

ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 811.111'27:811.161.2'27

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32838/2663-6069/2020.3-3/01>**Ahieieva V. O.**

Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University

Lymar M. Yu.

Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University

AUDIOMEDIAL TEXT AND ITS FEATURES IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

The article analyzes the concept of audiomedial text and its peculiarities in the aspect of modern linguistics. In particular, attention is focused on the comparison of the approaches for defining the concept of audiomedial text, the research of its peculiarities, the analyses of the components included in the audiomedial text, thanks to which the essence of this concept and the aspects of translation of the audiomedial text are defined, which poses some difficulties for the translator due to the factors of temporal limitation and the need for informative translation.

It is singled out that under the definition of audiomedial text we understand a special type of clear and perfect text with the existing verbal and non-verbal elements. Distinctive features of audiomedial texts are polyphony and multichannel. Among the components of audiomedial text researchers distinguish space-time aspect and the audiovisual method of perception. Within the audiomedial text, there are linguistic and nonlinguistic semiotic systems. The linguistic system includes symbols. A nonlinguistic semiotic system is represented by signs-indexes and signs-icons. Audiomedial text categories include integrity and connectedness, and audiomedial text is marked by its discrete nature, allowing for its membership. The study of audiomedial text is also related to the notion of film discourse, which, in its turn, is classified according to a number of criteria, including the criterion of content, purpose and communication principles, according to the degree of informativeness, by genre and target audience.

The translation of audiomedial texts is connected with both linguistic and technical peculiarities, as the translator should adhere to the principle of equivalence and adequacy of the translation. At the same time, the process of translating the audiomedial text is due to the fact that the movie is limited by the time limits of the sound, and it may also be complicated by the process of introducing comments. It complicates the translation process of audiomedial text and the need to create a film dialogue that should be as informative and understandable as possible. When translating, it is also necessary to consider that between the image and the text material is a bond, so it is necessary to consider verbal and non-verbal expressions of expression.

Key words: audiomedial text, film discourse, equivalence, verbal expressions, non-verbal expressions, signs.

Formulation of a research problem. Particular interest of researchers is devoted to the specific language of the film and the structure of audiomedial text, which is an excellent characteristic of polyphony and multi-channel. Specificity of audiomedial text lies in the interaction of a number of semiotic codes (languages, sounds, gestures, facial expressions, sets, etc.), which are designed to form the meaning of cinematographic works and to determine the nature of its influence on the target audience. The viewer as the addressee of the film and a participant

of the artistic interaction receives information not only from the verbal message, but also as a result of the interaction of units of different systems. The values are not only words and phrases, but also the details of the frame, illumination, angle, pattern, musical accompaniment, installation [4, p. 90].

The concept of "audiomedial text" is quite often seen in the works of modern researchers. Yu. Tsivyan writes about the audiomedial text the following: "In a certain approximation any movie can be defined as a discrete sequence of continuous areas

of the text. Let's call this sequence audiomedial text". This phenomenon, from the point of view of Yu. Tsivyan, is a "chain of nuclear frames". In this way, a certain message that is inherent in audiomedial may be revealed only after consideration of at least two nuclear frames and finding out which types of accession they carry out. The researcher concludes that the unit of the audio-medial text acts a pair of nuclear personnel [3, p. 109–111].

Analysis of the latest research into this problem proved that the study of an audiomedial text is of particular interest of scholars, especially if we talk about its features in the aspect of translation. Audiomedial texts have been studied by many scholars. Among them we may easily distinguish I. Antonio, V. Fedorov, A. Karasyk, S. Konshyn etc.

The main task of the article is to analyze the approaches to the definition of "audiomedial text", to study its primary features, to compare the definitions of audiomedial text components, and to describe the substantial peculiarities of translation for audiomedial texts.

