

# Translation as a Cross-cultural Phenomenon—"The Country of Miracles" in Translation

Milena Yablonsky

Pedagogical University of Cracow, Cracow, Poland

The article constitutes an attempt to depict the complexity of translation as a cross-cultural phenomenon. It discusses the author's own translation of "Kraj cudów"—one of Jerzy Pilch's feature articles from the collection *Pociąg do życia wiecznego* (*The Train to Eternal Life*) and aims at answering the following question: which translation procedures that deal with culturemes are the most frequently applied and prevalent in the presented sample of the translation? In the contrastive analysis Peter Newmark's translation procedures have been used. Moreover, the aim of the article is to describe translation as a cross-cultural phenomenon and discuss a person of a translator as an intercultural link.

**Keywords:** cultural turn, translation of culture, translation procedure, Newmark, Jerzy Pilch, culturemes

## Introduction

Since the time the first translation of the Bible into Latin was created, it is commonly known that some of the most problematic and challenging aspects of text rendition are cultural contexts, which are encountered in texts belonging to different cultures. Hence, the translator has to have a perfect command of the foreign language in which a particular text is written but most importantly s/he should be familiar with its cultural colouring. Translation, entailing the transposition of thoughts expressed in one language by a particular social group into another language, is inextricably linked with the process of cultural de-coding, re-coding and en-coding.

## The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies

The Cultural Turn (or "turn to culture") was a massive intellectual movement that was commenced in the 1990s among scholars in the social sciences who focused their attention on culture. In most humanities and social disciplines "culture" has become intellectually fashionable as a starting point for interpretation and analysis. George Steinmetz (1999, p. 1) described it as "a wide array of new theoretical impulses coming from fields formerly peripheral to the social sciences" that encompasses a more general allegation of the constitutive role of culture, and the former fields encompassing "post-structuralism, narrative theory and other forms of textual analysis" (Steinmetz, p. 1). Moreover, he claims that it is accurate "to describe the cultural turn as more or less synonymous with cultural studies within the field of the social sciences" (Steinmetz, 1999, p. 3).

Across the humanities, the questions on culture were gaining importance and were assuming prominent positions. In the field of linguistics, the growth of interest in discourse analysis and corpus linguistics was

observed. In literary studies, formalist approaches were superseded by textual study and numerous, novel approaches to literature that manifested a cultural dimension emerged, for example: gender criticism, deconstruction, post-colonialism, feminism. Similarly, history underwent a cultural turn, with more emphasis put on social and cultural history, as well as those areas that were once marginalized, for instance, the history of medicine, family and science (Bassnett, 2007, p. 15).

The cultural turn in Translation Studies is regarded as a part of a cultural turn that took place in the humanities and has shaped the image of many traditional subjects. Susan Bassnett along with André Lefevere in the introduction to the volume *Translation, History and Culture*, which consists of papers presented at a conference held in Warwick in 1988, called for a move from the dominant linguistic discourse in Translation Studies to a more cultural movement. They describe the cultural turn as “the abandoning of the ‘scientific’ linguistic approach as based on the *tertium comparationis* or ‘equivalence’ and moving from ‘text’ to ‘culture’ saying that they have moved from word to text as a unit, but not beyond” (1990, pp. 3-4). It was exactly the formulation and acknowledgment of this Cultural Turn in Translation Studies that served to broaden and revive the discipline and to release it from the rather mechanical tools of analysis existing in Linguistics. However, the idea that translation occurs between cultures, not solely languages was not entirely novel. In 1954 Casagrande claimed that “one does not translate languages, one translates cultures” (Branchadell, 2005, p. 6).

Munday (2001, pp. 126-127) admits that Bassnett and Levefere go beyond language and focus their attention on the relationship between translation and culture, on the ways in which culture exerts influence on translation as well as restrains it. In the same collection *Translation, History and Culture*, Mary Snell-Hornby (1990, pp. 78-86) in her essay “Linguistic transcoding or cultural transfer? A critique of translation theory in Germany” asks scholars to reject their “scientific” approach, get beyond the sentence and text level as units for analysis, and move on to “culture”. Moreover, she terms this shift from translation as text to translation as culture “the Cultural Turn” and this notion is taken up by Bassnett and Levefere as a metaphor for this cultural move, and is used to unite the variety of case studies delineated in their collection:

The “Cultural Turn” also explains why this volume, as opposed to so many others in the field, displays a remarkable unity of purpose. All contributions deal with the “Cultural Turn” in one way or another, there are so many case studies illustrating the central concept of the collection (Bassnett & Levefere, 1990, p. 4).

