

**PECULIARITIES OF TRANSLATION WITH REGARD
TO THE LINGUOCULTURAL AND SOCIOCULTURAL ASPECTS****ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ З УРАХУВАННЯМ
ЛІНГВОКУЛЬТУРНОГО ТА СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНОГО АСПЕКТІВ****Drabov N.Yu,***orcid.org/0000-0001-7332-6309**Lecturer at the Department of Theory and Practice of Translation
Uzhhorod National University***Тымчык М.Р.,***orcid.org/0009-0001-9763-3378**Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Lecturer at the Department of Applied Linguistics
Uzhhorod National University*

The article examines the peculiarities of translation between English and Ukrainian, and the challenges of overcoming the ethno-linguistic barrier in interlingual communication. Particular attention is paid to the influence of social and cultural factors on the meaning of linguistic units and their transmission. According to the study, language is not only a tool for transmitting thoughts but also a means of shaping them. It serves as a cognitive model of reality, influencing the perception and understanding of the surrounding world. At the same time, language reflects social and cultural processes within a specific community, acting as an integrative mechanism and shaping cultural norms and values.

The article analyzes the relationship between language and thought, as explored in numerous cognitive linguistics, philosophy, and psycholinguistics studies. In particular, the linguistic relativity hypothesis (Sapir-Whorf) emphasizes that language structure organizes cognitive processes, affecting thinking and perception. It is determined that translation is a unique form of intercultural communication that facilitates interaction and integration of different cultures. Successful translation requires the translator to understand both cultures deeply, adapt the text to the target audience's characteristics, and convey the original's functions in a new cultural context. Thus, the translator acts not only as a linguistic expert but also as a specialist in intercultural communication.

It is emphasized that the translator must be doubly culturally competent, possessing not only deep linguistic knowledge but also an understanding of cultural context, specific social values, traditions, and norms that shape worldviews and influence information perception. This includes analyzing cultural realities, identifying hidden meanings, and selecting appropriate means to convey them in another linguistic community. Such an approach ensures the accuracy of content transmission and the functional alignment of the translation with the cultural and social expectations of the target audience.

According to these findings, translation is a key tool of intercultural communication, uniting different cultures and promoting mutual understanding and integration. The success of a translation depends on the translator's high level of linguistic and cultural competence, his ability to consider the impact of language on thought formation, and his skill in adapting the text to the cultural and social peculiarities of the target audience. Future research perspectives include analyzing the adaptation of culturally specific elements, developing recommendations for translators, and studying the impact of modern technologies on translation quality in the context of globalization.

Key words: translation, language, culture, interlinguistic and intercultural communication, linguistic units, relationship and interaction of language and culture, cognitive linguistics, intercultural competence.

У статті досліджуються особливості перекладу між англійською та українською мовами, а також труднощі, що виникають у подоланні лінгвоетнічного бар'єру в міжмовній комунікації. Особлива увага приділяється впливу соціальних і культурних чинників на зміст мовних одиниць та їхню передачу. Згідно даної розвідки, мова є не лише інструментом передачі думок, а й засобом їхнього формування. Вона виконує функцію когнітивного моделювання реальності, впливаючи на спосіб сприйняття та осмислення навколишнього світу. Водночас мова відображає соціальні й культурні процеси в межах певної спільноти, виконуючи роль інтеграційного механізму та формуючи культурні норми й цінності.

У статті проаналізовано зв'язок між мовою та мисленням, який розглядається в численних дослідженнях когнітивної лінгвістики, філософії та психолінгвістики. Зокрема, гіпотеза лінгвістичної релятивності (Сапіра-Ворфа) підкреслює, що структура мови організовує когнітивні процеси, впливаючи на мислення та сприйняття. Визначено, що переклад – особлива форма міжкультурної комунікації, яка забезпечує взаємодію та інтеграцію різних культур. Успішний переклад вимагає від перекладача глибокого розуміння обох культур, адаптації тексту до особливостей цільової аудиторії та здатності передати функції оригіналу у новому культурному контексті. Таким чином, перекладач виконує не лише роль мовного експерта, але й спеціаліста з міжкультурної комунікації.

Наголошується, що перекладач має бути подвійно культурно компетентним, тобто володіти не лише глибоким знанням мов, а й розумінням культурного контексту, специфіки соціальних цінностей, традицій і норм, які формують світогляд та впливають на сприйняття інформації. Це включає здатність до аналізу культурних реалій, виявлення прихованих смислів і вибір адекватних засобів для їх передачі в іншій мовній спільноті. Такий підхід забезпечує не лише точність передачі змісту, але й функціональну відповідність перекладу культурним і соціальним очікуванням цільової аудиторії.

