

**2 Бөлім. АУДАРМА ТЕОРИЯСЫ ЖӘНЕ ПРАКТИКАСЫ
САЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕР**

**Раздел 2. ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ В ОБЛАСТИ ТЕОРИИ И
ПРАКТИКИ ПЕРЕВОДА**

Part 2. RESEARCHES IN TRANSLATION THEORY AND PRACTICE

UDC 81'255.2

IRSTI 16.31.41

<https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2026.3.82.029>

**SEMIOTIC ASPECTS OF CULTURAL TRANSFER IN LITERARY
TRANSLATION IN THE CASE OF "LANGUAGE POETRY"**

***Jailganova D.A.¹**

***¹ Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and
World Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan**

Abstract. The article explores literary translation as a semiotic process of cultural transfer, with particular attention to the ways cultural codes are reshaped in poetic translation. Within this framework, translation is approached not merely as a linguistic procedure but as the production of a secondary text situated within a different semiosphere. Emphasis is placed on the translator's role as a cultural mediator who recreates emotional, symbolic, and aesthetic meanings in accordance with the norms and expectations of the target culture.

Methodologically, the study adopts an interdisciplinary qualitative approach that combines comparative-contrastive textual analysis, semiotic and structural analysis, linguistic-cultural methods, and hermeneutic interpretation in order to examine processes of cultural transfer in literary translation. The analysis is based on Bob Perelman's poem "China" (1981) and its Russian translation by V. V. Feshchenko, examined in the context of Language poetry. The research identifies a range of semiotic codes including numerical and cosmological references, everyday pragmatic formulas, technological and urban imagery, elements of material culture, and political symbolism and investigates how these codes are preserved, modified, or recontextualized in translation.

The results show that poetic translation entails complex processes of cultural reinterpretation: while some semiotic structures remain relatively stable, others are intensified or reframed in line with the cultural conventions of the target language. The study concludes that translation functions as a form of symbolic reconstruction and a site of intercultural dialogue, through which new cultural meanings are generated. From a broader perspective, the findings underline the importance of a semiotic approach to translation as a creative and interpretive practice and contribute to ongoing discussions in translation studies, poetic analysis, and intercultural communication.

Keywords: cultural transfer, linguo-creative aspects, poetics, semiotics, literary translation, cultural codes, secondary text, intercultural dialogue, “Language Poetry” school

Introduction

Contemporary translation theory increasingly turns to the concept of cultural transfer, understood as a process of mutual penetration of meanings, symbols, and cultural codes when transferring a text from one semiotic system to another. Literary translation, especially poetic translation, becomes a space where cultural, linguistic, and aesthetic forms interact, transforming as a result of the translator’s interpretation.

A semiotic approach to translation makes it possible to view the translated text not merely as the result of linguistic transformation, but as a new semiotic construct emerging at the intersection of cultural discourses. In this context, translation functions as a special type of communication in which meaning is not only transmitted, but also reinterpreted within another cultural paradigm. The task of the translator is therefore not limited to literal rendering of the original content, but lies in achieving equivalent artistic impact reproducing emotional, symbolic, and aesthetic meanings through culturally relevant forms of expression.

The relevance of this topic arises from the growing intercultural communication in the globalized world, where literary translation serves as a key mediator of cultural knowledge and aesthetic values. In multilingual environments, such English-Russian literary exchange, translation becomes an active mechanism of cultural transmission. Understanding semiotic processes within translation helps reveal how meanings are transformed, reinterpreted, and contextualized for a new audience. Moreover, the interest in national identities, cultural models, and symbolic codes reinforces the need to examine translation as a semiotic act rather than a linguistic substitution.

The main aim of the study is to analyze how cultural transfer is manifested through semiotic mechanisms in literary translation, with particular focus on poetic texts. The objectives include:

- identifying semiotic markers involved in the transformation of the original text into the secondary text;
- examining how cultural codes are adapted or recontextualized in translation;
- highlighting the translator’s role as a cultural mediator;
- comparing examples of English-Russian translations to reveal differences in cultural reinterpretation.

