

UDC 821.161.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32689/maup.philol.2024.1.4>**Nataliia YEMETS**

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Kyiv National Linguistic University,

nataliiayemets5@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-1585-4565

POETIC TRANSLATION STRATEGIES IN READER RESPONSE PERSPECTIVE

The article investigates the effect of the chosen translation strategies on the readers' perception of poetry. In the receptive aesthetics perspective, the choice of poetic translation tactics can be viewed as a decisive factor in poetic text perception. The purpose of this research is to analyze readers' aesthetic reception of poetry with regard to the chosen translation strategy. The novelty of this study lies in the attempt to evaluate and analyze readers' perception induced by different types of poetic translation. Based on the methodological foundations of poetics with qualitative and quantitative data analysis, we hypothesized that the choice of poetic translation tactics could determine poetic artwork aesthetic potential. The material of the research is presented via three kinds of poetic translation of R. Frost's poem «The Rose Family»: phonetic, lexical, and interpretative. The phonetic translation focuses on reproducing the original melody of the text by choosing lexical units that are phonetically consonant with the original. The lexical translation emulates the lexical units of the original as accurately as possible. The interpretation of the poem ideologically follows the original text without emphasizing phonetic and lexical aspects. The questionnaire involved the students of the master's level elective course «Strategies and Tactics of Poetic Translation in Historical Perspective». The proposed questions focused on different aspects of poetic text perception: phonetic, lexical, and ideological respectively. The results of the analysis of the initial data show that the choice of translation tactics significantly affects the readers' reception. Thus, phonetic translation proves to be the most dynamic and rhythmic. The lexical translation is the easiest to read and understand in general. Readers consider the interpretation of the original poetry to be the most wonderful, real, and sincere. The results obtained have proved the hypothesis validity that translator's choice of tactics and strategies influence readers' reception. Further studies of poetic texts translatability in the perspective of receptive aesthetics will deepen the understanding of certain textual aspects impact on the readers that will contribute to the improvement of translation strategies and tactics.

Key words: poetics, poetic translation, reader response theory, strategies and tactics of poetic translation.

Наталія Ємець. СТРАТЕГІЇ ПОЕТИЧНОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДУ У РАКУРСІ РЕЦЕПТИВНОЇ ЕСТЕТИКИ

У статті розглядається питання впливу обраних перекладацьких тактик та стратегій на сприйняття читачем поезії. У ракурсі рецептивної естетики вибір тактик і стратегій поетичного перекладу може розглядатися як вирішальний фактор впливу на сприйняття поетичних текстів. Метою даної розвідки є аналіз естетичної рецепції поезії читачами відповідно до обраної перекладацької стратегії. Новизна такого дослідження полягає у спробі оцінити і проаналізувати читачьке сприйняття різних типів поетичного перекладу. Грунтуючись на методологічних засадах поетики із залученням якісного та кількісного аналізу даних, ми висунули гіпотезу, що вибір тактики поетичного перекладу обумовлює естетичний потенціал поетичного твору. Матеріалом дослідження слугують три види поетичного перекладу поезії Р. Фроста «The Rose Family»: фонетичний, лексичний та інтерпретативний. Фонетичний переклад фокусується на відтворенні оригінальної мелодійності тексту за рахунок вибору лексичних одиниць, фонетично співзвучних з оригіналом. Лексичний переклад якнайточніше відтворює лексичні одиниці оригіналу. Інтерпретація поезії ідейно наслідує текст оригіналу, не акцентуючи фонетичні та лексичні аспекти. До опитування були залучені слухачі магістерського рівня вибіркової дисципліни «Стратегії і тактики поетичного перекладу в історичній перспективі». Запропоновані питання висвітлювали різні аспекти сприйняття поетичного тексту: фонетичний, лексичний та ідейний відповідно. За результатами аналізу вихідних даних ми дійшли висновку, що вибір тактики перекладу суттєво впливає на рецепцію читача. Так, фонетичний переклад виявився найбільш динамічним і ритмічним. Найлегшим для читання і загального ідейного розуміння – лексичний. Інтерпретацію оригінальної поезії читачі вважають найбільш захоплюючою, справжньою і відвертою. Отримані результати засвідчили валідність робочої гіпотези щодо впливу обраних перекладачем тактик та стратегій поетичного перекладу на рецепцію читачів. Подальші дослідження перекладності поетичних текстів у ракурсі рецептивної естетики поглиблять розуміння впливу на читача окремих аспектів тексту, що сприятиме удосконаленню перекладацьких стратегій і тактик.

Ключові слова: поетика, поетичний переклад, рецептивна естетика, стратегії і тактики поетичного перекладу.