Отже, переклад є ключовим інструментом міжкультурної комунікації, який об'єднує різні культури, сприяючи взаєморозумінню та інтеграції. Успішність перекладу залежить від високого рівня лінгвістичної та культурної ком-

петентності перекладача, його здатності враховувати вплив мови на формування мислення і світогляду, а також від вміння адаптувати текст до культурних і соціальних особливостей цільової аудиторії. Перспективи подальших досліджень включають аналіз адаптації культурно-специфічних елементів, розробку рекомендацій для перекладачів та вивчення впливу сучасних технологій на якість перекладу в умовах глобалізації.

Ключові слова: переклад, мова, культура, лінгво-культурна комунікація, взаємозв'язок та взаємодія мови й культури, мовні одиниці, когнітивна лінгвістика, міжкультурна компетенція.

Statement of the problem and its meaning. At the current stage of science development, the need for a comprehensive study of language and socio-cultural processes in their functional interaction is becoming increasingly obvious. The expediency of such an approach is due to the impossibility of considering a number of the most important linguistic phenomena in isolation from the conditions of the functioning of society and the development of its culture. Accordingly, accounting for the linguistic context is of great importance for the adequate coverage of issues in the field of view of such related scientific disciplines as cultural studies, sociology, history, theory and practice of translation, etc.

The purpose. Modern linguistics increasingly focuses on understanding a nation's cultural consciousness through language. Language is the primary medium for humans to convey or exchange emotions, opinions, ideas, and views. It is a powerful communication tool, providing order, meaning, and coherence to abstract thoughts. One of its most important functions is the expression of identity. People from different communities or regions often use distinct languages for communication. The question of whether language reflects culture is central to linguistic studies.

The novelty. The growing importance of intercultural communication in today's globalized world highlights the need to systematize modern educational methods and techniques. Successful intercultural communication requires high intercultural competence, including linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge. It's essential to have a sufficient vocabulary and understand the extralinguistic meaning of words, linking them to cultural and historical contexts. The relationship between language and culture has long been a focal point for linguists, and despite different approaches, most agree on their close connection. This work explores the interaction of language and culture from a specific perspective without attempting to cover this complex and multifaceted topic exhaustively.

Practical implementation. Inclusion in the dialogue of cultures awareness of the role of the native language and culture reflected in the culture of another nation contributes to strengthening the communicative and cognitive motivation of students.

Linguistic phenomena, according to many researchers, are not only a means of communica-

tion and information transfer, but also a way of getting acquainted with the realities of another culture. Therefore, studying the features of different language terminologies is an important step on the way to mastering foreign language competence. When studying the language, it is worth focusing on the study of different layers of the vocabulary as a repository of cultural and historical information about the people who speak the language. In this way, we consider language as a means of storing cultural and historical information [9].

Analysis of studies and publications. For quite a long time the specifics of the relationship between the concepts of «language» and «culture» have been considered in the works of linguists, philosophers, logicians and in research on the theory and history of cultural studies. The problem of the interaction of culture and language was studied at different times by W. Humboldt, O. Potebnia, M. Kostomarov, E. Sepir, B. Whorf, V. Rusanivskyi, A. Wierzbicka and others. According to these linguists, language and culture are inseparable and the scholars do not consider them as separate systems because their influence on each other is undeniable. We also adhere to this opinion, with the present article supporting of it.

Presentation of the main material. Today, the issue of the connection between language and culture remains polemical, since any method of solving it can hardly be fully exhausted as the multifaceted nature of this problem determines its complexity and ambiguity. The very study of the relationship between the phenomena of «language» and «culture» is complicated by the lack of a clear and consistent definition of the concept of «culture». Specialists count dozens of definitions, and they operate a wide range of interpretations of the concept «culture» making it difficult for a non-culturologist to navigate in this sea of definitions. As a result, most often we have to be satisfied finally with an everyday view of «culture». Without going into the details of these definitions, we can note that culture is often identified with the entire set of spiritual and material values created by man, or with a historically acquired set of rules within society for its preservation and harmonization.

