

УДК 81.33

## **British Literature at the Turn of the 20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> Centuries in Russian Translations: Translatability and the Problem of “The Third Literature”**

**Anastasiya S. Dubovik\***

*Krasnoyarsk State Pedagogical University  
named after V.P. Astafiev*

*89 Ada Lebedeva Str., Krasnoyarsk, 660049, Russia*

Received 10.01.2017, received in revised form 18.12.2017, accepted 11.01.2018

*The extent of the national literary system's participation in the global translation process is one of the most important indicators of its openness. Therefore, the translation's role of the dialogue between literatures and cultures of different peoples occupies an important place among many translation functions as a communicative universal. Translation as a dialogue of literatures is possible only in the interaction of these literatures. In this regard, it is reasonable to raise a question about the role and place of translated literature in the context of national literatures. Since the translated literature actually does not belong to one of the national literatures, the important task of philology, on the one hand, is to define its ontological status, on the other hand, it is to elucidate the role of works of the so-called receiving literature and translated works in creating new translations from the language of the original literature into the language of the target literature. These issues are considered in the article both in a theoretical aspect and based on the material of some popular British works and their translations.*

*Keywords: literary translation, British literature, original text, receiving literature, third literature.*

*DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0202.*

*Research area: philology, translatology.*

### **Literary Translation in the Dialogue of Cultures**

Close ties between peoples of the world and an active international communication inevitably entail a mutual integration of cultures. A complete international and intercultural communication becomes possible only with the assistance of a mediator that is a translator. The need for translation has grown steadily since the very first contacts between people speaking different

languages. At all times interpreters helped to deal with international issues at different levels; thanks to interpreters, representatives of various nationalities still have the opportunity to meet other cultures and appreciate their unique features worthily.

A special place in the hierarchy of translation is taken by the translation of literature. This is primarily due to the fact that the literary text has certain features that distinguish it from

other kinds of literary creativity. Along with extraordinary semantic capacity, national and historical coloring, an individual author's style is another specific feature of fiction, whose originality is a complex system of interrelated features that fill the entire text of a work of art and form a coherent whole with its contents. Any writer with a strong individual artistic style uses the language creatively, often quite substantially deviating from literary norms, customary usages of language forms, the classical syntax and grammatical structures. It is through the creative use of the language the writer identifies an individual subjective attitude to the described events, characterizes the phenomena and objects and reveals his/her outlook (Natitnik, 2006). This explains the fact that the translation of a literary text as a multifaceted and complex structure inevitably causes many linguostylistic difficulties.

Literary translation plays an important role not only in the development of individual national literatures, incorporating the findings and achievements of the literatures of other nations, but also in the awareness of the unity of the world literature as an evidence of the consolidation of humanity, entered the third millennium. The problems of the literary unity of the world literature today are so relevant that researchers of modern literary process in different countries are increasingly turning to the issues of development of cooperation, mutual influence and mutual enrichment of national literatures. The study of multifaceted interliterary bonds along with other factors takes into account similarities and differences in the historical conditions of life of peoples, their cultural and social characteristics, as well as the degree of their openness to various forms of external influence and their readiness to perceive and process the new in the field of literary and linguistic creativity (Narbut, 2008). In the development of each national literature, as

well as in the work of a single writer, the part of the artistic traditions that have been accumulated over the centuries is extremely large. These traditions are an essential component of the literary process. However, it is obvious that the characteristics of any national literature are caused not only by intra-factors of its formation, but the peculiarities of its external relations as well, since the development of national literature necessarily involves its enrichment with external pulses to any extent. The extent of the national literary system's participation in the global translation process is one of the most important indicators of its openness. Therefore, the translation's role of the dialogue between literatures and cultures of different peoples occupies an important place among many translation functions as a communicative universal. Translation as a dialogue of literatures is possible only in the interaction of these literatures, in other words, in the process of moving ideas, themes and forms from one literature to another (Levy, 1974). In this regard, it is reasonable to raise a question about the role and place of translated literature in the context of national literatures. Since the translated literature actually does not belong to one of the national literatures, the important task of philology, on the one hand, is to define its ontological status, on the other, it is to elucidate the role of works of the so-called receiving literature and translated works in creating new translations from the language of the original literature into the language of the target literature. Some scientists regard the translated works, used for subsequent translations, as donor texts (Narbut, 2008; Fateeva, 2003; Bart, 1994). However, it is important to stress, that various researchers suggest different interpretations of the donor text. E.V. Narbut emphasizes that the use of the material of the donor text can contribute to achieving a higher level of adequacy of a literary translation. This is different from the value of the