Statement regarding the basic material of the research. V. Fedorov proposes to understand audiomedial text as "a message containing information and laid out in any form and genre of films (fiction, documentary, animation, educational etc.)" [4, p. 36]. Audiomedial text is regarded as a special type of text, which, according to M. Efremova, is a clear and complete creation, for the expression of which a whole complex of verbal (linguistic) and non-verbal (iconic and/or index) elements are used. The organization of this creation is determined by the "plan of the collective functionally differentiated author with the help of cinematographic codes, fixed on a material carrier and intended for reproduction on the screen and on the audiovisual perception of the spectator audience".

M. Efremova highlights the following components in the structure of audiomedial text: the general element, the relevance of audiomedial text as a communicative unity, the actuality of the linguistic form of a type of a text, narrative, thematic and problematic relevance of audio medial text [2, p. 3]. All these elements are organized in a special way and are in unbreakable unity, making holistic character of audiomedial text. In this type of text, two semiotic systems are represented – linguistic and non-linguistic, which use signs of different character: the first one – symbols-characters, and the second one – signs-indexes and signs-icons.

Linguistic and non-linguistic signs of audiomedial text can be sound and visual. Linguistic sound

signs are the language of the characters, voice-over language signs, texts sound of songs signs etc. Non-linguistic signs are natural and technical noise, music, and visual images of characters, landscape, interior, used by special effects etc.

The set of linguistic and non-linguistic sound and visual signs make up audiomedial text in the widest sense of this concept. The main text categories of the audiomedial text are the connectedness and integrity, that is completeness. Audiomedial text is characterized by its discrete nature. This type of texts is divided into episodes that have a formal and meaningful independence. On the other hand, the meaningful independence of an episode of audiomedial text is relative, as it requires a support for the entire audiomedial text [2, p. 6].

The cognitive nature of the film discourse is examined in the spectrum of a synergistic paradigm based on dichotomy of the whole – integrity (R. Jakobson, N. Antijev, L. Kiyashchenko Y. Kolodin), according to which the recipient (spectator) constructs and interprets content in the sphere of consciousness through the process of cognition, taking into account his own "cognitive baggage". In the aspect of interaction between language and society, the film discourse is exploited by the prism of ideologies, and it is described in the works of J. Androsopoulos, F. Rossi, M. Bednarek and M. Dainel. At this point of view, the film discourse is considered as an instrument of propaganda and ideological influence. Western linguists analyse the film discourse from the semiotics position.

P. Vollen claimed that the role of the icons is much more important than the role of indexing signs, and semiologists and linguists exaggerated the value of characters-symbols. Thus, within the framework of the theory, it represents the unity and synthesis of different linguistic and non-standard signs, where signs-indexes include intonation, cries, shifters, natural and technical noise, in staffing music, video sequence, signs-icons – sound production, gestures, facial expressions, characters-symbols, as a rule, represent a language component – credits, inscriptions in the film itself (written), language of the actors, voice-over text (oral) [1, p. 103].

I. Kovalenko convinced that in the video series the verbal component dominates in the narrative film structure, but the verbal makes the cinematic discourse plausible and closer to life. S. Kozloff, who called for the greater focus of attention on film dialogues, was the proponent of this view, because the focus on the visual aspect leads to contradictions in interpretation of the film discourse in general.

After S. Kozloff, J. Jackal analyzes how the genre determines the use of verbal elements. The researcher also offers his own 4-stage technique of analyzing the film: detailed intonation and transcribe; stuffing scenario; separation of verbal and audiorial components; allocation of figurative and neutral-literary elements in the script text to the characteristics of the characters. Film discourse as a system of signs is also investigated by S. Zaychenko, Yu. Tsyelm, M. Voroshilov. The fundamental principle of semiotic analysis of the film discourse is the interdisciplinarity, what is the methodological basis for the theory of discourse, intercultural communication, linguistics, history, sociology, basic methods of which (semiotic, introspection, methods of discourse analysis) explain the interaction of the verbal subsystem with other semiotic subsystems. I. Kovalenko treats the film discourse as a three-level syncretic system or “creolized” unity that represents its own text, the semiotic space, and the result of intersemiotic translation. A number of scientists (M. Bednarek, for example) propose to use the film discourse as a means of studying sociotics, professional jargon and non-legal language. However, opponents of this point of view argue that tactics of the most accurate representations of local dialects are “surrogate of speech activity”, the collective author-directive strategy, because the level of styling in the film discourse is much higher than in the real communication [5, p. 151]. This view reflects the so-called reflective approach to the analysis of the film discourse, initiated by S. Hollom and N. Koupland.