Therefore, there exists a whole series of definitions of the concepts of «language» and «culture». The term «culture» refers to the way of life, customs, and beliefs of a certain group of people during a spe-

cific period. Culture covers the entire lifestyle and lifeway of the community members, as much as this very community needs it. Accordingly, the idea of the role of language in the cultural process (as, for example, a part / element / tool / form of culture, etc.) varies. In general, the range of assessments includes either the complete dissolution of language in culture (and language is often wrongly attributed only to a purely instrumental role), or, on the contrary, the denial of a direct relationship between both phenomena. Researchers usually apply the concept of culture in a broader sense – as a set of material and spiritual values created by man. Moreover, the language is considered a mold, pattern, model, or even a matrix of this or that cultural layer, as a historically changing set of meanings, fixing the cultural progress of that society and its historical evolution. In other words, language records the layers of civilization, many of which are the subject of specialized etymological studies.

Language is a peculiar mirror of culture, which reflects not only the real world and the environment of a person, not only the real conditions of their life, but also the public self-consciousness of the people, their mentality, national character, way of life, traditions, customs, morality, the system of values, worldview and the world perception. Language preserves cultural values in vocabulary, grammatical systems, phraseology, proverbs, sayings, folklore, fiction and scientific literature, and written and oral forms of speech. Language serves as a means of naming everything that exists in culture, but it also reflects, models, and shapes it and unfolds and develops itself in culture.

Since domestic and foreign linguists consider language and culture indivisible and interdependent, with the study of a foreign language being regarded as possible only in the context of the corresponding culture, the need for a comprehensive study of linguistic and sociocultural processes in their functional interaction is obvious. And that is how the vast majority of linguists of the 20th century, as well as modern linguists consider the problem.

The views of the representatives of Noam Chomsky's school will prove to be an exception to the general vision. N. Chomsky, a prominent modern American linguist, is known for his psychological research on language. The scientist himself and his followers do not support the idea of the indivisibility of language and culture, arguing for the idea of the universality of human languages and the existence of an internal structure common to all languages [18, p. 11–12]. In his famous linguistic theory of language learning, N. Chomsky states that a person

comes into this world with the innate ability to speak, and the very process of speech development and acquisition of language skills is based on the study of language structures and grammar. N. Chomsky's theory is also known as biolinguistics. What he confirms in this theory is the existence of specific structures in our mind, which allow, firstly, the production of language and, secondly, the understanding of the message, regardless of the language. Therefore, the relative similarity in language learning in different cultures and the ease of learning a native language in childhood is due to the innate ability to understand everyday language structures, such as, for example, SVO (Subject – Verb – Object) in the English language. Thus, according to N. Chomsky's linguistic theory of language learning, children do not study language through influence and imitation. Still, they learn to associate their innate knowledge of the syntactic structures of the language with a limited set of words (also known as the lexicon), which is replenished throughout their life. This theory, having given rise to a new concept of linguistics, was later revised and modified by N. Chomsky himself into the theory of Universal Grammar (UG).

However, the issue of the relationship between language and culture does not belong exclusively to modernity. This is an ancient topic, which for centuries has been the cause of disputes among a number of scientists and thinkers. Some of them, starting with the ancient Greek philosopher Plato, argued that language creates culture, since ideas and concepts are embedded in our heads from birth, like veins in the depths of marble even before the sculptor begins to carve a figure out of it [18]. Others (W. von Humboldt and his followers) believed that language is a child of culture, and it reflects the entire national character. Language, in their opinion, depends on the spiritual strength of the people, it is an external manifestation of the spirit of the people: «The language of the people is its spirit, and the spirit of the people is its language» [21, p. 54–56].

Among the Ukrainian scientists, the one who supported this idea was the outstanding linguist, philosopher, literary critic, teacher, and doctor of philology O. Potebnia. In his philosophy of language, the starting point for the scholar was Humboldt's idea about language as an activity (*energeia*) of the spirit, about the creation of thought in language. O. Potebnya postulates the closest connection between language and thinking and according to his theory thought proves to reveal itself through language, with every speech act being creative and bearing the imprint of uniqueness. So, the process of communication is dialogic, understanding always involves misunderstanding.