text in which the concept of the donor text is used in aesthetics and criticism of the text, for example, in the works of R. Barthes, N.A. Fateeva and other researchers, considering the donor text primarily as a source of quotations, allusions, and so on. Despite the lack of study of the category of the donor text in the national history and the theory of translation, many scientists note its important role for the didactics of a literary translation. A separate problem is the isolation of the donor text as an intermediary link between the original and the translation, as well as the determination of the degree of competing translations' adequacy to the original.

Thus, a national literature cannot be seen in isolation from the world literature, since the development of the latter influences the state of the national literature, one way or another, enriching it. The result of this relationship is a simultaneous development of various artistic movements, traditions and genre-stylistic forms in the literatures of different languages.

### **Some problems of translated literature**

In the context of this perspective it is important to raise the issue of the status of the three kinds of literature, namely, the original, the receiving and the translated. Translated literature is a set of texts of originally written in one language and then translated into another. The separation of literature in the translated and the original in most cases is not too important for the scientific literature (some humanities disciplines in different countries are dominated by different scholar schools and approaches, so the translated monograph may differ a lot from what is written inside a given country in its language). However, for the fiction the division of literature into the translated and the original can be very important: in particular, the ratio of translated and original works in the total number of publications (both in

the number of names, and in terms of circulation) is an important indicator of the state of the national culture.

During some periods in some national cultures translated literature plays a more important than the original one; and this is not an indicator of the weakness of the national culture, but rather a symptom of its rapid growth and significant social changes. This raises the need for a rapid development and a transfer of a diverse new experience, and it can be quickly implemented due to translations and transcriptions than at the expense of the original creative work of writers who need more time to comprehend new phenomena and processes. In the history of Russian literature, the most famous and obvious example of such a situation is the turn of 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries, when a crucial role in its development was played by translations and transpositions (primarily those made by V. Zhukovsky). I.G. Neupokoeva, examining the relationship between literatures, believes that the national literary system's participation in the development of translated works is one of the most important manifestations of its openness (Neupokoeva, 1976). However, a number of researchers support the point of view that literary translation is not only a "liaison between peoples and cultures", but also becomes a fact of the receiving literature (Novikova, 1990). Such an approach in the evaluation of a literary translation is bound to create inconsistencies in determining its ontological status. The idea expressed in the scientific literature about the status of translated literature as the so-called third literature, unfortunately, has not been significantly developed yet (Chaikovsky, 1997). Referring to the views of Goethe, the famous German translation scientist J. Albrecht wrote the same in fact. According to Albrecht, the world literature for Goethe was "the literature-mediator", which served as a link between

national literatures. Translated literature belongs exactly to it (Albrecht, 1998). It seems that this idea contains the first argument for the foundation of a whole new theory of translated literature.

