

Time and Space in Translation (in Honour of Branislav Hocheľ 1951 – 2015)

DUŠAN TELLINGER

J. Pannonius University

Abstract: This paper reflects not only the present stage of the research of the topic time and space in translation but also its history and the way of development. The successors of James Stratton Holmes in Nitra include Anton Popovič, one of the most important founders of contemporary translation studies. A. Popovič's scientific research followed in footsteps of J. Holmes, his great teacher, and his famous fundamental book, *Theory of Literary Translation* (1975), was the starting basis for B. Hocheľ's till now seminal book, *Translation in the Communication Process* (1990). Unfortunately, neither of these books has been available in English, i.e. in the academic *Lingua Franca* of the West and East. Thus, the aim of this paper is to show how the topic of time and space (and other topics near to this basic translational phenomenon) are dealt with in both books in comparison with J. Holmes' book. The issue of time and space in translation is significant for practice, and equally important for its theoretical aspect. Both time and space are universal constraints and have integral roles in every literary translation because in every literary text no action can exist apart from the constraints of time and space (the primary procedures of translation across time and space are *historizing* versus *modernizing*).

Key words: translation conception, *historizing*, *modernizing*, *creolization*, *realia*, interpretation, criticism of translation

Abstrakt: Príspevok zahŕňa širokú oblasť translatologického výskumu, ktorý je zameraný na určenie významu času a miesta vzniku originálu v procese prekladu. Cieľom tohto článku je taktiež poukázať na historický vývoj v nazeraní na riešenie tohto základného prekladateľského problému nielen na teoretickej rovine, ale predovšetkým v praxi. Základnými spôsobmi, ako možno preklenúť rozdiely v čase a priestore pri preklade ľubovoľného literárneho diela, sú už tradične *historizácia* alebo *modernizácia*, inými slovami, *exotizácia* a *domestifikácia* (*naturalizácia*). Prechodným javom je *kreolizácia* dvoch kultúr v texte prekladu (s cieľom adaptovať ho na domáce pomery), keď sú prvky východiskovej a cieľovej kultúry v určitej rovnováhe. O čase a priestore pri prekladaní umeleckej literatúry písal vo svojich dodnes aktuálnych teoretických prácach James Stratton Holmes a pod jeho značným vplyvom aj Anton Popovič, ktorého knihy boli východiskom pri ďalšom rozpracovaní danej problematiky v základnej knihe Branislava Hocheľa *Preklad ako komunikácia* (1990). Pri porovnaní kníh uvedených autorov možno vidieť zhodu v názoroch na riešenie odvekej otázky, či postupovať pri preklade s upriamením sa na originál (*verný preklad*), alebo mať v stredobode pozornosti skôr príjemcu cieľového textu (vtedy je preklad do určitej miery adaptovaný v jeho záujme). Knihy obidvoch významných predstaviteľov modernej slovenskej translatológie nie sú zatiaľ prístupné v angličtine, čím je ich vplyv na západnú translatológiu dosť obmedzený.

Kľúčové slová: koncepcia prekladu, *historizácia*, *modernizácia*, *kreolizácia*, *realie*, interpretácia, kritika prekladu

Translation is primarily a time- and space-bound process, so it is inevitable that translation

studies will research how the transposition of original text occurs into a foreign cultural "time-space". This was the central issue in the research of James Stratton Holmes who was the first to recognize translation studies as a discipline in its own right. He was able to play by the late 1960s a pioneering role initiating this scientific area in his article *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies* (1972/1988, 2005, pp. 67-80). Prior to this most writing about translation was as a purely linguistic process about literary and sacral works. Holmes' research over a period of about fifteen years before his untimely death as his scientific activities (i.e. turning to metalanguage) matured offers a substantial theoretical basis for describing and explaining translational phenomena, including the role of culture in successful translation, and his whole work can be considered as the fruitful interaction between praxis and theory. He has brought linguistics and translational criticism closer together and referred to role of both in translation, because a good translation is substantially a critical instrument of literature, culture and language. His importance in the field of translation studies is remarkable and new trends in this scientific research could be seen as a direct offspring of his pioneering work. Holmes' heritage traces back to the Prague Linguistic Circle, because Roman Jakobson and his colleagues from the Prague School of Linguistics provided fruitful ideas for further study: they preserved the link between linguistics and literature. James Holmes was above all an important follower of this small group of Czech structuralists which were opposed to the previous prescriptive approach stressing fidelity to the original, although the translation must have the same meaning, same content and same style as the original. The translation equivalence can be generally only approximate, that is the reason for the non-existence of ideal translations. The freedom of translating was only an euphemism for infidelity in the translation process of cultural and material specifications like obscure vocabulary or unusual idioms, for instance realia, archaisms, jargon, dialectal words, argot, etc. Such lexical items may exclude translation readers from the circle of those who may understand the sense of texts without misconception.