The move to broaden the subject of investigation beyond the frame of the text had started even long before Bassnett and Levefere’s manifesto. It can be said that the first notion in cultural translation was a cultural turn as presaged by the work of the Polysystems Group inspired by Itamar Even-Zohar, Gideon Toury and James Holmes. Polysystems theory has paved the way for a cultural turn since, irrespective of its formalists background, the issues that were raised were linked with literary history and the position of translated texts in the receiving culture. Moreover, another example of the Cultural Turn in TS was the growth of interest in the research of norms governing translation strategies and procedures. In particular, Gideon Toury, Andrew Chesterman and Theo Hermans set their sights on exploring translational norms, but not only in terms of textual conventions but basically in terms of cultural expectations (Bassnett, 2007, pp. 14-18).

Translation Studies has shifted its focus from the incessant discussions on “equivalence” to debates on the factors influencing text production other than linguistic aspects. The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies reflects the Cultural Turn in other disciplines, which is an unavoidable effect of the necessity for greater intercultural awareness and the fact that translation takes place between cultures and not solely between languages.

### Cultural Translation

The term “cultural translation” is used in many different contexts and senses. The most comprehensive and influential formulation of the concept of cultural translation occurs in the work of postcolonial-postmodernist theorist, Homi Bhabha, in the last chapter of his book *The Location of Culture* (1994), titled “How newness enters the world: Postmodern space, postcolonial times and the trials of cultural translation”. In some contexts, the term “cultural translation” serves as a metaphor that fundamentally challenges the traditional dimensions of translation, while a narrower application of this term relates to such practices of literary translation that attempt at conveying wide-ranging cultural background and manifest another culture in translation. In this meaning, “cultural translation” is juxtaposed to “linguistic translation”, and it touches upon elaborate issues such as: a rendition of dialect and heteroglossia, allusions, intertextuality, culture-bound items. The notion of “cultural translation” has been used in a more intricate manner in the discipline of cultural anthropology which deals with questions of translation on a variety of levels (Sturge, 2009, pp. 67-70).

Lieven D’hulst calls “cultural translation” a problematic concept. He claims that cross-cultural translation is frequently analyzed in a great number of disciplines that contend with the translation process, for example postcolonial Translation Studies, cultural studies, cultural anthropology or sociology. It exerts a special emphasis on a variety of verbal and non-verbal facets of communication between cultures. Translating as an activity and a translation as a product are inseparable from the notion of culture. The translational capacity of culture is a vital principle of culture’s specificity. Culture expands through translational activity as the new texts are included in culture, and it might be observed that the borderline between culture studies and Translation Studies has become less clear-cut after the growth of the paradigm of postcolonial and gender studies into translation (D’hulst, 2008, pp. 220-228).

### Translator as a Cultural Mediator

In contemporary Translation Studies, translators are often referred to as “cultural mediators” or professionals in intercultural communication. Translators are frequently portrayed as cultural mediators who exhibit a great deal of cultural competence as well as appropriate expertise and other non-linguistic skills. A translator is a part of culture and as its member, s/he acts as an interpreter of signs, symbols and cultural codes.

The term cultural mediator was for the first time introduced by Stephen Bochner (1981) in the book *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures*, while R. Taft defines the task of the mediator as follows:

A cultural mediator is a person who facilitates communication, understanding, and action between persons or groups who differ with respect to language and culture. The role of mediator is performed by interpreting the expressions, intentions, perceptions, and expectations of each cultural group to the other, that is by establishing and balancing the communication between them. In order to serve as a link in this sense, the mediator must be able to participate to some extent in both cultures. Thus a mediator must be to a certain extent bicultural. (Taft in: Katan, 1999, p. 12)

Cultural mediators should be aware of their own cultural identity, as their own culture exerts influence on their perception. Translators are faced with an alien culture that requires that its message be conveyed in such a way that it is understandable for the recipients. Culture expresses its idiosyncrasies in a way that is “culture-bound”: cultural words, proverbs and idiomatic expressions are intrinsically and uniquely bound to the culture concerned. Hence, a success of cross-cultural translation depends on the translator’s understanding of culture features of the text they are working with and on cultural transposition, not merely on language transfer. Thus, translators should be both bilingual and bicultural. The more a translator is aware of intricacies and

differences between cultures, the better s/he will be.