As is known, so far translated literature has generally been referred to the literature of the receiving language, and translators were required to make their translations become part of the national literature, which is Russian literature in our case. Meanwhile, this approach initially contains a profound contradiction, because the work written by a foreign author in another language is proposed to consider as part of the literature, with which this translated product is linked only by the target language. According to R.R. Chaikovsky, a translated work is linked with the original literature by the content, and with the receiving literature it is linked by the language (Tchaikovsky, 1997). But the connection of a translated product with the original literature is much richer – it is an authorship, the original language, national peculiarities of the work, etc. A translated work is hardly connected with the receiving literature by anything else but the language. However, a language as a parameter is not enough to consider a work to be a fact of the literature of this language. It is therefore logical to define a place of translated literature at the junction or between two national literatures. However, a well-known Israeli scholar and translation theorist G. Toury believes it is the receiving culture or its part act as an initiator of the translation process. Translation as a teleological activity is mainly determined by the objectives which it serves, and these objectives are set by the intended recipient of the translation and in his system (culture). Therefore, first of all, translators translate for the benefit of the receiving culture, but not in the interests of the original, let alone the benefit of the original culture. The text of the translation seems to fit into the receiving culture, it is accepted by it and functions in it exactly

as a translated text. At the same time G. Toury understand culture as the whole social context of translation, including the standards, conventions, ideology and the values of the society, or the receiving system (Toury, 1995). E. Gentzler also writes about it, commenting on the position of G. Toury that no translation can be fully perceived by the target culture, likewise it can never fully meet the original text due to the difference in the target and the receiving cultures (Gentzler, 1993). Thus, translated literature forcedly appears in a certain way internally detached from both the original national literature and the literature of the target language.

Naturally, such a distinction does not diminish the role of literature in translation in the receiving culture, but it allows determining its genuine status, its difference from the so-called first – original and the so-called second – receiving literature. Furthermore, the same distinction makes it possible to clarify the relation of translated literature with the first and the second, to determine the literary and historical-cultural statuses of translated texts and more clearly define the social role of a literature translator.

An important achievement of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was the creation of the theory of translation and translation studies. A practical interest in translation, dominated for centuries, turned into a theoretical interest. The development of the new science was going in two directions, namely, the literary direction and the linguistic direction. Representatives of the literary direction consider translation as one of the sections of Comparative Literature. In our country, the literary direction is represented by the works of such researchers as K.I. Chukovsky (Chukovsky, 1964), M.P. Alekseev (Alekseev, 1931), I.A. Kashkin (Kashkin, 1968), G.R. Gachechiladze (Gachechiladze, 1972), and others. These scientists attached an utmost

importance not only to the text of the translation and its place in the system of literary works of the target language, but also to the literary value of the original. Proponents of this theory, which dominated in the Soviet Union until 1960, paid much attention to the transfer of the images of the original and attached an essential importance to the personality of the interpreter.

In the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the linguistic direction firmly held the leading position in the theory of translation. At this time, scholar schools developing this direction appeared in several Western countries. Among the schools that made the most significant contribution to the theory of translation, we can name the three main ones, such as the English, the German and the French scholar schools. At various times, the linguistic theory of translation was under the influence of various trends in linguistics, such as structuralism, transformational grammar, descriptivism, cognitive linguistics, corpus linguistics, etc. The common feature characteristic of the works in this direction is the tendency to link theoretical linguistics and the general theory of translation organically. Proponents of the linguistic theory of translation pointed to a number of translation techniques, which allowed overcoming the difficulties associated with structural differences in the language of the original and the translation.

Identifying the nature of the interaction of national literatures, many researchers stop at dealing with such categories as the donor text (see above), imitation, influence, the interpretation of the experience of others, the response to a literary phenomenon and the creative assimilation of world achievements. For example, the nature of the interaction of the source text, the donor text and the translation can be outlined very tentatively as follows: the translator, getting acquainted with the original, at the first phase of work with it determines its place in the original literature, i.e., reveals the

