УДК: 81′ 25 (063)(081)

Фаховий та художній переклад: теорія, методологія, практика: збірник наукових праць / за заг. ред. С.І. Сидоренка. – К.: Аграр Медіа Груп, 2021. – 420 с.

Збірник містить статті учасників XIV Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції з питань теорії та практики перекладу, що відбулась 9-10 квітня 2021 року на кафедрі англійської філології і перекладу Національного авіаційного університету (м. Київ, Україна).

Специальный и художественный перевод: теория, методология, практика: сборник научных трудов / под общей ред. С.И. Сидоренко. – Киев: Аграр Медиа Груп, 2021. – 420 с.

Сборник содержит статьи участников XIV Международной научно-практической конференции по актуальным вопросам теории и практики перевода, которая состоялась 9-10 апреля 2021 года в Национальном авиационном университете (г. Киев, Украина).

General and Specialist Translation / Interpreting: Theory, Methods, Practice: International Conference Papers. – Kyiv: Agrar Media Group, 2021. – 420 p.

The book contains papers contributed by the participants of the 14th International Conference on theory and practice of translation / interpreting held at the National Aviation University (Kyiv, Ukraine) on 9-10 April 2021.

Рекомендовано до друку Вченою радою факультету лінгвістики та соціальних комунікацій Національного авіаційного університету (протокол № 3 від 18.03.2021 р.)

художественной литературы. Пришедшая ей на смену советская цензура с легкостью подхватила разработанные в период монархии подходы и, поставив их на новые рельсы, начала активное строительство нового цензурного аппарата. Основной разницей между работами цензоров представляется то, что в то время как дореволюционная цензура была официально признана, а ее комитеты, подобно любым другим административным учреждениям, работали вполне открыто, Советский Союз существование цензуры в стране категорически отрицал. Это способствовало более активным и иногда стихийным вмешательствам в цензурную работу представителей самых разнообразных инстанций, что порождало неопределенность, которая, в свою очередь, вселяла все большие опасения в умы авторов, переводчиков и издателей и способствовала усилению самоцензуры в плане отбора иноязычных произведений для перевода, а также в выборе переводческих стратегий в передаче художественных текстов.

Литература

1. Эткинд Е.Г. Записки незаговорщика. Харьков: Права людини, 2013. 372 с. **2**. Жирков Г.В. История цензуры в России XIX–XX вв. М.: Аспект-пресс, 2001. 368 с. **3**. Kamovnikova, Natalia. Made under Pressure. Literary Translation in the Soviet Union, 1960–1991. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019. 272 p. **4**. Цензура в царской России и Советском Союзе. Материалы конференции 24–27 мая 1993 г., Москва / Под ред. Т.В. Громовой. М.: Рудомино, 1995. 175 с. **5**. Добровольский Л.М. Запрещенная книга в России 1825–1904: Архивно-библиографические разыскания. М.: Издательство Всесоюзной книжной палаты, 1962. 254 с. **6**. Каталог отдела специального хранения и справочной картотеки Российской Национальной Библиотеки. Ящик 14: Ден – Док.

Olga Kosovych
Ternopil, Ukraine

Principles of Literary Translation in France as a Reflection of Linguistic Culture

The article examines the history of the development of translation in France in terms of the linguistic culture of the reader and the translator. For each of the 4 stages in the history of literary translation, the author analyzes the goals and principles of working with a foreign text, as well as the reaction of readers to translation. Trends and principles in translation at each stage are considered. Today, the translation practice in France, as well

as around the world, is heavily influenced by theories and models of machine translation and computer translation programs. Modern researchers distinguish at least six theoretical approaches to translation that are developing: sociological, communicative, hermeneutic, linguistic, literary, semiotic.

Keywords: translation, linguistic culture, French literature, translation studies, history of translation, theory, translation principle, translation methodology.

The history of translation in France has four full stages: 14th-16th centuries, 17th-18th centuries, 19th century, 20th-21st centuries. Each period is characterized by its own approach to literary translation, however, unifying them, we can distinguish two main rules, which, to some extent, were followed by translators throughout the development of translation history in France. The first rule of transmitting a foreign language text was completely addressed to the literal reproduction of the original language, often to the detriment of the language of translation, as well as the content of the text itself. The second rule, on the contrary, insisted on reproducing the "spirit of the work", preserving the individuality of the author by refusing the word-for-word translation of the authentic text.