Although cultural transfer has been widely discussed in cultural studies and translation theory, insufficient attention has been given to its semiotic realization in poetic translation. Existing research often focuses on linguistic equivalence, stylistic norms, or lexical adaptation, while the deeper study of symbolic structures, cultural memory, and interpretative strategies remains fragmented. This creates a research gap: the lack of comprehensive analysis of translation as a semiotic act of cultural reinterpretation. The present study addresses this gap by

examining how poetic translation constructs new cultural meanings through sign transformation, emotional substitution, and symbolic adaptation.

Thus, the investigation of semiotic aspects of cultural transfer makes it possible to understand how meanings, textual structures, and aesthetic effects are reconstructed and re-encoded in translation. This is especially important for poetic translation, where each element of the text carries not only a linguistic value, but also symbolic, cultural, and emotional significance.

Literature Review

The concept of cultural transfer emerged in the humanities in the second half of the twentieth century as an attempt to explain processes of mutual influence and exchange between cultures. The term was introduced by French historians Michel Espagne and Michael Werner within their works on the history of cultural interrelations in Europe. They understood cultural transfer as a dynamic movement of meanings, forms, symbols, and practices from one culture to another, in which there is not simply borrowing, but transformation and reinterpretation of the original material within a new context [1].

According to Bachmann-Medick, translation functions as a key instrument of cultural transfer, enabling the movement of not only texts but also ideas, norms, and modes of thought from one cultural system to another [2]. This process allows scholars to observe both the differences and convergences between cultures, revealing how meanings are reinterpreted and adapted in the target context. In this sense, translation is a mode of intercultural communication that fosters the circulation and transformation of cultural knowledge.

Within translation studies, the concept of cultural transfer received further development. Translation began to be viewed not only as a linguistic, but also as a cultural process, in which mediation between different semiotic systems is carried out. In this context, the translator is seen not merely as an intermediary, but as an active interpreter of cultural meanings, participating in their adaptation and representation for a new audience.

Following A.A. Aldabergenova and G.G. Gizdatov, literary translation should be examined not only as a linguistic operation but as a cultural and semiotic process [3]. The study of cultural transfer enables researchers to go beyond a purely philological approach and to interpret translation as a form of semiotic reconstruction, where symbolic, discursive, and cultural meanings are re-encoded in the secondary text.

According to G.G. Gizdatov and S.K. Kim translation involves linguistic creativity and transcreativity, allowing deviation from normative forms in order to preserve aesthetic and ideological effects [4].

Cultural transfer in translation is not only the transmission of information, but also the interaction of cultural codes, the formation of new semantic connections, and the creation of a space for intercultural dialogue. What becomes important in this process is not equivalence of linguistic structures, but comparability of cultural imagery and symbolic systems.

Many scholars, including Yuri Lotman, Umberto Eco, Itamar Even-Zohar, and Gideon Toury, emphasized the semiotic and cultural nature of translation.

Yuri Lotman considered culture as a semiotic system, or “semiosphere,” in which translation functions as a form of interaction between different “languages of culture” [5]. Building on this idea of meaning as culturally mediated, Umberto Eco emphasized that translation involves the reinterpretation of meaning within another cultural code, highlighting that every translation is inherently an act of interpretation [6]. Expanding this perspective to the dynamics of literary systems, Itamar Even-Zohar, through his polysystem theory, argued that translation operates within the cultural system as a mechanism of renewal and exchange, thereby contributing to the development of the recipient literature [5]. Gideon Toury approached translation as an integral part of the sociocultural process, shaped by the norms and expectations of the target audience, linking the translator’s creative and interpretive work to broader social and cultural contexts [6]. More recently, Siri Nergaard has highlighted the post-translation studies perspective, focusing on the global circulation of texts and the evolving role of translation in intercultural communication, emphasizing how translation mediates between cultural, social, and ideological frameworks [9].

Thus, cultural transfer in translation can be defined as a multilayered interaction of linguistic, cultural, and semiotic systems, during which a new semantic space is formed. The translator becomes a mediator between cultures, creating a “secondary text” inserted into another semiosphere, where the original meaning is not copied, but interpreted and transformed. For this reason, the study of cultural transfer allows for a deeper understanding of translation as a cultural act, in which cognitive, aesthetic, and social dimensions of human communication converge.