### **Culture-Bound Elements**

“Culture-bound element” is a wide-ranging term encompassing a variety of linguistic expressions which are intrinsically and uniquely bound to the culture concerned, and which have cultural specificity, i.e. they are characteristic for a particular culture and they are frequently the source of translation problems. They include items such as proper names, names and phrases related to the organizational aspects of life in the source language country (e.g. political system, education system, health service, law, etc.), elements connected with the source language habits, traditions and holidays, all kinds of intertextual elements: quotations from and allusions to the source language literature, proverbs, songs, history, music, film, etc. (Hejwowski, 2004, pp. 128-142).

### **Culturemes**

Cultural or culture-bound words are bestowed with different terminological names, but all of them relate to the same phenomenon. One of the terms is a “cultureme”. In this paper the concept of cultureme as defined by Nord will be adopted. She defines cultureme as “a cultural phenomenon that is present in culture X but not present (in the same way) in culture Y” (Nord, 1997, p. 34). Culturemes are present in a particular form or function in a given culture and encompass a wide range of fields from geography and traditions to institutions and technologies. For the same notion Newmark introduces the term “a cultural word”, while Baker uses the term “culture-specific items” and concedes that the source language words may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. She points out that the concept in question may be “abstract or concrete, it may relate to a religious belief, a social custom, or even a type of food” (Baker, 1992, p. 21). Another scholar, Gambier proposes yet another term for the same notion. He refers to such concepts as “culture-specific references” and asserts that they connote different aspects of life:

Culture-specific references connoting different aspects of everyday life such as education, politics, history, art, institutions, legal systems, units of measurement, place names, foods and drinks, sports and national pastimes, as experienced in different countries and nations. (Gambier, 2007, p. 154)

Newmark admits that most cultural words are easily noticeable since they are associated with a certain culture and cannot be literally rendered, as it would distort the meaning. Moreover, Górski (2006, p. 419) claims that culturemes also exhibit social, ideological, or even geographical embedding, and that frequently a cultureme is known in its culture only for a short period of time in a particular context as later it may turn into a vague term, the significance of which is known only to specialists. In the article, all the terms presented above are used as synonyms.

### **Newmarks’ Procedures Applied to the Rendition of Culture-Bound Elements**

In contemporary Translation Studies, a great variety of classifications of translation strategies have evolved. In this article, special attention is given to classifications that have emerged particularly for culture-specific items. There are several independent systems of translation procedures’ classification. For the analysis of the translation of feature article in terms of culture specific elements, Newmark’s translation procedures have been chosen. In his book *A Textbook of Translation* he describes a much extended taxonomy of translation procedures.

*Literal translation* is defined as the chief procedure as it can be applied to single words and whole sentences. *Transference* (loan word, transcription) “the process of transferring a SL word to a TL text as a translation procedure”, corresponds to Vinay and Darbelnet’s borrowing. This procedure is applicable in rendition of a wide range of terms and names, e.g. geographical and topographical names, names of periodicals and newspapers; titles of yet not translated literary works, plays, films, names of companies and institutions; names of public or nationalized institutions, unless they have recognized translations, street names, addresses, etc. (Newmark, 1988, pp. 81-82). Newmark claims that cultural words are frequently transferred to add local colour to the translated text and “it shows respect for the SL country’s culture” (Newmark, 1988, p. 82). Transference includes also transliteration, i.e. conversion between alphabets.

The next procedure, *naturalisation* is related to transference, however a given word is not only borrowed, but also adapted (in terms of pronunciation and morphology) into the TL. The use of *cultural equivalent* encompasses translating a given culture-specific word by its TL cultural counterpart. Though such equivalents are frequently not accurate, they are nonetheless used in general texts, publicity and propaganda as means of disambiguation when the recipients are not familiar with the source culture items. *Functional equivalent* is deemed a common procedure applied chiefly to cultural words what involves the use of TL lexemes free of cultural bias. Consequently, the SL word becomes neutralized or generalized (e.g. Sejm—Polish parliament). Newmark (1988, p. 83) has noted that this procedure occupies the area between the SL language or culture and the TL language or culture (Newmark, 1988, p. 83).