cultural and historical context in which this work exists (era, literary movement, style) and usually finds some kind of equivalent to this original in the literature of the language of translation voluntarily or involuntarily. Speaking about the category of the donor text, we cannot but raise the issue about the so-called parallel texts. Today in the course of the accelerated globalization there is a constantly increasing demand for texts that are simultaneously sent to the recipients of various linguistic communities in many spheres of life. These texts are immediately produced as “parallel texts” in different languages (Best, Kalina, 2002). According to many researchers (Toury, Thiel, Kusmaul’, Holtz-Manttari etc.), parallel texts are, above all, an effective tool for the translation of professional literature, as they provide a language and, accordingly, translation normativity in different languages. The basis of parallel texts is the existence of original specified and accepted types of text for the respective areas. G. Toury, for example, emphasizes the functional relationship of parallel texts and treats them as interchangeable in different languages (Toury, 1995). G. Thiel notes such a feature of parallel texts, as their creating (independent on each other) in different languages (Thill, 2007). The translation, as we know, is always in a dependent relationship with the original, while parallel texts are independent on each other. In this regard, the statement by A. Neubert that parallel texts are not translations is quite logical (Neubert, 1978). Parallel texts are inherently utilitarian specific texts, which do not reflect individual stylistic features of their authors.

Speaking of parallel texts, it is appropriate to mention precedent texts, which are a corpus of well-known texts within a specific historical period. Folklore, fiction, media and others are usually indicated as a source of precedent texts. The ontology of parallel and precedent texts anyway contact with the concept of the donor

text, since the nature of parallel and precedent texts contains a lot of things that can be used in the development of the typology of donor texts. In particular, it may be a problem of as much as possible identical description of the relevant situations (Narbut, 2008). In parallel texts those characteristics manifest that are typical of all previous parallel texts, while precedent texts are the source of the material to create the following text. Precedent texts are found primarily in literature, while parallel texts are mainly used in professional literature.

### **Russian translations of British literature at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> centuries**

The end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was marked by the rapid development of all kinds of literature and the main directions of scientific and technical progress, which could not but affect the scope of translations, notably perked up at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in many countries. The existing social status of translators began to grow, and the translation process was finally formed as an independent direction of professional activity. After the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia a new burst of translation activities took place. On the initiative of M. Gorky a new publishing house *World Literature* was immediately created; it set an ambitious goal of publishing new or revised translations of all the major works of both Western and Eastern literatures. Despite the huge material and organizational difficulties, this publishing house managed for decades to publish the translations of the books of many prominent writers and poets, such as O. de Balzac, A. France, F. Stendhal, H. Heine, F. Schiller, J. Byron, Ch. Dickens, B. Shaw, M. Twain, and many, many others. The translations of 30s-80s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are qualitatively different from both the translation of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and the translations of the late 20<sup>th</sup>-early 21<sup>st</sup>

century. Using a functional approach allowed the translators of that time to convey the author's particular linguistic creativity adequately and to solve many problems of translation, which were unsolvable before, successfully (transfer of metaphors, puns, speaking names, idioms, etc.). An attention to detail, to the phonetic, lexical and syntactic features of the original, to the stylistic and aesthetic functional load of its units allowed the interpreters to approach the text to the original text as much as possible and to transmit not only the "letter", but also the spirit of works. No wonder these transfers were included in the "golden fund" of Russian literature in translation. A large number of translations were also published in the 30s and later by other all-Union and local publishers. The prominent scientists and writers, who raised the art of translation to a new level, took part in this work. A number of talented translators acquired a deserved distinction, and the translation names of such masters of translation as M. Lozinsky, T. Shchepkina-Kupernik, S. Marshak, N. Lyubimov, E. Kalashnikov and many others, were held in a deserved respect in the Soviet Union and abroad. In our opinion, K.I. Chukovsky should be acknowledged as the founder of the Russian theory of literary translation, because he was the man who happened to be among the first to develop the principles of literary translation in Russia, and who was professionally engaged in this problem for half a century. The work of N.S. Gumilev, who began together with Chukovsky at the turn of the 20s of the last century, was interrupted, as we know, by his untimely tragic death, and the first works of A.V. Fedorov appeared at the end of the third decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Chaikovsky, 2011). In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there were quantitative and qualitative changes in the translation work all over the world, of course, including Russia. Here the