In the second half of the last century translation theory gradually became part of a modern discipline which calls itself translation studies. The shift from linguistic view into a functional one has focused on the communication function of translation and translation's progressive and socially responsible role. This shift in the translation theory began also in the 1960s as the attention from the original formal aspects was refocused to the translation and its function in the receiving culture within other kinds of communication: the central new knowledge was that translations are culture-bound and especially target culture-bound. Holmes' translation reception theory was target oriented and was centred in the Low Countries – in the Netherlands, Belgium and Israel too thanks to personal contact between James Holmes and Itamar Even-Zohar. A progressive evolution in the translation theory started as early as before the middle of the 20th century: it was a turn away from literary to non-literary texts as new translation possibilities emerged with the help of machines (above all technical, legal, medical and multimedial texts). Translation of every kind was regarded no longer for only a language transfer of the message in a faithfully recreated form because translation is always at the mercy of cultures and the ideologies. James Holmes wrote three decades ago as follows: „We now have a better understanding than ten years ago of the ways in which literary translations function within a literary culture, or polysystem if you will, but still not enough to be able to predict to a publisher: This is (or will be) a translation that will change the system. We now know much more than we once did about the nature and characteristics of various kinds of texts, but we still have no international repertory of lexicon listing text kinds and types together with their general characteristics and functions and their structural and stylistic differences according to cultural area. And we now probably have more information than even before, most of it locked inside the heads of translators, about in-context counterparts in Language B for a given word, phrase, idiom, or cultural element in Language A, but our bilingual dictionaries and grammars are still a disgrace and a despair” (Holmes, 2005, p. 110).

Also in a target cultures there is an ideal cultural transfer that can never be realized because of the incongruence of languages and cultures (linguistic and cultural differences in the translation).

In general, it may be said that the value of a concrete work cannot be equated with a quality of a source culture. The aesthetic function of the source text which is communicatively relevant cannot be simply reproduced in the target text: “Romantism, for instance, which has many forms, but may be said to centre on the individual’s emotional relationship with another with nature, is characteristic of various cultures at various periods, but the value of this or that romantic work depends on its true to shared experience of life and its artistic qualities, not on its ‘culture’. In fact, when it is translated, and necessarily denuded of its phonaesthetic properties, it may be exposed for the poor and vacuous thing it is“ (Newmark, 1993, p. 173). That translation may cause such work to be empty because of transferring not only into another language, but into another cultural period, in which emotional relationships with nature and people are disparate in comparison with those of the time and area of the original work such as those written during the long period of romantic movement in American and European literature (since the beginnings in Germany in the 1790s till the last fading away of this literary tendency for in Russia in the 1840s). The hundred years old period of European and American history: they show changing tastes and values of living.

The role which the translation plays in the target culture justified that in addition to the interlingual transfer, both the intercultural and intertextual transfer came to the fore. Unfortunately not every translator’s goal for a perfect translation equivalence for single cultural words can be put into practice, though the translator’s primary aim for a good translation equivalence for a whole text is always possible. This was an acknowledgement that a translator is an intellectual language, literary and culture worker – not only a helpful co-author with limited possibilities, but a critic too. Translation is naturally a form of productive action in the sense of a productive action of an author, and may be, in some cases much better. A translator’s product however should be on no account an independent, autonomous text, if we speak about true translations of our common cultural heritage. Creative translations demand from translators that they understand the manner in which artistic reality is expressed in the source text: the reflexion of this reality should be reconstructed in the target text and the result is the reproduction of the same, or a similar, artistic effect. As cultural criticism many translators have recognized its interpretative or hermeneutic function. The translation is considered to be an instrument of criticism. The role of criticism in translation can be generally expressed according to Peter Newmark as follows: “We can criticise a translation using three points of reference. In the first place, if it is translated closely at the author’s level, it is exposed to a different language, culture and literary or non-literary tradition. It may be open to criticism for jarring with the reader’s concept of natural usage or social language, because it makes us laugh or feel embarrassed when this wasn’t the author’s intention (which is a common first reaction to close translation). Secondly if the translation conforms broadly to target language norms, and the translation follows what the author might supposedly have written had he been a master of the target language, not what he actually wrote, the only way to assess the deficiencies of the translation is to examine the linguistic differences between it and the original. The third form of criticism is basically non-linguistic, but may underscore both the first and second: it is to examine translation and with it the original in relation to the truth, the material facts, and moral and aesthetic principles, so that translation is evaluated as an independent free-standing work” (Newmark, 1993, p. 163).

