

Original article

doi: 10.47475/1994-2796-2022-10316

IPSOCENTRISM, ALTEROCENTRISM, LINGUOCULTURAL TRANSFER IN TRANSLATION

Elena V. Shelestyuk¹, Evgeniya S. Yakovleva²

Chelyabinsk State University, Chelyabinsk, Russia

¹shelestiuk@yandex.ru

²evgenia.yakovleva2012@yandex.ru

Abstract. The article discusses the concepts of ipsocentrism and alterocentrism as psychological attitudes to one's own and foreign linguocultures, frequently underlying and determining the already well researched strategies of familiarization/defamiliarization, domestication/foreignization in interpreting. Then the article focuses on the psychological concept of linguocultural transfer, considering it in terms of the following oppositions: 1) local vs. total; 2) conscious vs. unconscious; 3) connected with deep vs. with surface structures of the original and translation; 4) related to the difference of genres and styles in different languages; 5) connected with the social statuses of the original and translation languages.

Keywords: linguocultural transfer, adaptation, lacuna, foreignization and domestication, familiarization and defamiliarization, ipsocentrism and alterocentrism, linguistic and cultural interference, surface and deep structures

For citation: Shelestyuk EV, Yakovleva ES. Ipsocentrism, alterocentrism, linguocultural transfer in translation. *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University. 2022;(3(461)):115-130. doi: 10.47475/1994-2796-2022-10316.*

Научная статья

УДК 81'25

ИПСОЦЕНТРИЗМ, АЛЬТЕРОЦЕНТРИЗМ, ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНЫЙ ПЕРЕНОС В ПЕРЕВОДЕ

Елена Владимировна Шелестюк¹, Евгения Сергеевна Яковлева²

Челябинский государственный университет, Челябинск, Россия

¹shelestiuk@yandex.ru

²evgenia.yakovleva2012@yandex.ru

Аннотация. Рассматриваются понятия ипсоцентризма и альтероцентризма как психологических установок к собственной и зарубежным лингвокультурам, часто лежащих в основе стратегий приближения/остранения, доместикации/форенизации в переводе и определяющих эти уже хорошо изученные стратегии. Акцентируется внимание на психологической концепции лингвокультурного переноса, который рассматривается с точки зрения следующих оппозиций: 1) локальный vs. тотальный; 2) сознательный vs. бессознательный; 3) связанный с глубинными или с поверхностными структурами оригинала и перевода; 4) связанный с различием жанров и стилей в разных языках; 5) связанный с социальным статусом языков оригинала и перевода.

Ключевые слова: лингвокультурный перенос, адаптация, лакуна, форенизация и доместикация, приближение и остранение, ипсоцентризм и альтероцентризм, языковая и культурная интерференция, поверхностные и глубинные структуры

Для цитирования: Shelestyuk E. V., Yakovleva E. S. Ipsocentrism, alterocentrism, linguocultural transfer in translation // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. 2022. № 3 (461). Филологические науки. Вып. 128. С. 115—130. doi: 10.47475/1994-2796-2022-10316.

1. Introduction

The main objective of the article is to point out the psychological reasons for the strategies used in interpreting/translation. We arrive at such psychological

concepts as alterocentrism/ipsocentrism and linguocultural transfer. In Sections 2-3 the paper describes some strategies (domestication/foreignization, familiarization/defamiliarization) and techniques of adaptation resultant from cultural differences and, particularly, the psychological attitudes of ipsocentrism and

alterocentrism on the part of the reader. The reader is reminded of the problem of the untranslatability of texts created in different languages that arises because of the lacunar differences of linguocultures, and of adaptation as the method used to overcome the lacunarity of text. In Section 4, linguocultural transfer is described from the point of view of the aforementioned translation strategies and the following five oppositions: (1) local vs. holistic; (2) unconscious vs. conscious; (3) deep-structure vs. surface-structure; (4) related to the difference of genres and styles in different languages; (5) related to the difference of statuses of the language of the original and the translation. In Conclusion and Implication, the author makes a general observation on the (negative) role of globalization in making English the dominant code and, therefore, affecting the quality of interpreting/translation when English is either the source or the target language. As the best strategy, balanced adaptation, implying a constant shift from closeness to a foreign environment to closeness to a native one, is named. However, psychologically, ipsocentrism, the focus one's own national culture rather than the Global English culture, is preferred because of the inequality of cultural statuses. More than to "hear" the Global English culture it is necessary for a national culture to be "heard" veraciously, without any serious linguocultural changes.

2. Literature review

From the cultural perspective, scholars distinguish between two interpreting strategies: domestication (adaptation according to the norms of a domestic culture) and foreignization (adaptation according to the norms of a foreign culture) [30; 24]. As a golden mean between the two, traditionalist translation scholars recognize the strategy of balanced adaptation as a factor facilitating the pleasurable ("fluent, smooth") perception of a translated text. L. S. Barkhudarov, V. N. Komissarov, A. D. Schweitzer and others recognize the inevitability of the "smoothing out" of rough, jarring sounding of close-to-literal translation, facilitating readability of a resultant text. The domestication strategy is still largely observed in the Western world when translating from Eastern and other languages of the world (in this case the English linguocultural domestication is meant). Yet there is a growing understanding that domestication detracts from the quality of translation, makes it culturally distorted and is bound to become a thing of the past — used in interpreting practices before the late 20th c. This is consonant with Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere's statement that "neither the word, nor the text, but the culture becomes the operational 'unit' of translation" [22. P. 123]. At present the English-language natural-

izing domestication of national/ethnic texts becomes less frequent, but there appeared a more sophisticated type of it, allowing for the omission of national/ethnic realia, nondisclosure of extralinguistic cultural messages. Some scholars establish a scientific rationale for this. The skopos theories (Ch. Reiss, H. Vermeer, Ch. Nord) support the unlimited adaptation of an original text to particular needs, its free handling dependent on particular functions in a target culture. This approach is ipsocentric (Lat. ipse "he, himself, self"), the attitude to one's own culture as dominant and thence adapting an original foreign text to the target home culture dependent on this or that function the former performs in it.

Foreignization implying preservation of specificity of national/ethnic texts while translating them into major Western languages, including English, is supported by cultural translation theorists [23; 27 31; 31; and others], who advocate the foreign sounding of a resultant text and condemn the smoothness/readability strategy. They also urge the interpreter to show strong presence in a text in the form of their name, foreword, explanations, commentaries and so on. Following this line, foreignization is becoming a growing trend, complete with transliteration of original names of realia, calquing (word-for-word translation) of phraseology and cultural quotes, and even tending to retain original syntactic structures of national/ethnic languages while translating them into, say, English. We agree that foreignization of translated texts for dominant-language receivers (and simultaneously, their domestication for these texts originators) is absolutely topical for national and ethnic cultures who seek to be heard and read in the English-speaking world authentically at their face value, without additions, omissions or changes. National/ethnic cultures can well do it through interpreting their texts into accepted languages of intercultural communication, including English, using their native linguocultural units and linguistic patterns. However, more frequently — and deplorably — foreignization becomes widespread for translations from English into national/ethnic languages. This is so because English is the main language of global media and international communication and Anglo-American linguoculture claims to be the major global linguoculture. Anglicization of translated texts is observed across the board in journalism and media, popular science and culture. Interpreters and translators often do not bother even to shift scripts (e. g. from Latin to Cyrillic) when rendering realia, names, idioms, etc. from English into native languages. They can also freely transliterate realia, idioms, etc., invent new English-based words, translate word-for-word introducing English syntactic and morphological patterns to national/ethnic lan-

guages. We regard this particular development (the Anglicization strategy in English-native translations) as harmful, because it can account for the levelling out of people's conceptual apparatuses and modes of thinking according to native English-speakers' models. There is a constraint on foreignization (the strange, foreign sounding of the translation), though. It is the pleasure of reading, that is the main purpose of and reason for any reading procedure. A reader will not read a text willingly if they do not feel any pleasure from it — unless they have some specific purpose, e. g. a scholastic study or analysis of a text. Excessive roughness, "sharp edges", jarring foreignness can impede the reading, indispose for it, and make both the content and the implications of a text incomprehensible. More often than not a reader likes to be enchanted by reading rather than challenged by it! This is why balanced adaptation, implying moderate changes in the word-for-word to ensure the text "fluency", euphony, readability and pleasantness of reading are significant.