Another procedure delineated by the scholar is *descriptive equivalent*. This procedure focuses on the function of the SL item, and hence it is rendered through the description of its function. Newmark (1988, p. 84) uses synonymy in the sense of a near TL equivalent to an SL word in a context, where a precise equivalent may or may not exist. The application of synonymy is sanctioned in cases where literal translation is unfeasible and the word in question is not significant enough to be subjected to other procedures. The next procedure, i.e., through-translation refers closely to Vinay and Darbelnet’s calque. It mostly pertains to the literal translation of common collocations, names of organizations and some popular phrases. Ideally, *through-translation* should not be initiated by the translator and should be used only if there already exist recognized terms.

Other procedures are *shifts* or *transpositions* involve a change in the grammar from the SL to the TL. This shift may concern the grammatical number of a given lexeme (the change from singular to plural), the grammatical structure (when the SL structure does not exist in the TL) or the “natural usage” of a certain lexical item within the TL (when literal translation produces an “unnatural” passage). Under the concept of *modulation* he puts forward a categorization of sub-procedures as presented by Vinay and Darbelnet. *Recognised translation* constitutes a procedure by means of which mostly the SL institutional terminology is translated by its widely accepted and official TL equivalents, sometimes along with an explanatory gloss (Newmark, 1988, pp. 84-89).

The procedure of *translation label* is mainly applied to rendition of new institutional terms and allows for an introduction of provisional translation placed in inverted commas. By means of *compensation*, the loss of meaning, metaphor, or pragmatic effect that occurred during the translation process is compensated in the same sentence or contiguous sentence. Under the term *componential analysis* Newmark (1988, p. 90) presents “the splitting up of a lexical unit into its sense components, often one-to-two, -three or -four translations”. It is rather a time-consuming procedure reserved for lexemes that do not have apparent one-to-one counterpart in the TL. This technique entails the study of a lexical item by breaking it down to its sense components, thus making the

production of a valid counterpart feasible. *Reduction* and *expansion* are largely intuitive procedures providing means for rendering an SL term by condensing a semantic content into a shorter syntactic structure or making some implicit features of the SL item explicit (Newmark, 1988, p. 90).

Finally, the use of *paraphrase* involves amplification or explanation of an SL passage, and “the minimal recasting of an ambiguous or obscure sentence, in order to clarify it” (Newmark, 1998, p. 91). Additionally, Newmark recognizes that grouping of the procedures mentioned above, for instance, “couplets”, “triplets” and “quadruplets” (entailing two, three and four procedures, respectively), may be applied to contend with a single problem, frequently with cultural words. Finally, *notes*, *additions* and *glosses* are mentioned briefly and distinguished as methods used for disambiguation and clarification that accompany other procedures (Newmark, 1988, pp. 90-93).

### Methodology Applied in the Research

The model adopted in the research is based on *The Map. A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies* by Williams and Chesterman. From the presented theoretical models of translation that Translation Studies has traditionally used (process, comparative, casual models), the comparative model is used as the most suitable methodological tool for the subject matter of this article. Williams and Chesterman (2002, p. 48) claim that all kinds of research use a theoretical model of the object of the study which serves as a preliminary framework to orient the research. The scholars define a model as “a construction that represents some aspect of reality” while theoretical models represent their objects in an abstract way, and they are frequently grounded on suppositions about how something is built or in what manner it might be related to other phenomena. These models aim at constructing the subject of the study in order to facilitate the process of research, making it more comprehensible. A theoretical model is like “a map showing what are thought to be the most important features of the object” (Williams & Chesterman, 2002, p. 46).

A comparative model is the earliest model of translation, which is static, product-oriented and focused on some relation of equivalence. In its basic version, it has the following form:

Source text = Target text

The sign “=” is thought to stand for “is equivalent to”, which might be, to some extent, confusing as in the translation process, it is unfeasible to talk about perfect equivalency, hence the equals sign may be interpreted in terms of some kind of similarity. In this sense the sign “approximately equal” is more appropriate.

Source text  $\approx$  Target text

This model emphasizes the contrastive approaches manifested by scholars such as Catford, or Vinay and Darbelnet, and is closely connected with contrastive linguistics, however instead of the texts, it compares language systems:

Language A (source language)  $\approx$  Language B (target language)

It treats translation as “an alignment problem” and its task is to select the elements of the target language which will align most closely (under contextual constraints) with a given element of the source text (Williams & Chesterman, 2002, pp. 49-50).

