

5. Kramersch C. Context and culture in the language teaching. / C. Kramersch. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1993. – 296 p.
6. Kramersch C. Proficiency Plus: Next Step / C. Kramersch // PENN Language News. 7. – 1993. – P. 4.
7. Newmark P. Approaches to Translation / P. Newmark. – Oxford : Pergamon Press, 1981. – 213 p.
8. Nida E. Towards a science of translation / E. Nida. – Leiden, 1964. – 342 p.
9. Scollon R. & S. Wong Scollon // R. Scollon & S. Scollon. – Intercultural Communication : A Discourse Analysis. Blackwell Publishers. – 2001. – 302 p.
10. Wierzbicka A. Emotions Across Languages and Cultures Diversity and Universals / A. Wierzbicka. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1999. – 349 p.

Бордюк Л. В., кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри прикладної лінгвістики Національного університету «Львівська політехніка». E-mail: lyudmila.ukr@gmail.com

Прагматичні та структурні особливості навчального посібника «Переклад як міжкультурна комунікація: англійська ↔ українська мови» / Translation as Intercultural Communication: English ↔ Ukrainian.

Анотація

У статті розглядаються взаємопов'язані універсалії «мова та культура» крізь призму перекладу на матеріалі навчального посібника «Переклад як міжкультурна комунікація: англійська ↔ українська мови» / Translation as Intercultural Communication: English ↔ Ukrainian. Теоретичною основою посібника є розуміння перекладу як напряму прикладної лінгвістики та прояву міжкультурної комунікації. Переклад розглядається як процес і продукт міжкультурної комунікації.

Ключові слова: переклад, міжкультурна комунікація, культурні імплікації, англо-українські паралелі, прагматичний аспект.

Бордюк Л. В. Прагматические и структурные особенности учебного пособия «Перевод как межкультурная коммуникация: английский ↔ украинский языки» / Translation as Intercultural Communication: English ↔ Ukrainian.

Аннотация

Данное учебное пособие представляет собой комплексный курс, содержащий отдельные разделы теории перевода, а также практические задания из разнообразных источников для перевода с английского на украинский и с украинского на английский языки. Теоретической базой пособия является понимание перевода как направления прикладной лингвистики и проявления межкультурной коммуникации. Диалектическая связь и взаимозависимость языка и культуры являются определяющими при решении практических переводческих задач.

Ключевые слова: перевод, межкультурная коммуникация, английский / украинский лингвокультурный контекст.

УДК 81'246.2:81'25(045)

Vukolova V. O.

SELF-TRANSLATION AS A SPECIFIC ARTISTIC ACTIVITY OF BILINGUAL AUTHORS

The article analyzes the literary bilingualism phenomenon of V. Nabokov, the Russian and American writer, literary critic and translator. The scientific research of individual (literary) bilingualism and self-translation practice as rare and understudied phenomenon seems to be important and relevant. The peculiarities of bilingual texts and the author's reasons to perform the self-translation are discussed here. The article defines future trends in scientific development of this problem.

Key words: bilingual text, self-translation, bilingualism, biculturalism, V. Nabokov.

Introduction. The phenomenon of self-translation has become the special subject, the unique trend in recent translation studies. Frequently it is discussed as the marker of culture hybridization and intercultural transfers. Bibliography on self-translation peculiarities is long, but the problem still has more questions than answers, especially when we investigate a particular author's works and his/her manner of translation.

The topicality of the article. Manywriters and poets, using two or more languages in varying degrees, deny self-translation for various reasons. The most common reason for that is the meaning that translating your own work you are making a copy, repeating, replicating yourself. Therefore authors prefer to create something new, unique, and their masterpieces are translated by professional translators. Another question is interrelation between self-translation and bilingualism. By its definition self-translation is synonymous to bilingual and bicultural translation. Scholars see the phenomenon more closely connected with bilingualism than to translation *per se*. In Carolyn Shread's opinion, «one consequence of the marginalization of self-translation as a practice is that it reinforces western models in which monolingualism, rather than multilingualism, is the norm» [quoted in 5, p. 66]. Self-translatorshave been neglected in literary history and translation theory, and it is still often assumed that they are just rather idiosyncratic anomalies, mostly preening polyglots or maladaptive immigrants.

The works of self-translators and the works of bilingual authors are usually studied in only one of the two languages, in only one of the two cultures. As a result, an important dimension of these works remains unexplored without taking into account that the auto-translation represents the mediation between two cultures. Today, however, scholars in translation studies seem to make a greater interest in communication and culture than linguistic issues as such: translation is seen rather as action between cultures than between languages [4, p. 279]. So, the major emphasis should be put not only on translation of one text into another, of one language into another, but on translation of one culture into another.

