

CULTURE AND IDEOLOGY IN TRANSLATION PERSPECTIVE

КУЛЬТУРА ТА ІДЕОЛОГІЯ КРІЗЬ ПРИЗМУ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

Tulupov O.V.,

orcid.org/0000-0001-6788-577X

PhD Student at the Mykola Lukash Translation Studies Department

V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University

The article examines the interconnection between culture, ideology, and translation, emphasizing their influence on modern translation studies and the translator's decision-making process. It explores how cultural and ideological factors shape translation strategies, affecting both textual interpretation and audience perception. The study highlights that translation extends beyond linguistic equivalence, functioning as a mechanism for cultural representation and ideological negotiation.

Special attention is given to the role of culture in translation, including its impact on social norms, historical traditions, and artistic expressions. The article underscores the challenges translators face when dealing with culturally specific elements, such as folklore, customs, and symbolic references, which may not have direct equivalents in the target language. The translator's choice between domestication and foreignization is analyzed, illustrating how translation either preserves cultural uniqueness or adapts content for better audience accessibility. These decisions ultimately shape how cultural identity is transmitted across languages.

The article explores as well the ideological dimension of translation, demonstrating how political, institutional, and editorial influences affect the selection of words, rhetorical structures, and textual modifications. It is shown that translation is not a neutral act but rather a process of ideological mediation, where even minor linguistic adjustments can alter the ideological message of a text. The study examines how ideology manifests in translation through censorship, selective omissions, lexical choices, and discourse framing, all of which contribute to shaping public perception.

The research further discusses how culture and ideology often overlap in translation, creating a complex interplay that affects textual meaning. Translators must navigate ethical and communicative dilemmas, ensuring accuracy while considering socio-political implications. The study concludes that understanding the dual influence of culture and ideology is essential for producing translations that are not only linguistically accurate but also contextually and ideologically aware.

Future research may focus on developing strategies to balance cultural authenticity and ideological representation, particularly in the context of globalization and digital media.

Key words: culture, identical/different features, ideology, modern translation studies, translator's choices, translation problems.

У статті досліджується взаємозв'язок між культурою, ідеологією та перекладом, акцентуючи їхній вплив на сучасні перекладознавчі студії та процес ухвалення рішень перекладачем. Аналізується, яким чином культурні та ідеологічні чинники формують стратегії перекладу, впливаючи на інтерпретацію тексту та його сприйняття аудиторією. Доведено, що переклад виходить за межі простої мовної еквівалентності, виступаючи механізмом культурного відтворення та ідеологічного посередництва.

Особлива увага приділяється ролі культури в перекладі, зокрема її впливу на суспільні норми, історичні традиції та художні прояви. У статті наголошується на викликах, з якими стикаються перекладачі при передачі культурно специфічних елементів, таких як фольклор, звичаї та символічні реалії, які можуть не мати прямих відповідників у мові перекладу. Аналізується вибір перекладача між одомашненням та очуженням, що демонструє, як переклад або зберігає культурну унікальність, або адаптує зміст для кращого сприйняття цільовою аудиторією. Ці рішення зрештою визначають, як культурна ідентичність передається через мови.

У статті досліджено також ідеологічний вимір перекладу, ілюструючи, як політичні, інституційні та редакційні чинники впливають на вибір лексичних одиниць, риторичних конструкцій та текстових модифікацій. Показано, що переклад є не нейтральним процесом, а простором ідеологічного посередництва, де навіть незначні коректури на рівні мови можуть змінювати ідеологічне спрямування тексту. Досліджуються механізми ідеологічного впливу на переклад через цензуру, вибіркові вилучення, підбір лексики та конструювання дискурсу, що може тиснути на формування суспільного сприйняття.

Окремо в роботі розглядається взаємопроникнення культури та ідеології в перекладі, яке створює складну взаємодію, що відображається на семантиці тексту. Перекладачі змушені долати комунікативні та етичні труднощі, забезпечуючи функціональну еквівалентність тексту, враховуючи соціально-політичний контекст. Висновки статті підкреслюють, що розуміння подвійного впливу культури та ідеології є ключовим для створення не лише лінгвістично точних перекладів, але й контекстуально та ідеологічно обґрунтованих.