demand for information (non-fiction) translations in the social, political, business and scientific-technical spheres increased sharply again. The profession of a translator became mass, while an increase in the scale of translation activities was accompanied by organizational changes. A large number of translation services and departments within public institutions and industrial enterprises appeared. Many translators occupy staff positions, others worked on a contract basis. Along with informative translations, translations of literary works continued to be published in large editions. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the nature of translation activities and the market situation changed significantly. On the one hand, state-owned publishing houses, engaged in translations, were no longer funded, drastically reduced their output or even ceased to exist. On the other hand, censorship was abolished, and the works that were previously banned for ideological or moral grounds began to be translated. There were a lot of private publishers, book prices increased, the quality of translation, as a whole, declined. The market was flooded with translations of books intended for "light" reading, namely, detective, erotic, pornographic books, etc. The new situation in different ways affected the translators. Most of the translations were produced from the English language and were relatively well-paid. However, the demand for English language translators impelled many non-professionals to do translations, which led to the appearance of frankly weak translations on the market. New publishers tend to release new translations as soon as possible to get ahead of the competitors, and do not care about creating translation masterpieces. Despite the difficulties, the translation activity in Russia in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century retains its scale and social importance. The training of translators in schools went on, professional associations of translators were created, legislative acts regulating the translation

work were prepared. Russian scientists who have made a great contribution to the creation of the science of translation, continued research in this important area of human activity. At the end of 20<sup>th</sup> – beginning of 21<sup>st</sup> century (late 1980s – early 2000s) two different translation trends proliferated. One of these trends has the features similar to those observed in the translations of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. These are almost complete leveling of the author's linguistic creativity elements, which inevitably leads to smoothing or changing the effect, created in the original, the desire to make the text more "understandable" and "affordable", causing the appearance of "extra" words. In some cases, translators' treatment of the text of the original is so "free", that the reader gets a distorted view not only of the individual episodes, but also of some of the characters. As well as the translations of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the modern translations transfer mainly those stylistic features of the original in an unchanged way, which literal translation is not contraindicated to (Natitnik, 2006). As a result of the conducted analysis, it was found out that the principles that guided the translators at different times have undergone significant changes. Thus, the translators of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century thought their main task was to transfer the contents of the original as accurately as possible, without giving due consideration to its linguistic features at the same time. In the middle of 20<sup>th</sup> century the situation changed dramatically: the formal approach to the translation was replaced by the functional approach. Best translations made in the 40s-80s of the last century, successfully transfer both the content of the original, and its linguistic, stylistic and rhythmic originality. The translations made for the recent 10-15 years are characterized by two different tendencies, which are a significant leveling of the language features of the original (that brings them closer to the translations of the

end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century), and at the same time strengthening the expressivity of stylistically marked (reduced) vocabulary.

### **Popular British works translated by Russian authors**

An objective factor plays an important role in translation. However, in the process of translating a text from one language into another not only objective, but also subjective factors play a significant role. L.I. Sapogova said, "Subjectivity is understood as a trend towards the introduction of purely individual, personal information in the text of the translation, that is often completely different from, or not close to that one which is objectively contained in the original" (Sapogova, 2007). Each person is individual and unique, so everyone has their own perception of reality. According to L.I. Sapogova, the subjective is recognized as inevitable and manifested in the choice of the variant of the translation defined by the level of the information reservoir of the translator, their idiolect and professionalism. The subjective accompanies any speech product, tinting it with one's personal preferences, showing, when it comes to the translator, the limits of their competence (Sapogova, 2007).