The previous studies. As a phenomenon self-translation has a long and reach history dating for more than two thousand years and continues to be widespread in different cultures. The tradition of the bilingual writer creating a single text in two languages, smoothly spanning different audiences, is a rich and venerable one, arising in Greco-Roman antiquity and thriving in the European Middle Ages and Renaissance. Self-translation was a common practice in the ambient translingual world of early modern Europe, when bilingualism was the norm, and writers increasingly translated between Latin and vernaculars. For centuries it has been practiced by many men of letters such as Leonardo Bruni, Etienne Dolet, Thomas More, James Joyce, Samuel Beckett, Vladimir Nabokov, Chyngyz Aitmatov, Elsa Triolet, Andrei Makine and others.

J. Hokenson and M. Munson in their work «History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation» point out that monolingual literary critics extol the writers' texts in one language while neglecting their work in the other, even as theorists in linguistics and translation studies tend to ignore self-translators altogether, in their consensual focus on cultural and linguistic difference. As several scholars have shown apropos of single writers, it has been difficult even to classify self-translation as a literary and cultural endeavor: Are the two texts both original creations? Is either text complete? Is self-translation a separate genre? Can either version belong within a single language or literary tradition? How can two linguistic versions of a text be commensurable [3, p. 2]?

The act of self-translation or auto-translation was defined by the Slovak scientists Anton Popovič as «the translation of an original work into another language by the author himself» [quoted in 5, p. 66]. Many scholars studied the phenomenon of self-translation concentrating on the problem of identities, author's subjectivity and equivalence, the bilingual text, history and theory of literary self-translation (A. Berlina, R. Federman, V. Feschenko, J. Hokenson, A. Klimkiewicz, M. Oustinoff). The problem of self-translation makes it possible to study the theory of translation from a new point of view. The traditional approach is based on the concept of equivalence when comparing the source text and the target one. And it underlines the asymmetric positions in artistic freedom and creative independence of an author and a professional translator. As a rule, a translator excludes his/her own subjectivity and tends to explicit the author's subjectivity. R. Federman brightly illustrates this thesis : We always admire the faithfulness of a translation in relation to the original, and quickly deplore and criticize the liberties a translator takes with the original work of a writer [2]. So, the remark made by V. Feschenko is very significant: Translating from one language to another the author continues to express himself/herself by the means of the second language [6, p. 202].

Self-translators do not only master but choose to create in more than one language. They try to produce a new text on the basis of the written one but involved into another cultural environment. Understanding this

intention many linguists occupied in translation theory investigate self-translation not only as bilingual manifestation but also as bicultural phenomenon (G. Râbacov, E. Dzaparova, K. Baleyevskikh and others).

The aim of the article is to describe the uniquely bilingual text as the phenomenon of both linguistic and cultural fields, to study the peculiarities of V. Nabokov's bilingualism and biculturalism, to determine the author's reasons to perform the self-translation.

Discussion. Many studies try to answer the question: What is the bilingual text? The most common answer is: «the bilingual text is a self-translation, authored by a writer who can compose in different languages and who translates his or her texts from one language into another» [3, p. 1]. There is no doubt that literary bilingualism of any writer positively influences his or her creative work. the situation of bilingualism gives the possibility to see an ambivalent role of the language in the literary creation. But it is still the question, sounded by R. Federman, the French-American writer: I have often wondered, as a bilingual writer and a self-translator, whether I am blessed because of this phenomenon or cursed because of it [2]?

There are many reasons for the author to make the self-translation of his or her work. E. Khovanskaya and O. Pratchenko distinguish among them the political situation, the author's desire to combine two different cultures, educational status and others [7]. As for individual factors encouraging the practice of self-translations we can mention the perfect or almost perfect bilingualism of the author-translator, the distrust or the dissatisfaction with existing translations. And this point is supposed to be the first and the most important factor which describes the history of the formation of V. Nabokov as the self-translator.

Why could Nabokov be such an exceptional translator? He read and wrote Russian, English and French by the time he was seven, as he said he had «a perfectly normal trilingual childhood». Growing up trilingual in Saint Petersburg, with Russian parents and French and English governesses, Vladimir Nabokov seems to have learned to read English poetry before he could read Russian, his native language, though he soon spoke all three languages. At age eleven, Nabokov translated Mayne Reid's «The Headless Horseman» from English to French. As a writer, he wrote almost exclusively in Russian until 1938.