3. Methods

The methods employed by us are definitional and comparative-contrastive.

First of all we would like to clarify the terms used to describe the methodological strategies of translation and psychological attitudes of interpreters to the linguocultures they handle, thus the first method we apply to the above exposition is terminological.

The terms foreignization and domestication are converse, they may reverse provided from what side/party you view them: for the source linguoculture a translation may appear foreignized, and for the target (receiving) linguoculture — domesticated and vice versa. Thus the activity of the interpreter may be viewed as equivocal: for one culture one and the same translation reveals domestication, for the other — foreignization. Familiarization and defamiliarization — the terms introduced by the Soviet writer and literary critic Viktor Shklovsky — accurately and unambiguously express the ideas of adaptation and lack of adaptation in translation/interpreting. The terms familiarization and defamiliarization do not concern the two cultures, but, more precisely, the interpreter's treatment of a text on behalf of the target (receiving) culture.

Familiarization means: 1) minimization of the strangeness of a foreign text for the readers; 2) removal of culture specific units from the resultant text or their substitution with "functional substitutes" of the target culture, accommodation of syntax according to the patterns of the target culture, 3) exposition of the meanings of realia in a half-concealed, unobtrusive way, the "invisible translator", 4) maintenance of a clear,

native-sounding, fluent, readable style, 5) adherence to the conventions and stylistic canons of a target language, change of register, if there is a difference with the source language.

Defamiliarization means: 1) preservation of the strangeness of a foreign text for the readers; 2) retention of culture specific units of a foreign culture, their transliteration, frequently — preservation of the script of the original (e. g. Latin), genuine anthroponyms and toponyms, names of realia, word-for-word translation of idioms, proverbs, turns of speech, and even syntactic patterns, 3) exposition of the meanings of realia in a noticeable way (footnotes, endnotes, commentaries), the "visible translator", or else absence of any exposition, taking the readers' knowledge of foreign realia "for granted", 4) maintenance of "sharp edges" of a foreign text, its jarring sounding, paying little attention to readability, 5) production of a text "which deliberately breaks target conventions by retaining something of the foreignness of the original" [29. P. 59].

There are constraints on familiarization and defamiliarization — the native and foreign sounding of the translation.

In familiarization it is *production of a false picture of the world*, lack of trueness to life, beguiling the reader by the false image of another culture and cultural-anthropological types, a kind of "wishful thinking".

In defamiliarization it is *detracting from the pleasure of reading*, which is the main purpose of and reason for any reading procedure. A reader will not read a text willingly if they do not feel any pleasure from it — unless they have some specific purpose, e. g. a scholastic study or analysis of a text. Excessive roughness, "sharp edges", jarring foreignness can impede the reading, indispose for it, and make both the content and the implications of a text incomprehensible. More often than not a reader likes to be enchanted by reading rather than challenged by it! This is why balanced adaptation, implying moderate changes in the word-for-word to ensure the text "fluency", euphony, readability and pleasantness of reading, is significant.

Close to the above-mentioned dichotomies of strategies (foreignization/domestication, familiarization/defamiliarization), but not identical with them because of the psychological, rather than translation-methodological quality, is the dichotomy *ipsocentrism* (Lat. ipse "he, himself, self") — *alterocentrism* (Lat. alius "other, different").

Ipsocentrism is an attitude placing one's own culture in the center of one's outlook and viewing another culture (or other cultures) from the standpoint of one's own culture, from the internal perspective. It prompts an adaptation of a foreign text to a native

culture dependent on a particular function this text performs in it and preserving an original native text as close to its form and content as possible while translating it into a foreign language.

Alterocentrism is an attitude placing a foreign culture in the center of one's outlook and viewing one's own culture from the external perspective. Alterocentrism prompts preservation of a strange cultural and even linguistic ring of a foreign text, little attention being paid to the reduction of its foreignness for native readers. And vice versa, while translating a native text into a foreign language, this approach prompts making this text more readable and customary for foreigners, allows for omissions and substitutions of native realia.

The dichotomy ipsocentrism — alterocentrism reflects interpreters' psychological preferences of native or foreign linguocultures, their perception of these cultures as dominant or subordinate. Dominance is sensed subconsciously, and it is by far not necessarily one's own, "ipso" culture. Dominant cultures and languages are mostly derived from the economic and (geo)political dominance of their peoples¹.

Both familiarization and defamiliarization can be ipsocentric. Ipsocentric interpreter is focused on a native culture and when they translate a foreign text into a native language, they adapt it, make it familiar for native readers. Ipsocentric interpreter is focused on a native culture and when they translate a native text into a foreign language, they translate it as it is, hardly adapting it, defamiliarizing it for foreign readers.

Also, both familiarization and defamiliarization can be alterocentric. Alterocentric interpreter is focused on a foreign culture, and they translate a native text into a foreign language adapting it to a foreign culture, making it familiar for foreign readers. Alterocentric interpreter is focused on a foreign culture, and they translate a foreign text into a native language as it is, defamiliarizing it for native readers, rather than adapting it.

The best strategy of interpreting appears to be neither pure familiarization, nor pure defamiliarization, but *balanced adaptation*, a continual shift from closeness to the original to adaptation depending on the requirements of a situation and linguistic similarities/differences. Within balanced adaptation there may be some gradations of trueness to the original. Adaptation calls forth the necessity of ensuring *fluency*, i. e. natural sounding and easy readability by adhering to

¹ With that, dominant languages and cultures frequently disguise as universal, "global", "world" (cf. global English, world English), remaining native for the Inner Circle of its speakers and based on this people's history, culture, and mentality.

current usage, maintaining continuous syntax, fixing a precise meaning.

Fluency is highly criticized by the cultural and social translation critics² when applied to National/Ethnic > English translations as a tool to blur cultural differences, attribute Anglo-American values and implications to the translated world literature. We agree that defamiliarization, distinct foreign sounding should be the major strategy for National/Ethnic > English translations. Yet familiarization and fluency are preferable for English > National/Ethnic translations to avoid the levelling out of conceptual apparatuses and modes of thinking, to preserve cultural diversity and national identities.

In the study of balanced adaptation the most suitable method in our view is the comparative-contrastive analysis of original texts and their translations. We will apply it henceforth and later in our discussion of the linguocultural transfer.

Balanced adaptation ensures fluency of the translated text and at the same time preserves its necessary and sufficient foreignness. It is based on several principles.

- 1) smoothing of foreign sounding, creating euphony, harmony, readability;
- 2) rhythmization;
- 3) "rationalization" of syntax, providing its natural sounding and logic, permutations, expansions, reductions;
- 4) refinement or downgrading, simplification or complication of style dependent on stylistic canons of the target (receiving) culture;
- 5) euphemization, censoring dependent on stylistic canons of the target (receiving) culture;

² "By routinely translating large numbers of the most varied English-language books, foreign publishers have exploited the global drift toward American political and economic hegemony in the postwar period, actively supporting the international expansion of Anglo-American culture. This trend has been reinforced by English-language book imports: the range of foreign countries receiving these books and the various categories into which the books fall show not only the worldwide reach of English, but the depth of its presence in foreign cultures, circulating through the school, the library, the bookstore, determining diverse areas, disciplines, and constituencies — academic and religious, literary and technical, elite and popular, adult and child... British and American publishing, in turn, has reaped the financial benefits of successfully imposing Anglo-American cultural values on a vast foreign readership, while producing cultures in the United Kingdom and the United States that are aggressively monolingual, *unreceptive to the foreign, accustomed to fluent translations that invisibly inscribe foreign texts with English-language values and provide readers with the narcissistic experience of recognizing their own culture in a cultural other*" (emphasis added, E. Shelestyuk) [30. P. 15].

- 6) decrease or increase in expressiveness, idiomaticity;
- 7) accentuation and leveling of meanings;
- 8) explication of meanings or taking them into subtext;
- 9) preservation, with permissible changes, of the conceptual semiotic model of the original.

