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ABSTRACT
The given article is focused on the description of the most characteristic discrepancies in the linguistic picture of the world among representatives of the English, German, Russian and some other linguocultural communities and ways of neutralizing cultural barriers by means of translation that can cause “disruptions” in the process of mediated bilingual communication. In this regard, the problems of conveying the content of a literary text with special attention to its "cultural" components are investigated. At the same time, the author proceeds from the opinion expressed more than once by experts that national and cultural differences are one of the fundamental difficulties in translation.

Introduction
The transmission of cultural content in translation - the transmission of the (above-described) content of IT1, directly or indirectly related to national culture - is caused by the problem of choosing between the preservation in translation of culturally alien elements for the addressees of the PT or their replacement with functionally similar phenomena in their own culture. In this regard, it is necessary to say about two polar approaches to solving this issue, exaggerating one possibility and neglecting the other. We are talking about literal and free translation - two extreme traditions, the first of which was aimed at immersing the PT reader in a culture alien to him without any adaptation of the relevant cultural information to the perception of the PL carrier, and the second was aimed at over-adaptation, which often turned into a reworking of a foreign work.

Goethe describes these two principles as follows: “There are two principles of translation - one of them requires the resettlement of a foreign author to us, so that we can see him as a compatriot; the other, on the contrary, makes us a demand that we go to this stranger and apply to his living conditions, the
makeup of his language, his peculiarities "[cit. according to: Kopanev 1972: 193].

Free translation is an unnecessary linguocultural adaptation, because linguistic and cultural broadcasting is made with excessive corrections for the recipient of the translation. The recipients of the translation have a false impression that the culture of the native speakers of the original language does not differ from his own. The translator is not so much throwing a bridge over the chasm that separates the two cultures, as pretending that such a chasm does not exist. Such free translation was the main obstacle to the convergence of languages and cultures, since the IL reader completely loses information about the culture of the IL people.

Material and methods

In the history of the literatures of many peoples, there are many cases when representatives of the "free translation" trend, which became widespread in the 18th century, mainly in France, carefully etched out everything nationally specific from the translated works. Foreign-language narratives were transferred to their native soil, heroes received national names, the place and time of action changed, etc.

In Russia in the 18th-19th centuries, the tendency to alter the original is widely represented, resulting in the so-called "inclination to our mores." The requirement to preserve the foreign cultural flavor was completely ignored, and the original text was subjected to complete Russification. For example, O.I. Senkovsky is credited with translating Burns' ballad "John Barley Grain" in the spirit of Russian folk epic. This translation includes elements of Russian vernacular (busurmans, lime, Ivan Erofeich Khlebnoe Zernyshko, etc.). In Nekrasov's Sovremennik in 1851, such a translation of Thackeray's Vanity Fair was ridiculed, where English heroes expressed themselves as follows: “Yes, sir, it’s nishto, justly please judge…”, “Give him beer, wine, and cutlets , and suplets - all the swords that are in the oven ”[Chukovsky 1988: 107].

One of the most famous adherents of free translation is Irinarkh Vvedensky, who, according to K.I. Chukovsky, “both Dickens, Thackeray, and Charlotte Bronte became Russian citizens, residents of Sands or Okhta” [Chukovsky 1988: 264]. Chukovsky also recalls that it was not for nothing that Dickens himself called Vvedensky Vredensky. In accordance with his theoretical views on translation, 1 Vvedensky transferred English heroes to Russian society in the 19th century, therefore, in his translations, the English began to "poke" lackeys, "ride cabbies", "poke around in gateways", clerks were replaced by clerks, scribes - clerks , caps - in caps, taverns - inns, etc.

At a certain stage of communication, free translation acts as a historically conditioned stage of linguistic mediation, naturally preceding the translation itself. In this regard, the traditional, unambiguously negative assessment of free translation needs to be revised. Perhaps it was the "adaptive arrangement" that created the prerequisites for widespread use of the translation proper later [Latyshev 1988: 50]. Literal translation represents insufficient linguocultural adaptation, as linguistic and cultural broadcasting is made without corrections to the addressee of the translation. The translator's intentions to translate the text as close as possible to the original lead to the fact that the reader "collides" with a foreign culture and loses the ability to adequately perceive the text as a work of art.

The credo of representatives of this direction can be formulated as follows: "Everything is transmitted that lends itself to transmission." Only those elements of the text are transformed, replaced, omitted,
which are generally impossible to reproduce "straight out". A similar approach to translation was carried out in practice in the 19th century. A.A. Fet and P.A. Vyazemsky, at a later time in the works of a number of Soviet translators in the field of fiction, including Eug. Lanna and A.V. Krivtsova, who translated into Russian a number of works by Charles Dickens. Their translations were sharply criticized by K.I. Chukovsky.

In particular, Chukovsky gives examples of Krivtsova's literal translations:

“I, who knows so much and can pull up so many people, not counting myself ...”;

"The air seems too contaminated for that filth and filth."