Referring to the word «speech», O. Potebnia singles out its external form (articulated sound), content (meaning, thought), and internal form (image). The latter is determined by the originality of the folk (national) language with its unique perspective of vision and unique worldview. Thus, in O. Potebnia's theory language is believed to be the most important means of communication and knowledge exclusively in the context of culture [5, p. 25–26]. As a linguist, literary critic and philosopher O. Potebnia considers myth, folklore, and literature as modeling systems derived from language. Therefore, he puts the language in another essential relationship – to the people and the nationality (nation). Language is a product and manifestation of the «people's spirit»; it also outlines the national independence of the community, encoding a unique national worldview in the structures of the «intermediate» world created by it. This is the language where O. Potebnia finds the unique way and possibility for every person and every community to perceive the world, that is why the scholar strongly protested against denationalization as a mental, emotional, and spiritual decay. Even though O. Potebnia won respect among all philologists of the Russian Empire, as evidenced by the Lomonosov Prize, the researcher never betrayed the department of his native Kharkiv University and censured denationalization: «At all denationalization comes down to bad education, to moral illness: to incomplete use of the available means of perception, assimilation, influence, to a weakening of the energy of thought; to the abomination of desolation in the place of repressed but not replaced forms of consciousness; to the weakening of the connection between younger generations and adults, replaced only by a weak connection with strangers; to the disorganization of society, immorality, foulness and meanness» [17, p. 77–78].

A similar idea regarding the close relationship between culture and language is expressed by a modern philologist, Ukrainian linguist V. Rusanivskiy: «Man created culture, and culture created man. A person is realized in the culture of thought, the culture of work, the culture of language. Language is not only a means of communication, but also a natural reservoir of information about the world primarily about the people» [8, p. 6–8].

In the 1920s and 30s, American anthropologist and linguist Edward Sapir together with linguist Benjamin Whorf put forward their hypothesis about the relationship between language and culture. Scientists consider language as a cultural code of a nation and not just as a means of communication and knowledge. As evidenced by a number of scientific observations, it is the very culture that proves to be

the key to understanding and learning a language. After all, vocabulary that characterizes everyday life, phenomena from the life and history of one country, often do not have exact equivalents in the language of other nations. «No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached,» – Sapir emphasizes [19, p. 214]. That is, the world in which this or that people exist is completely original, and this originality is created not only by its own set of concepts. Besides, he espoused the viewpoint that because of the differences in the grammatical systems of languages, no two languages were similar enough to allow for perfect cross-translation. Sapir claimed that the speakers of different languages perceive reality differently because different languages represent reality differently. On the other hand, Sapir explicitly rejected strong *linguistic determinism* by stating: «It would be naive to imagine that any analysis of experience is dependent on pattern expressed in language» [19, p. 214–218].

The supporters of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis also believe that cognition does not have an objective universal character, because similar phenomena essentially form different pictures due to differences in thinking. At the same time, it is pretty fair that the history of language and the history of culture develop in parallel. The semantics of the language reflect the general, universal components of universal human culture and the distinctiveness of the culture of a particular nation [19].

In the context of our topic regarding the relationship between the phenomena of «language» and «culture», it seems appropriate to mention the significance of faithful, proper translation and one of the most essential issues of translation, namely the search for correspondence, or equivalents, for the designation of concepts, objects, phenomena in different languages. Modern linguistics claims that only proper names, geographical names, scientific and technical terms, days of the week, names of months, and numbers have complete lexical correspondence in different languages and different cultures. But even this correspondence can be questioned. An example will be the Ukrainian word *неділя*. Or, relatively, its translation into different languages and a brief analysis of the word's etymology. In all Slavic languages, except for Russian, the name of this day of the week comes from the concept of «not working», and «having nothing to do». So, in Ukrainian the word «неділя» is used, in Bulgarian «неделя», in Belarusian «нядзеля», in Serbian «неделя», in

Macedonian «недела», in Polish «niedziela», in Czech «nedele», in Slovak «nedel», in Croatian «nedjeija», etc. Among the northern Germanic tribes, this day – the first day of the week – was dedicated to the Sun, so the name of this day has its roots in paganism. The first part of the word means «sun»: English «Sunday», German «Sonntag», Norwegian and Danish «Sondag», Dutch «Zondag», etc. And in the Russian language, the equivalent is «воскресение». The meaning of the very word is «resurrection», the etymology of the word «воскресение» naming the day of the week has purely Christian roots as it is associated with the resurrection of Jesus Christ that took place on this very day of the week.

Though thinking and language of the people are influenced by external factors, those of the surrounding world, are nevertheless formed first of all in their own, native environment. Therefore, the same lexical form (unit) in each language can hide very different concepts that are created in the depths of the history of its culture. But neither native speakers themselves, nor even more so foreigners, usually do not realize where, how and when this process takes place. We agree with the opinion of the prominent Polish linguist Anna Wierzbicka that a person's perception of the world is primarily determined by his native language, and this process is unconscious. After all, as a rule, we do not know why we put this or that meaning in a native word.