If we view the *lexis* as the most important part of the language, it reveals five basic techniques of balanced adaptation:

- 1) removal of lacunae, omission of untranslatable text units, if they are immaterial for the understanding of a text, distracting the reader's attention from the main ideas. Albrecht Neubert's example: I came to Warley on a wet September morning with the sky the gray of Guiseley sandstone. — В Уорли я приехал дождливым сентябрьским утром. Небо казалось высеченным из серого песчаника. (= The sky seemed carved out of gray sandstone.);
- 2) explication — explanations of the implicit meaning of cultural realia. These are best made as brief intratextual commentaries and rarely as footnotes or endnotes. E.g. It was Friday. So they will soon go out and get drunk (J. Brain). — Была пятница, день полочки. Скоро они пойдут в пабы и напьются. (It was Friday, the day of pay. Soon they will go to pubs and get drunk.);
- 3) functional substitutes, naming lacunae by names of similar realia of the target language or stylistically relevant language/speech units. E.g. You could tell he was very ashamed of his parents and all, because they said "he do not" and "she do not" and stuff like that... (J. Salinger) — Сразу было видно, что он стесняется своих родителей, потому что они говорили "хочут" и "хочете", и все в таком роде. (It was clear that he was ashamed of his parents, because they spoke ungrammatically — "hochut" and "hochete" and stuff like that.);
- 4) calquing, transcription, transliteration and other means of formal adaptation, often with a short explication (for example, Knitters' Frolic — "Проделки вязальщиков", фестиваль вязальщиков в Торонто, выставка-продажа и семинары для мастеров и начинающих) ("Prodelki vyzal'shchikov" — festival of knitters in Toronto, exhibition, sale and master classes for beginners). These translations are applicable to all "onym lexicon", proper names, largely to names of realia, sometimes to idioms, etc.;
- 5) generalization or metonymic translation of lacunar realia. For example, She was what was

called the Walmart mom. — Она типичная мама семьи с достатком ниже среднего, закупающаяся в сетевых гипермаркетах (= mother of a lower-income family shopping in chain stores); I got all dressed and then I packed the two Gladstones I have. — Я оделся, потом сложил оба свои чемодана (= suitcases); The integration plan may include a specific on-the-job training period. — Схема интеграции может включать специальную стажировку без отрыва от производства = on-the-job internship.

The first case of handling lacunae can be called neutralization of realia and the four others are the actual pragmatic adaptation options.

4. Results and discussion

At the core of adaptation lies the phenomenon of *linguocultural transfer* (LT), that is the transfer of interpreter's cultural background knowledge (presuppositions) to the message of an original text prompting a certain interpretation and prioritizing a particular strategy of translation. Linguocultural transfer accounts for the interpreter's inevitable bias (varying in degrees with different translators), reflecting their presuppositions about their native language and a foreign language, respective cultures, a given text, its meanings, its author, recipients' background, etc.

If we talk about the transfer as such, it is ontologically a mental phenomenon. The concept of transfer (*Übertragung*) was introduced by Freud to refer to individual projections of an individual's subjective evaluations and illusions from the world of feelings to the outside world. C. G. Jung connected this phenomenon with the extrapolation of archetypes, symbolic images to objects of reality, or vice versa the interpolation of these objects to one's archetypes. Jung's concept of transfer is associated with archetypes, universal congenital protoimages of the unconscious, the analogy of which are found in alchemical symbols, mythology, art, etc. However, a transfer to newly conceptualized and categorized objects is not only triggered by inborn archetypes, but also by cultural stereotypes — conceptual and behavioral structures, acquired through interaction within sociocultural environment and language.

In describing the manifestations of the linguocultural transfer, in our opinion, the transformational model of translation has large explanatory power [1]. According to it, the translator must deal with the surface structures of an original text, which are rendered using equivalent structures of the language of translation, and with deep structures of the original, which are interpreted and rendered with the help of the deep structures of the host linguoculture. It should be noted

that our understanding of deep structures is psycholinguistic, rather than generative linguistic. By deep structures, we understand the image-verbal complexes, triggered off by thought of the speech producer and by the words heard or read by the speech perceiver. By surface structures, syntactic-semantic complexes are meant.

The linguocultural transfer reveals a number of oppositions, among which the most important are 1) local vs. holistic; 2) unconscious vs. conscious; 3) deep-structure vs. surface-structure; 4) related to the difference of genres and styles in different languages; 5) related to the difference of statuses of the language of the original and the translation. We will describe this phenomenon in terms of these oppositions.

***First opposition:
Local vs. holistic LT***

Local LT means the compensation in translation, when lacunar realia of an original are substituted for by their approximate counterparts in a host linguoculture; or when untranslatable imagery (metaphors, similes, etc.), idioms, comic elements (e. g. puns), idiolect features and other peculiarities are replaced with units of a host linguoculture. Holistic LT means the change of whole conceptual structures of an original, its complete adaptation to the host linguoculture.

Here are some more examples of local LT: He plied her with scones and jam (J. Galsworthy) — Он угощал ее оладьями с вареньем (literally, He treated her to pancakes with home-made jam) (translated by N. Volpin). I did not have a date or anything, so I and this friend of mine, Mal Brossard, that was on the wrestling team, decided we'd take a bus into Agerstown and have a hamburger and maybe see a lousy movie (J. Salinger). — Делать мне было нечего, и мы с моим приятелем, с Мэлом Броссаром из команды борцов, решили поехать на автобусе в Эгерстаун съесть по котлете, а может быть, и посмотреть какой-нибудь дурацкий фильм (literally, I had nothing to do, and we are with my buddy, Mel Brossard of the wrestling team, decided to go to Agerstown on a bus to eat a couple of cutlets, and perhaps watch a stupid movie) (translated by R. Rait-Kovaleva). She said maybe she'd eat a cheeseburger later on. Just what is this cheeseburger business? From what I gather, she's practically been living on cheeseburgers and Cokes all semester so far... Christ lived on cheeseburgers and Cokes. For all we know, he probably fed the mult — ... (J. Salinger) — Она сказала, что попозже, может, съест сырник. Но при чем тут сырники? Насколько я понимаю, она и так весь семестр питалась сырниками и кока-колой. ... Христос питался сырниками

и кока-колой. Как знать, может, он и толпы кормил (literally, She said that later she can eat a cream cheese fritter. But what's in the cheese fritters? As I understand it, she ate them an entire semester and drank Coca-Cola. ... Christ ate them too. Who knows, maybe he fed the crowds with them...) (translated by M. Kovaleva).

It should be noted that the Soviet contemporaries of translators R. Rait-Kovaleva and M. Kovaleva in the 1960s had no idea of the American catering and the assortment of McDonald's, while cheese fritters and cutlets were the usual food of Soviet schoolchildren. Therefore, such an interpreting solution, which did not distract the reader's attention to minor details from the main sense, was understandable.

Another example is the translation from Russian into English. Молдаванка шла толпами, как будто во дворе у Криков были перекидки (Moldavanka came in droves, as if there were perekidki in the courtyard of the Kriks) (Isaac Babel, *Odessa Stories*), the subsequent context — "People sat in the garden and took the treat"). The Moldavanka was arriving in droves, as if a wake were being held in the Kriks' yard. The translation of the polysemous Odessa word "perekidki" — "fair, circus, noise, domestic altercation; a type of attraction at a fair" is made using the word "wake" in its religious meaning — "vigil on the eve of a local feast." This word actualizes the meaning of spectacle, sacred ritual, but ignores the meanings of fair, bustle, and domestic altercation.

Compensation of imagery: Snail, snail, glister me forward, / Bird, soft-sigh me home, / Worm, be with me (Th. Roethke). — Несите ж домой меня, ты, переливчатая улитка, / и птица, взмах крыльев которой легок, как вздох, / и червь дождевой (Take me home, you, iridescent snail / and bird whose flap is as light as a sigh / and rainworm). The verb metonymies "glister" and "soft-sigh", formed by the conversion of nouns, are characteristic of English, but are lacking in Russian, which causes certain difficulties in translation. In our example, the imagery created by these metonymies is offset by an expressive epithet and a simile.

Compensation may be associated not only with the replacement of lacunar realia and transformation of imagery, but also with the replacement of conceptual structures of an original by conceptual structures of a target linguistic culture. This means a different interpretation of a literary work, whereby translation appears different from the original in its implications and inferences.

For example, in J. Brain's novel "Place at the top" a character, contemptuously describing the appearance

of a young man from the bottom, says that he had “the face behind the requests on Forces Favourites”, i. e. face of a person who sends applications to perform in a concert on the radio for the military. As explained by V. N. Komissarov, this situation is unlikely to be accepted by a Russian reader as a pejorative characterization. Therefore, translators (T. Kudryavtseva and T. Ozerskaya) chose to establish the equivalence with a completely different situation, he had “such a face that you can see on posters” [8].