In Holmes’ theory of translation it is important to recognize that every language is closely associated with the hierarchy of culture and every language itself is part of culture: language is a substantial but partial reflection of a culture. Culture is expressed in universal as well as in local words (above all *realia*). The number of equivalents of these cultural words in other languages depends mainly on the degree of contact between languages and cultures during long historical periods. The time-place-tradition elements of the source text have been replaced by their nearest possible equivalents in the target text. Mechanical and mindlessly transferred culture references may cause cultural shock in the target language readership. We must stress that every kind of translation is a cultural phenomenon because language itself is part of culture and

plays the central role for the cultural identity of a given community. Humour, for example, is part of the cultural identity and the translating of this organic part of culture requires special techniques. The ability to understand and translate jokes may be considered as a reliable measure of translator's foreign language proficiency. Translation is mainly a transference of one culture into another, because an overwhelming majority of source language texts is embedded in its familiar culture. Throughout human history translations have served as a channel between two cultures in the process of cultural exchange. Culture is one of the most difficult topics to deal with in translation. On one hand, in the intercultural exchange of values are the temporo-spatial factors of the origin of a literary work, and its perception on the other hand. Time and space within a literary work, i.e. the inner (structural) arrangement of time and space are portrayed in the work. Eugene Albert Nida referred to this fact: "Most competent translators become very sensitive to the fact that the meaning of words depends so much on context, including other words in the same sentence or paragraph, the historical setting in which the text was produced (the time, place, source, addressees, and circumstances), and the culture" (Nida, 1996, p. 110).

Culture remains a central element in translation to an increased degree as a result of a growing trend to present internationalism. It is a very new phenomenon that translational strategies and creativity must take into account new cultural and communication situations of our globalized world. A translation can only be complete when both the communicative value and the time-place-tradition elements of the source text have been replaced in the target text. The contemporary translation can be also described as a filling up the cultural gaps between languages. New international cultural words and old words are profoundly affected by their contexts and cannot be translated in isolation. They cannot be transported into the target language culture uncritically, in excessive amount. A good translation of cultural lexicon is conditioned by the degree of language contact present and past, and therefore the cultural contact too. A translator has to deal with cultural lexicon, above all with realia which are understandable in their context both linguistic, cultural and situational. The pioneering role in the research of culture in translation and intercultural communication by James Holmes whose words are so critical for translation studies in our time of unpredictable cultural turbulences: „In the field of culture-restricted theories there has been little detailed research, though culture restrictions, by being confused with language restrictions, sometimes get introduced into language-restricted theories, where they are out of place in all but those rare cases where culture and language boundaries coincide in both the source and target situations. It is moreover no doubt true that some aspects of theories that are presented as general in reality pertain only to the Western cultural area“ (Holmes, 2005, p. 75). In our Middle European cultural area the translational situations of those in Western countries English – German, French, Dutch, etc. are opposed to translational situations from Slavic languages or Hungarian into English, German and Roman languages.