The linguist claims that every language has «key words» that lose their meaning when literally translated into another language, and transferred to a foreign culture. These words express essential concepts from various spheres of people's lives, which semantically do not coincide with their linguistic equivalents in another language, because when searching for equivalents in the target language, the component accountable for making up the essence and specificity of culture is lost. Having little or no knowledge at all about the way of life and traditions of the people, no understanding of the style of thinking, as well as knowing nothing or very little about culture and history, it is difficult or even impossible to translate such words. In her opinion, this applies to concepts such as «privacy» or «committed» in English, «душа» and «туга» in Ukrainian [20]. It is known that as lexical units, these words do not exist in a cultural vacuum. For a citizen of the United States of America, they are associated with the tradition of individualism and in Slavic states – with the Orthodox worldview.

When rendered into the English language, be it spoken or written variant, the Ukrainian word «душа» (corresponding the English «soul») is often interchanged with the word «heart» (corresponding Ukrainian «серце»). For example: *від душі* – with

all my *heart*; брати за *душу* – to touch sb. to the *heart* / to tug at someone's *heartstrings*; в глибині *душі* (відчуваю...) – in my *heart*/in my *heart of hearts* (I feel that...). Phraseological dictionaries give a number of stable expressions with the word «heart», which in the Ukrainian translation is «душа»: go to one's *heart* and to come home to one's *heart* ~зворушити до глибини *душі*, знайти відгук у чийсь *душі*; to open / uncover / pour out one's *heart* to sb – вилити / відкрити *душу* кому-небудь; he wears his *heart* on his sleeve – він *душевна*, щира людина; single *heart* – *душевна* простота/*прямодушність*.

Quite often, the Ukrainian word «душа» in the English translation is «mind» (the word corresponding Ukr. «розум»). For instance: чистий *душею* – *pure-minded*; спокій в *душі* / *душевний спокій* – peace of *mind*; *однодушно* / *одноставно* –with one *mind*; до *душі*, до вподоби – to one's *mind*; відкрити *душу* –open one's *mind*; камінь з *душі* звалився – off one's *mind*; відводити *душу* – to disburden one's *mind*; *душевний* спокій – an easy *mind*; великодушність – a high *mind*; *душевна* простота – *singlemind* [14]. In the English proverb «Face is the index of *mind*», the word «mind» is also used to denote «soul» (ukr.: «душа»): «Обличчя – дзеркало *душі*». At the same time, in the Latin counterpart, the word «anima», that is, «soul», «душа» is present: «Vultus est index *animi*» [11].

On the basis of idiomatic expressions, proverbs and sayings of ancient Roman and Latin origin, as well as biblical texts, we can state that the Ukrainian word «душа» (Latin «anima») is not often rendered into English by means of its equivalent «soul» in these texts. Still sometimes it happens: Lat.: «Не бійтеся тих, що вбивають тіло, *душі* ж убити неможуть; а бійтеся радше того, хто може погубити *душу* і тіло в пеклі». – Eng: «And do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the *soul*; rather fear him who can destroy both *soul* and body in hell» (Matthew 10:28).

(The following examples are taken from [11]): Lat.: Magnificat *anima* mea Dominum – Ukr.: Величає *душа* моя Господа. – Eng: My *soul* glorifies the Lord. Rather often the word denoting «soul» is omitted when translating into English:

Lat.: De profundis clamavi ad te Domine – Out of the depths I call to you, Lord = 3 глибини *душі*я взиваю до тебе, Господи (Ps., 130:1).

Lat.: ...*anima* measi cuterrasinea quatibi – Ukr.: ...*душа* моя прагне Тебе, як води пересохла земля – Eng.: It thirst for you like a parched land. (Ps., 142:6);

Lat.: Et per desomnes, quitrubulant *animam* meam – Ukr.: І вигуби всіх, хто ненавидить *душу* мою – Eng.: Destroy all who attack me (Ps., 142:12);

Lat.: *Anima satur calcatur favum* – Ukr.: Сита душа топче і мед щільниковий – Eng.: One who is full, tramples on virgin honey (Pr., 27:7).

