotions and aesthetic responses in the reader of the translation. At the same time, the target text itself ceases to be perceived as a text of foreign literature and culture. It risks, as O. V. Rebriy notes, “dissolving into the receiving culture” [3, p. 34]. The foreignisation strategy, in its turn, avoids this danger, since all cultural phenomena are reproduced in the target text. However, this creates another problem: the reader may fail to understand the message of a foreign culture because of the ‘collision’ between two cultures (source and target), which may lead to the loss of part of the author’s intended message. To prevent this from happening, various compensatory methods are often employed, which can affect the style of the work in translation, altering it [3, p. 34; 4, p. 204].

It is evident that translators must choose between the two strategies mentioned above on each occasion. And each time questions arise: what criteria should guide the choice? What should be the starting point? What should be the primary focus? We will try to answer these questions focusing on just one feature of the original literary text from among the many ‘behind-the-scenes’ factors that influence the decision-making process. It is highly evident and engaging for both readers and translation critics, yet at the same time very problematic to reproduce. This is the cultural conditioning of the source text. We will pay particular attention to the cultural-and-educational function of literary translation, as it is this function that provides the impetus for strategising the translation process of a particular original.

The focus of the author of the source text on a particular type of reader (the recipient of the work) determines a multi-vector set of background knowledge, the markers of which must be reproduced in the target text for the cultural-and-educational function of translation to be fully realised. To achieve adequacy in this translation challenge, it is necessary to understand the influence of the inseparability of culture and literature on the process of literary translation; to be aware that the choice of translation strategy largely depends on the translator’s intention and on which function of translation is considered decisive; not to neglect the indisputable fact that the density of cultural exponents in the original depends on the personality of the source text’s author and their intended readership; to be able to explicate the knowledge about the source culture embedded in the source text. Furthermore, efforts must be directed towards cultivating the target readership’s cultural competence, preparing them to engage with ‘other’ cultures – including through translated works of fiction.

Bibliography:

1. Гриценко В., Ясинська Т. Культурологічний аспект у перекладі. *Scientific practice: modern and classical research methods*: Collection of scientific papers «ΛΟΓΟΣ» with Proceedings of the III International Scientific and Practical Conference, Boston, September 16, 2022. Boston – Vinnytsia : Primedia eLaunch & European Scientific Platform, 2022. Pp. 105-110. <https://doi.org/10.36074/logos-16.09.2022.29>
2. Ребрій О. В. Вступ до перекладознавства : конспект лекцій для студентів освітньо-кваліфікаційного рівня «Бакалавр» факультету іноземних мов. Харків : Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, 2016. 116 с.
3. Ребрій О. В. Сучасні концепції творчості у перекладі. Харків : Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, 2012. 376 с.
4. Ткачівська М. Р., Щерба Р. М. Переклад крізь призму міжкультурної комунікації. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Філологія*. 2022. Вип. 57. С. 202-207.
5. Чередниченко О. І. Про мову і переклад. Київ : Либідь, 2007. 248 с.
6. Akhter T., Lamba M. Culture and Literature: Interdependence. *Culture and Literature* / ed. by T. Akhter. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2022. Pp. 1-14.