Translators are also not only mediators between manifold languages but mediators between miscellaneous cultures too. Every translator knows two or more cultures in our time of growing multiculturalism and can realize specific cultural transfer strategies to bridge the gaps between very different cultures. The translator's creative abilities enable him to make appropriate decisions as an active participant in translation process. However some people still believe a translator should make no changes: he is till now a neutral and faceless person without criticism. The translator is concerned in the interpretation and reproduction for readers of cultural values which the text contains either visibly or latently. Translational interpretation and reproduction in the target text are totally different from the process of literary interpretation of a critic and for example a reproduction of an old painting in a mechanical sense. Translator's interpretation bears resemblance to critic's interpretation of literary works, but the differences between both activities are too important. In full awareness of these differences (i.e. modifications of a source text in the target culture in process of translation) is it evident that translational interpretation is distinct from critical interpretation. The critic's work is orientated to finding

of artistic values of literary works for readers and to destineting of their importance for the literary development. He can expose every work to the harsh light of a different language and culture. The critic's interpretation might provide one account among an indefinite variety of admissible accounts, but on the contrary the translator's interpretation might merely provide one account among a limited amount of partial accounts. The interpretation in the translating process is a part of cultural transfer in which the translator brings the literary work into full existence in a new receiving milieu. A fair amount of imagination on a translator's part allows him to identify the artistic reality behind the text and his translation will function as a literary work of art in the receiving culture. Regularities of specific cultural transfer strategies can be detected in translators' solutions when they have several alternatives to choose from.

James Holmes researched the various aspects of translation which determine it as a time- and space-bound process and has produced sensitive analyses of contemporary or old literary works – as historical accuracy of translated literature too. In the centre of his research were such translational methods like historizing (exotization) – modernizing (naturalization). An example of full-scale modernizing is the change of the young lovers on horseback, in a Charles d'Orléans' poem, into present-day rockers on motor bikes. This rondel written by Charles, duc d'Orléans (1394-1465) in an old temporal dialect contains realia which are an art of reflexion of an older état de langue. In Charles d'Orléans' time, the 15th century, a popular symbol was horseback-riding swains, similar to a modern symbol of young men riding motorcycles and driving cars as depicted in the translation made by C.R. Nicholson in the 1960s: a culturally determined rewriting (interlingual and intersemiotic). The translator has replaced the reality from medieval time with modern technical achievements which would seem awkward, even magical to the author of this rondel. The main objection of contemporary readership can be that this modernizing translation is not a true copy of medieval world caused by translator's lack of correspondence with French and English reality of the 15th century. In any case, this translation is an important document of the 1960s since motorcycles, the cars, and motor scooters are symbols of modern look and played an important role in constituting an image of American and Western European youth.

As translation theories makes James Holmes differences between space-(area)-restricted and time-restricted theories, „which fall into two types: theories regarding the translation of contemporary texts, and theories having to do with the translation of texts from an older period. Again there would seem to be a tendency to present one of the theories, that having to do with contemporary texts, in the guise of a general theory; the other, the theory of what can perhaps best be called cross-temporal translation, is a matter that has led to much disagreement, particularly among literarily oriented theoretists, but to few generally valid conclusions“ (Holmes, 2005, p. 76). The literary work has to be translated from one time into another, from one space into another. A later receiver (an extra-spatial perciever) with a limited knowledge of the reality and tradition, relating to the origin of the work, fails to grasp certain elements of the text connected with the period reality (realia, allusions, connotations, etc.), resulting in a loss (or alternation) of meaning. The meaning of such “untranslatable” words cannot be translated into another time and space (cultural milieu) in isolation for the sake of misunderstanding of translated texts by readers, such words are understandable only in their contexts both linguistic, cultural and situational. The translation can contain “the necessary criticism made in the translator's preface, or, in extreme case (perhaps Hitler's *Mein Kampf*) in footnotes, unless the translator is confident that the readership will not be misled“ (Newmark, 1993, p. 169). This example shows that literal translation has a powerful critical function. The translator's awareness of moral criticism is purposeful in case of much controversial political texts of our terrible times as well. The criticism here is in the service of better understanding not only of the text written by Adolf Hitler together with his co-prisoner Ernst Röhm nine decades ago. Only such translations can fulfil expectations which enlighten the background: their role is in generally regarded as progressive and socially responsible.