Besides, the Ukrainian word «душа» can be rendered by the English one *life* (і. е. Ukr. «життя»):

Lat.: ... quia ad te levavi *animam* meam – Ukr.: ... бо до тебе підношу я душу свою – Eng.: ... for to you I entrust my *life* (Ps., 142:8);

Lat.: In patientia vestra possidebitis *animas* vestras – Ukr.: Терпеливістю вашою души свої ви здобудете – Eng.: By your perseverance you will secure your *lives*. (Лк., 21:19)

There is one more «key word» which may cause certain difficulties in the process of translation into English, according to Anna Wierzbicka, a Polish linguist. In the Ukrainian language it is rendered as «тужа». The word can be explained or interpreted for a foreigner as follows: «That is a kind of longing a person feels when wants something, but does not know exactly what; he or she only knows that it is unattainable» – this is the definition given by Anna Wierzbicka to this concept, in such a way depriving it of its mystery [20]. Ukrainian «тужа за Батьківщиною» can be *homesickness, longing after home, nostalgia*. If a person yearns, misses his or her native home (in Ukrainian «тужити за рідним домом») such a feeling can be conveyed by the English phrase «be *homesick*»: e.g. Живучи у Сполучених Штатах, вона страшенно тужила за Україною – Living in the USA she was terribly *homesick* for Ukraine. However, longing at separation is «*wrench*»: Leaving Uzhhorod had been a *wrench* for us – Нам було дуже важко покидати Ужгород. Here are some more instances of rendering the concept: гіркота розлуки – *the wrench of saying goodbye*; тужити за кимось, дуже скучити, сумувати – *tomissomebody*; тужити, томитися – *to yearn for/ after*; e. g.: тужити, сумувати за друзями, котрих немає поряд – *to yearn after absent friends*; томитися на чужині – *to yearn for home*. Another shade of meaning of the Ukrainian «тужа» is grief, sorrow, sadness. E.g.: Проїшло вже два роки після смерті Лори, та він все ще *глибоко тужить* за нею. – It has already passed two years after Lora's death but he still nurses his sorrow for her behind her.

So, the concept of «тужа» contains a number of different ingredients in Ukrainian, such as *смуток, печаль, журба, ностальгія, сум, скорбота, томління духу, меланхолія*. And although for each of these feelings in the English language you can choose your counterpart from the synonymic row *sadness, sorrow, grief, nostalgia, languor, dolour, melancholy* it is difficult to express and convey all shades of the meaning of the word «тужа».

If it is not possible to find an adequate equivalent for a word, it is worth mentioning a descriptive or explanatory translation. After all, every language has a non-equivalent vocabulary, including words to denote specific cultural phenomena, usually such units do not have a one-word translation into another language. When translating, a specialist must find an opportunity to convey such vocabulary descriptively or use borrowed words which are also called exotisms. This can be achieved using a loan word or a loan word plus an explanation. Besides, translation by cultural substitution or translation by paraphrase can be used. Denying a possibility of translation would mean agreeing with the opinion of the Slavophiles of the Soviet era, who claimed that «the Russian character is so elusive and so intangible for foreigners, that it is impossible for others to cognize it». The translator's task is to skillfully possess professional competence, as well as knowledge of not only language, but also culture, to use various types of translation strategies to ensure adequate translation of even, at first glance, untranslatable lexical units denoting concepts characteristic of a certain culture, a separate nation.

Returning to the topic of the relationship between language and culture, we assert that language is inherently cultural, as it reflects various norms and factors in both subtle and explicit ways. A language may develop sayings that reflect cultural norms, slang terminology that reflects cultural trends, or even syntax that reflects cultural beliefs. Language is a part of culture and plays an important role in it. Since any language not only contains a nation's cultural background, but also reflects a national view of life and way of thinking, when studying a foreign language, one should do it exclusively in the context of two cultures.

We offer, as confirmation of this statement, to mention the so-called «optimistic language» or «positive language» of Americans. The fact that most Americans are optimistic about life is a well-known one. The mentality of Americans has long been the subject of close attention of representatives of other nationalities and cultures [22]. Due to specific historical circumstances, Americans have been inculcated in the power of «positive thinking» since early childhood, which implies a positive attitude and optimistic mood towards the world. It is evident that Americans try to fix their optimistic attitude to life in their language as well [22]. For example, goods that can barely be sold are not called «illiquid goods», but «minor flaws or imperfections or defects» or just «not the most optimal assortment». In Ukrainian it might sound like «не найбільш оптимальний асортимент». If the employer refuses

you after the interview, they say you did not have a complete mutual understanding («there was a failure to achieve mutual understanding or there was a lack of mutual understanding»). In Ukrainian it could be «не склалося повного взаєморозуміння». Any mass layoff will be called «staff optimization» (rationalizing the workforce/downsizing). It could be rendered into Ukrainian as «оптимізація штатів». And in the field of real estate trade, the word «cozy» will actually mean «very tight, there's nowhere to turn around».

