

UDC 81'25:81'255.4

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2522-4077-2025-214.1-6>**REPRODUCTION OF CULTURALLY MARKED UNITS
IN ENGLISH TRANSLATION****ВІДТВОРЕННЯ КУЛЬТУРНО МАРКОВАНИХ ОДИНИЦЬ
В АНГЛІЙСЬКОМУ ПЕРЕКЛАДІ****Kylyvnyk V. V.,***orcid.org/0000-0002-0770-265X**Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,**Lecturer at the Department of Germanic Philology,**Communal Higher Education Institution "Vinnytsia Humanities Pedagogical College"***Lebed Iu. B.,***orcid.org/0000-0002-8325-3462**Candidate of Philological Sciences,**Head of the Department of Foreign Literature and Fundamentals of Rhetoric,**Communal Higher Education Institution "Vinnytsia Humanities Pedagogical College"***Kushnir A. S.,***orcid.org/0000-0002-2073-5261**Ph. Doctor, Lecturer at the Department of Germanic Philology,**Communal Higher Education Institution "Vinnytsia Humanities Pedagogical College"*

As one of the main components of intercultural communication and translation studies, the article focusses on the analysis of culturally marked vocabulary. In interlingual communication, culturally determined lexical units are thought to be a way to convey national and cultural specificity. The work's relevance stems from the growing need for accurate translations of nationally specific language and the lack of research on the mechanisms underlying its transmission. The study aims to categorise culturally marked language, explain the challenges associated with translating it, and examine the primary techniques for replicating such units. The work systematises the classification of vocabulary with a cultural component, in particular allusive, background, and non-equivalent, and specifies the terms «reality», «lacuna», «ethnographism», etc. The analysis of contemporary journalistic texts from English-language sources that present Ukrainian reality regarding the conflict and national identity receives particular focus. Transcription, transliteration, tracing, descriptive, contextual, approximation, hyponymic translation, and the development of a new equivalent are the primary translation techniques taken into account. Media examples of their application on particular units are displayed. It is highlighted that the setting, genre, target audience's degree of training, and communication goal all influence the best translation technique. In order to preserve the emotional, intellectual, and semantic elements of the source text, it is concluded that the translator must be well immersed in the culture of the target language. Since the translator serves as a mediator and can modify nationally distinct components without sacrificing their meaning or cultural weight, translation is regarded as a dialogue of cultures. When translating media materials that actively depict national realities, the study highlights the significance of considering the sociocultural context. Greater accuracy and cultural suitability can be achieved through the employment of mixed translation procedures. It is demonstrated that certain contemporary terms associated with the conflict in Ukraine have already made their way into the global conversation as cultural indicators. A translator must possess both linguistic and multidisciplinary skills in order to translate cultural concepts effectively. The maintenance of the associative field of lexemes, which serves as the conduit for national memory and identity, is a significant component of the task.

Key words: culturally marked vocabulary, non-equivalent vocabulary, translation of realities, intercultural communication, translation strategies, linguocultural specificity, translation.

Статтю присвячено дослідженню культурно маркованої лексики як одного з ключових елементів між-культурної комунікації та перекладознавства. Культурно зумовлені лексичні одиниці розглянуто як засоби передачі національно-культурної специфіки у міжмовному спілкуванні. Актуальність роботи зумовлена зростаючим попитом на адекватний переклад лексики з національною специфікою та недостатнім вивченням механізмів її передачі. Метою дослідження є класифікація культурно маркованої лексики, з'ясування труднощів її перекладу та аналіз основних способів відтворення таких одиниць. У роботі систематизовано класифікації лексики з культурним компонентом, зокрема алюзивної, фонові, безеквівалентної, ономастичної, та уточнено терміни «реалія», «лакуна», «етнографізм» тощо. Особливу увагу приділено аналізу сучасних публіцистичних текстів англomовних видань, що містять українські реалії, пов'язані з війною та національною ідентичністю. Розглянуто основні перекладацькі стратегії: транскрипцію, транслітерацію, калькування, описовий, контекстуальний, наближений, гіпонімічний переклад та створення нового відповідника. Показано приклади їх реалізації на конкретних одиницях із ЗМІ. Наголошено, що правильний вибір способу перекладу залежить від контексту, жанру, рівня підготовки цільової аудиторії та мети комунікації. Зроблено висновок про необхідність глибокого культурного занурення перекладача в мову оригіналу, що забезпечує збереження емоційної, концептуальної та семантичної складової вихідного тексту. Переклад розглядається як діалог культур, у якому перекладач виступає посередником, здатним адаптувати національно специфічні одиниці без втрати їх змістового й культурного навантаження. Дослідження демонструє важливість урахування соціокультурного фону під час перекладу медійних текстів, що активно репрезентують національні реалії. Застосування комбінованих стратегій перекладу дозволяє досягти більшої точності та культурної адекватності. Показано, що низка сучасних лексем, пов'язаних із війною в Україні, вже увійшла в міжнародний дискурс як культурні маркери. Ефективна трансляція культурних концептів потребує не лише мовної, а й міждисциплінарної компетенції перекладача. Важливим аспектом у роботі визнано збереження асоціативного поля лексем, яке є носієм національної пам'яті та ідентичності.