In 1370 N. Oresme, the closest adviser of Charles V, made a fairly accurate translation of Aristotle's treatises ("Ethics", "Politics", "Economics"), which many historians consider the first translation into French [3, p. 22]. Despite the lack of a theoretical basis, N. Oresme thinks a lot about the quality of the work done, placing his translational self-reflection in the preface to "Ethics". He writes: "... I tried to translate Aristotle's text accurately, but I apologize if I speak about the subject not as skillfully and clearly as it should be" [16, p. 100]. N. Oresme repeatedly emphasizes this "new approach" to translation, and also notes some forced inaccuracies, because at that time there was no vocabulary in French, necessary for the philosophical translation of "Ethics". This uncertainty of N. Oresme in his translation and in the possibility of full adaptation of a foreign text can be interpreted as a desire for development, for perfectionism: as noted by the researcher of N. Oresme's translations S. Serra, "according to N. Oresme, the translated treatise should not be considered a finished work, but a work that will need to be changed and supplemented in the future"[18]. However, to what extent was the literal accuracy of the translation important in the fourteenth century? N. Oresme had a specific goal – "to acquaint the rulers with the ancient Greek wisdom" [16, p.112] – by order of the king, Aristotle's translations were to become available so that advisers and rulers learned the basics of the art of government.

Despite the translator's own admission of some inaccuracies, N. Oresme's translations are distinguished by respect for the text of the original, which inspired his followers not to deviate from the given standard. Thus, in the 15th century, R. Hagen translates "Notes on the Gallic War" by J. Caesar, the translation of which remained exemplary for a century.

However, the history of translation in France in its theoretical aspect begins in the 16th century. and begins with a tragedy: in 1546 in the Place de Paris in Mober the famous humanist E. Dole was burned "for free thought" – the author of the first (and only in the Renaissance [17, p. 24]) formal treatise on the French theory of translation "on the art to translate well from one language to another" *("La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en autre",* 1540). This document outlines the ideas that are still reflected in translation practice, as well as outlines the main approaches to literary translation. In particular, E. Dolet argued that translation should not be carried out consistently, and a translator who is fluent in the original language and the language of translation must avoid linguistic innovations, contenting himself with commonly used words.

The first of the five rules of E. Dolet says that a translator must fully understand the meaning of what is written by the author he is translating. To do this, he must be fluent in the foreign language from which the translation is made. Also, E. Dolet did not allow the word-for-word translation: *"Et si quelq'un le fait, cela lui procède de pauvreté et défaut d'esprit"* [9, p. 192]. Only commonly used forms of language should be used in translation, avoiding innovations and Latinisms. And lastly, the translator must not forget about the phonetic side of the text, choosing and having words in the original key.

Of course, the treatise of E. Dolet can be considered as the first document of the French theory of translation, which absorbed the trends of that period. It contains ideas that influenced the development of translation art of subsequent generations.

However, there was also a critical opinion about this approach to working with foreign texts. Nine years after the publication of E. Dolet's treatise, J. du Bellay's famous manifesto "Defense and glorification of the French language" *("Défense et illustration de la langue française",* 1549) appeared, in which the author, among other things, lists the arguments against translation. For example, in the fifth chapter he argues that in practice translations do not contribute to the improvement and enrichment of the French language, and in the sixth he completely accuses translators of incompetence, lack of knowledge of the language from which they

translate: "*Ils sont vraiment mieux dignes d'être appelés traditeurs que traducteurs*" [7, p. 76].

However, for all his shortcomings, the translator played an important role in the dissemination of knowledge: previously inaccessible scientific works and works of art translated from classical and modern languages appeared in French. Thus, thanks to C. Marot, translations of Ovid's "Metamorphosis" and Virgil's "Bucolics" were published, Grandichan and Pelletier du Mans made Horace's "Poetics" available, V. Solomon and P. Serton translated Homer, Jean de Guth translated "Crazy Orlando" from Italian, and so on.

One of the most prominent translators of the 16th century was J. Amyot, "prince des traducteurs" [11, p. 51], who gained popularity, in particular, thanks to the translation of "Comparative Biographies" by Plutarch, who had a huge impact on both translation practice and the cultural environment of the time. It was from the French translation of J. Amyot that the English translation of T. North was made, which was used by W. Shakespeare in his work on historical tragedies. M de Montaigne called J. Amyot "our prayer book": "Thanks to his work, we now dare to speak and write French; even ladies compete in this with masters" [15, p. 442]. J. Amyot himself in his work "Projet d'éloquence royale" (1574) and in many prefaces to translations spoke about the importance of "being as clear as possible", and for this reason to avoid barbarisms, to adhere to the logical connection between sentences and paragraphs, write in simple and natural language, listen to the text to withstand the phonetic beauty of what is written" [11, p. 52].