It is common knowledge that Americans are actually used to both thinking and expressing themselves positively. That is why foreigners in the USA, when speaking English, often make a mistake related to «positive language» [13]. This is especially related to the incorrect understanding of the word OK. In its origin, this word is an exclamation, but in terms of its meaning it has a much wider sense, so it is very often used in the English language. One of the most famous publications in the USA about human relations – the book by Dr. Thomas Harris – is called by the author «I'm OK, you're Ok» where he sets out to elucidate how we can understand our behavior using simple terminology.

«Everything's fine, everything's OK», – this is how Americans often answer the question: «How are things?» Unfortunately, many foreigners in the US not only use OK but sometimes misuse and misapply it. This happens when they want to express their approval or agreement, and automatically insert too much positive charge in OK. As a result, it is used by non-Americans too often and loses any meaning.

Although OK is not as popular among Americans as in other countries, the USA is probably the only place on the planet where the semantics of this word are not distorted. Here it is not a «regular» word, even though it is often used colloquially. In a formal business environment, OK is usually not used [13]. Example: responding to the boss's request «Could you please have your report ready by 4 p.m.?» it is not recommended to answer «OK, sure», it is better to say: «Yes. Of course / Certainly / Will do». In an informal setting, OK often acts as confirmation upon an already agreed arrangement: «So we're meeting at 7 at Sam's place for a talk, right?» – «OK then / OK, fine / OK. See you later.» OK is also used when the speaker asks a question or makes a request, expecting a positive answer: «Is it OK with you if the Browns join us? – Of course, that's OK. – I'll be glad to see them».

OK can also be used in the sense of «normal» or «not bad / good enough», but not in the sense of «wonderful»: «How are you feeling these days? – Good, I'm OK, but lately I've been rather tired for

I'm terribly busy.» Or, for example, «How was the performance? – It was OK, though nothing special... / It was an OK play but to tell the truth I wouldn't recommend it/ It was OK, but I'm not crazy about it».

A Ukrainian phrase with a positive connotation «Ну, а він таки нічого!» in no case should it be translated literally: «Well, he's just nothing!», but it can be translated with OK: «Well, he's OK!» or «Well, he's all right!». Though depending on the intonation and logical stress the phrase «Well, he's OK» can render something like «Ну, він так-собі...» in Ukrainian. That is why not only lexical and grammatical means are of great significance while translating.

OK can also mean consent, provided there are some circumstances or facts that one of the interlocutors must necessarily take into account: «Mom, I am to go out for a minute. I'll come in no time. – OK, but hurry up. You must come by 11:00. Otherwise we'll miss the bus».

In other contexts, especially if this word is repeated several times, OK indicates the speaker's irritation and dissatisfaction: «So please do remember to buy bread! – OK, OK! How many times will you say that?» We often forget the ambiguity of OK, believing that this word always means only an affirmation («Yes, all right» meaning «yes, I agree»). However, when used in a question form, it can mean «Did you understand me?» («You understood me, didn't you?»). For example, «Sorry, but we don't sell alcohol to teenagers, OK?». Such a question form does not require an answer at all. Here OK is close in meaning to the Ukrainian «Зрозуміло? / Understood?»

Ukrainians and Americans, as a rule, address a passerby who has slipped or grabbed their heart in different ways. The Americans, in view of their positive thinking, will say: «Are you OK?» In this case, a Ukrainian will most likely ask a question like: «Can I help you?» or «Are you unwell?», which will sound quite logical, although more gloomy.

These and many other nuances once again confirm the fact that any foreign language must be studied in the context of two cultures, taking into account the differences that exist in the mentality and culture of different countries, as well as their historical and national characteristics.

Conclusions from the study. Therefore, most linguists agree that language and culture are inseparable; they are interconnected, interdependent, and indivisible. Language is not only influenced by culture, but it is also incomprehensible without it. It serves not only as a means of creating culture but also as a fundamental component of it. While some specialists may view language and culture as separate

entities, they are, in fact, systems that interact closely with each other, influencing thinking and communication. Language shapes an individual's thoughts, as well as societal values and beliefs, guiding how a person perceives and interprets the world.

The influence of culture on language is undeniable and shapes the uniqueness of lexical and phraseological expressions, regulatory and stylistic systems, and speech etiquette. However, the impact of language on culture is often less visible, emerging only over time. The process of finding equivalents and addressing translation specifics between English and Ukrainian emphasizes that translation is a dialogue between cultures. This dialogue allows one culture to reveal itself more fully and deeply to the other.