Перспективи подальших досліджень могли б зосередитись на розробці стратегій балансування між культурною автентичністю та ідеологічною репрезентацією, особливо в умовах глобалізації та цифрових медіа.

Ключові слова: культура, ідентичні/відмінні риси, ідеологія, сучасні перекладознавчі студії, вибір перекладача, перекладацькі труднощі.

1. INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement. Modern Translation Studies underscore the necessity of scrutinizing culture and ideology as core components of translation [1; 2], thus pointing the *actual value* of regarding culture and ideology in translation perspective.

Earlier theories targeted basically on linguistic equivalence [3; 4; 5], but a growing body of studies has shown that translation extends into socio-political domain and cultural contexts. In an interconnected global environment, texts do not often move between languages without reconfiguring their embedded meanings, necessitating a deeper research into the forces shaping these shifts. Neglecting the cultural or ideological matrix heightens the probability of generating misinterpretations with severe ethical and communicative repercussions.

Analysis of studies and publications. Leading scientists emphasize translation's susceptibility to cultural and ideological pressures. Lefevere views translation as "rewriting" that aligns texts with target norms [6], while Bassnett highlights the "cultural turn" in Translation Studies [7]. Venuti's domesticating and foreignizing strategies reveal the moral-ideological weight of translational decisions [8]. Baker explores the reconfiguration of narratives under the pressures of ideological frameworks [9]. Fairclough and van Dijk illustrate how texts encode power relations [10; 11], supported by means of empirical statistics from corpus-based analyses [12]. Despite enormous advances, numerous questions remain about balancing cultural constancy and target audience accessibility, and the extent to which ideology openly or covertly governs translators' choices.

The goal of this article is to show how culture and ideology converge, at times synergistically and at others antagonistically, to influence translation practices. The *specific objectives* include:

- Identifying primary cultural references that translators commonly face with, including but not limited to ceremonies, social structures, and identity markers;
- Analyzing ideological pressures – political mandates, editorial constraints, and personal beliefs – that act as invisible forces steering translation outcomes through both explicit and implicit mechanisms;
- Demonstrating how culture and ideology can prompt the translator to conduct the meaning at each linguistic and socio-political stage;
- Bringing forward the common and distinctive features of culture and ideology from a translation perspective.

By combining multiple approaches, the study emphasizes the complexity of decision-making in

translation within contexts where culture and ideology are dominant.

2. THE NOTION OF CULTURE IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

Presentation of the main material. In the initial trajectory of Translation Studies, practitioners often framed culture as an external setting or context, subordinate to lexical and grammatical priorities [3]. However, paradigm-shifting works in the 1980s and 1990s – especially following the so-called "cultural turn" related to Bassnett and Lefevere – positioned culture as central to academic inquiry in translation [7; 6]. This shift stemmed from the developing cognizance that linguistic signs and indicators are inseparable from the cultural matrices in which they are embedded. Language choices are governed by societal conventions, historical traditions, and shared collective beliefs, each critically shaping the production and interpretation of texts.

From this angle, culture encompasses an expansive array of components, inclusive of social structures (e.g., personality, family, community hierarchies), religious traditions, artistic expressions, customary practices, and deeply held values that underpin the ethos of day-to-day existence [9; 2]. Consequently, translators must negotiate not only the 'visible' facets of language (vocabulary, syntax, style) but also the implicit strata of culture, including a community's shared emotional undercurrents or unspoken behavioral norms. Neglecting these underlying structures can result in translations that seem linguistically accurate yet culturally dissonant, ultimately obscuring the text's complete significance for the target audience.

Culturally distinct elements serve as key junctures where language and cultural frameworks converge in translation [7; 13]. They encompass references to local beliefs, historic figures, mythological concepts, folklore, region names, and different culturally embedded phenomena. These elements often lack direct equivalents in the target culture, therefore posing a predicament for the translator: whether or not to preserve the "foreignness" via retaining unfamiliar terms (a strategy frequently called "foreignization"), or to conform them to align to the target culture's expectations and norms ("domestication") [6; 8]. Each choice includes implications for the textual content's authenticity, readability, and the way the target recipients will engage with it on both a cognitive and emotional level.