Building on this understanding, the notion of a secondary text originates from the semiotic concept developed by Yu. Lotman, according to which translation functions as a secondary modeling system—a text that forms a new structure of meanings based on an already existing original. Translation is not a mechanical replication of content, but rather a creation of a new semiotic reality in which original meanings are interpreted, adapted, and re-signified in accordance with the cultural context of the target language.

The discursive aspect of translation allows us to view the secondary text as part of a broader cultural and communicative space. Translation is always embedded within a particular discourse—literary, historical, national, or ideological. This discourse sets the framework and norms within which translational interpretation is constructed. While producing a new text, the translator inevitably takes into account genre models, social attitudes, and aesthetic and linguistic standards of their time and cultural environment. Thus, translation becomes not only an individual engagement with the text but also an expression of the discursive practices of an era, reflecting dominant cultural values and modes of expression.

The discursive and interpretive aspects are closely interconnected. Interpretation always occurs within a specific discourse, which determines cultural references and frames of possible transformations of meaning. At the same time, each new translation has the potential to alter the discourse itself by introducing new cultural or aesthetic meanings. Translation therefore operates as a mechanism of semantic mediation, connecting social, cultural, and individual creative dimensions.

The success of cultural transfer largely depends on the translator's ability to accurately manage the recipient's cognitive processes. Drawing on M. I. Kiose's concept of attention management, literary translation in the context of cultural transfer can be understood as a strategic redistribution of the reader's attention, with the translator acting as a mediator who directs the reader's perceptual focus toward the key semiotic nodes of the text [10].

This interconnectedness is especially evident in the "secondary" text: the translator not only reproduces another author's text but also creates a new cultural artifact that reflects their worldview, historical moment, and cultural environment. Literary translation becomes the result of a complex interaction of language, culture, and interpretation, turning into an independent creative form through which cultural transfer takes place and a dialogue between different semiospheres is established.

Materials and methods

This study employs an interdisciplinary qualitative approach, integrating linguistic, semiotic, and cultural frameworks to analyze the process of cultural transfer. The following methods are utilized:

- Comparative-Contrastive Analysis: This method is used to examine the source text (Bob Perelman's "China") alongside its Russian translation. This method identifies formal and semantic shifts, linguistic transformations, and the degree of equivalence between the primary and secondary texts.

- Semiotic and Structural Analysis: The core method used to decode the text as a system of signs. It focuses on identifying specific semiotic codes (numerical, cosmological, technological, and political) and tracing their reconstruction within a new "semiosphere".

- Linguistic-Cultural Method: Employed to study the "cultural transfer" aspect. This involves analyzing how culturally-specific concepts and "pragmatic formulas" are adapted or recontextualized to meet the expectations of the target culture.

- Hermeneutic / Interpretative Method: Used to evaluate the translator's role as a mediator. This method focuses on the subjective process of meaning-making, where the translator interprets the original's aesthetic and emotional layers to create a functional secondary text.

The material for analysis is the poem "China" (1981) by Bob Perelman and its Russian translation by V. V. Feshchenko. The selection of this text is motivated

by its fragmented structure, dense semiotic layering, and reliance on cultural references, which make it particularly suitable for examining the mechanisms of cultural transfer in literary translation.

Results and discussion

When examining the semiotic aspects of cultural transfer, it is essential to draw on I. V. Zytkova's proposition that artistic discourse involves the interaction of macro-conceptual sign systems. In this context, literary translation functions not merely as an interlingual representation but as a complex process of transmitting cultural codes from one global sign system to another[11]. Among literary genres, poetry represents one of the most challenging forms of cultural transfer, as poetic texts integrate linguistic, cultural, aesthetic, and symbolic meanings into a highly condensed structure. The translator must therefore preserve not only the semantic content but also the network of cultural references, imagery, rhythm, and stylistic features that shape the poem's artistic effect.