As an example of a holistic conceptual re-interpretation (transfer on text-level) let us cite V. N. Toporov’s interpretation of the second part of W. H. Auden’s “In Memory of W. B. Yeats”, in which there are paraphrased images that do not fit into Auden’s conceptual construal [9]. It is most evident in the actualization of such concepts, typical of the Russian outlook, as Родина (Motherland), отчие места (places of forefathers), держава (Power, Empire, Sway), державный (Sovereign) — instead of the neutral “Ireland”, “valley”, “ranches” in the original. The introduction in the translation of such culturally and emotionally loaded and symbolic concepts results in a conceptual discord between the two texts. The same translation manifests marked stylistic and ideological substitutions: instead of the neutral “Ireland” the lofty archaic “Eire” is used; instead of “executives / would never want to tamper” — “where no one of the main titles bow their heads”, reflecting the substitution of colonial realities with imperial ones and the substitution of pragmatics of reluctance with pragmatics of impossibility, etc. We can say that all aspects of the above-mentioned transfer: conceptual, stylistic, ideological — entail a significant transformation of the deep structures of the original.

Second opposition: Conscious vs. unconscious LT

The transfer may occur if a translator is influenced by their presuppositions, background knowledge and the strategies of “smoothing out” a text for the sake of readability and fluency, in this case we may speak of unconscious linguocultural transfer. Unconscious, unintentional LT may cause inadequate translation.

There is also conscious, deliberate adaptation when units of a text are offset by corresponding quasi-equivalents in a target language with the inevitable transformation of meanings. a translator may also be guided by his own specific intentions, by his individual “interpretation super-task”.

Let us consider a few examples. a translation, leading to a change in the conceptual and interpretive structures of the original, is Heinrich Heine’s *Ein Fichtenbaum steht einsam* — the story of a pine and a palm

tree in the presentation of Mikhail Lermontov. According to literary theoretician I. S. Chistova, “Lermontov made no reckoning of the grammatical gender distinctions: in German *pine* is masculine and *palm tree* — feminine. So his poem is not about separation of lovers, like Heine’s, but about the tragedy of loneliness, about irreversible separateness of people” [4]. We believe this is one of the cases of an unintentional re-interpretation, based initially on the unconscious transfer of Lermontov’s own mental image to the poem.

As another example of an unconscious linguocultural transfer we will cite the transformation of the image of Yossarian, the hero of the novel “Catch-22” by Joseph Heller — a cowardly crew member of a World War II bomber, made by translators M. Vilensky and V. Titov. The translators strengthened the negative and expressive connotations related to the description of the hero. Thus they used “окончательно потерял мужество” (“he lost the rags of his courage”) to render “he lost his nerve”; “душа ушла в пятки”, “в ужасе взмолился” (“his soul was at his heel”, “he begged in terror”) to render “he was unnerved”; “он почувствовал, как к сердцу подступает страх” (“he felt fear creeping into his heart”) to render “in incipient panic”; “спасти свою шкуру” (“to save his own skin”) when it comes to struggle for life. The reason for the change of Yossarian’s image lies in the translators’ linguocultural transfer: they perceive the struggle against fascism as an overall heroic deed and condemn even the slightest signs of cowardice during the war, accordingly, they impose negative moral evaluation on any signs of it.

M. Lorie, translation theoretician, notes: “Yes, in our view, Yossarian is not a decent man. He gets drunk and is given to rowdy debauchery, he is no better than others when placed on furlough in Rome and then at the base. He is not full of high patriotism and noble thoughts about the need to rid the world of fascism. But I think you cannot judge him by our yardstick. ...Heller’s novel is an anthology, which, even with grotesque exaggerations, shows what American generals and colonels behave at war, how the unlimited power, which is given them by the army hierarchy of command, awakens in them the worst instincts — greed, cruelty. And here in front of us is the hero, who really does not want to die in this ‘vile and muddy war’ (this characteristic of war as perceived by Yossarian was altogether left out in translation)” [10].

Another bright example of linguocultural transfer (this time apparently conscious) is a translation of Eleanor Porter’s “Pollyanna”. There are in fact four translations of this novel into Russian: by B. Zakhoder, A. Ivanov & A. Ustinova, E. Yanovskaya and

M. Batisheva — each remarkable for a special idiom and some cases of linguocultural transfer. The most peculiar of them, by talented Boris Zakhoder, is marked by the specific Soviet pathos of proletarian solidarity with the oppressed and exploited, whereas in the original and most of other translations this sentiment is absent or blurred. The scene of Miss Polly telling off Nancy, a kitchen maid, is interpreted by B. Zakhoder with a clear moral denunciation of the mistress (See the Table below).

Perhaps even more frequently linguocultural transfer is observed in translations of Russian literature by English-speaking translators, in what R. Hingley called “the kind of unthinking “translationese” which has so often in the past imparted to translated Russian literature a distinctive, somehow doughy, style of its own with little relation to anything present in the original Russian” [26], quoted in Venuti (1995) [30. P. 4]. Examples of this phenomenon are well demonstrated in the translation theory of K. I. Chukovsky. For example, Chukovsky criticizes instances of emasculation of imagery and neutralization of style that can be found in B. G. Guerney’s translation of Gogol’s works: “Mr. Guerney wraps the laconic proverbial phrases with such a lean but heavy crochet... He deprives them (idiomatic phrases) of all semblance of wingedness. Is it hardly surprising that when reading such a translation, foreigners, much as they would like to, cannot understand why Russian people consider this dull author one of the greatest humorists that existed in Russia, why “The Inspector” is perceived not as a historical mon-

ument, but as a living work of art” [16]. Overlooking stylistic diversity, inadequate rendering of realia/idioms, nearly literal translation even of poetry can often be observed in English translations of Russian literature, it may be attributed to overlooking the balance, to either inappropriate familiarization in the case of prose or queer defamiliarization in the case of poetry used by British and American literary translators.

To date, we note as a trend that in translations of national translators their national cultural and ideological ipsocentrism has been replaced by the cultural and ideological alterocentrism of Global English. And for English-speaking translators, the English national cultural and ideological ipsocentrism has remained unchanged. The ideal situation, in our opinion, would be such an interpreting attitude, when national translators adhere to their national ipsocentrism, and the English-speaking translators of the countries of the Inner Circle — to alterocentrism (also see The Fifth Opposition, Conclusion and Implication).

Third opposition:

LT of deep structures vs. LT of surface structures

On the one hand, the rules of interpreting stipulate that the linguocultural transfers of deep structures, i. e. verbal-image conceptual frames, should preponderate over the literal translation; thus images and concepts of reality of a source linguoculture are rendered with their correlates in a target linguoculture. On the other hand, many types of translation require transfers of surface structures from original to translated texts —

Original in English	B. Zakhoder’s interpretation into Russian	Re-translated into English
<p>Miss Polly Harrington entered her kitchen a little hurriedly this June morning. Miss Polly did not usually make hurried movements; she specially prided herself on her repose of manner. But to-day she was hurrying — actually hurrying... “Nancy!” “Yes, ma’am.” Nancy answered cheerfully, but she still continued wiping the pitcher in her hand. “Nancy,” — Miss Polly’s voice was very stern now — “when I’m talking to you, I wish you to stop your work and listen to what I have to say.”... “That will do, Nancy. I did not ask for explanations. I asked for your attention”</p>	<p>Походку мисс Полли Харрингтон отличала горделивая неторопливость. Как и подобает уважающей себя хозяйке. Но этим июньским утром — небывалое дело! — мисс Полли влетела в кухню как ракета. Если не сказать, как фурия... — Эй, Нэнси! — Да, мэм? — робко отозвалась девушка, поднимая глаза на госпожу и продолжая протирать кувшин тряпкой. — Сколько раз повторять, — раздраженно сказала мисс Полли, — когда к тебе обращаются, не хлюпай тряпкой, а слушай, что тебе говорят!.. — Поговори еще! Мне твоих объяснений не требуется. Ты должна молчать и слушать</p>	<p>Miss Polly Harrington’s gait was distinguished by proud unhurriedness. As befits any self-respecting mistress. But this June morning — an unprecedented thing! Miss Polly flew into the kitchen like a rocket. If not to say, like a fury. — Hey, Nancy! — Yes, ma’am? — the girl responded timidly, raising his eyes to the Mistress and continuing to wipe the pitcher with a rag. — How many times should I repeat, — Miss Polly said irritably — when someone speaks to you, don’t squish with a rag, but listen to what they say to you!.. — Keep talking and... I don’t need your explanations. You must be silent and listen</p>

words, phrases and turns of speech of are translated nearly word for word, unadapted to the target language linguistic norms. This particularly concerns simultaneous interpretation as well as translation of contracts, agreements and official documents. In consecutive interpreting and most written translations of non-rigid structure texts transfers of surface structures from original to translated texts (word-for-word translations) are best avoided.