From an academic angle, the translator's handling of these elements can profoundly influence cross-cultural perception. For instance, using transliteration or loanwords may respect the cultural identification of the source text however could alienate a segment of

target recipients who find such phrases opaque [2]. Conversely, replacing such elements with approximate regional equivalents or explanatory paraphrases may also beautify accessibility yet risk erasing cultural specificity or reducing complex concepts to superficial generalizations. Scholars argue that these change-offs replicate deeper ideological stances concerning how much a target culture needs to accommodate foreign elements [9; 7].

Empirical studies into translator selection-making of culturally distinct elements have highlighted styles of “explicitation” or “implication”. Studies show, for instance, that translator annotations or explanatory notes can elucidate unfamiliar terms (e.g., *hanbok* or *ongelet*), yet excessive reliance on such tools may fracture the narrative’s coherence [12]. On the opposite, a desire to localize a term completely (e.g., converting a particular cultural event into a prevalent “harvest festival”) may obscure the socio-historical significance that underpins the original. As House [2] argues, each of these strategies affects not simply textual coherence but also the broader dynamics of cultural values and identity politics.

Beyond explicit mentions of historical symbols or region-specific terminology, culture infuses texts with implicit worldviews – cognitive maps that govern how reality is interpreted and expressed [14; 6]. These deep-seated frameworks are evident in how an author builds arguments, structures storytelling elements, or emphasizes specific cultural practices. For instance, a literary text featuring collectivist values may depict characters prioritizing family and societal harmony over individual ambition, whereas a culture with a more individualistic orientation may emphasize individual agency and self-expression [9; 11]. Translators who fail to understand these foundational frameworks risk replicating the text’s literal wording while overlooking its intrinsic resonance.

Interdisciplinary studies display that rhetorical patterns – such as indirectness, cyclical storytelling, or reliance on proverbs – regularly encode communal beliefs [7; 10]. In oral-dominant societies, epics and folklore might serve as repositories of history safeguarding moral lessons, turning narrative tools into cultural signifiers. Subsequently, a “literal” translation that flattens circular plots or mutes symbolic language can misrepresent the text’s cultural logic. Research [7] has confirmed that efforts to impose linear structures on cyclical narratives can erase culturally distinct storytelling models, efficiently “domesticating” them right into a more globally recognizable layout. Although this technique may enhance clarity for some readers, it additionally raises ethical issues about overshadowing local literary traditions in favor of universalized narrative patterns [8].

Culture isn't merely an aesthetic layer of a text; it is intertwined as well with socio-political realities. Texts that invoke national history, collective adversities, or social hierarchies inevitably mirror power relations embedded within cultural institutions [10]. Consider, for instance, an ancient novel set in the period of colonial occupation, where ordinary practices – like clothing fashions, forms of address, or public celebrations – convey symbolic weight referencing oppression or resilience [6]. When rendering these elements, the mediator skillfully navigates the historical burden of political domination and cultural trauma that can complicate the choice to neutralize, highlight, or recontextualize specific details [11].

In addition, some cultural references contain contested heritages. A single festival, for example, might be understood in the source culture as a sign of communal pride but regarded in the target context as potentially contentious if linked to religious supremacy or ethnic tension [7; 6]. Scholars that specialize in postcolonial translation have highlighted that even the apparently neutral depiction of a cultural event can convey undertones of resistance or hegemony when examined through the lens of global power imbalances. Thus, translators must balance not only the text’s embedded cultural codes but also target context where these codes will be reassessed [9; 1].

Current studies show a growing acknowledgment of cultural fluidity – the notion that present-day societies are rarely uniform but rather constituted by interwoven identities, diasporic impacts, and worldwide interconnections [2; 8].

Ethnographic research additionally shows that fluid cultural identities can result in textual elements that resist straightforward domestication or foreignization [14; 11]. A character’s dialogue, for example, might include loanwords from a heritage language, modern urban slang, and old-fashioned terms drawn from ancestral narratives. Translating this mosaic requires a nuanced methodology, frequently employing adaptive equivalences that aim to mirror the effect of linguistic layering. By preserving the layered or hybrid nature, translators enable target recipients to engage with the text’s cultural complexity, even if it questions conventional reading norms [9; 7].