Introduction. Problem statement. The unique kind of communication via poetic texts is aimed at reaching resonance between the encoded in imagery message of the author and the reader's picture of the world [10, p. 79]. Decoded information,

therefore, can be interpreted in various ways as the personal perception may differ immensely due to multiple factors [11, p. 847]. One of these factors is translation. The issue of poetic texts comprehension is raveled by translation hindrances that

may cause ambiguity due to the selected translation strategies. Consequently, readers' response is partially predetermined by the translator's choice of tactic that leads to different variations in target text general composition. Basing on Andre Lefevere's [9] classification of poetic translation kinds, we have conducted the research into the reader response analysis of poetic texts perception with reference to the translation strategies – phonetic, lexical, and interpretative.

Purpose and tasks. The purpose of the research is to evaluate readers' response to different kinds of translation of the same source text. This approach to poetic texts perception embraces a deep insight into the issues of translation strategies and reader response theories. Therefore, to reach the set goal, we need to analyze translation tactics with their reference to subsequent readers' emotional response. The **novelty** of the research lies in the attempt to disclose possible variations of poetic texts reception in translation angle.

The **material** of the research is Robert Frost's poem «The Rose Family» [6] translated in three different ways: phonetically, literally, and in form of interpretation. The translations were prepared by the author of the article with regard to the above mentioned tactics and strategies.

Methodological foundation rests upon general principles of poetics and reader response theory. To analyze the deviations of poetic texts translation perception, the qualitative and quantitative analyses are implemented. The data processed is retrieved from the questionnaire developed on Microsoft 365 platform and includes the feedback of 58 students enrolled in Elective Discipline «Poetic translation strategies and tactics».

Research results. R. Jakobson [7] believed that poetry, according to its definition, cannot be translated. This statement, however, sounds as an exception to his general judgment about the translatability of any text [7, p. 113–114]. The researcher explained that in the case of poetic texts translation, creative transposition appears to be the only valid way to translate the author's intention. And this standpoint can be supported. Poetic text constituents at all linguistic levels – phonetic, grammatical, lexical, syntactic – contribute to the overall unity of the artwork. Therefore, all elements (structural and figurative) of each level are interconnected in accordance with the author's intention and poetic tradition [3, p. 4]. Regarding the differences between source and target languages, the attempt to preserve every element in translation looks rather questionable. Supported by Coleridge's definition of poetry in terms of «the best words in the best order», its translation process that involves replacing these «best» words seems to be an unfulfilled mission.

The words of R. Frost, who believed that «poetry is what is lost in translation» [5, p. 24], resonate with the standpoint of the British poet and literary critic.

A. Lefevere's significant contribution to the theory of translation lies in his attempt to generate a valid definition of literary translation. The researcher defines translation as «a form of rewriting that is produced and read in accordance with a set of ideological and political constraints of the target language» [9, p. 8]. André Lefevere's seven strategies are aimed at overcoming the difficulties faced by translators and strengthening the empirical foundations of translation studies [13].

A. Lefevere approaches the problem descriptively: the author's «seven strategies» [9] outline the translation process itself, as well as the influence of the context of the original and translation. The researcher not only considers linguistic techniques, but also involves extra-linguistic factors such as *time*, *place*, and *tradition* in the development of translation methodology. By *time* and *place*, the author means the historical aspect as a culturally significant factor of influence. The *tradition* refers to poetic principles on which the «tradition of poetry composition» is based.

In his work, the researcher distinguishes between «translation itself» and «interpretation», which has subtypes of «version» and «imitation» [9, p. 56–57]. In a «version» the translator retains the content but changes the form. «Imitation» is a more creative type of translation that preserves the main elements of form and content. In each of the variants, consciously or not, the translator limits himself or herself in accordance with the chosen strategy.

By choosing the phonetic translation strategy, the translator tries to preserve the sound correspondence to the original to reach the musicality of the source text [1; 2]. However, according to Lefevere, this strategy may lead to infidelity of idea and imagery. He admits that purely phonetic approach is undoubtedly utopian as «it creates a bilingual parody unable to survive in literature» [9, p. 21]. Nevertheless, its sensible application may add original musicality to the translation. For example, in the phonetic translation, we chose to use the word «ружа» to phonetically relate to «rose» in the original.

Literal translation accentuates lexical side of the poem by providing precise translation of each word. Lefevere admits that this strategy distorts the meaning by devaluing poem's communicative component. Contextual meaning and connotations, therefore, are being mostly neglected. In our variant of literal translation we deliberately duplicated lexical patterns of the original in tar-

get text. For example, the original lines «*But now the theory goes / That the apple's a rose*» is translated as «*Та зараз теоретично / І яблуко то троянда*». Phonetic translation of the lines sounds as follows: «*Та зараз буває дуже, / Що яблуко також ружа*». This exemplifies differences within two strategies that reveal weak and strong aspects of both. In phonetic translation, we follow the musicality of the original; however, the dialectal variant of «rose» («ружа») may sound perplexing for some readers. On the contrary, the literal translation poses no lexical difficulty being reader-friendly to the target audience. Phonetically, rhythmically, and metrically, this kind of translation loses its original luring charm.