Language is inherently cultural, as it not only reflects societal norms and values but also plays a vital role in encoding and transmitting culture across generations. The language we speak mirrors our beliefs and values, and these elements are inseparable. Language

is the medium through which humans think, engage in cultural activities, and communicate with one another.

Ultimately, linguistic and cultural diversity is a valuable aspect of human civilization, and translation plays a crucial role in preserving this diversity. As a unique form of interlinguistic and intercultural communication, translation facilitates understanding and interaction between different linguistic and cultural communities, enriching our collective heritage.

The prospects for further research include a deeper analysis of the influence of cultural factors on linguistic structures and the mechanisms of their translation. An important direction is studying the adaptation of culture-specific elements in translation, as well as exploring the role of modern technologies in the translation process, especially in the context of globalization. Additionally, it is necessary to develop methodological approaches to enhance the effectiveness of intercultural communication and improve translation in the framework of intercultural dialogue.

REFERENCES:

1. Бик І. Теорія і практика перекладу. URL: <https://moodle.znu.edu.ua/pluginfile.php/571239/>
2. Карабан В. Переклад англійської наукової і технічної літератури. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2008. 576 с.
3. Коваленко А. Загальний курс науково-технічного перекладу: навчальний посібник. 2001. 290 с.
4. Лімбах Ф. Лінгвокраїнознавчий аспект підготовки перекладачів. К.: Вища школа, 2001. 108 с.
5. Потебня О. Думка й мова (фрагменти). *Слово Знак Дискурс Антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / За ред. М.Зубрицької. Львів, 1996. 633 с.
6. Потебня О. Естетика і поетика слова: збірник / Упоряд., вступ. ст., приміт. І. Іваньо, А. Колодної; Пер. А. Колодної. К.: Мистецтво, 1985. 302 с.
7. Потебня О. Про купальські вогні та споріднені з ними уявлення. *Фольклористичні зошити*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 167–188.
8. Русанівський В.М. Історія української літературної мови. К.: АртЕк, 2001. 392 с.
9. Сотниченко, В., Гупан. М. Лінгвокраїнознавчий аспект навчання іноземної мови. Львів: Сіач, 2005. 112 с.
10. Франчук В. Олександр Опанасович Потебня: Сторінки життя і наукової діяльності. К.: Видав. дім Д. Бураго, 2012. 376 с.
11. Цимбалюк Ю., Кобів І., Смурова Л., Латун Л. Біблійна мудрість у латинських афоризмах українською та англійською мовами. Науково-навчальний посібник. Вінниця: НОВА КНИГА, 2003. 410 с.
12. Faul S. Xenophobe's Guide to the Americans. Oval Books: 2008. 77 p.
13. Words and Their Stories: Where Did 'OK' Come From? URL: <https://learningenglish.voanews.com/a/ok--85357622/115551.html>
14. Англо-український фразеологічний словник / Уклад. К.Т. Баранцев. 2-ге вид., випр. К.: Т-во «Знання», КОО, 2005. 1056 с.
15. Практичний англо-український словник фразеологічних синонімів / Авт.-уклад.: Береза Т. А., Коцюк, Л. М., Кулинський О. С. Львів: БаК, 2011. 400 с.
16. Балахтар В., Балахтар К. Адекватність та еквівалентність перекладу. URL: <http://www.confcontact.com/20110531/fk-balahtar.htm>
17. Потебня А. Язык и народность. *Юрій Шевельов. Мова, національність, денаціоналізація*. Нью-Йорк: Українська Вільна Академія Наук у США, 1992. С. 77–116. URL: <https://diasporiana.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/books/2300/file.pdf>
18. Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. Second edition. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002. 118 p. URL: https://tallinzen.net/media/readings/chomsky_syntactic_structures.pdf
19. Sapir E. The Status of Linguistics as a Science. *Language*. 1929. Vol. 5 No. 4. URL: <http://www.bibleresearcher.com/sapir.html>
20. Wierzbicka A. English: Meaning and culture. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication. Oxford University Press, Inc., 2006. URL: <http://eprints.dinus.ac.id/6245/1/33895172-English-Meaning-Culture.pdf>
21. Humboldt W. von. On Language: On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species / ed. by M. Losonsky; translated by P. Heath. Cambridge University Press. URL: https://assets.cambridge.org/97805216/67722/frontmatter/9780521667722_frontmatter.pdf
22. The Power of Positive Thinking: Raising Resilient Kids. URL: <https://brightchamps.com/blog/positive-thinking-for-kids/>