Modern scholarship underscores the indispensability of profound cultural expertise for translators. A superficial command of a language’s grammar and vocabulary is insufficient; translators must understand communal narratives, symbolic artifacts, and social norms to craft nuanced and context-sensitive renderings [2; 6].

Given culture’s close connection to identity, translators carry an ethical burden: their choices can either honor or weaken cultural uniqueness. Domestication

poses a risk of assimilationist biases, while foreignization could alienate local audiences. Achieving equilibrium requires ongoing ethical reflection of the consequences of each translatorial approach [9; 7].

As cultural landscapes worldwide become more fluid, rigid differences between domestic and foreign contexts become less sustainable. Hybrid methods, combining selective preservation of source-culture features with judicious incorporation of explanatory paratexts, have emerged as preferred approaches for acknowledging cultural intricacy without sacrificing comprehension [14; 11].

Empirical studies confirm that translators systematically adapt cultural items to align with target norms, though the degree of adaptation correlates with factors like text genre, publisher policies, and translator preferences [7; 12]. This indicates that culture is not a peripheral aspect but a central determinant of translational outcomes.

The growing prominence of cross-cultural, multilingual, and hybrid identities in texts necessitates further research into how emerging media (e.g., digital platforms, audiovisual media) reshape the understanding of culture in translation. Similarly, sustained focus on how cultural references intersect with power dynamics, ideological frameworks, and globalization trends will likely remain pivotal for Translation Studies in future scholarship [10; 6].

In summary, culture in translation transcends mere decorative layers or background details. Instead, it forms the essential core that gives texts their significance and meaning. By applying thorough cultural insight – historical context, societal norms, and symbolic frameworks – translators can more effectively bridge linguistic gaps, promoting deeper and more compassionate intercultural dialogue.

3. THE NOTION OF IDEOLOGY IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

In modern Translation Studies, ideology typically refers to a structured set of ideas, beliefs, and values that shape how individuals or institutions perceive and engage with social reality [10; 11]. Early linguistically oriented approaches frequently framed translation as a neutral process, focusing on equivalence or fidelity in lexical and syntactic terms. Over time, critical scholarship demonstrated that translation reflects and perpetuates ideological currents, whether intentionally or unintentionally [6; 8]. These insights emerged in part from Critical Discourse Analysis, which examines how language perpetuates power relations across diverse sociopolitical settings [10]. Thus, far from being a merely technical task, translation is now understood as a practice rooted in ideological frameworks, influenced by cultural

norms, political agendas, institutional limitations, and individual biases.

The systematic examination of ideology in translation emerged as prominent in the late twentieth century, propelled by scholars exploring how socio-political forces shape textual creation and interpretation. 6 [6], for example, proposed the concept of “rewriting,” suggesting that all translations are mediated through ideological frameworks shaped by cultural, literary, and political norms. Venuti [8] subsequently contended that domestication or foreignization strategies transcend stylistic choices; they reflect deeper attitudes toward the source text’s cultural “otherness” and stand as ideological positions on how to represent difference. This shift coincided with the broader ‘cultural turn’ in Translation Studies, which expanded the focus beyond narrowly linguistic equivalence to explore how translations shape or contest societal constructs [7; 11].

Empirical studies following these theoretical developments has shown that translators often omit or modify source-text content perceived as politically sensitive or culturally incompatible [9; 2]. For instance, translations of political speeches might soften critiques aimed at specific governments, while academic works from politically sensitive contexts may remove sections that challenge state-endorsed narratives [11]. These practices highlight how ideology operates at both macro (editorial, institutional) and micro (lexical, stylistic) levels, shaping the final text that reaches the target recipients.

Vocabulary usage serves as a key arena for ideological positioning. Terms like ‘terrorist,’ ‘freedom fighter,’ ‘illegal immigrant,’ or ‘undocumented person’ can carry sharply distinct ethical/political connotations [10; 6]. Even seemingly neutral words may be ‘loaded’ with ideological nuances in certain contexts. For example, ‘reform’ might appear innocuous, but in certain political climates, it reflects alignment with a particular agenda or policy discourse [11]. Translators, in selecting which synonyms or collocations to employ, unintentionally participate in reinforcing or challenging the original text’s ideological framing.