B. Boyd underlines that translation helped turn V. Nabokov from a Russian writer into an English one [1, p. 7]. Living in the Russian emigration in Germany in the 1930s, V. Nabokov found the first English translation of one of his novels so bad that he translated a second himself, then rewrote from scratch in English the first novel translated, then another novel directly in English, although he was still also writing in Russian. When he moved to the US in 1940, he decided to renounce writing in Russian prose, to force himself to write English, but the best way for him to earn money as a writer was to translate from Russian. V. Nabokov translated poems by Pushkin, Lermontov, Tyutchev, and Fet, the greatest nineteenth-century Russian poets, and by his friend Vladislav Hodasevich, whom he thought the greatest of twentieth-century Russian poets. He found jobs in American universities teaching Russian, and translated more Russian poetry for his students. As the Professor of Russian Literature at Cornell, Nabokov translated found most English translations to be «the wild asses of ignorance» [quoted in 3, p. 178] (in contrast to Pushkin's words «translators are the post-horses of civilization»).

V. Nabokov didn't trust translations and he was the strict judge for his own self-translated works. At the end of the English version of «Lolita», Nabokov had written an afterword, which concludes: None of my American friends has read my Russian books and thus every appraisal on the strength of my English ones is bound to be out of focus. My private tragedy, which cannot, and indeed should not, be anybody's concern, is that I had to abandon my natural idiom, my untrammelled, rich, and infinitely docile Russian tongue for a second-rate brand of English, devoid of any of those apparatuses – the baffling mirror, the black velvet backdrop, the implied associations and traditions – which the native illusionist, frac-tails flying, can magically use to transcend the heritage in his own way [quoted in 1, p. 7]. Interestingly, though, when he translated «Lolita» back into Russian, he found his remembered Russian not quite as magical as he had thought. In a new Postscript to the Russian translation, he wrote: I so fervently stress to my American readers the superiority of my Russian style to my English that some Slavists might really think that my translation of *Lolita* is a hundred times better than the original, but the rattle of my rusty Russian strings only nauseates me now. The history of this translation is a history of disillusionment. Alas, that «wondrous Russian

tongue»that, it seemed to me, was waiting for me somewhere, was flowering like a faithful springtime behind a tightly locked gate, whose key I had held in safekeeping for so many years, proved to be nonexistent, and there is nothing behind the gate but charred stumps and a hopeless autumnal distance [quoted in 1, p. 8].

Here we'd like to stress one more problem connected with the phenomenon of self-translation. The self-translation is not very much different from translation proper. The author-translator has to mediate between the two texts so as to maintain the purpose of the translation action, he must master not only the two languages but also their cultures. The traditional analysis of bilingual texts are concentrated on «gaps» between texts, languages, and cultures. One must start from a point closer to the common core of the bilingual text, that is, within the textual intersections and overlaps of versions. Real translators live and work not in a hypothetical gap between languages, between source and target cultures, but in the midst of them; they combine several languages and cultural competencies at once, and constitute a mid-zone of overlaps and intersections, being actively engaged in several cultures simultaneously. Hence every translator is “a minimal interculture”. In R. Federman’s opinion the bilingual writer allows his readers (if he has any) to listen to the dialogue which he entertains within himself in two languages, even though in most cases the readers (who are usually not bilingual) only hear half of this internal (one should almost say infernal) dialogue [2]. Claiming that “literature” was his passport, Nabokov lamented that «Nobody can decide if I’m a middle-aged American writer or an old Russian writer – or an ageless international freak» [quoted in 3, p. 161].

Explaining his practice of self-translation R. Federman notes: Usually when I finish a novel <...>, I am immediately tempted to write (rewrite, adapt, transform, transact, transcreate – I am not sure what term I should use here, but certainly not translate) the original into the other language. Even though finished, the book feels unfinished if it does not exist in the other language [2]. In our opinion these words could be applied to Nabokov's approach to the translation. For the major period of self-translation, after 1960, he developed a method of using “subtranslators” (often his wife or son) who submitted a literal translation from which he prepared the final text for publishers: nine novels, four volumes of stories, one play, one volume of his poetry. He also checked translations of his work into French and German, and his wife learnt Italian in her sixties to check the translations of his poetry into Italian.

It should be added that the translation, or rather the self-translation often augments, enriches, and even embellishes the original text — enriches it, not only in terms of meaning, but in its music, its rhythm, its metaphoric thickness, and even in its syntactical complexity. This is so because the self-translator can take liberties with his own work since it belongs to him [2].

Conclusion. Nabokov's language is unique and original, native and at the same time alien for either of the readers since it made of two language world pictures that interact and enrich each other. A bilingual author is not merely a sum of two complete or incomplete monolinguals but rather a unique and specific linguistic and cultural configuration. This question still remains opened and new categories of analysis of the bilingual texts of self-translators must be developed.