During the Renaissance, the translator remained a popularizer, who introduced new ideas and, to some extent, really improved his language (as many translators introduced modern realities into the text). He, a translator, undertook the difficult task of refusing to translate "word-for-word", to present the meaning of the work at the same time, showing the beauty of the two languages, enriching the French language with new expressions. On the one hand, the attitudes given by E. Dolet and J. Amyot on the clarity of language, simplicity and beauty of the French text were followed, but on the other hand, the desire to get the approval of not very educated readers forces many translators to gradually modernize antiquity, adapt the text to the tastes of the epoch. This is especially noticeable in the 17th century, when the perception of translation shifts from a theoretical point of view to a more practical one: a translator is highly praised, especially if his style corresponds to modern taste. This is how the notion of "les belles infidèles" – "unfaithful beauties", came about – translations that indulge the spirit of the time. The reading audience was inclined to refined and elegant translations – however, this style was increasingly achieved by refusing to

be close to the original. For example, Abbot Perrin, who in his translation of "the Aeneid" turned the main character into a "French gentleman", enjoyed great affection. Or P. D'Ablancourt, who does not follow the exact originals, but embellishes his translations with countless metaphors, sometimes distorting the meaning of the source. Researcher of the history of translation in France M. Ballard quotes P. D'Ablancourt about the principles of his work: "My freedom [in translation] – is also my loyalty to it, since it allows me to maintain a balance between the original and clarity of meaning" [5, p. 116].

Under the influence of two tendencies (literal translations and translations that "adorn"), theoretical works by B. Meziriac "On translation", G. de Tende "On the rules of translation", A. le Mestra "Rules of translation", treatises on refinements of translation by A. Arnaud and "On the best translation" by P.D. Huet were published.

The work of P.D. Huet is still considered one of the most valuable for the translation thought of the classicist era. From his point of view, the translator is obliged, on the one hand, to convey the author's thoughts, on the other hand, to follow his words in the most scrupulous way. P.D. Huet denied free translation, criticized any inaccuracies made by the translator, which provoked a discussion of supporters and opponents of the method of "unfaithful beauties".

The 18th century introduced new ideas about the principles and purposes of translation from a foreign language into French. During this period, the controversy "about the ancient and the new" fuels the debate between "supporters of tradition, which maximally reproduces the stylistic and semantic features of the original, and defenders of tradition to remake "the source according to modern taste, excluding anything that may seem ugly and leave only beautiful". [5, p. 130]. This problem found expression in the conflict between Anne le Fèvre Dacier and Antoine Houdar de la Motte, regarding their translations of Homeric poems. Anne le Fèvre Dacier became famous in literary circles for her translations of "The Iliad" (1711) and "The Odyssey" (1716): defining the basic principle of "reproduction of living antiquity", she strongly opposed the "ornaments" in translation. Antoine Houdar de la Motte, in turn, proposed another version of the translation of "The Iliad" (1714), throwing out of the text everything he considered "barbarism". As a result of such modernization, "The Iliad" was reduced to the size of a "sophisticated salon fable" [14, p. 43]. In the preface, Antoine Houdar de la Motte explained the principles of his translation and did not miss the opportunity to criticize the translation of Anne le Fèvre Dacier, calling it rude and awkward. Supporters of Anne le Fèvre Dacier were outraged: the intelligentsia, salon visitors, and ordinary

readers took part in the controversy. The translator herself criticized the essay *"Des causes of la corruption du goût"*, and Antoine Houdar de la Motte responded with a treatise "Reflections on criticism" *("Réflexions sur la critique")*. The exchange of theoretical views on translation was supported by Abbot Terrasson, who wrote "A Critical Reflection on the Iliad", then Pierre de Marivaux joined the debate with the text *"L'Homère travesti"*, etc.

The result of these linguistic and cultural disputes was, at least, that Anne le Fèvre Dacier managed to draw public attention to the important role of the translator, to raise his authority in the eyes of the readership, and to determine the vector in translation practice: to correspond to the original.

Thus, interest in the literal translation, in the "calque" (gradually it will be noticeable in the second half of the 19th century) is gradually reviving. Leconte de Lisle writes: "The time of "wrong "translators has passed. It is necessary to return to the accuracy of the meaning" [19, p. 216].