Ideology can also be observed through shifts in tone, register, or rhetorical structure. A translator might recast a series of imperative statements into suggestions or conditional clauses, thereby mitigating the text’s authoritative stance [10]. Conversely, intensifying adjectives or exclamations can amplify a political viewpoint, aligning the target version with an agenda more emphatically than the source text. Corpus-based analyses reveal patterns in how politically loaded documents undergo nuanced or overt rhetorical modifications to appeal to new readerships [12].

Beyond lexical adjustments, the excision or incorporation of entire passages – such as cultural references, disclaimers, or ‘sensitive’ content – also reflects ideological mediation [6]. For instance, a government-aligned report might omit a damaging statistic to align with official narratives, while a translator advocating for a cause might supplement footnotes to contextualize injustices allegedly absent in the source [9; 2]. Such examples highlight the translator’s or editor’s agency in shaping the text’s ideological contours through selective disclosure or omission.

The pervasiveness of ideology in translation provokes intense ethical discussions. A central dilemma revolves around whether translators bear a duty to reproduce the source text’s ideological core “verbatim,” even when it clashes with human rights principles, or whether they should modify or censor the material to avoid harm or discriminatory rhetoric [10; 11]. Venuti [8] and fellow scholars contend that absolute neutrality is an untenable notion, positing that each decision – domestication vs. foreignization, addition vs. deletion – originates from an ideological stance regarding the treatment of cultural “otherness” or socially specific content.

Critical Discourse Analysis has emerged as a primary methodological tool for examining these issues. By deconstructing textual features such as modality, metaphor, cohesion, and intertextuality, it seeks to uncover how linguistic structures reinforce or challenge dominant ideologies [10]. As to translations, this involves comparing source and target texts to identify discursive shifts that signal ideological realignment [9; 12]. Researchers using corpus-based methods have documented systematic patterns – such as repeated under-translation of politically charged adjectives or consistent mitigation of derogatory terms – that indicate intentional ideological manipulation [7; 6].

Narrative Theory also serves a pivotal role in highlighting ideology’s impact. 9 [9], for instance, argues that translations are ‘re-narrations,’ restructured narratives that mirror the translator’s cultural stance and the ideological context in which they operate. By examining shifts in narrative structure (e.g., the inclusion of explanatory prefaces or the reorganization of chapters), scholars can identify how ideology alters the text’s internal logic and its audience-oriented perspective [6].

Scholarly consensus holds that ideological embeddedness is inescapable, and no translation is ideologically neutral [10; 6]. Both external forces (state policies, market dynamics) and internal factors (translator convictions) influence how source texts are interpreted and represented.

Translators encounter moral dilemmas when engaging with source material that conflicts with the target culture’s ethical norms or promotes harmful ideologies [9; 11]. Such challenges necessitate structured ethical frameworks, encompassing protocols for managing texts that risk perpetuating harm, while balancing respect for authorial intent and historical accuracy.

Ideology frequently operates in tandem with cultural references, creating a multilayered interplay of meaning. A text’s cultural subtexts can strengthen or moderate its ideological drive, and vice versa [2; 6]. Grasping this synergy is essential for crafting translations that faithfully convey the text’s multifaceted context.

Contemporary discussions on ideology and translation increasingly encompass novel domains such as audiovisual translation (subtitling/dubbing decisions that modify ideological undertones) and machine translation (algorithmic biases embedded in systems that may intensify or distort ideological messaging) [12]. These advancements necessitate sustained academic inquiry to address new challenges in translational ethics and politics.

In essence, ideology in translation embodies the power-driven mechanisms through which linguistic decisions – at lexical, syntactic, or textual levels – reinforce, reshape, or contest socio-political norms. These mechanisms may be dictated by institutional or commercial mandates, shaped by the translator’s individual worldview, or demanded by the source text’s inherent characteristics. Acknowledging and scrutinizing ideology’s ubiquitous influence is therefore essential for a holistic grasp of translation as a practice rooted in the intersection of culture, politics, and ethics.