By using interpretative translation strategy, the translator, according to Lefevere, concentrates on the poem's imagery and philosophy. The formal organization – rhyme, rhythm, meter – as a rule, are neglected. Therefore, we may state that the translators create their own text based on the main idea of the original. For example, the initial verse of the poem «*The rose is a rose / And always a rose / But now the theory goes / That the apple's a rose*» is presented like «*Троянда – краси незрівняної квітка – / Завжди була нею, навічно. / Хоча порівнятися з нею / Прагнуть і інші квіти*».

Deeply rooted in cognitive approach, reader response theory «acknowledges the varied interpretations that readers might have on literary works» [8, p. 252]. Moreover, it stems from the idea that readers, in order to decode the message, have to be critical, thoughtful and engaged. In regard to meaning, Charles E. Bressler admits that «Meaning [...] is context-dependent and intricately associated with the reading process» [4, p. 61]. Consequently, the reading process as the response predetermining factor relies on linguistic peculiarities of the text itself. Poetry in translation highly depends on the translator's tactics and techniques that foreground different textual aspects. Depending on translator's approach, text may be more phonetically, lexically or idea oriented. Therefore, reader response to the text may vary based on general perception and interpretative readers' abilities [12].

Basing on the assumption that a poem as a literary work emerges from mutual relationship of the reader and the text [12], we set forward the idea that different translations may evoke various perceptions and construct multiple meanings. The potential value of each kind of translation develops particular response based on emotional and intellectual involvement into the text. Phonetic translation adds to general musicality [1, p. 42–43] and, therefore, resonates with emo-

tional side. Literal translation may be more intellectually oriented, whereas poetic interpretation opens readers' minds to analysis and judgment.

To evaluate readers response to phonetic, lexical and interpretative tactics of poetic translation, the questions to such textual characteristics were offered:

1. Easy to remember.
2. Musical.
3. Dynamic.
4. Rhythmic.
5. Easy to read.
6. Wonderful.
7. Deep.
8. Real.
9. Breathtaking.
10. Sincere.

Each quality is rated from 1 to 5 where 1 suggests the lowest and 5 – the highest characteristic appreciation level (Table 1). In our reader response data analysis, we mainly concentrate on these two extreme responses with answers rating from 2 to 4 used as additional.

Highest points for *Easy to remember* characteristic reach 19, 20, and 21 responses for each kind of translation. The lowest rate (4 answers) is observed in interpretational translation. This suggests that free translation approach may pose some difficulty for readers to remember the text. However, the majority of answers show no distinct variation as to this textual characteristic.

The *Musicality* of the poem rates from 13 in phonetic translation to 18 in lexical and interpretation kinds. The lowest grade levels at 3 for free translation and 5 for lexical and phonetic types. This may suggest that phonetic approach to translation due to the usage of archaic and dialectal words influences general perception and overloads musicality of the text. Consequently, source text phonetic patterns replication in translation does not influence textual euphony and should not be misused. On the other hand, phonetic kind of translation was appreciated as the most *Dynamic* with 21 points against 18 for other two. Therefore, we should admit that phonetic approach to translation adds to the rhythmic pattern of the verse by creating a peculiar beat.

This assumption is supported by the results of the next question that reveals the readers' response to *Rhythm* in the translations. Phonetic approach demonstrates the highest appreciation level of rhythmic structure (25); on the contrary, lexical and interpretational types of translation level at 16 positive responses only. Therefore, despite obvious drawbacks of phonetic approach in poetic translation, we should not

Table 1

Reader response quantitative results

Level Criteria	Phonetic translation		Lexical translation		Interpretation	
	5	1	5	1	5	1
Easy to remember	19	2	20	1	21	4
Musical	13	5	18	5	18	3
Dynamic	21	3	18	3	18	4
Rhythmic	25	1	16	2	16	4
Easy to read	18	4	32	0	26	1
Wonderful	17	5	29	1	28	4
Deep	9	6	22	4	20	4
Real	12	7	24	3	28	1
Breathtaking	11	10	18	4	27	3
Sincere	10	8	14	5	26	2

disregard its strong sides that promote better readers' comprehension of rhythmic patterns and general dynamics. Contrastingly, lexical and interpretational translations hinder poem's musicality affecting overall perceptions.

Nevertheless, we should admit that latter types of translations turned out to be *Easy to Read*. According to the questionnaire results, lexical translation scores 32 top positive answers for this question. Therefore, rather limited phonetically and rhythmically, this kind of translation facilitates readers' comprehension by providing clear lexical correspondence between source and target texts. Interpretational approach falls behind by 6 points; phonetic translation is easy to read for less than a third of respondents. Consequently, the choice of vocabulary promotes more comfortable comprehension of the encoded message compared to other poetic translation strategies.