As a case study for exploring the semiotic aspects of cultural transfer in the practice of literary translation, this article examines the poem "China" (1981) by Bob Perelman alongside its Russian translation. Bob Perelman is a well-known American poet, critic, and scholar, closely associated with the Language poetry movement, which emphasizes the materiality of language and challenges traditional notions of poetic transparency and referentiality. His poetic practice foregrounds fragmentation, discontinuity, and the active role of the reader in meaning construction.

The poem "China" represents a typical example of Perelman's poetics. It is built as a sequence of seemingly simple, everyday statements that resist linear narrative and stable interpretation. Meaning emerges through juxtaposition, repetition, and the interaction of cultural and semiotic signs rather than through explicit thematic development. The poem reflects late-modern experience marked by mobility, technologization, and the fragmentation of perception, making it a productive text for the analysis of cultural transfer in translation.

The original text of the poem is presented below as the primary object of analysis:

We live on the third world from the sun. Number three. Nobody tells us what to do.

The people who taught us to count were being very kind.

It's always time to leave.

If it rains, you either have your umbrella or you don't.

The wind blows your hat off.

The sun rises also. I'd rather the stars didn't describe us to each other; I'd rather we do it for ourselves.

Run in front of your shadow.

A sister who points to the sky at least once a decade is a good sister.

The landscape is motorized.

*The train takes you where it goes.
 Bridges among water.
 Folks straggling along vast stretches of concrete, heading into the plane.
 Don't forget what your hat and shoes will look like when you are nowhere
 to be found.
 Even the words floating in air make blue shadows.
 If it tastes good we eat it.
 The leaves are falling. Point things out.
 Pick up the right things.
 Hey guess what? What? I've learned how to talk. Great.
 The person whose head was incomplete burst into tears.
 As it fell, what could the doll do? Nothing.
 Go to sleep.
 You look great in shorts. And the flag looks great too.
 Everyone enjoyed the explosions.
 Time to wake up.
 But better get used to dreams.*

The semiotic analysis of the poem focuses on everyday utterances as cultural signs, numerical and spatial markers as tools of world-ordering, and the transformation of natural and human elements into functional or residual signs. Particular attention is paid to how these semiotic structures are preserved, shifted, or neutralized in the Russian translation [12].

The Russian translation of the poem was produced by V. V. Feshchenko, a Russian philologist and semiotician specializing in the interrelation between language and art, linguistic aesthetics, and poetics. His scholarly interests and research practice are directly connected with issues of semiotic analysis of literary texts and intercultural transfer, which makes this translation particularly significant for examination within the framework of the present study.

In V. V. Feshchenko's Russian translation, it appears as follows:

*Мы живем в третьем от солнца мире. Номер три. Никто не
 указывает нам,
 как жить.
 Люди, учившие нас считать, - сама доброта.
 Всегда пора уходить.
 Если идет дождь, у вас либо есть зонт, либо нет.
 Ветер срывает шляпу.
 Восходит и солнце.
 Лучшие бы звезды не толковали о нас между собой; лучшие бы мы сами
 делали это.
 Бежать поперек своей тени.
 Сестра, указывающая на небо хотя бы раз в десять лет, - хорошая
 сестра.
 Пейзаж моторизирован.
 Поезд несет вас туда куда едет.
 Мосты посреди воды.*

*Народ плетется по обширным просторам бетона, прямо в самолет.
Не забудьте, как на вас будут смотреться имотки, когда
запропастьтесь.*

*Куртки в витрине висят на крючках; на месте голов - вопросительный
знак.*

*Даже слова, парящие в воздухе, отбрасывают синие тени.
Когда вкусно - едим.*

Листья падают. Указать на вещи.

Выйти на верные вещи.

Эй, прикинь! Что? Я выучился говорить. Здорово.

Чья голова не завершена, расплакался.

Падая, что могла сделать кукла? Ничего.

Спать.

Тебе идут шорты. И флаг тоже неплохо смотрится.

Все любовались взрывами.

Время вставать.

Но лучше бы и привыкать ко снам [13].