4. CULTURE AND IDEOLOGY IN TRANSLATION: IDENTICAL AND DIFFERENT FEATURES

While culture and ideology are often treated as distinct constructs in Translation Studies, a number of scholars emphasize their intertwined nature [7; 10; 6]. Both concepts shape how communities perceive themselves and the world, influencing texts at conscious and subconscious levels. When a work crosses linguistic boundaries, these elements often transfer together, affecting how the target audience interprets social identities, power dynamics, and ethical norms embedded in the source material. This section examines how culture and ideology jointly fulfill core functions in translation practices.

Culture and ideology each offer a system of reference – one mostly centered on communal beliefs, traditions, and social routines; the other oriented toward political, moral, or philosophical stances [9; 10].

In practice, they intersect in collective meaning-making, coining a worldview that guides language use. For example, a source text steeped in national history (culture) may advance political assertions (ideology) about historical events, thereby embodying an integrated framework of identity and values [6; 8].

Both culture and ideology encode particular judgments about right and wrong, acceptable and unacceptable [7; 2]. A cultural norm – such as hospitality toward guests or reverence for elders – may intersect with ideological perspectives on hierarchy, social roles, or civic responsibility. Translators who prioritize lexical accuracy alone may overlook how these norms perpetuate wider ideological frameworks (e.g., paternalistic worldviews or nationalist sentiments). Scholars like House [2] contend that recognizing these implicit values is essential for communicating the text's authentic intent and impact, particularly when the target culture operates under divergent foundational principles.

Readers inevitably filter translated texts through their own cultural frameworks and ideological perspectives [9; 14]. In other words, the target audience's cultural and ideological context determines whether certain ideas are perceived as natural or "alien," progressive or objectionable. When a source text advocates values that sharply conflict with the target culture's prevailing ideology, the translator must decide whether to maintain that dissonance or soften it to comfort readers [6; 8]. This interplay highlights how culture and ideology influence not only the textual creation but also its reception, positioning them as joint factors in a translation's acceptance or contentiousness.

Culture and ideology both are engaged in transfers of power – culture through shared norms and heritage, ideology via explicit policies, discourse regulation, or political agendas [10; 11]. In translation, these power transfers emerge when a text either contests or reinforces existing status quo. For example, a novel championing collective solidarity (cultural facet) might concurrently endorse socialist principles (ideological facet), creating a disruptive synergy in an individualistic target environment. Translators thus navigate the delicate task of upholding textual fidelity amid political or market pressures [9; 2].

Despite their shared aspects, culture and ideology differ in significant ways that profoundly influence the translator's approaches and limitations. Scholars widely underscore that recognizing these distinctions enable translators to address ethical, linguistic, and contextual challenges with heightened precision [7; 6; 9].

Culture, fundamentally, is a gradually evolving fabric – woven over generations through shared

experiences, customs, and traditions [7; 2]. Its changes typically unfold incrementally and collectively. Ideology, by contrast, can shift abruptly in response to political events, revolutions, or shifts in governance [10]. A text grounded in enduring cultural practices (e.g., ancient rituals) may retain stability, while references to dominant political ideologies risk becoming outdated amid rapid sociopolitical transformations [14; 11]. Translators working on historically rooted literary pieces often contend with embedded cultural codes, while those handling contemporary political content confront the volatility of immediate ideological shifts.

Cultural norms and practices are often passed down through socialization: family structures, communal rituals, artistic heritages, religious frameworks, or oral traditions [9]. In contrast, ideology is typically propagated through institutional or political channels – government policies, party manifestos, mass media, academic discourse – that shape public perceptions more directly and swiftly [10; 6]. Thus, translators addressing "cultural references" might prioritize connecting symbolic traditions or folk narratives; when handling "ideological content," the emphasis may shift to managing censorship, editorial biases, or state-sponsored messaging [11].

Cultural elements are often deeply implicit, woven into the text's structure or style – such as the use of cyclical narratives or reliance on communal values that remain unspoken but intuitively recognized within the source community [15; 8]. Ideology, by contrast, often surfaces more overtly through slogans, policy declarations, or deliberate lexical selections that signal partisan or doctrinal positions [10]. Translators risk overlooking profound cultural subtexts if they concentrate solely on explicit ideological markers, or conversely, missing covert ideological undertones if treating the text as strictly "cultural" [9; 6]. This twofold challenge necessitates a holistic reading that considers both the unspoken cultural logic and the overt ideological directives.