“Sometimes, when an investigation was carried out about a parish child, who was overlooked, and he knocked over the bed, or who…”;

“The fist left imprints on his body too often so as not to be imprinted deeply in his memory” [Chukovsky 1988: 50-51].

All these are constructions that are completely allowed by the laws of construction of English phrases, but in Russian they are completely unnatural.

There is no consensus on the issue of literal translation. Thus, Alfred Malblan, dividing all types of translation into direct and indirect, puts literal translation on a par with two other types of translation - tracing paper and borrowing. However, neither tracing paper nor borrowing can be considered a literal translation in the above sense. Calca is a literal translation of a word (by morphemes) or a stable phrase (by lexemes). Calca can be assimilated by the target language and become borrowing, which contributes to the convergence and mutual enrichment of cultures. So, penetrating into everyday speech through the mass media, some "translations", at first perceived as a deviation from the norm (tracing the brain drain from the English brain-drain, the military presence from the English military presence), took root in the Russian language.

Nor should the literal translation be confused with the literal translation. Literal translation is the closest possible semantic and structural copy of the translated IT segment into the TL. The concept of "literal translation" does not contain an assessment. It can be good if it does not violate the norms of the TL and Uzus, if it is understandable to the carrier of the TL and can be adequately interpreted. If it is possible to translate well and literally, then this should be done, since this is consistent with the social purpose of the translation. However, such cases are not always possible. Literal translation is an evaluative concept. It is always bad, because it means setting to blind copy with the help of the TL everything that somehow lends itself to copying in IT. Because of this, the emotional and aesthetic perception of the literary text suffers, distortions, inaccuracies, and ambiguities arise.

There are two sources and two types of literalism. The first is rooted in the external similarity of foreign and Russian words, graphic or phonetic similarity. Such words are called "false friends of the translator."

The second type of literalism consists in the use by the translator of the most common meaning of the word instead of the contextual one, or translation of phraseological units based on the individual meanings of its components. Despite the fact that over time, translation practice rejected the literalist direction, and at present there are scholars who consider literal translation to be the only possible one. For example, V.M. Gasparov in his article “Bryusov and literalism” [Gasparov 1995] believes that
“literalism is not a swear word, but a scientific concept” [Ibid. : 112], and proves the need for literalistic translations of Bryusov, “pulling the reader up to the original”. The author of the article believes that such translations "enable people who do not know Latin to read Horace Latin." This point of view contradicts the social purpose of the translation and the essence of communicative-pragmatic adaptation - the translator's realization of an attitude towards a foreign language recipient.

Literal translation and free translation must be distinguished from the translation itself, which has been established as a result of "trial and error" in public practice, the translation that meets the expectations of society. Such translation is considered as a type of linguistic mediation, in which the content of a foreign language text (original) is transmitted into another language by creating an informational and communicatively equivalent text in that language [Brandes, Provotorov 1999: 7].

Like any type of professional activity, translation satisfies a certain social need, i.e. has its own public purpose.

It is most convenient to reveal this social purpose, to describe the essential features of translation determined by its social purpose, starting from the comparison of translation with other types of linguistic mediation. Such a comparison shows that translation is the only way of linguistic mediation, the purpose of which, within the realistically achievable limits, is to provide for those communicating through the linguo-ethnic barrier the opportunity to communicate as if each of them spoke with his foreign partner in his language, or, conversely, as if a foreign the partner understood his native language. In other words, the social purpose (function) of translation can be defined as follows: translation is designed to provide such mediated bilingual communication, which in its capabilities would be as close as possible to ordinary, monolingual communication1 [Latyshev 2000: 14].

The axiom of modern linguistics is the provision that the purpose of any communication (both "natural", monolingual, and bilingual, through a translator) is to provide a certain regulatory impact on the addressee. Since the public purpose of translation is to provide communication across the linguo-ethnic barrier, equivalent to monolingual communication (communication in one language), the above means that this equality should, first of all, be manifested in the equivalence of potential reactions to the original text of those addressees who they perceive it in the source language, and those who perceive it in the target language (dynamic equivalence) into the translated text. In modern translation studies, the beginning of the "dynamic concept of translation" was laid by Yu. Naida [see: Naida 1978: 114-137]. The very concept


Perceiving the information received, the recipient enters into a certain relationship with the text, which are called pragmatic. These relationships can be of an intellectual nature, when the text serves as a source of information for the recipient about any facts and events. The information contained in the text can cause a certain emotional reaction of the recipient, induce some action. The ability of the text to produce such a communicative effect, to cause the recipient of the text to have a pragmatic attitude
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towards the communicated, that is, to exercise a pragmatic effect on the recipient of information, constitutes the pragmatic potential of the text. The term "pragmatic" has another meaning - as the opposite of the word "Semantic" and synonymous with the word "contextual". The semantic meaning is inherent in the sign even before it is used in speech [Dridze 1980: 13]. The pragmatic content arises only in speech (directly in the process of using the sign), when the sender uses the sign in some special way, as if turning it one way or another, in extreme cases even with an unusual side.