In the following analysis, several different cultural codes have been identified and examined in both the original poem and its Russian translation. These codes include numerical and cosmological markers, everyday and pragmatic instructions, technological and urban references, and material and visual aspects of language. By comparing how these semiotic structures function in the source text and how they are rendered in translation, we can trace the ways in which cultural meanings are preserved, shifted, or transformed in the process of intercultural transfer.

1. Numerical and Cosmological Code

Original:

We live on the third world from the sun. Number three.

Translation:

Мы живем в третьем от солнца мире. Номер три.

The number *three* / *три* functions as a cultural and semiotic marker for the ordering of the world. In the original, this numerical code reads almost mechanically, like a fact from a textbook or an instruction. The translation preserves this dry nominative quality, without interpreting or “animating” the number, thereby maintaining the scientific-bureaucratic cultural code characteristic of the late-modernist discourse.

The phrase “third world” instead of the expected “third planet” creates semantic ambiguity by evoking both Earth’s position in the solar system and the socio-political concept of the “Third World.” V. V. Feshchenko preserves this ambiguity in the translation («в третьем от солнца мире»). By maintaining the short, detached structure («Номер три»), the translator also preserves the analytical, non-lyrical style characteristic of Language Poetry.

2. Everyday Logical Code

Original:

The train takes you where it goes.

Translation:

Поезд несет вас туда куда едет.

In the original, the train functions as the active agent, while the human is the passive object. The Russian version amplifies this sense through the verb *несет* (*carries*), which in Russian carries an additional nuance of uncontrollable movement. Thus, the translation enhances the semiotics of alienation, making it more expressive than in the original text.

In the source text, the verb takes presents the train's movement as a neutral, mechanical action. By choosing the verb *несет*, V. V. Feshchenko introduces a stronger sense of passivity, as in Russian it often implies being carried by an uncontrollable force. The omission of the comma also preserves the fragmented syntax characteristic of Language Poetry. As a result, the translation subtly shifts the line from a simple description of movement toward a stronger sense of human helplessness and alienation.

3. Technological Code

Original:

The landscape is motorized.

Translation:

Пейзаж моторизирован.

Here we observe an almost calque-like transfer, which is significant: the terminological artificiality of *motorized* / *моторизирован* emphasizes a distanced, alienated perspective on space. The translation preserves the technocratic descriptive language without replacing it with more familiar Russian expressions, thereby maintaining the aesthetic strategy of Language poetry.

From a semiotic perspective, this line contrasts the natural ("landscape") with the mechanical ("motorized"), presenting nature as an artificial, mechanized object. By preserving the loanword *моторизирован* instead of using the more natural *механизирован*, V. V. Feshchenko maintains the effect of defamiliarization, emphasizing how technology reshapes human perception of space.

4. Code of Collective Identity

Original:

Folks straggling along vast stretches of concrete, heading into the plane.

Translation:

Народ плетется по обширным просторам бетона, прямо в самолет.

The word *folks* in English carries a conversational, generalizing cultural code. The Russian *народ* strengthens the sense of collectivity and depersonalization, adding an almost sociological tone. From a semiotic perspective, there is a shift from conversational neutrality to a more mass-media and ideological code, slightly altering the tone while preserving the overall sense of alienated mass movement.

This lexical substitution reflects how cultural transfer interacts with the historical associations of the target language. While the English *folks* refers to ordinary people, the Russian *народ* carries stronger political and collective connotations. Combined with the imagery of *просторы бетона* and the verb *плетется*, the translation transforms an everyday scene into a more dystopian image of weary, mechanized collective movement.

5. Material Culture Code

Original:

Don't forget what your hat and shoes will look like when you are nowhere to be found.

Translation:

Не забудьте, как на вас будут смотреться шмотки, когда запропаститесь.

Here a significant semiotic shift is noticeable:

- *hat and shoes* — concrete, culturally neutral objects
- *шмотки* — colloquial, informal term with a consumerist cultural code

The translation shifts the emphasis from personal identity to objecthood and consumer discourse, reflecting a different cultural context and enhancing an ironic effect, while slightly diverging from the minimalist quality of the original.