Ключові слова: культурно маркована лексика, безеквівалентна лексика, переклад реалій, міжкультурна комунікація, перекладацькі стратегії, лінгвокультурна специфіка, переклад.

The Problem Statement. Every country has a distinct culture, and the language reflects this. There are universal human values and ideals as well as those that are specific to a culture and absent from cultures in other countries. Since translators act as mediators in the process of intercultural communication, this phenomena is very interesting from a translation standpoint. One significant area of contemporary linguistics is the investigation of the connection between language and culture. This is explained by the lack of universal theoretical research and the ever-increasing practical requirements of intensive intercultural communication. Language is the medium through which culture is transmitted. Additionally, language offers an organic link between education and culture, between the individual and society, between the individual and social consciousness, and between the individual's culture and society. Additionally, foreign languages are a powerful tool for regulating an individual's social development. Their study should help speakers of the languages being studied develop their social ethics, communication culture, and humanitarian thinking [1, p. 20].

In the present world, one of the primary ways to implement intercultural communication is through translation activities. In order to better understand how culture is transmitted through the vocabulary of the language being studied, intercultural communication examines how cultural factors impact translation, the relationship between language and culture, and the particular difficulties of translating terms with cultural connotations. The key to success of personal and professional development of future professionals is not only high professional competence, but also a responsible attitude to their professional duties, personal and social maturity [2, p. 293].

The necessity to increase background knowledge about how to effectively express national words in the original language and the lack of research on the issue of translating culturally marked vocabulary make this topic relevant.

Review of Recent Researches. The issues of culturally marked lexical units and the characteristics of their classification, operation, and translation are the focus of the writings of linguists I. Holubovska, R. Zorivchak, M. Kocherhan, O. Snytko, O. Tupytsia, N. Khil, and others. A. Hryshchenko and V. Rusanivskyi's work focusses on identifying the characteristics of the reflection of cultural phenomena in language; M. M. Pylynskyi's work focusses on determining the aesthetic function of

the national-cultural component of the word's semantics; and R. Kis's work focusses on determining the relationship between language and mentality and language and culture, based on linguistic facts of the regularities of linguistic behaviour of various ethnic groups. The studies of T. Anokhina, O. Boka, A. Korol, M. Kotelenets, O. Lototska, K. Nevinna, and others examined the reproduction of culturally marked lexicon during translation.

It is worth noting that not only domestic but also foreign scientists J. Lyon, P. Newmark have considered and continue to consider the problem of culturally marked units and methods of their translation.

The goal. The main goal of this work is to determine the classification of culturally marked vocabulary and the specifics of translating culturally marked units and to identify the most common difficulties when translating culturally marked vocabulary, as well as the main methods of translating it.

The objectives. The object of research is culturally marked vocabulary and methods of transmitting culturally marked vocabulary.

The material for the study was electronic texts from the most authoritative English-language publications – The Guardian, The Washington Post, The Times, and The Economist – and news agencies like the Associated Press, BBC News, etc.

The Research Results. Since language is what maintains the collective experience in linguistic units – words, phraseological units, and aphorisms – it reflects aspects of the people's culture. Culturally marked vocabulary is a crucial cognitive component of intercultural communication, since it constitutes a substantial portion of the lexical and phraseological levels of the language (especially English), without which communication is frequently difficult. Thus, contemporary linguistic research emphasises that «the effectiveness of linguistic communication largely depends on cultural factors that significantly affect not only the elements of the language code (for example, the semantics of individual words or phrases), but also the communication process itself, its components, principles and rules of communication, communicative strategies and tactics» [3, p. 16]. The distinctive characteristics of a certain language and cultural community are most obviously displayed throughout the intercultural communication process. Therefore, the translator needs to be adequately knowledgeable with the quirks of the culture of the country – the native speaker of the language of translation – in addition to having a thorough understanding of his own culture. Translation, then, is a form of intercultural communication.