In general, the sharp controversy that took place during the 18th century became a logical stage in the long theoretical search in the field of interpretation of a foreign language text, which will take place in the future. If we consider translation as an act of bilingual communication, it is necessary to take into account the cultural differences of its participants: the problem of translation is not only "bilingual" but also "bicultural" [1, p. 99]. It is appropriate to quote the linguist G. Mounin: "Translation is a contact of languages, a phenomenon of bilingualism. But it is a statistically very rare case where resistance to the usual consequences of bilingualism is more conscious and more organized. This is the case when bilinguals consciously fight against any deviation from the norm, against any interference" [2, p. 36].

According to G.D. Tomakhin, the translation in terms of intercultural communication is "not only the collision of two semantic systems with their national and cultural properties, but also the contact of representatives of two linguistic and cultural communities, each with its own worldview and a certain fund of cultural heritage: background knowledge, language etiquette, moral norms" [4, p. 130] In addition, as can be seen from the examples in the diachrony, translators are often prone to bias, depending on the peculiarities of the linguistic culture of readers, on their "horizon of expectations".

For example, at the end of the 18th century J.F. Marmontel in his article "Translation" (1777) noted that in French society there are still two opposing views: "high society" demands that "the translator erase the traces of the original, decorating it", "scholars want to find the spirit in translation, atmosphere of the original", want to see in the work a monument to his time and country [3, p. 24].

During the 19th century there is a growing interest in foreign works. In addition, the controversy between romantic aesthetics and classicism takes effect. J. de Nerval translates Goethe's Faust, A. de Vigny translates W. Shakespeare's Othello, and F.-R. de Chateaubriand translates J. Milton's Paradise Lost. The latter spoke of his method as follows: "I translated Milton's poem in his manner; I was not afraid to change the form of the verb, because if I remained more French, I would lose something from the accuracy of the original text, from its originality and energy" [12, p. 550]. The Romantics singled out two principles for their translation – the ability to broadcast the "local flavor" and the individuality of the author. Translation was to become a work of art, which means that the translator does not seek to limit his access. This gave rise to two views on the essence of translation:

1) Translation was considered as a mental category (hence cognitive linguistics): the translator was thought of as a creative genius, almost a co-author.

2) Translation was considered a technical, mechanical work aimed at acquainting readers with the original text or its author.

In addition, in the middle of the 19th century new "requirements" appeared – hypertrophied accuracy of translation: literal, meticulous transfer of meaning. Thus, translators either concentrated on the direct transmission of meaning, or resorted to "artificial" language and lexical innovations.

Realizing the complexity of the situation, as well as the presence of texts that are particularly difficult to interpret, translators began to distinguish between translation and adaptation, as well as translation and imitation.

The 20th century was marked by the emergence of linguistic theories, including structuralism, as well as various computer translation programs. A theoretical basis is being developed – translation studies, the purpose of which is a consistent description of the translation process. In part, translation disputes are embodied in the translation schools of French linguists and philosophers, who speak of *"sourciers"* and *"ciblistes"*. In the terminology of the French translator J.-R. Ladmiral, *"sourciers"* are translators who focus on the source, *"ciblistes"* – translators who focus on the language of the host ("target") culture (*langue cible*), on the reader [13, p. 33].

Self-reflection of the translator, which manifested itself in the 15th century in N. Oresme, doubts and disputes over translation methods gradually merged into formal "directions", the focus of which is the position of the translator. Discussions continue about his "presence" or "absence" in the text, his role is discussed: he is a scribe or co-author, and, as an echo of

the romantic approach of the 19th century, what is the translated text – "replica of the original" or an independent work.

The American theorist and translator L. Venuti, who experienced the significant influence of "French theory" in the person of M. Foucault, J. Derrida and A. Berman, notes the "secondary position of the translator in modern society: translation is defined as something secondary, only foreign text can be considered the original; the translation is a forged, potentially incorrect copy. Therefore, in order to hide its secondary nature, the translation must be carried out in a transparent language, which hides the very fact that the translation is in front of the reader, and not the original" [20, p. 6].

For the founders of "French theory", translation as a structure has always been a philosophical category, conceivable much deeper than any theoretical scheme. Thus, J. Derrida saw in the basis of translation issues the biblical myth of the Babylonian confusion: the philosopher tried to consider how the translation of meaning first constructs itself, and, embodied, constructs a new reality for the reader. At the same time, J. Derrida insisted on the value equation of the original and the translation. A. Berman divided the text into "own" and "foreign", and the translation for him is always a "test of another". Moreover, he believed that the original remains "forever young", and the translation becomes obsolete over time, thus requiring new translations [8, p. 16].