In the original text, “hat and shoes” function as signs of human presence that remain after a person’s disappearance. By replacing them with the colloquial term *шмотки*, V. V. Feshchenko shifts the focus from existential absence to consumer culture. This effect is reinforced by the informal verb *запропаститесь*, which softens the tragic tone of the original. As a result, the translation reinterprets the line as an ironic critique of a society where identity is reduced to material possessions.

6. Political Code

Original:

And the flag looks great too.

Translation:

И флаг тоже неплохо смотрится.

The neutral evaluative tone is preserved, however, in the Russian context, the word *флаг* inevitably activates a stronger political code than in the American context. Thus, the translation inadvertently amplifies the ideological load of the image.

In the source text, this line juxtaposes the national symbol (“the flag”) with the casual image of “shorts,” reflecting the integration of patriotism into everyday American life. In the Russian cultural context, however, the sign «флаг» carries stronger political and ideological associations. By preserving the colloquial tone («тоже неплохо смотрится»), V. V. Feshchenko retains the original irony, but the translation intensifies it, making the line sound more provocative and politically charged.

7. Media Code

Original:

Everyone enjoyed the explosions.

Translation:

Все любовались взрывами.

The verb *enjoyed* in the original and *любовались* in the Russian translation intensify the aestheticization of destruction. From a semiotic perspective, the translation emphasizes the spectacularity of violence, making the cultural code sharper and more disturbing compared to the original.

This line reflects the media code of the late twentieth century, where catastrophic events become consumable visual content. While the English verb *enjoyed* implies passive satisfaction, V. V. Feshchenko's choice of the Russian verb *любовались* ("gazed with admiration") intensifies the meaning by associating aesthetic appreciation with destruction. As a result, the translation amplifies the original critique of media desensitization, turning casual enjoyment into a disturbing sign of the aestheticization of violence.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that the translation of literary texts—specifically within radically avant-garde movements like Language Poetry—functions not merely as a linguistic substitution, but as a complex semiotic process of cultural transfer. Through a comparative analysis of Bob Perelman's poem "China" and its Russian translation by V. V. Feshchenko, this research illustrates that a translator acts as an active cultural mediator. Rather than mechanically replicating the source text, the translator constructs a functional "secondary text" situated within the coordinates of the target semiosphere. The semiotic analysis revealed several key mechanisms through which linguistic and cultural transformations occur in the translation. Numerical, logical, and technological codes are transferred mainly through literal translation and calquing. This strategy enables V. V. Feshchenko to preserve the characteristic features of Language Poetry, including the defamiliarization of everyday language, the rejection of lyrical expressiveness, and the presentation of language in its flat, impersonal form.

At the same time, social, material, and political codes undergo noticeable semiotic shifts within the Russian cultural context. The replacement of the conversational folks with *народ* and the neutral hat and shoes with the colloquial *шмотки* demonstrates how the historical and cultural associations of the target language reshape the original meanings. As a result, the existential dimension of the source text is partially reinterpreted as a critique of consumer culture and collective identity.

Finally, media and political codes acquire greater semiotic weight in translation. The choice of *любовались* instead of the more neutral *enjoyed* intensifies the aestheticization of violence, while the image of the flag evokes stronger ideological associations in Russian culture. These shifts do not alter the

overall meaning of the poem but amplify its critical potential within the target cultural environment. Ultimately, the findings confirm that cultural transfer is an interpretive process rather than a simple linguistic substitution. While preserving the conceptual core of the source text, the translator adapts individual cultural and semiotic codes to the conventions of the target culture. The layered code analysis employed in this study demonstrates how literary translation reconstructs meaning across cultures and may serve as a useful approach for further research in translation studies, semiotics, and intercultural communication.