The term «culturally marked vocabulary» falls within the category of non-equivalent vocabulary. Concepts like «background vocabulary», «lacuna», «reality», «exoticism», «ethnographism», «barbarism», and others are also found in linguistics. The lack of agreement among linguists on how to categorise culturally marked vocabulary is the reason why there are so many terminology in semantics for identifying lexical units with a cultural component.

Therefore, the idea of "language realities" in conventional linguistics is similar to culturally marked vocabulary that is bound to particular aspects of culture. The distinction between phraseological realities, polysyllabic realities (which are nominative in nature), and monosyllabic realities is proposed by R. P. Zorivchak [4, p. 78].

Geographical realities, ethnographic realities, and local characteristics, such as folk life, food, clothes, transportation, employment, art, and culture, as well as ethnic items (such as names of people by place of residence, hilarious or insulting nicknames), measures, and money, are the subjects that researchers recommend differentiating by. Military realities: ranks, weapons, soldiers, and commanders; socio-political realities: state structure, activities, and figures (administrative and territorial entities, settlements); and national and public parties (government organisations and holders of power) [5, p. 54].

The following classification of culturally marked vocabulary is distinguished:

1. Allusive vocabulary – culturally specific realities of everyday life that have no correspondences at the level of concepts and lexical correspondences in other languages, for example: *Diia*: *Ukraine's Digital Revolution in Governance* (The Economist); *Bayraktar*: *The Drone That Became a Sym-*

bol of Ukrainian Resistance (BBC News); *Stefania Kalush Orchestra Wins Eurovision 2022* (The Guardian); *ZSU: The Backbone of Ukraine's Defense Against Aggression* (CNN); *Palyanytsia: The Ukrainian Word That Became a Wartime Shibboleth* (The New York Times).

2. Background vocabulary – words that coincide in objective meaning in several languages but differ in emotional and aesthetic associations [6, p. 126]. The following can be attributed to background vocabulary: toponyms (place names), anthroponyms (proper names), symbol words (artistic images), and words that have national associations: *Chornobyl Liquidators: Honoring the Heroes through Augmented Reality* (The New York Times); *Reviving the 'Vinok': Gaptuvalnya's Bridal Collection Shines* (Harper's Bazaar); *Gunia Project 'Vil'tsya' Collection: A Theatrical Homage to Ukrainian Wedding Traditions* (Elle); *Petrykivka Art: The UNESCO-Recognized Folk Painting of Ukraine* (BBC Culture).

The following category of vocabulary with potential for regional studies is suggested by linguists: 1) vocabulary that is not equivalent; 2) vocabulary that is connotative; 3) vocabulary that is background; and 4) vocabulary that is onomastic [7, p. 65]. Words that indicate particular cultural phenomena and aspects of a particular people's daily lives and that lack a single translation in another language are included in non-equivalent vocabulary. One characteristic of non-equivalent words is their untranslatable nature, or their incompatibility with terms from other languages. They are either borrowed or replicated descriptively during translation. Because humans have broad thought patterns that enable us to appropriately name objects, this lexical zone is the widest [3, p. 105]. According to Bulgarian scholars S. Florin and S. Vlahov, these are lexical units that lack local language translation counterparts. Additionally, they make a clear distinction between non-equivalent terminology and realities. The substance of non-equivalent vocabulary is more expansive and encompasses realia as well. These experts believe that proper names are close to realia, although they have several doubts [3, p. 105–106]. Lexical-subject non-equivalence includes realia [4, p. 49].

The problem of realities is the overarching issue with the national cultural character of language in translation studies. They have a close relationship with the national form's expression in translation. The first issue with translating realities is that there is no whole or partial equivalent in the language into which they are translated because native speakers of that language do not have such a reality. Second, the translator must express the meaning and colour of the reality's historical and national colouring while also taking into consideration its denotative meaning. The issue is further complicated by the necessity of considering several factors that give distinct verbal reflections to particular living experiences.

In modern translation theory and practice, the following methods of translating culturally marked vocabulary are distinguished: transcription and transliteration, tracing, descriptive, approximate, hyponymic, contextual translation, and creation of a new equivalent.