Translation as a substitution process makes possible the exchange of difficult to translate

words in the source text to other words in the target text on the basis of similar communicative effects. All languages have many “untranslatable” words, above all by translating poetry, as stated by James Holmes in almost all his papers. Modern translators pay great attention to literary as well non-literary allusions and connotations of non-standard lexis in translations both of poetry, prose and drama. Translation equivalence may have difficulties because of non-equivalent lexical units and quite often lack cultural background information. According to Peter Newmark as “untranslatable” words, their “meaning, if important, has to be spread and manipulated across two or more words or a phrase of the target language” (Newmark, 1993, p. 25). A good example is from the United Kingdom’s system of education: „Thus in one place the term public school might be glossed as elite English school but in another as expensive private school“ (Shuttleworth – Cowie, 1997, p. 38). Translation of common non-standard forms of speech (not only realia, dialectal words, neologisms, but above all slang and various sociolects too) is governed by the universal requirement of a socio-dialectal equivalency, also the target text must be adequate to the source text to the highest degree possible. All these cultural words seldom have perfectly satisfactory equivalents in other languages. The sociolectal elements of speech and dialects in generally different from realia: hence, the relation: slang expression in the original = slang expression in the translation, is not always valid. When we investigate the problem of translating slang, we must draw on abundant examples from which we derive our theoretical conclusions. As to the measure of utilizing slang or dialectal expressions in a translation there are antithetical ideas by prominent authors.

The translator’s task is to bridge over the differences between the time and space of the work’s origin and the time and space of its reception – the decisive factor here being a certain translation conception (choice of the significance of the translated work which determines the translation methods). Translation can bridge the gap between linguistic and literary aspects of texts. All translations reflect not only literary interpretation but the translation fashions of the time (for instance naturalization versus foreignization). An important question is whether the translator has the right to modify an old well-known work. Translational interpretation of significant features of the original work is warranted for completion and authority. Every translator as an interpret of texts indicates a way in which the text may be transformed. Every interpretation which a translator makes can be correct or not correct. The comparison of multiple translations of one concrete work shows that every translator has his own interpretation. All interpretations of one concrete work provide one account among a variety of admissible accounts. The performance of one translation needs a tentative understanding of the original text as result of critical analysis and interpretation. We are confronted with the views of foremost translators, though it should be observed that the translator’s ideational and ideological attitude determinate the success of every translational performance. In generally there is a degree of ideology in every literary work and in all other kinds of writing and the neutrality of translators in respect of texts with political background is a myth. The impact of ideology on the choice of a work for translation and the technique of translation was really remarkable in our society in the years after the WWII. In the 1960s the impact of ideology on the choice of a work for translation was reduced. An oppressive period followed the Prague Spring which was crushed on 21st August 1968. During the 1970s and the 1980s the so-called „normalization“ strengthened the impact of ideology on the choice of a work for translation. The political development that has taken place in Czechoslovakia after the turn of 1989 shows that some of ideological roles of translator’s work haven’t become outdated.

A translator needs a certain concept, strategy, idea, or “philosophy” for all kinds of texts – for their various types and genres. These strategies make him able to do a thoughtful interpretation of the original, as we know from hermeneutics, text interpretation well-known as deconstruction according to the French philosopher Jaques Derrida and a comprehensive reconstruction of the reality behind the text. Hermeneutics tell us about translational interpretation that the translator must base his interpretation on ideological and aesthetic values which texts contain. Every experienced translator uses a substitution process, the first step is identifying aesthetic

and communicative functions of source text, and the second step is substituting them in the target text. His concept enables a recognition of realia and plays on words and nuances of meanings and style. A translator has some kind of strategy, background knowledge and cultural awareness in order to consider the significant features of the source language text and transmit these components into target language text, producing the same, or a similar, artistic and communicative effect. Translation scholars can express their views on translatability of lexis without equivalence, i.e. realia which cannot be simply translated into the target language. Not all components of text can be translated without meaning loss, because translators are at a loss for words: they can borrow words from the source language text, but they require a long explanation by the translator. If inexperienced translators use equivalents in the target language for special realia from history (for example in Russian *tushinskiy vor* – self-appointed from Tushino, a village by Moscow, on the beginning of the 16th century), which exist only in the source language and are untranslatable without comments into English, French, German, etc. they will have errors if they do not use a well-thought-out strategy. This conceptualism was criticized in connection with the naturalization of Russian realia in Slovak translations of the 1950s. This discussion on Russian realia opened the way for the later translation theory of František Miko and Anton Popovič, well-known worldwide as Nitra School. Miko's model of communication was the beginning of investigation of literary translation at Nitra since 1967 with fruitful cooperation of Anton Popovič and James Holmes since the spring of 1968. Together these scholars made the investigation of metatexts, „what made feasible to take into account not only aesthetical aspects of texts, but even literary-sociological and pragmatological aspects in the literary communication“ (Tellingner, 2012, p. 117). Important insights into mind of contemporary researchers associated with the Nitra School can be seen in the work of foreign and Czechoslovak authors since the 1970s. This was a starting-point for Branislav Hocheľ in an investigation of almost all translational issues during four decades till his untimely death on April 11, 2015.