Thus, F. Rossi argues that the film discourse is “unreliable means of studying life situations, since it is carefully spelled out with a small percentage of improvisation”. Therefore, according to the author, film dialogues are closer to literary works, than to spontaneous broadcasting. However, M. Alvarez-Pereyre does not agree with this point of view, because, while being a linguistic artifact, socio-artistic phenomenon and a reflection of real speech, the film dialogue represents a separate genre, extremely promising for further research. F. Rossi even offers a chart of differentiation conversational-writing levels of film text.

Continuing the tradition of studying the film discourse in the aspect of narratives and summarizing the achievements of D. Bordvela, E. Hrangana, S. Četmena, M. Kuhn and I. Schmidt, the main features of the film discourse are identified as different from narrative text: the presence of several narrative structures connected by the installation; visual-auditive dimension of the narrative representation; the presence

of a multimedial narrator or “combined audio-visual-verbal instance”, which includes specific cinematic techniques and technologies; “double timeline / double tempo logic” (external dimension – length of the film, internal dimension – duration of the events covered); the presence of the collective author; establishment of a clear causal logic of developments and subject-object relations even in the absence of a coherent narrative continuum. The role of indexes (sounds, noise) in the creation of the viewer’s effect is extremely important. An implicit interaction between the narrator and the audience with the help of internal monologues, human resources, “multiple focalization”, which includes constant oscillations from the narrator to characters or from hero to hero; no dominance between verbal and visual.

The film discourse is classified according to a number of criteria: according to the meaning criterion, for the purpose and communicative principles, according to the nature of the component of informativeness, by the genre and the target audience.

A. Zaretska also points out a collective addressee with the characteristic “socio-cultural heterogeneity” [4, p. 152]. The characteristic of the film discourse is that the role of recipient is always active, which determines the heterogeneity of the interpretation [4, p. 153]. Other features of the film discourse the author also counts are the principles of “audience listening” (S. Kozloff) or “dual expression effect” (V. Gorshkova); bulleted start and the end messages (credits at the beginning and in the end); the defined duration; planned and clearly designed nature of depicted reality; double transmitter information (director and screenwriter); reproducibility (possibility of viewing), which gives viewer the ability to control the process of perception. The film discourse operates at two communication levels: “inter-character” (interaction between the characters), Addressee-Recipient (the audience interpretation of the collective address plan).

The film discourse is classified according to a number of criteria:

1) by meaning criterion: artistic (movie) and documentary film discourse. A significant scientific tour of documentary film theory was made by Adrian, according to whom a documentary film is “skillfully constructed artificial reflection of reality”;

2) for the purpose and communicative principles: cooperative (communications oriented to harmonious interaction) and the conflicting film discourse (real or imaginary contradictions between actors exist);

3) by the nature of the component informativeness: normative and professional;

4) by the genre and the target audience (theatrical discourse, dramatic film discourse, comedy film discourse, psychological film discourse, detective film discourse, historical film discourse, youth film discourse, animated film discourse). According to the communicative purpose, there are three components of the actual film discourse: the formal/official film discourse (direct script, posters, trailers, accompanying advertising campaigns), critical film discourse (reviews of film critics, bookmaker forecasts), spectator film discourse (feedback from viewers) [3, p. 53].

In modern cinemiology the tendency to delineate the adjacent notions to indicate the film discourse is released: film, film dialogue and actual film discourse (Ye. Kolodina, S. Kopyaff, V. Gorshkova). Within the framework of the semiotic paradigm, the term “film text” is dominant, based on the unity of the linguistic (signs and symbols) and non-linguistic (signs-icons, signs-indexes) systems. The concept of film dialogue is singled out by V. Gorshkova, who define it as a verbal component of the discourse of a certain film, the completeness of which is provided by the audiovisual (sound spectator) series. V. Gorshkova also uses such terminology series as “image-time” and “image-movement”.