Transliteration is the borrowing of a foreign word, which is then transmitted in the letters of the target language and, in oral speech, is pronounced according to the pronunciation norms of the target language: *Ukrainian Film '20 Days in Mariupol' Wins First Oscar for the Country* (Espresso.tv); *Ukrainian Fashion Week Spring-Summer 2025: Highlights from Iryna Danylevska, Katya Silchenko, Elvira Hasanova, Natalia Kamenska* (Elle.ua). Many words formed by this method have entered the language of translation.

Transcription is a letter-by-letter transmission of the sound of a word in a foreign language using graphic means of the target language with maximum phonetic approximation to its original form. As a rule, transliteration and transcription are used when transmitting foreign-language proper names, geographical names, and names of various companies, firms, steamships, newspapers, and magazines. For example: *Germany Recognizes Holodomor as Genocide of Ukrainian People* (BBC News Україна); *Vyshyvanka: Ukraine's national costume conquers the catwalk* (Yahoo! News).

Because of their similarities, the transcription and transliteration processes can occasionally coincide entirely or in part. The correctness and conciseness of conveying the essential realities in a different language are the benefits of these translation techniques [8, p. 66]. However, compared to earlier times, these methods are now employed far less frequently when translating literature. And for

good reason – transferring a foreign-language lexical unit's sound or letter shape does not reveal its meaning, and words like these remain unintelligible to readers who are not familiar with the source language without the proper explanations [9, p. 362].

Calcification is the translation of a lexical unit, in which its components are literally transmitted using the corresponding elements in the target language [8, p. 66]. The use of this method can maximally preserve the semantics of the original reality, but not the national flavour. Words obtained through calcification can become widespread in the language but at the same time remain foreign: *The latest attacks coincided with the 90th anniversary of **Holodomor**, also known as the Great Ukrainian Famine, a catastrophe engineered by Stalin that killed ...* (The Times); *The plan was delivered to the **Verkhovna Rada**, Ukraine's parliament, where MPs sat alongside senior military and intelligence figures, including ...* (The Times); *She was one of thousands of people who joined the **Maidan** protests of November 2013 in Kyiv* (The Times); *This **borscht** is gorgeous – and good for you* (The Washington Post). This method also has a disadvantage: it leaves some information unclear to the reader.

When a linguistic aspect cannot be conveyed because it is absent in the target language, descriptive or explanatory translation is employed. The primary benefit of this approach is that, unlike tracing or transcription, it may completely disclose the substance of the phenomenon while removing any room for the reader to have an incomplete understanding. However, there are a number of drawbacks to descriptive translation as well: It is highly verbose, and in this sense, reality is frequently translated using a comprehensive phrase or extensive explanation rather than a structurally comparable unit of another language: *To identify spies and saboteurs, Ukrainians ask strangers to pronounce «**palianytsia**», **the word for «loaf»**, which Russian-speaking Ukrainians can say but Russians can't ...* (The Times); *Kiev prepares to apply for international recognition of its bragging rights to the warming **beetroot soup*** (The Times); *Saturday President Zelensky announced the successful deployment of «a completely new class of weapon» – the **Palianytsia, a domestically produced jet-powered drone*** (The Times); *The strikes in Russia have been a morale booster for Ukrainian citizens, who have taken to **calling the billowing smoke from the mysterious explosions «bavovna», or «cotton»**.* (The Washington Post); *My death-row, apocalypse dish would be my mum's **Ukrainian dumplings** called varenyky, which are filled with her homemade cheese that we call syr* (The Guardian).

Therefore, descriptive translation can accurately express the phenomenon of a foreign culture in some challenging situations by revealing the substance of reality, which is marked for the reader by an unfamiliar lexical unit. Translators frequently use a combination of two methods: descriptive translation, which is presented in a commentary or footnote, and transcribing or tracing. This enables the exposure of this unit's semantics, which is accomplished by descriptive translation, to be combined with the economy and brevity of expression inherent in transcription: *On Thursday, Ukrainians observed an emotional **Vyshyvanka Day, the annual celebration of the country's traditional clothing**, amid the ongoing war* (The Washington Post).