We can read one translator's conception of a categorial and axiological issue in the crucial work written by Branislav Hocheľ *Translation in the Communication Process* (1990) – a work smallish as to extent, yet unusually stimulative for the development of a Czechoslovak theory of translation by the topical nature of the questions dealt with. Hence, the latter may be understood as one of the key concepts in the modern “trendy” theories – as an essential premise of the quality of translation – as one of the decisive factors in the translation process. As regards the development in the conception of Czechoslovak translation theory after 1945 from its absence in the 1950s, we passed through an elemental, later a conscious conception of the present, now reaching for a future “aconceptualism” whereby B. Hocheľ (1990, pp. 45-46) understands a conception – as he designates it of a “higher rank”, i.e. experimental, provocative conceptions of translation. This seeming “aconceptualism” will be under a rigorous rational control of translation criticism which was often missing in the past. This translational criticism is important nowadays too. The role of translational criticism differs from the more simply role of literary criticism as we can read it in Anton Popovič's central book: “As a rule have been put into practice three fundamental courses of translational criticism: 1. Translational criticism regards to qualities of translation for readers, though literal translation has a powerful critical function. 2. The comparison of translation with original from a viewpoint of original's ideological and aesthetical values realized in translation. 3. The ideological and aesthetical importance of a translated work in the development context of a receiving literature“ (Popovič, 1975, p. 274).

An attempt at an answer as to what in fact a translational criticism is may be found in Hocheľ's book (1990, pp. 54-59) when he comes to the conclusion that the goal of translational criticism should be an assessment of the ways of transposing the original text into a foreign cultural “time-space”, hence, an investigation of the conception of a translation and not floundering in its peculiarities comparing them with those in the original. In the concept of translation we may single out three subdisciplines, viz. 1. Theory of translation (general and special, praxeology, didactics of translation), 2. Criticism of translation (translation as instrument of creative literary

and linguistic criticism), 3. History of translation. From the existing periodization of the history of thinking about translation we can mention George Steiner's division into four periods: the first goes from the works of Cicero and Horatius up to 1791 (Essay on the Principles of Translation by Fraser Tytler), the second period lasts up to 1946 (Valéry Larbaud's book *Sous l'invocation de Saint Jérôme – Invoking the Name of St. Jerome*), the third stage is even shorter – it ends at the beginning of the 1960s and is marked by reflexions on machine translation which affected thinking about translation especially in the Western countries, the fourth period lasts from the 1960s till this day – it is marked by a reevaluation of notions about other disciplines. However, neither the last nor any other periodization is accepted unreservedly. In translation studies is an absence of an expert, well-grounded systematic processing of the history of translation. Maybe the second period goes from Hölderlin's enigmatic commentary (1804) on his own translations from Sophocles (1804) as we can read it in Steiner's periodization (1992, p. 248).