The study of subjectivity in the translation is not possible without addressing the concept of the linguistic identity of the translator. According to the definition by Yu.N. Karaulov, "Linguistic identity is a person who has the ability to create and perceive texts which differ by: a) the degree of structural and linguistic complexity; b) the depth and accuracy of the reflection of reality; c) a specific target focus" (Karaulov, 2010). Despite different views and approaches to the co-authorship of the translator and the author of the original, Russian linguists have a prevailing view that the interaction of two creative personalities in translation is, above all, cooperation (Gudii, 2012). By virtue of indisputable artistic merits of

the first translations of foreign classical literature, as well as, possibly due to a lack of interest in the issues of translation theory and popularity of translation studies in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, you can hardly find two or more well-known and widely recognized translations of popular classical works of the 20<sup>th</sup> century that became masterpieces of the world literature in Russian translation practice. However, no doubt, the translation of contemporary literature of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> -21<sup>st</sup> centuries, especially from the English language, is of great interest both for professional translators, and among amateurs. Many books of modern foreign writers translated by Russian authors become very popular among Russian readers because of the film adaptation, especially if it is successful, with a big box office. The magic of the international bestseller is that even translators are no longer invisible and end up in a halo of glory (good or bad). Readers discuss the translations in the Internet, write petitions to the publisher, compare the variants of speaking names and sometimes even touch translators personally. The novel *Bridget Jones's Diary* by H. Fielding, J. Tolkien's trilogy *Lord of the Rings*, *Harry Potter* by J. Rowling and others can be noted among such works.

In the autumn of 2016 immediately after the last book of J. Rowling about Harry Potter the internet was blown by the conflict of the novel's fans, which arose on the basis of dissatisfaction with the translations made by different Russian-speaking translators. The fans, especially those who knew English, debated passionately on the issues of the translation of names, titles, character names, the transformation of the religious facts and events. One reason for the existence of such errors in the Russian version of the translation could be that at the time J. Rowling completely distanced herself from any contacts with translators. It is worth mentioning that this does not always happen, sometimes the world's best-



selling authors are interested in the life of their offspring in other languages. For example, U. Eco collected his translators for special conferences, Tolkien made instructions for the translation of complex realities and names, others, sometimes very famous authors, willingly enter into correspondence and answer questions.

In the case of *Harry Potter* the author's aloofness led to the serious difficulties faced by translators. Sometimes the development of events in the book made a translation solution unsuccessful (when the translator Maria Spivak called one of the heroes (Severus Snape) Zlodeus Zlei using her own associations with the original name of the character, she probably did not foresee that the character would turn out to be much more ambiguous). The name of the sixth book *Deathly Hallows* was first translated into Russian differently, but then the translation had to be changed, as the first name in Russian made completely unclear what the book was about. In addition, the rightholders set stringent deadlines, making the implementation of a high-quality translation almost impossible. Several Russian translators of children's literature refused to work with *Harry Potter* for this very reason – they did not want to spoil the book in a rush.

With tight deadlines a translator sometimes gets the text of the book in advance, before it is published in the original, but in the case of *Harry Potter*, the privacy was respected in a rather manic way, up to the extent that the layout designers worked under the protection in special areas, so the translators received the text at the same time as all other readers (besides, it increased the sale of English copies of the book worldwide). In 2000, there was a scandal around *Warner Brothers*, which deprived the translators in some countries of their contractual rights, and acted extremely rudely. The Catalan translator refused to sign a new contract, and was replaced. In some countries, the rightholders interfered

with translation solutions: in particular, they forbade translating speaking names to facilitate their marketing.

Three well-known translation of the novel *Bridget Jones's Diary* by the British writer H. Fielding (1996) are also among the most talked about in terms of translation solutions. The first translation was made by A. Moskvicheva (2000), the second one – by G. Bagdasarian (2004) and the third one – by M. Zorina (2014). When analyzing the original and the three translations, we discovered different approaches to their implementation. The translation by G. Bagdasarian can be considered more appropriate, as she explained many realities, incomprehensible to the reader, in the footnotes. However, the introduction of untranslated realities makes the process of reading and receiving the work complicated; the reader constantly refers to the footnotes, and in order to get a more or less clear idea of the described fact, they are forced to make the necessary calculations constantly, if it concerns a word denoting measurements. Speaking of the translation by Zorina, we should note the boldness, with which the author translated the original text, making the new translation less censored, sometimes more honest, and, according to many readers, “less English” for this reason.