Let us focus on the faulty surface structures handling in translation/interpreting. It may manifest itself either in circumlocutional explanatory verbiage or literalism. Novice translators often have the unconscious intention of expressing a rendered idea in the best possible way, they resort to explanatory verbiage and use excessively complex turns of speech. On the other hand, the stiffness of a novice translator, their inability to switch codes or their excessive desire for accuracy often leads to literalism.

— Circumlocutional verbiage. For example, the phrase “What do they want to see me about?” instead of a short “Зачем я им понадобился?” is translated as “Что они хотят — увидеть и убедиться, что у меня все в порядке?” (“What do they want — to see me and to make sure that I am in order?”).

— Literalism, word-for-word translation. For example, the phrase “It is absolutely necessary to avoid the technique of keeping this pedal constantly pressed” was translated as the literal and incongruent “Следует абсолютно избегать техники держать постоянно нажатой эту педаль” instead of the adequate “Не следует постоянно нажимать на эту педаль”; “This disease can be cured and most people recover quickly” was translated as the literal “Эта болезнь может быть излечена, и большинство людей выздоравливают быстро” instead of the adequate “Болезнь излечима, улучшение обычно наступает быстро” (“The disease is curable, improvement usually occurs fast”).

In the Soviet times, the basic rule was to translate as accurately as possible, to preserve the “foreign coloring”, combined with neutralization or moderate adaptation of less important cultural lacunae, so as not to distract readers’ attention from the main message of the text. This requirement is emphasized by such Russian classics of the theory and practice of translation as Y. M. Lotman, E. G. Etkind, M. L. Gasparov, A. B. Fedorov, A. D. Schweitzer and others. M. L. Gasparov expressed this idea concisely and clearly: an interpretation must fit into a stylistic perspective of native literature [6].

In the 21st c., a departure from the classical rule of translation and interpreting began. The use of transformations has been reduced, while the percentage of transliteration and calquing, word-for-word translation has significantly increased. That is to say, in English > Other-Languages translations (not in Other-Languages > English translations!) defamiliarization has begun to prevail over familiarization. This trend above all reflects the worldwide domination of the English language, the growing incursion of English cultural-ideological clichés into other cultures and languages, and the convergence of their verbal expression under the dominance of the English-speaking linguoculture. It also reflects such objective things as the massive flow of information, necessity for speed in its transmission and processing, and deprofessionalization of translation.

Since most information on the Internet and in other domains takes place in English, there appeared the predominance of English deep and surface structures. It can also be illustrated by the anglicized dubbing of movies. An advocate of close-to-literal translation of film texts, Russian interpreter Dmitry Puchkov (Goblin) renders them with maximum authenticity, character’s dialogues in his translations are replicas of original dialogues, including profanities. Some translators criticize this not euphemistic rendering of English originals. In response, he indicates the inaccuracy, inauthenticity of the official dubbed versions; so comparing his translation of the film *Snatch* with the official Russian dubbing, he remarks: “Their translation has all that it should have... They observe the lexis and rhythm impeccably. No matter how irrelevantly the heroes talk, they do it so rhythmically. They have even translated Gypsy Mickey’s passages. In the original his speech is hardly comprehensible, and in translation he utters words absolutely distinctly” [12].

So, on the one hand, defamiliarization may detract from fluency for Russian readers, besides the idiolects of heroes with lots of slang and rude jokes are untypical of the Russian cultural tradition of censorship and neutralization of low-register language. It relates to the fact that the perception threshold of lower registers and simplistic modes by Russians is low, it is limited to exclusive, marked use. On the other hand, the euphemistic translation in official dubbings does not convey the specificity of the characters’ speech and significantly modifies the image of reality of the foreign linguoculture.

This dilemma is best solved by observing moderation, balanced adaptation, sometimes neutralization. There should be a continual shift from familiarization to defamiliarization, ensuring trueness to the original and general observation of the canons of recipients’ style.

The interference of surface structures is also found in translations of interpreters who lost touch with current language forms. The translation theorist Y. Y. Yakhnina's in her article *Three Camus* criticizes the translator Georgy Adamovich's rendering of Albert Camus' *L'Étranger*. The main troubles with his interpretation are literalism, interference of the surface structures of the French original on the Russian translation, caused by the loss of touch with the live Russian speech¹. The critic points out a "naïve" vocabulary inconsistency and halting, stumbling rhythm. "Laconic modern phrasing is combined with old-fashioned inversions, colloquial speech is wedged in by obsolete words, and the text falls apart" [21].

Fourth opposition:

LT due to the difference of genres and styles in the source language and the target language

Undue transfer of characteristics of styles of a source language to a target language may be called *stylistic maladaptation*. It is also caused the translator's linguocultural transfer.

Before the late 20th c. the standard practice in interpreting was stylistic adaptation of the original to the norms and standards of a target linguoculture. Translators were subconsciously aware of the significant differences in correlate literary styles across languages and cultures, differences in norms and usual modes of expression.

Let us focus on important differences in Russian and English styles. The manuals and reference-books on styles, e. g. by William Strunk Jr., R. M. Gorrel, Ch. Laird, I. R. Galperin, A. D. Schweitzer, E. V. Breus, T. A. Kazakova and others attempted to bring to light patterns of stylistic expression. Based on these sources, we present below a few observations on the differences in journalistic (publicistic) style in Russian and English — which readily lend themselves to extension to science, official and belles-lettres styles.

Let us focus on Russian first. Throughout the Russian history of literature, communicative persuasiveness was achieved in accord with classical European canons: refined language, elevated tone of speech, rhetorical pathos. To create this stylistic effect, elevated bookish lexicon, Greek-Slavonic calques, Greek and Latin international lexis, words of French origin are used. In morphology and syntax compound words, adverbial prefix-suffixal formations, complex sentences, attribute and adverbial participial phrases are common.

The larger part of the Russian bookish vocabulary, pertinent in formal domains of speech, is formed by abstract

and generalized words, expressing abstract concepts that exist only in the mind: отношение "relation", сущность "essence", сфера "sphere", курс, направление "course", обеспечение "provision", осознание "consciousness", ухудшение "aggravation", ускорение "acceleration", облегчение "facilitation", задача "task", мера "measure", особенность "peculiarity", also spiritual-moral words such as духовный "spiritual", совесть "conscience", мудрость "wisdom", надежда "hope".

There is a nominal structure and organization of Russian written styles, *nomenocentrism* — a trend to substantivize, or objectify, actions and processes [3; 7]. Information is centered round the name, while verbs basically predicate it, relate a certain notion to reality. The consequence of this pattern is a large number of abstract deverbal nouns in the positions of the subject, object and adverbial modifier, e. g. осложнение, урегулирование, преодоление, усилие, возобновление, требование.

Abstract and deverbal nouns in Russian sentences often take the position of the subject, which generally contradicts the norms of the English journalistic style.

Genitive-case combinations of nouns, particularly, abstract ones are widespread in Russian (even more so than attributive combinations of the N+N type in English), e. g. оказание помощи, одержание победы, нанесение поражения, оказание влияния (услуги, давления), совершение преступления, произведение анализа, организация мероприятий, достижение результатов, созыв конференции, реализация программ, заключение договора, предоставление займа (независимости), возникновение опасности (войны), создание предприятий.

The general rule to translate Russian abstract/deverbal nouns and genitive combinations is to verbalize them, to make them into verbal phrases and sentences (since English is verbocentric, when describing processes it prefers verbs, and the use of the infinitive, participle, gerund is restricted by the rules of syntactic compatibility).