The comparative model is functional when it comes to study shifting, i.e. differences ensuing from translation strategies, or systemic differences which exist between source and target languages and cultures. Hence, in this kind of research, the source text and the target text are analyzed in terms of differences existing between them. The certain linguistic items, or particular portions of the original text are compared with their

counterparts in the target text, and labeled either similar or divergent.

The comparative model of research as applied in terms of culturemes rendition, takes the following form:

CULTUREME 1 (C1):

CULTUREME 2 (C2):

CONTEXT (ST):

TRANSLATION CHOICE (TT):

TRANSLATION PROCEDURES:

JUSTIFICATION:

### **Contrastive Analysis of the Feature “Country of Miracles” in Terms of Culturemes Rendition**

This part of the article is devoted to the presentation of the contrastive analysis of the culture-specific items encountered in the translation of *Kraj cudów* (*Country of Miracles*) into English. For the sake of clarity, all culture specific items have been discussed individually and presented in the charts. The fragments of the texts in which culture-bound elements appear have been localized and subjected to contrastive analysis with their counterparts appearing in the source text. The various culture-specific items encountered in a given feature article have been listed chronologically according to the place of their appearance, and they have been indicated in bold writing. Sometimes a section under analysis includes more than one culture-related element and in order to mark them, the numbers (1), (2), (3), etc., have been inserted in front of the source text elements. Each presented translation has been accompanied by an identification of the employed translation procedure basing on Newmark's taxonomy and its justification:

- CULTUREME 1 (C1): *Gazeta Wyborcza*

Table 1

#### *The Analysis of the Translation of Cultureme 1*

W “Gazecie Wyborczej” (nr 97/2004) interesująca rozmowa o populizmie z profesorem Jerzym Szackim.	CONTEXT (ST):
In the daily newspaper <i>Gazeta Wyborcza</i> (no. 97/2004) there is an interesting discussion on populism with professor Jerzy Szacki.	TRANSLATION CHOICE (TT):
C1: translation couplet: expansion + transference	TRANSLATION PROCEDURE(S):
This translation provides the reader with the best understanding of what “Gazeta Wyborcza” is thanks to the expansion procedure (the insertion within the body of the text of “the daily newspaper”). The literal translation of the name of the newspaper (e.g. “Electoral Gazette”) was not given as it would render this sentence too long and an English equivalent is not indispensable in this case for the general understanding of the text. Hence, the procedure of through-translation was not applied, as titles of magazines or newspapers are rarely translated.	JUSTIFICATION:

- CULTUREME 2 (C2): Stefan Kisielewski
- CULTUREME 3 (C3): (za Peerelu)
- CULTUREME 4 (C4): prymasowi Wyszyńskiemu

Table 2

#### *The Analysis of the Translation of Culturemes 2-4*

Stefan Kisielewski miał swego czasu (za Peerelu) prymasowi Wyszyńskiemu—na jego tezę, iż Polska jest pod specjalną opieką Matki Boskiej—odpowiedzieć, iż kraj nasz nie najlepiej na tej opiece wychodzi. Ale Peerel upadł i bieg najnowszych dziejów jął bezwyjątkowo wskazywać, że	CONTEXT (ST):
---	---------------

nie Kisiel, a Wyszyński miał rację.	
Stefan Kisielewski, nicknamed “Kisiel”, was to once (under Communism in Poland) tell the Primate of Poland, Stefan Wyszyński in a response to his thesis of Poland being under the special care of the Mother of God that this care hasn’t done our country much good. Communism, however, has collapsed and the course of the current history has begun to absolutely indicate that not Kisiel, but Wyszyński was right.	TRANSLATION CHOICE (TT):
C2: expansion; C3: recognized translation; C4: expansion	TRANSLATION PROCEDURE(S):
The addition of “nicknamed Kisiel” gives a clearer understanding of the text in which the word “Kisiel” appears in the second sentence. The procedure of recognized translation in case of C3, provides the readers with the best understanding of what associations were meant to be evoked in the ST recipients. In C4, the insertion of additional elements makes this cultureme more lucid and may serve as a reference point for further reading on the topic.	JUSTIFICATION:

- CULTUREME 5 (C5): Solidarności
- CULTUREME 6 (C6): stanie wojennym
- CULTUREME 7 (C7): Okrągły Stół
- CULTUREME 8 (C8): prosty elektryk
- CULTUREME 9 (C9): Nobla

Table 3

*The Analysis of the Translation of Culturemes 5-9*

Cudem były narodziny Solidarności, cudem jej wskrzeszanie po stanie wojennym, cudem był Okrągły Stół i cudem było, że prosty elektryk został prezydentem, cudem było, że dostał Nobla (...).	CONTEXT (ST):
The miracle was the birth of Independent Self-governing Trade Union Solidarność, and its resurrection after the martial law, the miracles were the Polish Round Table Talks and the miracle was that the simple electrician Lech Wałęsa became president and received the Nobel Prize.	TRANSLATION CHOICE (TT):
C5: recognized translation; C6: recognized translation; C7: paraphrase; C8: expansion; C9: recognized translation	TRANSLATION PROCEDURE(S):
The application of recognized translation for C5, C6, and C9 helps to evade ambiguities making the rendition comprehensible. Paraphrase is indispensable in C7 because it clarifies the cultureme used in ST as the literal rendition of “Okrągły Stół” into “Round Table” would not convey the exact significance of this notion, while the addition of the name and surname of the electrician brings to mind the person who is well-known; otherwise C8 might cause some misunderstanding. Moreover, all these culturemes have a connotative meaning, which unfortunately, cannot be conveyed to TL recipients, and which may be experienced only by the Polish readers who were living at the times of the depicted events, or those who are familiar with the Polish history.	JUSTIFICATION:

- CULTUREME 10 (C10): kwota 20gr

Table 4

*The Analysis of the Translation of Cultureme 10*

Rzeczywistość polskiej prowincji, małych miasteczek, dalekich wiosek, biednych domów, biednych ludzi, wszystkich tych, dla których kwota 20 gr to jest kwota warta zastanowienia.	CONTEXT (ST):
The reality of the Polish provinces, small towns, distant villages, poor houses, poor people, of all those people who would love to have a dime to spend.	TRANSLATION CHOICE (TT):
C10: cultural equivalent	TRANSLATION PROCEDURE(S):
This adaptation provides recipients with an expression culturally and linguistically acceptable and creates a similar effect on the target audience as the ST would have on the readers of the original. Furthermore, it evokes the same connotative meanings (e.g. poverty).	JUSTIFICATION:

- CULTUREME 12 (C11): gierkowskich
- CULTUREME 13 (C12): zrzutowych ciuchach



Table 5

*The Analysis of the Translation of Culturemes 11-12*

Imię ich jest legion, oni nie kupują gazet ani książek, oni poza tym co najtańsze do jedzenia niczego nie kupują, oni chodzą w gierkowskich albo zrzutowych ciuchach i jedyny kontakt ze światem kultury, a przede wszystkim polityki, utrzymują za pośrednictwem też wiekowego telewizora.	CONTEXT (ST):
They wear rags-out from the Gierek era or from second-hand shops and the only contact with the world of culture and mainly with the world of politics they maintain, is through an age-old television set.	TRANSLATION CHOICE (TT):
C11: modulation; C12: cultural equivalent	TRANSLATION PROCEDURE(S):
An alternation in grammatical structure is unavoidable in translation of C11 in order to convey its meaning. However, this target language expression does not bring to SL recipients' mind the same picture that is evoked in SL readers. In case of C12, application of cultural equivalent formulates an expression that evokes the same connotations as the SL item and is culturally understandable in the TL.	JUSTIFICATION:

- CULTUREME 13 (C13): UOP
- CULTUREME 14 (C14): marszałkiem Sejmu

Table 6

*The Analysis of the Translation of Culturemes 13-14*

I słuchają telewizyjnych nowin jak tureckiego kazania: Jakaś komisja się zbiera, miesiącami radzi, niczego nie uradza, ministrowie idą do więzień, gangsterzy z nich wychodzą, UOP kogoś zamyka, (...) jeden gość w ciągu tygodnia jest kolejno szefem partii, wicepremierem, kluczowym ministrem, marszałkiem Sejmu, kandydatem na premiera i na prezydenta, ten, co ujawnił aferę, jest głównym winowajcą (...).	CONTEXT (ST):
They listen to television news not being able to make heads of things: some committee gathers, debates for months, and it ends with nothing. Ministers go to prisons, criminals are released from them, Office for State Protection (UOP) locks up somebody (...), within a week one guy is in turn: a leader of a political party, a vice prime minister, a key minister, the Speaker of the Polish Parliament, a candidate for a prime minister and a president, the one who reveals a scandal is the main guilty party (...).	TRANSLATION CHOICE (TT):
C13: recognized translation; C14: functional equivalent	TRANSLATION PROCEDURE(S):
In case of C13, the abbreviation was left in the brackets, as later in the feature article Office for State Protection is simply referred to as UOP. Functional equivalent makes the cultureme more comprehensible as in the SL culture there exists a different political system, and the notion of "Sejm" is exotic.	JUSTIFICATION:

## Conclusions

The presented results of the conducted research on rendition of culture-bound elements bring answers to the question asked at the beginning of this article. On the basis of the analyzed data material it has turned out that the most prevalent procedure in culturemes rendition in case of English translation of "*Kraj cudów*" is the procedure of recognized translation. It may not be very surprising as the common practice is to reach for existing, officially accepted equivalents instead of creating new ones. Expansion is also a very frequently applied technique, as the majority of the analyzed culturemes have to be accompanied by some complementary information in order to be comprehensible for the readership, and to clarify the content of a particular feature article. Translation couplets were also common as sometimes for the sake of better understanding of a given culture-specific item it is essential to apply two procedures simultaneously. However, it has to be noted that frequently it is unfeasible to convey connotative meanings or implicatures that source language elements have

due to the fact the source text is so strongly embedded in the Polish history, culture. Hence, it often happens that social, literal, cultural allusions are only partially translatable. Indisputably, the presented results of the conducted research prove that, sometimes, rendering culture constitutes an insurmountable challenge for the translator, especially when the source text is deeply embedded in culture and is brimful with references and allusions to literal, social or historical spheres of the culture concerned. Thus, frequently such texts are only partially translatable as it is extremely difficult to compose a target text that would have an analogous effect on its recipients as the original text has on its readership. Undoubtedly, the translation loss occurs as it is sometimes unattainable to convey cultural connotations that are deciphered by the readers of the source text while for the recipients of the translation they might be completely unknown as they belong to different culture. Hence, only partial cultural equivalency might be attained, and in this case, the translator is forced to resort to explaining a given cultureme or providing supplementary information that will clarify some culture-bound expressions.

### References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words. A coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Routledge encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 283-286). London: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (2007). Culture and translation. In P. Kuhiwczak (Ed.), *A companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 13-23). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Bassnett, S., & Levefere, A. (1990). *Translation, history and culture*. London: Printer Publishers.
- Bochner, S. (Ed.). (1981). *The mediating person: Bridges between cultures*. Boston: G. K. Hall.
- Branchadell, A. (Ed.). (2005). *Less translated languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- D'hulst, L. (2008). Cultural translation. In A. Pym (Ed.), *Beyond descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury* (pp. 220-232). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gambier, Y. (Ed.). (2007). *Doubts and directions in Translation Studies: Selected contributions from the EST congress, Lisbon 2004*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Górski, T. (2006). On translating culture: Between domestication and foreignization. In P. Chruszczewski (Ed.), *At the crossroads of linguistic sciences* (Język a komunikacja, Vol. 10, pp. 419-426). Kraków: wyd. Tertium.
- Hejwowski, K. (2004). *Translation: A cognitive-communicative approach*. Olecko: Wydawnictwo Wszechnicy Mazurskiej Acta Universitatis Masuriensis.
- Katan, D. (1999). *Translating cultures. An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators*. London: St Jerome Publishing.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, history and culture: A sourcebook*. London: Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies—Theories and applications*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice-Hall International.
- Nord, Ch. (1997). *Translation as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1990). Linguistic transcoding or cultural transfer? A critique of translation theory in Germany. In S. Bassnett and A. Levefere (Eds.), *Translation, history and culture* (pp. 78-86). London: Printer Publishers.
- Steinmetz, G. (Ed.). (1999). *State/culture: State-formation after the cultural turn*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Sturge, K. (2009). Cultural translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia* (pp. 67-70). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vinay, J., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Williams, J., & Chesterman, A. (2002). *The Map. A Beginner's guide to doing research in Translation Studies*. London: St Jerome Publishing.