### Conclusion

The translation of literary texts into a foreign language or from a foreign language is considered to be the most difficult. In addition, not every translator can perform the function of a co-author and create a new text on the basis of the original text. The literary translation supposes not only the excellent knowledge of a foreign language, but also requires the presence of a creative intuition. An experienced translator of literature should be able to feel subtly and convey the idea implied by the author in the text.

The literary translation has an artistic value, if it is made at a high level. A huge number of works of the world literature became known to readers primarily thanks to the creative intuition and skills of translators. The translated masterpieces of the world literature became available to the world public.

Thus, the main feature of the quality literary translation is an excellent knowledge of the country, culture and mentality of the original literature. In addition, the translator should convey the style of the author, the

author's intent, display the meaning of the work accurately and keep the harmony of the literary text. The combination of all of these conditions has a major influence on the final product. And whether it is the translated literature or the third literature, part of the original literature or something already belonging to the receiving literature is one of the central problems of translation studies today, the basis for all new translation analyses and the foundation for the emergence of a greater number of scientific works in this area.

### References

- Albrecht, J. (1998). *Literarische Übersetzung: Geschichte, Theorie, kulturelle Wirkung*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 360 p.
- Alekseev, M.P. (1931). *Problema khudozhestvennogo perevoda [The Problem of Literary Translation]*. Irkutsk, 50 p.
- Barth, R. (1994). *Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika [Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics]*. Moscow, Progress, Univers, 616 p.
- Best, J., Kalina, S. (2002). *Übersetzen und Dolmetschen: eine Orientierungshilfe*. Tübingen, Francke, 341 s.
- Borisenko, A. *Garry Potter i trudnosti perevoda. O chem sporiat russkoiazychnye chitateli knig Dzhoann Rouling [Harry Potter and the difficulties of translation. What Russian-speaking readers of the books by J. Rowling argue about]*. Available at: <https://nplus1.ru/material/2016/09/12/harrypotter> (accessed by 20 October 2016).
- Chaikovsky, R.R. (1997). *Real'nosti poeticheskogo perevoda (tipologicheskie i sotsiologicheskie aspekty). [The Realities of Poetic Translation (typological and sociological aspects)]*. Magadan, Kordis, 197 p.
- Chaikovsky, R.R. (2011). *Perevod i perevodchiki: nauchnyi al'manakh kafedry nemetskogo iazyka Severo-Vostochnogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta (g. Magada) [Translations and Translators: Scientific Almanac of the Department of German at Northeastern State University (Magadan)]*, In *Teoriia i istoriia perevoda [The Theory and History of Translation]*, 7. Magadan, Kordis, 53-65.
- Chukovsky, K.I. (1964). *Vysokoe iskusstvo. O printsipakh khudozhestvennogo perevoda [High Art. On the Principles of Literary Translation]*. Leningrad, 353 p.
- Fateeva, N.A. (2003). *Poet i proza: Kniga o Pasternake [Poet and Prose: The book about Pasternak]*. Moscow, Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 400 p.
- Gachechiladze, G.R. (1972). *Khudozhestvennyi perevod i literaturnye vzaimosvazi [Literary Translation and Literary Interconnections]*. Moscow, 262 p.
- Gentzler, E. (1993). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London, Routledge, 224 p.
- Gudii, K.A. (2012). *Ot originala k perevodu: problema vzaimodeistviia avtora i perevodchika [From the original to the translation: the problem of interaction between the author and the translator]*. Moscow, Vash Poligraficheskii Partner, 99-103.

Karaulov, Yu.N. (2010). *Russkii iazyk i iazykovaia lichnost'* [Russian Language and Linguistic Identity]. Moscow, LKI, 31-57.

Kashkin, I.A. (1968). *Dlia chitatelia sovremennika. Stat'i i issledovaniia* [For the Contemporary Reader. Articles and Research]. Moscow, 371-547.