While culture frequently draws upon shared identity, emotional heritage, and aesthetic values, ideology generally seeks adherence to specific doctrines – whether political, religious, or socioeconomic [7; 11]. A text centered on cultural celebration (festivals, cuisine, traditional arts) may elicit nostalgic or pride-inducing reactions, while one filled with ideological rhetoric might aim to inspire readers toward particular actions or beliefs [6]. This contrast shapes translators' choices in maintaining emotional resonance or rephrasing content for clarity and regional relevance, particularly when the target culture's ideological foundations diverge markedly.

A national holiday speech might intricately intertwine cultural pride (traditional attire, historical milestones, folklore references) with a contemporary political manifesto (appeals for unity, advocacy for a specific governance model). In such cases, the translator confronts a text where cultural components reinforce the ideological narrative [7; 2]. For example, invoking folk heroes functions both as a nod to cultural heritage and as embodiments of national ideals that the political rhetoric aims to promote. The translator's task lies in preserving this dual resonance – ensuring the target audience comprehends the emotional weight of cultural symbols while also recognizing their ideological deployment [6; 8].

In contrast, certain texts exhibit tension where external or emerging ideologies challenge entrenched cultural norms [9]. For instance, a feminist manifesto promoting gender equality in a society with deeply patriarchal traditions may face resistance in the target context if local customs oppose the manifesto's stance. The translator must choose between retaining the confrontational tone – risking alienation or outrage – or softening it for wider appeal [10; 11]. Such tension highlights the ethical complexity of translation, where cultural sensitivity and ideological promotion may conflict.

Some texts, especially those from postcolonial or diaspora backgrounds, exhibit hybrid identities blending ancestral cultural elements with novel ideological viewpoints [6]. For example, a novel by an emigrant author might honor a homeland's folklore while subtly challenging nationalist narratives from a distance. Translators working with such hybrid texts must untangle multifaceted layers of meaning – cultural pride, political critique, historical wounds, and emergent identities. This interplay can be intricate, demanding careful textual adjustments to capture both nostalgia and criticism [7; 2]. Here, the translator's task goes beyond bridging linguistic gaps to mediating a nuanced cultural-ideological dialogue.

Ethnographic inquiries – through interviews with translators, editors, and readers – further clarify the behind-the-scenes pressures shaping the interplay of culture and ideology. Translators frequently cite editorial guidelines aimed at “harmonizing” certain passages to avoid political controversy, thereby weakening original cultural contexts or ideological nuances [2; 8]. Others mention personal convictions compelling them to highlight or tone down specific references they consider ethically or socially significant [9; 10]. Such findings validate the claim that translation is not a neutral transfer but a site of negotiation among cultural authenticity, ideological fidelity, and practical adaptation.

Recognizing the dual influence of culture and ideology necessitates that translators evaluate both overt and underlying signals. A text abundant in cultural elements may harbor implicit ideological assumptions, whereas an overtly ideological text might rely on cultural narratives for validation [7; 6]. A comprehensive analysis identifying these overlaps aids in formulating well-informed translation choices.

Translators must develop a deep grasp of the target culture's sociopolitical landscape, as this knowledge shapes the potential acceptance or rejection of culturally or ideologically distinct elements [10; 11]. Reflexivity – a critical awareness of one's own biases and limitations – enables translators to grapple more transparently with ethical challenges, such as deciding whether to retain contentious content or adjust it to meet editorial requirements.

Balancing cultural authenticity and ideological nuance requires deliberate strategies like footnotes, glossaries, or explanatory commentary. While foreignization emphasizes cultural or ideological distinctions, domestication enhances accessibility; employing a hybrid approach can maintain textual integrity without alienating readers or obscuring significant content [7; 8]. For example, a translator might preserve culturally specific terms pivotal to ideological messaging while adding clarifications to minimize ambiguity.