References

1. Boyd B. Nabokov as Translator: Passion and Precision / Brian Boyd. – [Internet resource]. – Access mode : http://www.usp.br/rus/images/edicoes/Rus_n01/04_BOYD_Brian_-_Nabokov_as_Translator_-_Passion_and_Precision.pdf
2. Federman R. A Voice within a Voice: Federman Translating / Translating Federman / Raymond Federman. – [Internet resource]. – Access mode : <http://www.federman.com/rfsr2.htm>
3. Hokenson J. W. The Bilingual Text. History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation / Jan Walsh Hokenson, Marcella Munson. – Manchester; N. Y. : St. Jerome Publishing, 2007. – 236 p.
4. Pascua I. Translation and Intercultural Education / Isabel Pascua // Meta. – 2003. – XLVIII, № 1-2. – P. 276–284.
5. Râbacov G. Self-Translation as Mediation between Cultures / Ghenadie Râbacov // International Journal of Communication Research. – Volume 3. – Issue 1. January / March 2013. – P. 66–69.
6. Фещенко В. В. Автоперевод поэтического текста как разновидность автокоммуникации / В. В. Фещенко // Критика и семиотика. – 2015. – № 1. – С. 199–218.
7. Хованская Е. С. Авторский перевод. Причины обращения / Е. С. Хованская, О. В. Праченко // Научный журнал КубГАУ. – 2014. – № 99 (05). – С. 1–13.

Вуколова В. О., кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри сучасних європейських мов Вінницького торговельно-економічного інституту Київського національного торговельно-економічного університету. E-mail: violavuk@mail.ru

Авторський переклад як особливий вид творчої діяльності письменників-білінгвів.

Анотація

У статті проаналізовано феномен художнього білінгвізму російсько-американського письменника, літературознавця, перекладача В. Набокова. Звернення до проблем індивідуального (літературного) білінгвізму та авторського перекладу як рідкісного та недостатньо вивченого явища є актуальним і своєчасним.

Мета статті – описати унікальність білінгвальних текстів як феноменів не лише лінгвістичної, але й культурологічної сфери, дослідити особливості білінгвізму і бікультуралізму В. Набокова, визначити причини звернення письменника до авторського перекладу.

Двомовність В. Набокова реалізовано як в оригінальних творах різними мовами, так і в галузі художнього перекладу (зокрема автоперекладу). Автор-перекладач є посередником не тільки між двома текстами, що є основним завданням перекладу, а й між двома культурами, до яких належать мови цих текстів. Недовіра до фахових перекладачів і досконале володіння англійською мовою слугували головними чинниками звернення В. Набокова до перекладу власних творів і творів інших письменників і поетів. Доводиться думка, що робота над власним перекладом – це продовження творчої праці письменника, удосконалення і збагачення оригінального твору. Традиційні перекладознавчі методи аналізу оригіналу та перекладу не можуть бути застосовані для дослідження авторських перекладів.

В роботі визначено перспективи подальших наукових розвідок у цьому напрямку.

Ключові слова: білінгвальний текст, авторський переклад, білінгвізм, бікультуралізм, В. Набоков.

Вуколова В. А. Авторский перевод как особый вид творческой деятельности писателей-билингвов.

Аннотация

В статье анализируется феномен художественного билингвизма русско-американского писателя, литературоведа, переводчика Владимира Набокова. Обращение к проблемам индивидуального (литературного) билингвизма и авторского перевода как редкого и недостаточно изученного явления представляется актуальным о своемвременном. Рассмотрены особенности билингвальных текстов, проанализированы причины обращения авторов-билингвов к автопереводу. В статье определены перспективы дальнейших научных исследований в этой области.

Ключевые слова: билингвальный текст, авторский перевод, билингвизм, бикультурализм, В. Набоков.

УДК 811.111'42

Dunaievskia O. V.

«GODFATHER», «GODMOTHER», «GODPARENT» – FROM LINGUAL AND CULTURAL MODEL OF INFANT BAPTISM TO THE INTERDISCURSIVE REALIZATION

The paper outlines the ways in which the set of the nominative units pertaining to Infant Baptism: godfather, godmother, godparent act in interdiscursive space.

The study is based on the traditional religious texts of Anglican Church: Book of Common Prayer, Christian Initiation, Becoming of Godparent Leaflet, the utterances of different types of discourse taken from «The Times» and «The Sunday Times» (2015 – 2016).

The way the religious language represents the situation of Infant Baptism is viewed as the main aim of our study. The target of the research is the scope of the lexis used to describe the religious event, whereas the trial subject covers particularly the typical situation of Infant Baptism. Precisely the major attention is paid to the aspects of the definite set of Infant Baptism nominative units' interdiscursive realization that is primarily based on the cognitive, lingual and cultural models.

The results of the research reveal the tendencies the nominative units: «godfather», «godmother», and «godparent» demonstrate while actualization of different meanings in the interdiscursive scope.

The further study can be continued with the aim to find out the possible reasons of interdiscursive actualizations sorted out in the work.

Key words: godfather, godmother, baptism, nominative space.