

Therefore, edutainment should be considered not as a secondary trend, but as a structural component of modern media education, defining new principles of interaction between knowledge, attention and culture of information consumption.

REFERENCES

1. Buckingham D., & Scanlon, M. (2005). Selling learning: Towards a political economy of edutainment media. *Media, Culture & Society*, 27(1), 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443705049057>
2. Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. (2011). From game design elements to gamefulness: defining “gamification”. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference* (pp. 9–15). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2181037.2181040>
3. Kousha, K., Thelwall, M., & Abdoli, M. (2012). The role of online videos in research communication: A content analysis of YouTube videos cited in academic publications. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 63(9), 1710–1727. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22712>
4. Okan, Z. (2003). Edutainment: Is learning at risk? *British Journal of education technology*, 34(4), 255–264.
5. Vázquez-Herrero, J., Negreira-Rey, M.-C., & López-García, X. (2021). Let’s dance the news! How TikTok is reshaping news and educational content. *Journalism*, 23(8), 2980–2998. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884920969092>

Maryana Gajduk

*Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design
(Kyiv, Ukraine)*

Maryna Vyshnevskya

*Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design
(Kyiv, Ukraine)*

CHALLENGES IN TRANSLATING CULTURALLY SPECIFIC VOCABULARY

Within the linguistic system of every nation, there are linguistic units that are closely linked to its culture, history, and traditions. Such linguistic units are commonly referred to as culturally marked vocabulary. It encompasses words and expressions that reflect nation-specific phenomena, way of life, customs, realities, and peculiarities of worldview, and often have no complete or exact equivalents in other languages.

In view of the active development of intercultural communication, the problem of adequately rendering such vocabulary is becoming particularly relevant. The translation

of culturally marked units requires not only knowledge of languages but also a deep understanding of the cultural context, as incorrect rendering can lead to a loss of meaning or distortion of meaning. The aim of this paper is to explore the characteristics and complexity of translating culturally marked vocabulary.

Whilst the term ‘culturally marked vocabulary’ has not yet become widely accepted in academic circles, many researchers have simply referred to items with a cultural component as ‘realia’ in their works. In works on translation studies, in addition to this term, researchers also use the terms: non-equivalent vocabulary, exotic vocabulary, omissions/gaps, barbarisms, ethnocultural vocabulary, and alienisms. Despite the variety of terminology, the key consideration remains the choice of translation method for such units (Boiko, 2015, 8).

The adequate rendering of culturally marked vocabulary in translation requires consideration of several factors: the nature of the text, the significance of the cultural element in context, the nature of the cultural element itself, its place in the lexical systems of the source language and the target language, the languages themselves – their word-formation capabilities, literary and linguistic traditions, and the target reader (Boiko, 2015, 11).

The main difficulties in conveying nationally marked vocabulary in translation are the lack of an equivalent in the target language and the need to convey, alongside the word’s literal meaning, its flavor, its additional nuance, and specific connotation.

In modern translation theory and practice, the following methods of translating culturally marked vocabulary are distinguished: transcription and transliteration, calquing, descriptive translation, approximate translation, hyponymic translation, and the creation of a new equivalent (Kulish, Garah, 2020, 66).

Transliteration is the borrowing of a foreign word, which is then rendered using the letters of the target language whilst retaining its phonetic and graphic form. For example: Мама зліпила мені галушки - My mum made me halushky.

Transcription is the letter-by-letter rendering of the sound of a foreign word using the written symbols of the target language, with the greatest possible phonetic approximation to its original form.

A calque is a translation of a lexical unit in which its constituent parts are rendered literally using corresponding elements in the target language. Using this method can preserve the semantics of the source reality as much as possible, but not the national flavor. For example, every year in Ukraine, exactly one week before Easter, people celebrate Palm Sunday.

Descriptive, or explanatory, translation is used in cases where it is not possible to convey a linguistic element due to its absence in the target language. The main advantage of this method is that it is capable of fully revealing the essence of a phenomenon, thereby preventing the reader from gaining an incomplete understanding, as can happen in the case of calquing or transcription. However, descriptive translation has its fair share of drawbacks, namely: it is very wordy, and therefore the realia is often translated not by a structurally analogous unit in the other language, but by a detailed phrase or a verbose description. For example: We ate kutia on Christmas Eve – We ate a traditional sweet dish made of wheat, honey, and poppy seeds on Christmas Eve.

An approximate translation is a method of translation that involves using a lexical unit from the source language that only partially corresponds in meaning to words in the target language. Since Ukrainian and English have different characteristics, particularly at the morphological and syntactic levels, this method is used extremely rarely, as it is quite difficult to achieve an adequate translation using it.

Hyponymic translation is the rendering of nationally marked vocabulary using a linguistic unit with a broader meaning. For example: a ‘zabigailivka’ – a small café without amenities.

Contextual translation – the replacement of a lexical equivalent with a word logically related to it in translation. In this case, the context serves as the translator’s

main guide. For example: Діти пішли щедрувати – The children went round visiting neighbors and singing for treats.

The main drawback of such a translation is the complete loss of the cultural reality that conveys a particular national flavor (Kulish, Garah, 2020, 66–67).

In translation practice, two fundamentally opposing types of translation strategies are also distinguished: foreignisation and domestication. Foreignisation is based on preserving the culturally specific features of the original. Common strategies of foreignisation include transliteration, transcription, and calque, whereas domestication usually involves a descriptive approach to translation or the search for equivalents in the target language (Diachuk, Dovzhenko, 2022, 73).

Thus, culturally marked vocabulary is a complex and multifaceted process that goes beyond mere linguistic reproduction and is unique to each nation. It has its own specific characteristics, strategies, and methods of translation. The main challenge for the translator lies in the lack of equivalence and the need for cultural awareness. To achieve an adequate translation, an individualized approach is required, taking into account numerous factors.

REFERENCES:

1. Diachuk, L. S., & Dovzhenko, I. V. (2022). Nationally marked vocabulary in Ukrainian media discourse: the specifics of its rendering in English translation. *Scientific Notes of V. I. Vernadsky Ternopil National University. Series: Philology. Journalism*, 33(72), 72–77. <https://doi.org/10.32838/2710-4656/2022.1-2/12>
2. Boiko, Y. V. (2015). Linguistic and pragmatic aspects of translating culturally marked vocabulary in English-language journalistic texts. *Bulletin of Kyiv National Linguistic University. Philology Series*, 18(2), 7–13.
3. Kulish, V., & Garah, O. (2020). THE CHALLENGES OF TRANSLATING CULTURALLY MARKED LEXIS. *Young Scholar*, 12 (88), 64–68. <https://doi.org/10.32839/2304-5809/2020-12-88-14>