Verbal-nominal abstract clichés with the weakened meaning of the verb are common in Russian literary styles (оказывать содействие "render help"; оказывать сопротивление "offer resistance"; предоставлять поддержку "extend support"; принести благодарность "express gratitude"; возбуждать иск, подавать жалобу "lodge complaint", выражать удовлетворение "express satisfaction", находить применение "find employment"; принимать меры "take steps"). They are also recommended to be verbalized in Russian-English translations.

Along with abstract names, Russian journalese is characterized by a wide use of bookish verbs — bor-

¹ Adamovich lived abroad most of his life.

rowings and calques from the Greek and Latin languages: реализовывать(ся) “realize”, констатировать “constate”, гарантировать “guarantee”, обеспечивать “procure”, предназначать(ся) “design”, предусматривать “envisage”, посвящать “devote”, etc.

As for syntax, in Russian written styles long complex sentences, participial and adverbial phrases are normal, speech figures and emphatic constructions are common. The syntax of information materials is bookish with frequent use of complex sentences, participial and adverbial clauses. Complex sentences predominate over compound ones [7].

Typical of Russian is high frequency of complex denominative prepositions and conjunctions in all literary styles (nomenocentrism), while in English they are confined within the domain of officialese (в области; в сфере; на ниве; на поприще “in the field of”; насчет, в части, по поводу, в аспекте, в смысле, в отношении, по отношению, с точки зрения “as regards”; на основе, в контексте, с учетом, в свете, сквозь призму, ввиду “in the light of”; с намерением, с целью, с прицелом, в целях, с перспективой, с расчетом на, в надежде, в расчете на, на предмет, в рамках, для реализации “with a view to”, “for the purpose of”; в связи с, в части, касающейся, по вопросу, в применении к, по поводу, на фоне “in connection with”; посредством, в соответствии с, в силу, за счет, по причине, вследствие, согласно, на основании, опираясь, руководствуясь, благодаря “by virtue of”, в наличии, в отсутствие).

Theorist of interpreting T. A. Kazakova writes: “...Inherent in the Russian literary styles are many linguistic features that are not inherent in similar English domains. Appurtenance of a text to the high functional style imposes special requirements on an interpreter and influences the course and result of the translation process. A peculiar stylistic adaptation should take place: language means of the original are replaced by language means that meet the requirements of this style in the target language” [Ibid.].

Now let us focus on literary styles in English. In the Anglo-American historical development of literature the Puritan trend played a great role. Since the 17th c. in England matter-of-factness, austerity, and lack of pretence superseded the artificial rhetorical-stylistic ornateness and euphuism¹. So the English language solves the problem of expression in a different way than Russian: persuasiveness is achieved not through

¹ This revealed itself even more sharply later in the USA, cf. James Russell Lowell’s collection of objectionable meaning-adumbrating phrases like a great crowd — a vast concourse; came to see — was assembled to witness; great fire — disastrous conflagration, etc.

elevated tone and abstract concepts, but through a personal address to the recipient, to their reason and emotions. In the journalistic and stylistic methodology, pathos is castigated as artificial and officious. It is recommended to avoid bookish lexicon and turns of speech but use lexical units and expressions inherent in conversation — idioms, metaphors, phrasal verbs.

Less frequent than in Russian, is the occurrence of emotional expressive, abstract or “moralistic” words

Bookish and abstract words, for example, *essence, sphere, course, provision, consciousness, task, spiritual, conscience*, do not evoke in English-speaking recipients the elevated stylistic effect, they are perceived as too formal and abstract. The emphasis in English journalistic phraseology is on sensory perception, intimacy, emotional impact. This is achieved using short dynamic words of the Germanic origin, assimilated Romance words, idiomatic phrases, metaphors, etc.

Among them noticeable there are verbs with postpositives: turn down (reject), look up to (admire), put up with (tolerate), make up for (compensate), stand behind (support), stand by (defend), give up, hand in (surrender); “body verbs”: back out (withdraw), stand up to (oppose), head off (prevent), bow to (accept), sniff at (ignore); image-carrying verbs: hound, roar, hammer out, iron out, curb etc.

English is characterized by the predominance of concise sentences with contracted and dense meaning, logical links between parts of utterances are less explicit than in Russian. Simple sentences constitute over 50% of the total number of sentences.

Translation methodologists, as a routine rule, recommend to observe the stylistic canons of languages concerned. With the translation pair Russian-English it is recommended to “raise”, i. e. make more abstract and sophisticated the style in the English > Russian translation and to “lower”, make more concrete and colloquial the style in the Russian > English translation. The former means frequent impersonal and indefinite-personal sentences, abstract and deverbal nouns, bookish vocabulary, Latin and Greek origin words, rhetorical pathos, complex syntax, the latter — personal sentences, idiomatic, vivid vocabulary, concrete figurativeness, actional predicates, few gerundial and participial phrases.

Stylistic maladaptation may result in a communicative failure. Subjectively, a stylistically maladapted translated English text may seem to Russian recipients as not serious, subjective, “lightweight”, superficial or factoid. Conversely, a stylistically maladapted translated Russian text may seem to English recipients as abstract, pompous, stilted, non-essential, not to the point.

However, let us emphasize that in changing styles there should be no “hamming up” and downright familiarization; balanced adaptation, sometimes moderation and neutralization should be the main strategy and tactics.

Fifth opposition:

LT while translating into dominant linguistic code vs. LT while translating into less prestigious linguistic code

One more opposition is the linguocultural transfer due to the social status of the source and host languages and cultures, because the status largely determines the type of adaptation. In broad-brush terms, we can deduce two opposite strategies caused by two different attitudes:

- 1) loose translation from a less prestigious source language into a more prestigious target one, involving explanatory verbiage and free use of target-language functional substitutes for the realia of the source language;
- 2) precise or overrefined translation from a more prestigious source language into a less prestigious target one, literalism — translating nearly word-for-word, continuous calque, including idioms and specific cultural turns of speech of the source language, leaving some units not transliterated or not pronounced according to the phonetics of the target language (esp. proper names, toponyms, names of brands or organizations).

These trends reflect themselves in all functional styles and genres, including the belles-lettres language. The linguocultural transfer English > Other Languages often makes translations foreignized, anglicized. As it stands, given the English-language dominance, the world literature is slowly but surely transforming along the English verbal expression and linguocultural concepts. Standardized anglicized vernacular is now found in written-style translations from English across the board, generating non-native sounding of fiction and journalistic prose.

The written English styles are generally less explicit and logically unravelling. Peculiar to English are compressed syntax, semantic contraction, implicitness of logical subordination, specific collocation and frequency of words. All of this is often overlooked by translators, and English texts are rendered in other languages, including Russian, by means of the above-mentioned continuous calque, which causes an artificial ring of text, missing of connotations or even downright meaninglessness.

Compare some “wooden” translations of J. K. Rowling’s “Harry Potter”: “The Prime Minister had stood

there, quite motionless, and realized that he would never, as long as he lived, dare mention this encounter to a living soul, for who in the wide world would believe him?” — “Премьер-министр стоял неподвижно и понимал, что, пока он жив, ни одна живая душа не узнает об этом случае, потому что никто во всем мире ни за что ему не поверит”; “A little tufty-haired man in plain black robes had got to his feet and stood now in front of Dumbledore’s body. Harry could not hear what he was saying. Odd words floated back to them over the hundreds of heads. ‘Nobility of spirit’... ‘intellectual contribution’... ‘greatness of heart’... it did not mean very much. It had little to do with Dumbledore as Harry had known him.” — “Маленький человечек в обычной черной мантии встал со стула и подошел к телу Дамблдора. Он не слышал, что он говорил. Странные слова доходили к ним через сотни голов: “Благородство духа... умственный вклад... величество сердца...” это все ничего не значило. Это мало относилось к Дамблдору, которого знал Гарри”.

According to our hypothesis, currently the translation reveals a tendency to prefer the actualization of deep (and often superficial) structures of the English linguoculture, regardless of the direction of translation: English > Other languages or Other languages > English. This is due to a frequent perception of English as a dominant code in comparison with native languages.

Let us clarify the above. Say, in English > Russian translations adaptation tends to occur through “gentrification” (improvement) and often complication of deep structures of the original. As for surface structures, they frequently reveal anglicization in translation.

In Russian > English translations basic is the adaptation along the line of simplification, the deep structures of the original are formulated in accessible forms, the content and meaning of the original are adapted according to the deep structures of English-speaking recipients. As for surface structures, they also reveal anglicization: the surface structures of national languages are transformed according to the rules of English, in any case, translation methodology dictates so.