Latyshev explains the above with the following well-known example. It is known that once A.S. Pushkin, working on "Boris Godunov" and being very pleased with the result of his poetic work, began to dance with joy, exclaiming: Oh yes Pushkin! Oh yeah son of a bitch! In the mouth of the great poet, the abusive expression turned into praise, that is, it received a pragmatic content, directly opposite to its semantic meaning. The semantic meaning, however, did not change. This kind of opposition of semantic content to pragmatic one creates a strong emotional effect. Denotative meaning and significative connotations of a linguistic sign, in their totality, make up its semantic meaning. All other information carried by linguistic signs falls into the category of pragmatic content, or, in other words, appears only in speech with some "special" use of linguistic signs in the corresponding speech and / or situational context.

Results and Discussion

In translation, the dialectical connection and the communicative-pragmatic interdependence of the main components of the communicative-pragmatic situation - the sender, the text and the recipient - are manifested.

Without proper consideration of the recipient's communicative potential, orientation towards his understanding and adequate interpretation of the text, it is impossible to ensure the effectiveness of bilingual communication, to overcome the linguo-ethnic barrier, each of the factors of which has its own weight, as an anticommmunicative factor that prevents communication between the speakers of the FL and the PL in the absence of a linguistic intermediary. Accordingly, the unrealized neutralization of one or another of these factors has a different (negatively) effect on bilingual communication with translation, on its quality.

In monolingual communication, the sender embodies the communicative intention in the text in such a way that it objectifies those natural moments that, according to his intention, should ensure the adequacy of understanding the meaning in the process of perceiving the text. In bilingual mediated communication, the direct connection between the sender and the text and the recipient is violated, the text itself must be subjected to communicative and pragmatic adaptation based on attitudes towards a foreign language recipient. The implementation of an adequate pragmatic impact of translation largely depends on the translator's choice of linguistic means when creating the translation text [Komissarov 1990: 209–210]. In the process of linguocultural translation, translation is determined primarily by language, and then by various cultural systems that make up the extra-linguistic sphere. As already noted, it refers to the way carriers of different cultures interpret the same phenomena of reality. Therefore, special difficulties in the translation of the content, and, consequently, in the transmission of the pragmatic influence of the text, arise when an extra-linguistic barrier is added to the linguistic barrier, when the contradiction between the original and the translation being created is intensified due to the difference between the two cultures - the culture of the sender and the culture of the receiving environment. Along with overcoming the differences in linguistic systems, norms, usus, we have to
overcome the "contrast" of two different cultures. Since translation is the transposition of a text not only into another system of signs, but also into another culture, it is not reduced to the process of recoding, but is also an explanation, interpretation, interpretation. The interpretation of the content is based on the cognitive (background) information already available to the recipient of the message. If such information is missing due to cultural differences between the two linguistic communities, the message in the translation will not be understood and the translation will hardly take place. Therefore, such an “anticommunicative” factor as differences in cultures necessitates additional cultural and pragmatic adaptation of the broadcast material in the process of translation.

First of all, what interferes with the understanding of the original and that in the adapted form does not distort the figurative system of the work is adapted. Adaptation, which is based on the adaptation of a work of art as a reflection of objective and social reality to the socio-cultural conditions of the social reality of the perceiving environment, is a socio-cultural adaptation of a work of art. It should correspond to the communicative intention of the author, the communicative-pragmatic norms of the LJ as a whole, to take into account the national specifics of the foreign language addressee.

So, according to Yu. Naida, for the English phrase "common people" in the Mayan language, it was possible to find only a more or less adequate descriptive correspondence - "people living on the outskirts of the village", since in the culture of the Indian tribes of Yucatan the remoteness of housing from the center of the village is an indicator socio-economic status [Schweitzer 1988: 16].

Another interesting example of pragmatic adaptation of the text is given in one of his works by A. Neubert [Neubert A., 1970]. Let's say we have to translate the opening lines of Shakespeare's eighteenth sonnet into Arabic: “Shall I compare thee to a summer’s day…” The exact reproduction of the denotative meaning of the word summer may cause the Arab reader to react differently than the Shakespearean text is intended for. Indeed, in this text, a summer day is associated with the concept of beauty. At the same time, for the Arab reader, the image of a sultry summer day is unlikely to evoke similar associations. Therefore, to maintain equivalence, it is necessary to replace the comparison with a summer day with another comparison that can convey the communicative attitude of the statement, say, with a spring day. This example is a clear example of the situation often encountered in translation practice when the exact transfer of the denotative meaning turns out to be incompatible with the exact transfer of the pragmatic meaning and the translator has to make a choice in favor of the latter.

**Conclusion**

Linguocultural translation in the process of translation is carried out by various degrees of adaptation1. It can be weak, strong, or absent altogether (pure linguistic translation). In this regard, the translator is faced with the question: how to deal with the elements of culture when transferring content: to keep the IT conventions or replace them with the IL conventions? The choice of a translator is determined by a pre-selected strategy and depends on the place of cultural and ethnic information in the system of values presented in the original text.
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