In the 20th century, the reader did not become more demanding, he only received a number of privileges – simplified acquaintance with a foreign text, its understanding through the promotion of foreign languages, the availability of electronic translators. This process, on the one hand, reduces the quality of countless translations, but, on the other hand, highlights really good examples in general. Translation practice in France, as well as around the world, is currently heavily influenced by theories and models of machine translation and computer translation programs. Modern researchers distinguish at least six theoretical approaches to developing development: sociological, communicative, hermeneutic, linguistic, literary, semiotic. However, the problems voiced several centuries ago seem relevant and have not exhausted themselves. Back in 1854 M.N. Bouillet wrote: "Translation is hard and ungrateful work. When works are valued for style, the translator is always lower than the original. Wittily, though not quite rightly, it was noticed that translation is always a reversal of the carpet, that the translator is always a traitor... " [10, p. 216].

Translation in France developed along with French society, its needs, tastes and demands. As J. Bellanger notes in his "History of Translation in France": "Every subsequent change in the art of translation depends on more or less profound changes in the minds, customs, literary tastes of the

nation. Translation, "decorated with plumage" in the days of Louis XIV, philosophical in the days of the Encyclopedia, theatrical and standard in the days of the Empire – today we have come to scientific realism in translation, which dominates our era" [6, p. 123].

References

1. Гудий К.А. От оригинала к переводу: проблема взаимодействия автора и переводчика. *Филология и лингвистика в современном обществе*: материалы Междунар. науч. конф. М.: Ваш полиграфический партнер, 2012. **2**. Мунэн Ж. Теоретические проблемы перевода. *Перевод как языковой контакт. Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике*. М., 1978. **3**. Пахсарьян Н.Т. Этапы истории перевода во Франции (опыт энциклопедической статьи). *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету імені Альфреда Нобеля. Серія: Філологічні науки*. 2015. № 2. С. 22-26. **4**. Томахин Г.Д. Перевод как межкультурная коммуникация. *Перевод и коммуникация*. М.: ИЯз РАН, 1997. **5**. Ballard M. Histoire de la traduction. Repères historiques et culturels. Bruxelles: De Boeck. 2013. **6**. Bellanger J. Histoire de la traduction en France. A. Lemerre, 1903. **7**. Bellay Du J. La défense et illustration de la langue française: avec une notice biographie et un commentaire historique et critique. E. Sansot & Cie., 1549. **8**. Berman A. L'Épreuve de l'étranger. Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique. Paris: Gallimard, 1984. **9**. Bocquet C. Etienne Dolet traducteur réinterprété. Institut Etienne Dolet, collection Histoire, Lausanne et Châteuneuf Loire, 2001. **10**. Chevrel Y. Histoire de traductions en langue française. XIX siècle. 1815–1914 / Sous la dir. de Y. Chevrel, L. D'Hulst et C. Lombez. P.: Verdier, 2012. **11**. Delisle J., Woodsworth J. Les traducteurs dans l'histoire. University of Ottawa Press, 1995. **12**. Dotoli G. Traduire en français du moyen âge au XXI siècle. P.: Hermann, 2010. **13**. Ladmiral J.-R. "Sourciers et ciblistes" *La traduction. Revue d'esthétique* n.s. n 12, Toulouse, Privat, 1986. Pp. 33-42. **14**. Leung C. Etienne Fourmont (1683-1745). Leuven University Press, 2002. **15**. Montaigne. Essais, II, 12, Villey. Vol. 2. **16**. Oresme N. Livre de éthiques d'Aristote. Menut (éd.), New York, G.E. Stechert and Co, 1940. **17**. Oseki-Dépré I. Théories et pratiques de la traduction littéraire . *Le français aujourd'hui*. N 142. 2011. **18**. Serra S. "Doute et méthode chez Nicole Oresme", Questes [En ligne], 23|2012, mis en ligne le 01 janvier 2014, consulté le 22 août 2020. URL : http://questes.revues.org/960. **19**. Tran-Gervat Y.-M. Traduire en français à l'âge classique. Génie national et génie des langues / Sous la dir. de Y.-M. Tran-Gervat. P.: Presses de la Sorbonne nouvelle, 2013. **20**. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisiblity. A History of Translation, Routledge, 2005.