However, as a rule, the film dialogue is considered to be a sphere of realization of the film discourse, “meaning in the space of film discourse”, rather than synonymous with the concept. The actual film discourse is regarded as a “continuum of film and film discourse”, where the latter acts as an abstract environment for the implementation of the components called “synergetically dynamic space”. The Western linguists pay considerable attention to the televised dialogue (M. Bednarek, R. Pyatzza) and the television discourse (S. Hall, T. van Dejk, M. Tulan).

A television discourse is interpreted as a “kind of film discourse, a creolized formation characterised by communicative-pragmatic addressing, quasi-sponsiveness, reproducibility, fragmentation, based on a somewhat generalized and simplified, stereotyped picture of the world” [5, p. 88]. S. Hall offers an alternative approach to decoding television discourse, the main postulates of which are the following: the dominant position (the audience directly and without changes perceive the encoded information, that is, acts “within the dominant code”), a contractual position (the decode takes the main code at the abstract level, but devits on a personal level), the opposite position (complete rejection of the main code). There is the unity and synthesis of different linguistic and the characters, characterized by the logistics, completeness, and connectedness within the theory of the film discourse.

The motion text is a coherent, and complete message expressed by the verbal (linguistic) and non-verbal system, organized in accordance with the plan of the collectively-functional differentiated author with the use of cinematographic codes, fixed on the material copy and intended for reproduction on the screen and audiovisual perception of viewers. The translation of the film is related to the peculiarities of not only linguistic but also of technical nature that influences the degree of equivalence and adequacy of the translation of the source language, as well as its technical implementation on the screen (i.e. synchronicity of the actor’s articulation and replicas of the duplicers).

The perception of the film within foreign culture complicates the process of actualization of its interdiscursive ties, which influences the interpretation of this film text both qualitatively (some elements get another interpretation, stipulated by typological differences of cultures) and quantitatively (some elements, do not have equivalents in another culture, they are ignored by foreign language audience or deliberately removed during the interpretation). The verbal component of the film is a film dialogue.

The wide artistic possibilities of movies, free operation of time and space, which became possible due to the mounting principle, interdependence of elements of different semiotic structures define two important peculiarities of the film dialogue: its implicit character and interdependence of verbal means and other elements of the film language. The film dialogue consists of replicas; replicas, in their turn, are subdivided into: 1) character broadcast; 2) character thoughts; 3) onomatolith (sound).

The main distinguishing features of the film dialogue, which determine the process of its translation, are that, firstly, the film text is limited to the time limits of sounding, which excludes the introduction of comments. Secondly, the film dialogue is intended for instant perception and reaction of the viewers, respectively, should be informative and understandable. And, thirdly, the film dialogue is accompanied by video, which leads to the choice of possible translation: when working with it, it is important to consider the communication of an image and a text material, to pay the same attention to verbal and non-verbal aspects.

Movie translator of the comic film is a kind of bridge of transfer to the recipient by means of the incoming language of information, laid down in the animated film, and therefore he is a participant in the film discourse. The film’s discourse is the process of bilingual intercultural communication between the addressee and the address, during which the process of transferring from the address (collective author) to the addressee

information, encoded in the form of semiotic marks (signs-indexes, signs-icons, signs-symbols) with the help of cinematographic codes (frame, stage, etc.) is taking place. In the film's Discourse, the film interpreter works with animated film text which is a creolized text, i. e., contains verbal (movie dialogue) and non-verbal system. The translator is equally important to assess the extent of participation of linguistic and nonlinear means of creating the image in order to provide an influence, adequate to the original that the viewer had, given that translation is the secondary communication that takes place in the new socio-cultural context. Within the movie, the film interpreter works directly with the film dialogue, which recorded in writing in the installation letters.

Thus, the film discourse is an abstract space, against which the dialog is revealed (as the time-spatial unity of verbal and audiovisual images) and cinematic text (as the unity of the iconic systems). At the same

time, as linguistic artifact, socio-artistic phenomenon and representation of the real broadcasting, film dialogue constitutes a separate genre, very promising for further research.