REFERENCES

- [1] Espagne M., Werner M. History of Cultural Transfers in Europe. – Paris: CNRS Éditions, 1997. – 412 p.
- [2] Bachmann-Medick D. Kul'turnye povoroty: novye orientiry v nauках o kul'ture [Cultural Turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture]. – Moscow: NLO, 2017. – 580 s. [in Rus.]
- [3] Aldabergenova A.A., Gizdatov G.G. Cultural transfer in the semiotic model of translation (based on the example of a literary text by J. Heller) // Bulletin of Shokan Ualikhanov Kokshetau University. Philological Series. – 2024. – №2. – Pp. 20-31.
- [4] Gizdatov G.G., Kim S.K. Perevod literatury absurda kak primer kul'turnogo transfera («Sluchai» Daniila Kharmsa na koreiskom iazyke) [Translation of the absurdist literature as an example of cultural transfer (“Cases” by Daniil Kharmis in Korean translations)] // Slovo.ru: Baltic Accent. – 2024. – Vol. 15. – №1. – S. 158–171. [in Rus.]
- [5] Lotman Y.M. The Structure of the Artistic Text. – Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 1970. – 224 p.
- [6] Eco U. How to Say Almost the Same Thing. – Moscow: Progress, 1990. – 352 p.
- [7] Even-Zohar I. Polysystem Theory of Literature. – Jerusalem, 1978. – 284 p.
- [8] Toury G. Translation as a Sociocultural Process. – Paris: Sorbonne, 1985. – 210 p.
- [9] Nergaard S. Translation and Transmigration. – London: Routledge, 2021. – 220 p.
- [10] Kiose M.I. Lingvisticheskoe konstruirovaniye i kognitivnoye modelirovaniye vnimaniya v tekste [Linguistic Construction and Cognitive Modeling of Attention in the Text]: Monograph. – Moscow: MSLU Pub., 2021. – 412 s. [in Rus.]
- [11] Zyкова I.V. Lingvokreativnost' v razlichnykh tipakh diskursa: media, politika, literatura [Linguocreativity in Various Types of Discourse: Media, Politics, Literature]: Monograph. – Moscow: Subbota Pub., 2024. – 416 s. [in Rus.]
- [12] Jameson F. Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. – Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991. – 314 p.

[13] Probsthein Ya., V. V. Feshchenko V. Ot “Chernoi gory” do “Yazykovogo Pisma”: An Anthology of Contemporary U.S. Poetry. – Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2022. – 728 s. [in Rus.]

«LANGUAGE POETRY» ҮЛГІСІНДЕГІ ӘДЕБИ АУДАРМАДАҒЫ МӘДЕНИ ТРАНСФЕРДІҢ СЕМИОТИКАЛЫҚ АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ

*Джайлганова Д.А.¹

*¹Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және
әлем тілдері университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Мақалада әдеби аударма мәдени трансфердің семиотикалық үдерісі ретінде қарастырылады, мұнда поэтикалық аудармада мәдени кодтардың қалайша түрленетініне ерекше назар аударылады. Осы тәсіл аясында аударма тек лингвистикалық процедура ретінде ғана емес, өзге семиосферада қызмет ететін қосалқы мәтінді жасау үдерісі ретінде түсіндіріледі. Ерекше назар аудармашының мәдени медиатор ретіндегі рөліне аударылады, ол қабылдаушы мәдениеттің нормалары мен күтулеріне сәйкес эмоционалдық, символдық және эстетикалық мағыналарды қайта жаңғыртады.

Әдіснамалық тұрғыдан зерттеу әдеби аудармадағы мәдени трансфер үдерістерін талдауға мүмкіндік беретін салыстырмалы-салғастырмалы мәтіндік талдауды, семиотикалық және құрылымдық талдауды, лингвомәдениеттанымдық әдістерді және герменевтикалық интерпретацияны біріктіретін пәнаралық сапалық тәсілге негізделеді. Талдау материалы ретінде «Language Poetry» мектебі аясында қарастырылатын Боб Перельманның «China» (1981) өлеңі мен оның В. В. Фещенко орындаған орысша аудармасы алынды. Зерттеуде сандық және космологиялық сілтемелерді, күнделікті прагматикалық формулаларды, технологиялық және урбанистік бейнелілікті, материалдық мәдениет элементтері мен саяси символиканы қоса алғанда, бірқатар семиотикалық кодтар айқындалады, сондай-ақ бұл кодтардың аудармада қалай сақталатыны, түрленетіні немесе қайта пайымдалатыны талданады.

