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Annotation. The article discusses the role of national-cultural information in a literary text and the necessity for its representation in a translated text. The opinions of several researchers regarding the relationship between language and culture are observed here. Basing on these general assumptions, the conclusion related to the specificity of culture representation in a literary translation is given.
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Modern Translation Studies pays much attention to extralinguistic factors influencing the recreation of a literary text in connection with the change in research paradigms and the demarcation of the boundaries between the concepts of “linguistic picture of the world” and “national-cultural picture of the world”. Consequently, a literary text by its nature is not only a collection of linguistic phenomena, but also a carrier of voluminous cultural information that requires correct interpretation. Thus, the culturological aspect of translation becomes one of the most essential elements in the process of translating a text into another language, since the study of text transformation is an irreplaceable material for describing the linguistic picture of the world and the mentality of the personality of another culture. [1] First of all, it should be noted that researchers approach the consideration of the national and cultural specifics of certain aspects or fragments of the picture of the world from different positions: some of them take it as the original language, analyzing the established facts of interlingual similarity or divergence through the prism of linguistic systematization and discussion related to the linguistic picture of the world; for others, the primary is culture, the linguistic consciousness of members of a certain linguocultural community, and the focus is on the representation of the world. There are frequent cases when the fundamental differences between these two approaches are simply not noticed or when the declared study of the picture of the world is actually replaced by a description of the linguistic picture of the world from the standpoint of the language system. [2] According to the researchers D. Ashurova and M. Galieva, the differences between the linguistic and national worldviews are relative and from a practical point of view, they can coincide in the plans that define universal or nationally-specific
knowledge or experience. [3] Undoubtedly, each language reflects a national picture through culturally-specific words, expressions, phraseological units and even grammatical constructions, in this regard, in our opinion, it is impossible to draw a clear line between the linguistic phenomena themselves included in the linguistic picture of the world and the specific national ones, which are also represented in the language. Moreover, as it was noted by S.G. Ter-Minasova, there is a thinking person, a native speaker, in the process of communication between language and culture [4], which also confirms the impossibility of drawing clear boundaries between these pictures of the world, especially regarding the study a literary text. On the other hand, the analysis of a literary text from the point of view of Translation Studies requires understanding not only the essence of such information, but also determining its role in a specific context. Meanwhile, it must be admitted that there is an awareness of the necessity for a decisive reorientation of such studies from a comparative analysis of linguistic systems to the study of the national and cultural specifics of the real functioning of the language and the cultural values associated with it, linguistic consciousness, linguistic / linguocultural competence, etc.

According to V.N. Telia’s definition of the subject of cultural linguistics as the study and description of the cultural semantics of linguistic signs (nominative inventory and texts) in their living, synchronously acting use, reflecting the cultural and national mentality of native speakers [5], we can infer that the national picture of the world is always represented in any literary text as this is the reflection of people’s way of perception of the objective reality. At the same time, it is indicated that the interactive processes of interaction of two semiotic systems (language and culture) are studied from the standpoint of the cultural and linguistic competence of the speaker / listener; the explication of cognitive procedures carried out by the subject when interpreting the culturally significant reference of linguistic signs is carried out on the basis of the living functioning of the language in discourses of different types in order to study “cultural identity, or mentality, of both an
individual subject and the community in its polyphonic wholeness.” [5] According to A. Wierzbicka, any text and any statement are culturally conditioned, since native speakers belonging to a certain culture are usually guided by certain subconscious norms when they create the text. This influence of the culture on the text production was called “culture-conditioned scenario” [6] Moreover, the very concept of “culture” is so voluminous that, according to many scientists, it leads to the understanding of translation phenomenon not as an interlingual act, but as cross-cultural communication, which to some extent deprives the language of some independence. In our opinion, such approach can be justified only partially - only to the extent that language really cannot exist outside the context of culture and the nation that uses the language as a means of communication. However, it is necessary to understand that culture is situational and depends on the context in which the communication takes place in the same manner as the word depends on the context and changes its meaning. [7] In other words, language is an integral part of any culture, which is considered as the cultural code of any nation, on the basis of which the concepts and names of certain objects are transmitted, where its role is no longer limited to “an instrument of communication and cognition”. [8]

Developing these ideas, we can state that for cultural studies it is of the most interest to compare the mentality of two linguocultural communities in order to identify differences and coincidences between them. The signals of the specificity of the linguocultural community are the gaps, which are delimited into confrontational gaps caused by the “drift” of two different cultures, and contrasting gaps caused by a shift within the same culture. The study of such gaps is necessary for various purposes, including translation, which is interpreted by Yu.A. Sorokin as a form of the existence of a semiotic experience of one linguocultural community in the symbolic means of another linguocultural community. [9] In this regard, he introduces the concept of a translated text-menthefact (understood as units of the content of consciousness), isomorphic to the original text and belonging to the corresponding culture. However, in practice, in order to recreate the entire depth of
conceptual information contained in a particular nationally-specific unit, it is necessary to conduct a holistic cognitive-linguocultural analysis and determine the relationship between such signals (markers of cultural information) and the general context, as well as their correlation to the author's intention.

Awareness of the need for an integrated approach to objects related to language and culture, was also discussed by a Finnish researcher M. Lehtonen who emphasized the implicit character of culturally-specific units: “Though culture, symbols, technologies, symbol systems, texts, contexts and readers all relate to each other in the formation of meanings, the order in which they are presented does not represent any kind of a hierarchical mutual relationship”. [10] Therefore, on the basis of the knowledge gained as a result of an integrated approach to language learning, the task of cultural linguistics is to “explicate the cultural significance of a linguistic unit (i.e. “cultural knowledge”) on the basis of correlating the prototype situation of a phraseological unit or another linguistic unit, its symbolic representation with so-called “codes of culture”, which can be meaningful only for the representative of this culture. While agreeing with this formulation as one of the potential tasks of cultural linguistics, it is nevertheless necessary to pay attention to the opportunity of conducting a linguoculturological research not only on the principle “from a language unit to a culture unit”, but also from a “culture unit to language units”. It is the language that realizes and verbalizes the national cultural picture of the world, as well as stores and transfers it from generation to generation. Thus, it should be noted that the linguocultural interpretation of culturally significant and nationally specific units in a literary text is an obligatory stage in the pre-translation analysis of the text.

Summarizing the abovementioned, we can conclude that a literary text is a peculiar phenomenon from a cultural point of view, as it describes a reality that is completely special in relation to the real one, since it is created by the author of the text, placing certain “keys” or “signals” throughout the text. These “keys” are the markers that allow the text space to be attributed to a particular culture. Explicit
references to certain models of culture or implicit indications of actions, deeds, specific features that are usually associated with models of a particular culture can be used as clues to identify such specificity and, what is more important, should be represented in translation in order to render the conceptual extent of the original text.
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