Conclusions. Researchers define audiomedial text as the text characterized by verbal and non-verbal components in its structure. The unity of linguistic and non-linguistic visual signs creates audiomedial text in its full sense. The primary peculiarities of audiomedial texts in the aspect of translation are the facts that the translation is faced with the lack of time for sounding which, in its turn, leads to impossibility of usage of commentaries. The next fact about the translation is that it must be short, informative, and understandable for everyone. And, finally, the third fact is that we should take into consideration the connection between the image and the textual material, therefore, not to neglect verbal and non-verbal means of expressiveness.

References:

1. Бодрова А. А. Невербальные элементы конструирования контекста интерпретации в кинотексте. *Вестник Нижегородского университета имени Н.И. Лобачевского*. 2009. № 1. С. 208–210.
2. Горшкова В. Е. Перевод кинодиалога в свете концепции Жюль Делёза. *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22 «Теория перевода»*. 2010. № 1. С. 16–25.
3. Мороховский А. Н. Стилистика английского языка. Киев : Вища школа, 1984. 247 с.
4. Рецкер Я. И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. Москва : Р. Валент, 2004. 240 с.
5. Ягода О. В. Стилистика комического: проблемы та перспективи. *Нова філологія*. 2001. № 2(11). С. 92–102.

Агєєва В. О., Лимар М. Ю. АУДІОМЕДІЙНИЙ ТЕКСТ ТА ЙОГО ОСОБЛИВОСТІ В СУЧАСНІЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ

У статті проаналізовано поняття аудіомедійного тексту та його особливості в аспекті сучасної лінгвістики. Зокрема, увагу зосереджено на порівнянні підходів до визначення поняття аудіомедійного тексту, досліджуються його особливості, здійснюється аналіз компонентів, які входять до складу аудіомедійного тексту та завдяки яким повністю розкривається сутність цього поняття, а також розглядаються аспекти перекладу аудіомедійного тексту, що становить певні труднощі для перекладача у зв'язку з факторами часової обмеженості й потребами в інформативності перекладу.

Виявлено, що під аудіомедійним текстом ми розуміємо особливий тип чіткого та довершеного тексту з наявними вербальними й невербальними елементами. Відмінною характеристикою аудіомедійного тексту є поліфонія та багатоканальність. Серед компонентів аудіомедійного тексту дослідники виокремлюють просторово-часовий аспект та аудіовізуальний спосіб сприйняття. У межах аудіомедійного тексту виділяють лінгвістичну й нелінгвістичну семіотичні системи. До лінгвістичної семіотичної системи належать знаки-символи. Нелінгвістична семіотична система представлена знаками-індексами та знаками-іконами. До текстових категорій аудіомедійного тексту належать цілісність і зв'язність, а сам аудіомедійний текст характеризується своєю дискретною природою, що допускає можливість його членування. Дослідження аудіомедійного тексту також пов'язане з поняттям кінодискурсу, який своєю чергою класифікується за низкою критеріїв, зокрема: за змістом, метою та комунікативними принципами, за ступенем інформативності, за жанром і цільовою аудиторією.

Переклад аудіомедійних текстів пов'язаний як із лінгвістичними, так і з технічними особливостями, оскільки перекладач має дотримуватися принципу еквівалентності й адекватності перекладу. Водночас процес перекладу аудіомедійного тексту зумовлений тим фактором, що кінотекст обмежений часовими рамками звучання, і через це може ускладнитися процес введення коментарів. Ускладнює процес перекладу аудіомедійного тексту також потреба у створенні кінодіалогу, що має бути максимально інформативним та зрозумілим. Під час перекладу також необхідно враховувати, що між зображенням і текстовим матеріалом є зв'язок, тому варто враховувати вербальні й невербальні засоби вираження.

Ключові слова: аудіомедійний текст, кінодискурс, еквівалентність, вербальні засоби вираження, невербальні засоби вираження, знаки.