Significant for practice, though equally important from the theoretical aspect, is the issue of time and space in translation. Literary texts convey a culturally (temporally and spatially) bound message. It is important to mention the integral roles of time and space as universal constraints because in every literary text no action can exist apart from the constraints of time and space. Translation across time and space: 1. The translation of the primary meaning of the work involves following the modernizing principle (the traditional dichotomy "to modernize" versus "to historicize"). A translation text may represent a compromise between both principles. Mostly it is the language of previous generations translated into the modern language (in the theater and films classic works like Shakespeare's are sometimes adapted) in interests of readers to bring them close to the present times. 2. Historization – it makes a sense to look at the historical context of the original text in order to understand and transfer the ideas of author adequately: the phenomenon of translation is traditionally conjoined with the modernizing and historicizing. 3. Domestication is influenced by macro and micro factors: the basic idea of domesticating principle is the translator's effort to make a text conform to the target culture. Domestication refers to the fluent translation. Naturalizing versus exoticizing methods can be linked with the fundamental option between „retentive“ and „recreative“ translation. 4. Foreignization is one of both basic translator's strategies in the literary translation (domestication = naturalization and foreignization = exoticization) which provides an additional information about a distant culture. Foreignization signifies the foreignness of the foreign text and can be achieved if translators use the transference of source language cultural words, proper names and connotations. A domestication principle used throughout our long history is that translators adapt or delete foreign components of text, above all realia, allusions and connotative words. In view of foreignization and domestication one principal question is which way a translator's ideology influences his choice of source language texts. Cultural foreignization or adaptation are basic translation procedures, but as we know, true translations are not usually just a question of translator's procedure (technique, strategy, method, approach). No mentioned principle is a guarantee of successful translations, because all concepts of perfect and ideal adequate translations are illusory. All methods of translating cultures have a great influence according to A. Popovič, who speaks about three possibilities by the confrontation of two cultures in translation: „1. The activity of the original work's culture (C1) is more powerful than the activity of target culture (C2). 2. The activity of the target culture (C2) is more powerful than the activity of the original's work culture (C1). 3. In the translation is the tension between both source (C1) and target culture (C2) equalized“ (Popovič, 1975, p. 188). A common tradition is trivial domestication (i.e. creolization or full naturalization of cultural words) which involves making the target text read as fluently as possible.

If we pay attention only to literary translations we can see for example that translations of classic works for mass markets may involve a number of changes not only according to authorial individual style which can be lost, but discarded are often dialects, slangs, and all hard translatable elements – metaphors, word plays, puns, realia, poetic elements, and the result is a homogenous, „correct“ language. The more classic texts are simplified the less meaning they have. The style

should be preserved, because it is influenced by the tradition of a concrete literary period. According to Peter Newmark „the idea of adapting or abbreviating a classic is controversial and cannot be resolved by argument“ (Newmark, 1993, p. 167). As cultural translation of hard translatable elements of texts „the translator has three basic choices: to keep the source language (SL) culture (say Matignon); to convert to the target language (TL) culture (the ‘French Downing Street’), or to select a neutral international, inter-cultural term (‘the French Prime Minister or his office’) – within each of the three choices, there are various alternatives, and, two or three of the procedures (couplets, triplets) may well be combined in the translation“ (Newmark, 1993, p. 168). These two basically types of translation strategy (domestication and foreignization) are important from a viewpoint of identity and historical cultural accuracy of translated literature. Foreignization highlights the foreign culture and prevents it from being absorbed by the target culture. Social values are very important and have to be integrated into the translation process. Original works integrate both linguistic and literary phenomena from the wider system of social values of the concrete society from which they arise. A translations artistic and communicative values consist of inherent complexity of understanding of semantic and stylistic dimensions which are expressed in original works. Every translator must understand perfectly the sense and style of his author’s work, because without that he cannot translate it adequate and faithfully. The literary translation is a question not of translating a series of sentences. According to James Holmes the elementary unit for translation may be regarded not as a word, sentence or paragraph, rather the whole text should be assumed to be the unit of translation (text as a translation unit versus sentence-for-sentence or word-for-word translation). For instance individual authorial metaphors are translatable in some cases only on the level of the whole text according to James Holmes because metaphor is a touchstone in poetry translation (contrary to a standard metaphor in an informative text).

Bibliography

- HOCHEL, B.: *Preklad ako komunikácia*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1990.
- HOLMES, J. S.: *Translated!: Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. 3rd ed. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi, 2005.
- NEWMARK, P.: *About Translation*. 3rd ed. Clevedon – Philadelphia – Adelaide: Longdunn Press, 1993.
- NIDA, E. A.: *The Sociolinguistics of Interlingual Communication*. Bruxelles: Éditions du Hazard, 1996.
- POPOVIČ, A.: *Teória umeleckého prekladu. Aspekty textu a literárnej metakomunikácie*. Bratislava: Tatran, 1975.
- SHUTTLEWORTH, M. – COWIE, M.: *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997.
- STEINER, G.: *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. 2nd ed. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- TELLINGER, D.: *Der kulturelle Hintergrund des Translats – Kultur als Substanz der Kommunikation*. Košice: Typopress, 2012.

PhDr. Dušan Tellinger, CSc.
J. Pannonius University, Pécs, Hungary
tellingerdusan@gmail.com