Only 17 respondents refer to phonetic translation as *wonderful* opposed to 29 and 28 positive responses for lexical and interpretational translations. Such high points may be justified by lack of lexical ambiguity in the latter translations which harnesses overall appreciation in the phonetic kind. Therefore, we may assume that easy to read and comprehensive vocabulary complements aesthetic readers' perception of the artwork.

Similar observations are valid for *deep* and *real* criteria where phonetic kind of translation demonstrates the lowest resonance with the readers. On the contrary, lexical and interpretational translation techniques nurture profound aesthetic comprehension and stimulate positive readers' feedback. The specifics of these criteria are enrooted in readers' interpretational capacity of message decoding. Partially, it may be explained by the choice of vocabulary: lexical and interpretational translations operate

with comparatively simple and straightforward words. On the contrary, phonetic translation poses significant difficulty for readers in defining the translation as deep and real.

Interpretative approach proves to be the most *breathtaking* and *sincere* for readers. The words choice and flexible structure of the translation promote readers' comfortable comprehension and aesthetic appreciation. In contrast, phonetic and lexical translations fall considerably behind exposing low evocative power.

Conclusions. Literary texts, according to reader response theory, are viewed as performing art where readers create their own text-related practice. This approach avoids subjectivity or essentialism in descriptions produced through its recognition that reading is determined by textual and cultural constraints. Therefore, the text itself acts as a feedback defining factor, revealing text's characteristics as response oriented. Different translations tactics and strategies, consequently, prove to be crucial for overall readers' perception of poetry.

Phonetic translation due its formal organization and focus on replicating the source text musicality is perceived as the most *dynamic* and *rhythmic*. *Lexical* translation appeals to comprehensive abilities: the readers regard to it as *wonderful* and *real*. Moreover, the majority of respondents find this translation *the easiest to read*. Interpretative translation tactics reveal aesthetic properties of the text, appealing to artistic interpretative skills of the readers.

Quantitative analysis of the questionnaire results supports the initial assumption of variable readers' response to the different poetic texts translations. The strategies, chosen by translator, influence readers' perception of text qualities. Therefore, via implementation of various translation tactics and strategies, the translator accentuates different textual properties that, in their turn, predetermine comprehension

and interpretation of the artwork. Guided by the text peculiarities, the reader perceives the text multifariously, being more sensitive and insightful to peculiar text qualities.

The results obtained may be used to pursue further investigations of textual properties as

response predetermining factor. Similar reader response analyses can help obtain more accurate results as to the text characteristics of poetic translations. The practical value lies in the possibility to deepen insight into poetic translation strategies to develop valid translation algorithms.

Bibliography:

1. Кикоть В. М. Семантика звуку в поетичному оригіналі й перекладі. *Psycholinguistics*. 33(1). С. 41–47.
2. Кикоть В. М. Образна матриця та переклад поезії : монографія. Черкаси : Видавець Чабаненко Ю. А., 2020. 632 с.
3. Лановик М. Б. Проблеми художнього перекладу як предмет літературознавчої рефлексії : автореферат дис. д-ра філол. наук, НАН України. Ін-т л-ри ім. Т. Г. Шевченка. Київ, 2006. 39 с.
4. Bressler, Ch. *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. New Jersey : Prentice Hall, 2003. 307 с.
5. Frost, R. *Poetry and Translation. The Art of the Impossible*. Liverpool University Press, 2010. P. 23–47.
6. Frost, R. Robert Frost Poetry. Retrieved from <https://www.poemhunter.com/poem/the-rose-family/> (25.03.2024)
7. Jakobson, R. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London. New York : Routledge, 2000. 524 p.
8. Kunjanman, S. & Abdul Aziz, A. Reader-Response Theory: a Systematic Literature Review. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*. Vol. 6. P. 252–260.
9. Lefevere, A. *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975. 127 p.
10. Mart, C. Reader-Response Theory and Literature Discussions: a Springboard for Exploring Literary Texts. *The New Educational Review*. Vol. 56(2). 2019. P. 78–87.
11. Mart, C.T. Reflections on Discussions of literature: a Language Learning Environment to Promote Speaking Skills. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*. Vol. 5(4). 2019. P. 846–850.
12. Rosenblatt, L.M. *Literature as Exploration*. New York : MLA, 1995. 321 p.
13. Yarmohamadi Khameneh, M., & Dehbashi Sharif, F. A Model for Translation Poetry Based on the Lefevere's Theory on Poetry Translation and Dastjerdi's Model. *ELT Voices*. Vol. 5(4). 2015. P. 53–65.