Thus, in both directions there is again anglicization of a resultant translated text. In the first case, the Russian audience is sort of placed in the English-speaking culture, in the second, the Russian author is placed therein.

The translator may flaunt their knowledge of English idioms, which produces an effect of exaggeration, “hamming it up”, or “sounding more English than the English themselves”, and in the long run it often misleads recipients. It must be borne in mind that idioms, proverbs, allusions retain their internal form, usage, culture connotations, place and time associations.

That is why linguists and translation methodologists advise against translation using characteristic language idioms. The tactic often recommended by the Russian school of translation is to pick neutral words and phrases if there are no ready substitutes for some idioms, allusions, imagery. A transparent and less affected interpretation will be better understood by the reader. For example, to translate the phrase “Экономика до сих пор пробуксовывает” as “The economy is still hamstrung” will be too expressive and negative-evaluative, moreover, it involves deliberate degradation of meaning (hamstring — “maim”). The adequate translation will be “The economy is still slow (is still in bad shape, not working properly).” And it is perhaps too flowery to translate the neutral “матч 1971 года — самая яркая страница в шахматной истории города” as “the 1971 match was the most quicksilver page in record logs”, but preferably as “Your match of 1971 is the brightest page in the chess history of the city.”

A recommended translation of the sentence “Спортивный комплекс ‘Мои’ назван в честь того самого диктатора, чуть не доведшего страну до ручки...” would be “The Moi International Sports Centre was named after that very politician, during whose rule the country was close to debacle”, and not the options “who nearly ruined the country”, “plagued the life out of the country”, “took the country down the drain”, “ran the country into the ground” or even “nearly screwed up the whole country.”

Then, the translator sometimes rather loosely manages the cultural realia of their native language and applies modifications that, in their view, adequately describe the situation “as seen by the foreigner.” Such kind of substitution of national realia by the realia of a reference (“etalon”) linguoculture often causes an undesirable comic effect. C.f. the translation of such terms unmatchable in the scope and content as Russian образование, обучение vs. training or instruction, колледж (техникум, училище) vs. college. Similarly inadequate seems the translation of positions, academic titles and degrees differently created and awarded in different countries. E.g. the dictionary multitrans.ru suggests several variants for the Russian university position “старший преподаватель” — senior lecturer, associate professor, senior instructor, and nearly the same variants for the academic title “доцент” — senior lecturer, docent, adjunct lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor.

The translation methodologist Jane Povey analyzes the translation into English of the following Russian sentence: “Высшее образование было у 8 тысяч, из них — 42 кандидата и 11 докторов наук” — “8,000 had higher education and those included 42 candidates

of science and 11 people with doctorates.” The author believes that this interpretation leads to a communication failure: foreign students, unfamiliar with the Russian system of education, may not understand this information. In the absence of exact equivalents the author proposes to resort to cultural adaptation, “42 people were with the equivalent of a PhD and 11 with advanced degrees” (Visson, 2011). However, it is more accurate to translate this sentence with the preservation of the Russian realia and English explanations: “8,000 had higher education and those included 42 candidates of science (the equivalent of a PhD) and 11 people with doctorates (the equivalent of PhD advanced degrees).”

5. Conclusion and implication

The notion of linguocultural transfer is connected with globalization, and to a large extent, standardization and unification of linguocultures. Although these factors may also condition the enrichment of all languages and cultures with each other’s accomplishments, provided they share some language of international communication as a common code, this does not happen. The point is that to become an adequate cross-cultural communication tool this universal code should be *subordinate* and *neutral* in relation to national languages and cultures.

In reality the situation is different: the proliferation and dominance of English-language culture in the world entails that English is often perceived as the dominant code and the English-speaking cultures are often perceived as reference cultures, while other world codes and cultures — as subordinate. In fact, intercultural communication today prevalently takes place with the help of the deep and surface structures of the dominant language. These structures may replace relevant structures of other languages of the world. In its turn, this can lead to the decline of national languages/linguocultures and their gradual oblivion¹.

For the sake of balance and preservation of diversity the best approach for national translators will be balanced adaptation with the ipsocentric bias. It means that when translating from the national languages into English it is necessary to largely preserve the realia and syntactical structures of national languages and transfer them freely to the translated text, and when

¹ We argue that the best solutions to the problem would be either the international adoption of a widespread artificial language as a universal auxiliary language or an agreement upon the conventions on the teaching and use of English as a language of international communication (we elaborate on the issue in [28]). The conclusion and implications of the present article fit into the second solution.

there is interpreting from English as a language of international communication into national languages the English linguocultural transfer should be precluded and the text should be either culturally neutralized or familiarized for the target culture.

Ipsocentric approach should also be central for polyglottic international translators, meaning that they should be focused on the national/ethnic linguocultures in both directions of translations, rather than on the linguoculture of the language for international communication.

Sources of illustrations

Translators forums: <http://www.proz.com/kudoz/>; <http://forum.lingvo.ru/actualtopics.aspx?bid=18>; <http://www.trworkshop.net/forum/viewforum.php?f=25>; <http://forum.study.ru/>; <http://www.vavilon.ru>.

References

1. Barkhudarov LS. On the surface and deep structure of the sentence. *Voprosy iazykoznanii = Questions of linguistics*. 1973;(3):50-61. (In Russ.).
2. Borisenko A. Selindzher nachinaet i vyigryvaet = Salinger starts and wins. 2009. Available from: <http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2009/7/bo16.html> (In Russ.).
3. Breus EV. Osnovy teorii i praktiki perevoda s russkogo iazyka na angliyskiy = Fundamentals of the theory and practice of translation from Russian into English. Moscow: URAO; 2004. (In Russ.).
4. Visson L. Praktikum-2 po sinkhronnomu perevodu s russkogo iazyka na angliyskiy = Workshop-2 on simultaneous translation from Russian into English. Moscow: Valent; 2005. (In Russ.).
5. Gasparov M. Ne zasloniat' soboy podlinnik ot chitatelia = Not to obscure the original from the reader. 2001. Available from: http://old.russ.ru/krug/20010626_kal-pr.html (In Russ.).
6. Kazakova TA. Teoriia perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty) = Theory of translation (linguistic aspects). St. Petersburg: Soyuz; 2001. (In Russ.).
7. Komissarov VN. Teoriia perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty) = Theory of translation (linguistic aspects). Moscow; 1990. (In Russ.).
8. Leontieva KI. Vernost' interpretatsii vs. "neytralizatsiia" pri perevode poezii = Fidel interpretation vs. "neutralization" in the translation of poetry. 2012. Available from: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=23190602> (In Russ.).
9. Lorie MF. Ulovki perevodchikov = Interpreters' ruses. In: *Masterstvo perevoda = The skill of translation*. Iss. 7. Moscow: Soviet writer; 1970. (In Russ.).
10. Markovina IY, Sorokin YA. Kul'tura i tekst. Vvedenie v lakunologiiu = Culture and text. Introduction to lacunae study: study guide. Moscow: GEOTAR Media; 2010. (In Russ.).
11. Marova ND. Dialogi o perspektive teksta (na materiale nemetckoiazychnykh hudozhestvennykh tekstov) = Dialogues on the text perspective (based on the German-language literary texts). Almaty: Publishing House of the Kazakh University Press; 1989. (In Russ.).
12. Puchkov D. Professional'nyy perevod kh/f Snatch — Tynu40k Goblina = Professional translation of the feature film Snatch. 2004. Available from: <https://www.oper.ru/news/read.php?t=1051601005> (In Russ.).
13. Sorokin YA, Markovina IY. Opyt sistematizatsii lingvisticheskikh i kul'turologicheskikh lakun: Metodologicheskie i metodicheskie aspekty = Systematization of linguistic and cultural lacunae: Methodological and methodical aspects. In: *Leksicheskie edinity i organizatsiia struktury literaturnogo teksta = Lexical units and organization structure of the literary text*. Kalinin; 1983. Pp. 35—52. (In Russ.).
14. Antipov GA, Donskikh OA, Markovina IY, Sorokin YA. Tekst kak iavlenie kul'tury = Text as a cultural phenomenon. Novosibirsk: Nauka. Sib. Div.; 1989. (In Russ.).
15. Chistova IS (compilation, comments). Lermontov M. Yu. Compositions: in 2 vol. Moscow: Pravda; 1988—1990. (In Russ.).
16. Chukovsky KI. Vysokoe iskusstvo. Printsiipy hudozhestvennogo perevoda = The high art. Principles of literary translation. St. Petersburg: Avalon, Azbuka-classic; 2008. (In Russ.).
17. Schweitzer AD, Nikolsky LB. Vvedenie v sotciolingvistiku = Introduction to sociolinguistics. Moscow: Higher school; 1978. (In Russ.).
18. Schweitzer AD. Teoriia perevoda: status, problemy, aspekty = Theory of translation: status, issues, aspects. Moscow: Nauka; 1988. (In Russ.).
19. Jung CG. K voprosu ob izuchenii psihologicheskikh tipov = The question of the study of psychological types. Available from: <http://www.yourdreams.ru/biblio/pages/carl-gustav-jung-spt-1.php> (In Russ.).