Зерттеу нәтижелері поэтикалық аударманың мәдени қайта пайымдаудың күрделі үдерістерін қамтитынын көрсетеді: кейбір семиотикалық құрылымдар салыстырмалы түрде тұрақты болып қалса, ал басқалары аударылатын тілдің мәдени конвенцияларына сәйкес күшейтіледі немесе қайта құрылымдалады. Жұмыста аударма символдық реконструкцияның бір формасы әрі жаңа мәдени мағыналар қалыптасатын мәдениетаралық диалогтың кеңістігі ретінде қызмет атқарады деген қорытынды жасалады. Кеңірек тұрғыда алынған нәтижелер аударманы шығармашылық және интерпретативтік практика ретінде қарастыратын семиотикалық тәсілдің

маңыздылығын айқындап, аударматану, поэтикалық мәтінді талдау және мәдениетаралық коммуникация салаларындағы заманауи ғылыми пікірталастарға үлес қосады.

Тірек сөздер: мәдени трансфер, лингвокреативтік аспектілер, поэтика, семиотика, әдеби аударма, мәдени кодтар, қосалқы мәтін, мәдениетаралық диалог, «Language Poetry» мектебі

СЕМИОТИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ КУЛЬТУРНОГО ТРАНСФЕРА В ЛИТЕРАТУРНОМ ПЕРЕВОДЕ НА ПРИМЕРЕ «LANGUAGE POETRY»

*Джайлганова Д.А.¹

*¹Казахский университет международных отношений и
мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается литературный перевод как семиотический процесс культурного трансфера с особым вниманием к тому, каким образом культурные коды преобразуются в поэтическом переводе. В рамках данного подхода перевод понимается не просто как лингвистическая процедура, а как создание вторичного текста, функционирующего в иной семиосфере. Особый акцент делается на роли переводчика как культурного медиатора, который воссоздаёт эмоциональные, символические и эстетические смыслы в соответствии с нормами и ожиданиями принимающей культуры.

Методологически исследование опирается на междисциплинарный качественный подход, сочетающий сравнительно-сопоставительный текстовый анализ, семиотический и структурный анализ, лингвокультурологические методы и герменевтическую интерпретацию, что позволяет исследовать процессы культурного трансфера в литературном переводе. Материалом анализа послужили стихотворение Боба Перельмана «China» (1981) и его русский перевод, выполненный В. В. Фещенко, рассматриваемые в контексте школы Language Poetry. В исследовании выявляется ряд семиотических кодов, включая числовые и космологические отсылки, повседневные прагматические формулы, технологическую и урбанистическую образность, элементы материальной культуры и политическую символику, и анализируется, каким образом эти коды сохраняются, модифицируются или переосмысливаются в переводе.

Результаты исследования показывают, что поэтический перевод включает сложные процессы культурной реинтерпретации: одни семиотические структуры остаются относительно стабильными, тогда как другие усиливаются или переоформляются в соответствии с культурными конвенциями языка перевода. В работе делается вывод о том, что перевод функционирует как форма символической реконструкции и как

пространство межкультурного диалога, в рамках которого порождаются новые культурные смыслы. В более широком плане полученные результаты подчёркивают значимость семиотического подхода к переводу как творческой и интерпретативной практике и вносят вклад в современные дискуссии в области переводоведения, анализа поэтического текста и межкультурной коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: культурный трансфер, лингвкреативные аспекты, поэтика, семиотика, литературный перевод, культурные коды, вторичный текст, межкультурный диалог, школа «Language Poetry»

*Мақала түсті / Стаття поступила / Received: 13.04.2026.
Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации / Accepted: 25.09.2026.*

Information about the author:

Damelya Jailganova – Lecturer, PhD student, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: damelya9999@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4103-244X>

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Джайлганова Дамеля Абатқызы – оқытушы, докторант, Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: damelya9999@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4103-244X>

Информация об авторе:

Джайлганова Дамеля Абатқызы – преподаватель, докторант, Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: damelya9999@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4103-244X>