Levy, I. (1974). *Isskusstvo perevoda: per. s chesh. Vl. Rossel's* [Art of Translation: translated from Czech by V.I. Rossels]. Moscow, Progress, 397 p.

Narbut, E.V. (2008). *Original, tekst-donor, perevod: problemy vzaimodeistviia (na materiale perevodov romana E.M. Remarka "Iskra Zhizni" na russkii iazyk). Avtoreferat po VAK 10.02.20.* [Original, Donor text, Translation: Problems of Interaction (based on the translations of the novel Spark of Life by E.M. Remarque into Russian). Abstract by HAC 10.02.20. Available at: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/original-tekst-donor-perevod-problemy-vzaimodeistviya-na-materiale-perevodov-romana-em-remar> (accessed by 15 October 2016).

Natitnik, A.V. (2006). *Tvorcheskoe ispol'zovanie iazyka i ego granitsy v perevode. Avtoreferat kandidata filologicheskikh nauk, 10.02.24, 10.02.20* [The Creative Use of language and its Limits in Translation. Dissertation Abstract of PhD in Philology, 10.02.04, 10.02.20]. Available at: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/tvorcheskoe-ispolzovanie-yazyka-i-ego-granitsy-v-perevode> (accessed by 14 October 2016).

Neubert, A. (1978). *Pragmatische aspekty perevoda* [Pragmatic aspects of translation, In *Voprosy teorii v zarubezhnoi lingvistike* [Theory Issues in Foreign Linguistics]. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniia, 185-202.

Neupokoeva, I.G. (1976). *Istoriia vseмирnoi literatury. Problemy sistemnogo i sravnitel'nogo analiza* [The History of World Literature. Problems of the system and comparative analyses]. Moscow, Nauka, 358 p.

Novikova, M.A. (1990). *Perevodcheskie konteksty* [Translation Contexts], In *Masterstvo perevoda: Sb.st.* [Translation Skill: collection of articles]. Moscow, Sovetskii Pisatel', 45-74.

*Otzyvy i retsenzii o knige "Dnevnik Bridzhit Dzhozns"* [Comments and Reviews on the book Bridget Jones's Diary]. Available at: <http://www.ozon.ru/reviews/21078089/> (accessed by 12 October 2016).

Sapogova, L.I. (2007). *Chitatel' i perevodchik* [The Reader and the Translator]. Tula, Tolstoy TGPU, 120-173.

Thill, B. (2007). "Défaire les cases": la langue et la traduction dans le transfert culturel, In *De la traduction et des transferts culturels*. Paris, 195 p.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia. John Benjamins.

## **Британская литература рубежа XX-XXI вв. в русских переводах: переводимость и проблемы «Третьей литературы»**

**А.С. Дубовик**

*Красноярский государственный педагогический  
университет им. В.П. Астафьева  
Россия, 660049, Красноярск, ул. Ады Лебедевой, 89*

---

*Одним из важнейших показателей открытости национальной литературной системы является степень ее участия в мировом переводном процессе. Поэтому среди многих функций перевода как коммуникативной универсалии важное место занимает и его роль диалога между литературами и культурами разных народов. Перевод как диалог литератур возможен только при взаимодействии этих литератур. В связи с этим вполне правомерно встает вопрос о роли и месте переводной литературы в контексте национальных литератур. Поскольку переводная литература фактически не относится ни к одной из национальных литератур, то важной задачей филологической науки является, с одной стороны, определение ее онтологического статуса, с другой – выяснение роли произведений так называемой принимающей литературы и переводных произведений в создании новых переводов с языков исходных литератур на язык целевой литературы. Эти вопросы рассматриваются в статье как в теоретическом аспекте, так и на примере отдельно взятых популярных произведений британских авторов и их переводов на русский язык.*

*Ключевые слова:* художественный перевод, британская литература, оригинальный текст, принимающая литература, третья литература.

*Научная специальность:* 10.00.00 – филологические науки, переводоведение.

---