20. Yakhnina YY. Kazhdy perevod — interpretatsiia = Every translation is interpretation. 2001. Available from: <http://www.elkost.com/authors/kostioukovitch/media/51-russkiyzhurnal2001yulianay> (In Russ.).
21. Yakhnina YY. Tri Kamiu = Three Camus. 1997. Available from: <http://www.vavilon.ru/noragal/yahnina.html> (In Russ.).
22. Bassnett S. Translation Studies. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press; 2012.
23. Berman A; Venuti L (ed.). Translation and the Trials of the Foreign. In: The Translation Studies Reader. Routledge; 2000.
24. Eco U. Saying Almost the Same Thing: Experiences in Translation. Milan: Bompiani; 2003.
25. Fishman J. Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. *Language in society*. 1974;(2-1):79-102. [Ed. by J. Fishman. Hague: Mouton].
26. Hingley R (ed. and trans.). The Oxford Chekhov. Vol. III. London, New York: Oxford University Press; 1964.
27. Lefevere A. Translation: Its Genealogy in the West. In: Bassnett S, Lefevere A (eds.). Translation, History and Culture. London, New York: Pinter; 1990.
28. Shelestyuk E. Exercising Eco-Linguistic Approach in Teaching English: Proposed Conventions for TESOL/TEFL Pedagogy. In: The Third International Conference on Current Issues of Languages, Dialects and Linguistics, 31 January — 1 February 2019, Iran, Ahwaz. Vol. 2. Book of Full Articles. 2019. 1—21. ISBN: 9786008873877.
29. Shuttleworth M, Cowie M. Dictionary of Translation Studies. Manchester, UK: St Jerome Publishing; 1997.
30. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. London, New York: Routledge; 1995.
31. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation (2nd ed.). Abingdon, Oxon, U.K.: Routledge; 2008. ISBN 978-0-415-39453-6.

Источники иллюстративного материала

Форумы переводчиков: <http://www.proz.com/kudoz/>; <http://forum.lingvo.ru/actualtopics.aspx?bid=18>; <http://www.trworkshop.net/forum/viewforum.php?f=25>; <http://forum.study.ru/>; <http://www.vavilon.ru>.

Список источников

1. Бархударов Л. С. О поверхностной и глубинной структуре предложения // Вопросы языкознания. 1973. № 3. С. 50—61.
2. Борисенко А. Сэлинджер начинает и выигрывает. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/inostran/2009/7/bol6.html>.
3. Бреус Е. В. Основы теории и практики перевода с русского языка на английский. М.: УРАО, 1998. 240 с.
4. Виссон Л. Практикум-2 по синхронному переводу с русского языка на английский. М.: Валент, 2005. С. 15.
5. Гаспаров М. Не заслонять собой подлинник от читателя. URL: http://old.russ.ru/krug/20010626_kal-pr.html.
6. Казакова Т. А. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). СПб.: Союз, 2001. 320 с.
7. Комиссаров В. Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты): учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. М.: Высш. шк., 1990. 253 с.
8. Леонтьева К. И. Верность интерпретации vs. «нейтрализация» при переводе поэзии. URL: <http://rgf.tversu.ru/node/642>.
9. Лорие М. Ф. Уловки переводчиков // Мастерство перевода. Вып. 7. М.: Совет. писатель, 1970. 542 с.
10. Марковина И. Ю., Сорокин Ю. А. Культура и текст. Введение в лакунологию: учеб. пособие. М.: ГЭОТАР-Медиа, 2010.
11. Марова Н. Д. Диалоги о перспективе текста (на материале немецкоязычных художественных текстов). Алма-Ата: Изд-во Казах. ун-та, 1989. 84 с.
12. Пучков Д. Профессиональный перевод х/ф Snatch — Tynu40k Goblina. URL: <https://www.oper.ru/news/read.php?t=1051601005>.
13. Сорокин Ю. А., Марковина И. Ю. Опыт систематизации лингвистических и культурологических лакун: методологические и методические аспекты // Лексические единицы и организация структуры литературного текста: сб. науч. тр. Калинин, 1983. С. 35—52.

14. Текст как явление культуры / Г. А. Антипов, О. А. Донских, И. Ю. Марковина, Ю. А. Сорокин. Новосибирск: Наука. Сиб. отд-ние, 1989.
15. Лермонтов М. Ю. Соч. в 2 т. Т. 1 / сост. и коммент. И. С. Чистовой; вступ. ст. И. Л. Андроникова. М.: Правда, 1988. 720 с.
16. Чуковский К. И. Высокое искусство. Принципы художественного перевода. СПб.: Авалонъ, Азбука-классика, 2008. 442 с.
17. Швейцер А. Д., Никольский Л. Б. Введение в социолингвистику: учеб. пособие. М.: Высш. шк., 1978. 216 с.
18. Швейцер А. Д. Теория перевода: статус, проблемы, аспекты. М.: Наука, 1988.
19. Юнг К. Г. К вопросу об изучении психологических типов. URL: <http://www.yourdreams.ru/biblio/pages/carl-gustav-jung-spt-1.php>.
20. Яхнина Ю. Я. Каждый перевод — интерпретация. URL: http://www.langinfo.ru/index.php?sect_id=1540.
21. Яхнина Ю. Я. Три Камю. URL: <http://www.vavilon.ru/noragal/yahnina.html>.
22. Bassnett S. Translation Studies. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2012.
23. Berman A. Translation and the Trials of the Foreign. The Translation Studies Reader / ed. by L. Venuti. Routledge, 2000.
24. Eco U. Saying Almost the Same Thing: Experiences in Translation. Milan: Bompiani, 2003.
25. Fishman, J. Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning // Language in society. 1974. Vol. 2, no. 1. P. 79—102. [Ed. by J. Fishman. Hague: Mouton].
26. The Oxford Chekhov. Vol. III / ed. and trans. by R. Hingley. London; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964.
27. Lefevere A. Translation: Its Genealogy in the West. Translation, History and Culture / ed. by S. Bassnett, A. Lefevere. London; New York: Pinter, 1990.
28. Shelestyuk E. Exercising Eco-Linguistic Approach in Teaching English: Proposed Conventions for TESOL/TEFL Pedagogy // The Third International Conference on Current Issues of Languages, Dialects and Linguistics, 31 January — 1 February 2019, Iran, Ahwaz. Vol. 2. Book of Full Articles. 1—21. 2019. ISBN: 9786008873877.
29. Shuttleworth M., Cowie M. Dictionary of Translation Studies. Manchester, UK: St Jerome Publ., 1997.
30. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.
31. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. 2nd ed. Abingdon, Oxon, U.K.: Routledge, 2008. ISBN 978-0-415-39453-6.

Information about the authors

Elena V. Shelestyuk — Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics.

Evgeniya S. Yakovleva — graduate student of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics.

Информация об авторах

Е. В. Шелестюк — доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры теоретического и прикладного языкознания.

Е. С. Яковлева — аспирантка кафедры теоретического и прикладного языкознания.

Статья поступила в редакцию 13.02.2022; одобрена после рецензирования 23.02.2022; принята к публикации 25.02.2022.

The article was submitted 13.02.2022; approved after reviewing 23.02.2022; accepted for publication 25.02.2022.

Вклад авторов: авторы сделали эквивалентный вклад в подготовку публикации.
Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Contribution of the authors: the authors contributed equally to this article.
The authors declare no conflicts of interests.