Scholars stress that the translator's responsibility goes beyond textual equivalence to encompass the possible societal impacts of the translated work [9; 2]. Neglecting to tackle harmful ideological content risks perpetuating oppressive discourses, while excessive rewriting may undermine historical precision or cultural authenticity. Setting ethical guidelines from the start, often in partnership with publishers or clients, helps define the translator's role in handling sensitive cultural and ideological elements [6; 11].

A synthesis of scholarly work demonstrates that culture and ideology operate as interconnected dynamics within translation, jointly shaping and reframing the source text's impact for new audiences [7; 10; 6; 8]. They share the ability to communicate collective values, shape group identities, and steer interpretive results, yet differ in temporal aspects, mechanisms of transmission, and expressive forms. These differences require translators to navigate a complex terrain where cultural fidelity, ideological alignment, ethical considerations, and market demands intersect.

Ultimately, the identical and different features of culture and ideology highlight the intricate nature that lies at the core of translational practice. By recognizing where they overlap (in constructing collective

worldviews and shaping textual reception) and where they differ (in their rate of evolution, institutional mechanisms, and forms of articulation), Translation Studies can better empower scholars and practitioners to produce well-informed, nuanced translations. These translations, in turn, function not as mere linguistic reproductions but as ethically and culturally resonant texts that respect and elucidate the multidimensional facets of human communication.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis confirms that translation is not a neutral process but a dynamic interplay of cultural representation and ideological negotiation, shaped by personal agency, institutional demands, and market pressures. Even seemingly minor textual adjustments can alter the cultural or ideological subtext, profoundly impacting how a text resonates in the target context. Such shifts either mirror or contest entrenched power structures, reaffirming that translation transcends mere technical equivalence.

This research expands current theoretical discourses [6; 16; 8] by demonstrating how culture and ideology interact or clash in real-world translation practices. These insights advocate for further

refinement of theories on translator agency, ethical accountability, and the sociopolitical dimensions of cross-cultural communication.

Integrating culture–ideology analysis into translator curricula fosters heightened awareness of potential biases and ethical dilemmas. Clear, transparent guidelines can help translators navigate political or cultural sensitivities while avoiding excessive distortion of the source text.

Ultimately, culture and ideology stand as foundational pillars in the practice and theory of translation, necessitating ongoing scholarly and professional engagement with their complexities. The translator functions as a key mediator and ethical actor, empowered to either reinforcing or challenging dominant narratives through strategic linguistic choices. Recognizing this high-stakes dynamic underscores the vital role of critical, informed, and context-aware translation in an era of rapid cultural exchange and global interdependence.

The implementation of this evaluation in the study of English-Ukrainian literary translation can shed light on the effect of cultural and ideological troubles which is a promising **prospect** for further research.

REFERENCES:

1. Snell-Hornby M. The turns of translation studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints? Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006. xi, 205 p.
2. House J. Translation quality assessment: Past and present. London & New York: Routledge, 2015. 170 p.
3. Catford J. C. A linguistic theory of translation. London: Oxford University Press, 1965. ix+103 p.
4. Nida E. A. Toward a science of translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. 331 p.
5. Jakobson R. On linguistic aspects of translation. *On translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959. P. 232–239.
6. Lefevere A. Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame. London & New York: Routledge, 1992. viii, 176 p.
7. Bassnett S. Translation studies. 3rd ed. London & New York: Routledge, 2002. 188 p.
8. Venuti L. The translator's invisibility: A history of translation. London & New York: Routledge, 1995. xii + 353 p.
9. Baker M. Translation and conflict: A narrative account. London & New York: Routledge, 2018. 204 p.
10. Fairclough N. Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. London & New York: Longman, 1995. xiii, 265 p.
11. van Dijk T. A. Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. London: SAGE Publications, 1998. 384 p.
12. Zanettin, F. Corpus Methods for Descriptive Translation Studies. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2013. № 95. P. 20-32.
13. Newmark P. A textbook of translation. London: Prentice Hall, 1988. 292 p.
14. Chesterman A. Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997. 219 p.
15. Even-Zohar I. Polysystem studies. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990. 267 p.
16. Toury G. Descriptive translation studies – and beyond. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. 320 p.