Techniques for creating a new word are used when it is impractical to translate a word using the above methods, so the translator is forced to introduce an author's word to denote a term close in meaning to the original language using the means of the target language: *Isaieva describes her class as «**gentle Ukrainization**»*; *On the board were four sentences in a mix of Ukrainian and Russian for an exercise to combat students' tendency to use «**Russianisms**» when speaking Ukrainian* (The Washington Post); *Svyatoslav Palamar, deputy commander of the Azov Regiment, a nationalist group that is part of Ukraine's National Guard, said from Mariupol's Azovstal Iron and Steel Works that they are «surrounded» but «continuing to defend» themselves* (The Washington Post). At the same time, the semantic content and form of the source language lexeme, as well as national and historical originality, are preserved [10, p. 64]. Over time, many neologisms are assimilated and enrich the vocabulary of the target language.

Since Ukrainian and English have different characteristics, specifically at the morphological and syntactic levels, approximate translation – translation using an analogue – is used very infrequently

because it is very difficult to achieve adequate translation with its assistance. It involves using a lexical unit of a foreign language that only partially coincides in meaning with the words of the target language.

Hyponymic translation is the replacement of a specific concept with a generic one, that is, the transfer of nationally marked vocabulary with a linguistic unit that has a broader meaning: *A deputy commander of the last remaining Ukrainian forces [Azov] in Mariupol said Thursday that his troops are fighting on, even as Russian officials claimed victory in the strategic port city in the south; Why Ukraine's Turkish-made drone [Bayraktar] became a flash point in tensions with Russia* (The Washington Post). The described translation method allows you to abandon transcription and replace concepts, the difference between which in a certain context is insignificant.

Contextual translation is the replacement of a dictionary equivalent during translation with a word logically related to it. The main orientation of the translator is the context: *Kyiv remains a free city; Ukraine remains a sovereign state. The resilience [незламність] of the Ukrainian people has been an inspiration* (The Times); *Seeing the brothers Vitali and Wladimir Klitschko donning their Territorial Defense Forces [Територіальна оборона] uniforms and saying they too would be fighting to save their country* (The Times). The main drawback of such a translation is the complete disappearance of reality as a carrier of a certain national flavour.

Conclusions. As a result, the translation must accurately capture the original's concept, style, and beauty while also reflecting the culture and times of the original's home nation. The translator must transmit all of the author's goals in order to make a translation that is appropriate; this includes maintaining the original source's imagery, colour, and rhythm while also producing a similar ideological and emotional impact on the reader. In this situation, the translator will unavoidably need to modify the source text pragmatically while accounting for the historical, sociocultural, and psychological elements unique to the target language region, which frequently have a big impact on how the translation is viewed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Киливник В. В., Лебедь Ю. Б. Соціокультурні аспекти компетентності майбутніх учителів іноземної мови. *Молодий вчений*. 2023. №. 1.1 (113.1). С. 19–22. <https://doi.org/10.32839/2304-5809/2023-113.1-5>.
2. Mizani S. Proper Names and Translation. *Translation Journal*. July 2008. Vol.12 (3). URL : <http://translationjournal.net/journal/45proper.htm>
3. Воробйова І. Основи лінгвокраїнознавства. Київ, 2014. 272 с.
4. Зорівчак Р. П. Реалія і переклад (на матеріалі англomовних перекладів української прози). Львів : Видавництво Львівського університету, 1989. 215 с.
5. Kolomiets L., Shulga G., Lebed Iu. Formation of social responsibility of young people in the process of obtaining higher education. *Society. Integration. Education. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference*. Volume I, May 28–29, 2021, pp. 292–305.
6. Зорівчак Р. П. Реалія в художньому мовленні; перекладознавчий аспект. Іноземна філологія. Львів, 1994. 232с.
7. Мороз Т. О. Специфіка перекладу культурно маркованих одиниць. *Молодий вчений*. 2018. №. 4.4 (56.4). С. 64–68.
8. Куліш В., Гарах О. Труднощі перекладу культурно маркованої лексики. *Молодий вчений*. 2020. № 12 (88). С. 64–68. <https://doi.org/10.32839/2304-5809/2020-12-88-14/>
9. Середа Н. А. Культурно-маркована лексика в мові оригіналу й перекладу. *Актуальні питання лінгвістики, професійної лінгводидактики, психології і педагогіки вищої школи* : зб. статей IV Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. (м. Полтава, 7–8 листопада 2019 р.). Полтава : Астроя, 2019. С. 358–364.
10. Зорівчак Р. П. Статус реалії як перекладознавчого терміна. Київ : А.С.К., 1985. 164 с.

Дата надходження статті: 04.07.2025

Дата прийняття статті: 07.08.2025

Опубліковано: 16.10.2025