

Zdrazko A.Y., assistant lecturer

Kherson national technical university, Kherson

REALIZATION OF STRATEGIC APPROACHES OF DOMESTICATION AND FOREIGNIZATION IN TRANSLATIONS OF CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

The article deals with investigation of realization of domestication and foreignization strategies in translations of children's literature. The author carries out a comparative analysis of Ukrainian translations of English literary fairy tales.

Key words: *children's literature, translation, foreignization, domestication.*

УДК 81'33.811.111

Korotkova I., Senior Lecturer

Alfred Nobel university of Dnipropetrovs'k, Dnipropetrovs'k

SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEM OF LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN FOREIGN LINGUISTICS

The article deals with the problem of language interference, it considers the nature and different approaches to this phenomenon in foreign linguistics. The paper analyses factors that can cause language interference, and the effects of its occurrence are explained.

Keywords: *language interference, target language, interlanguage, contrastive analysis, language acquisition, interference errors, bilingual, bilingualism.*

Characteristics of bilingual speech have been of special interest for many years. Researchers have been studying how language processing actually takes place, how bilinguals mentally organize their languages, and in which manner the two codes interact.

The second language learning environment encompasses everything the language learner hears and sees in the new language. It may include a wide variety of situations. Regardless of the learning environment, the learner's goal is mastery of the target language. The steady accumulation of the mastered entities of the target language, eventually amasses them in quantities sufficient to constitute a particular level of proficiency [1: 65-82].

This characterization of language learning entails the successful mastery of steadily accumulating structural entities and organizing this knowledge into coherent structures which lead to effective communication in the target language [2: 58]. If this is the case, then we would expect that well-formed accurate and complete target language structures would, one after another, emerge on the learner's path towards eventual mastery of the language. If the learner went on to master the language, we could, in principle, tabulate the expansion of his/her repertoire up to the point where all of the well-formed structures of the target language had been accounted for [3: 10].

In reality second language learners appear to accumulate structural entities of the target language but demonstrate difficulty in organizing this knowledge into appropriate, coherent structures. There appears to be a significant gap between the accumulation and the organization of the knowledge [4: (1: 22)].

Extensive research has already been done in the area of native language interference on the target language, in other words, it is the contrastive analysis to what extent the two language systems are separate, and to what extent they share mental representations and mental processes. The investigation of such linguistic phenomenon as interference is of great importance because it is closely connected to such professional fields as terminology, general or technical translation, language teaching, writing interpretation, and computer processing of language.

Thus, on the basis of the analysis of different approaches in foreign linguistics, the main objectives of this article can be formed in the following way: 1. to analyse and differentiate the linguistic terms concerning the phenomenon of language interference; 2. to provide a comprehensive analysis of the nature of language interference; 3. to explain the factors that can cause language interference; 4. to mention the effects of its occurrence.

In the works of such foreign linguists as N. Chomsky, R. Skiba, S. Corder, J. Richards, D. Lott, H. Dulay, R. Ellis, L. Selinker, W. Rutherford, H. Beardsmore and others several linguistic terms concerning the language interference can be found, such as language acquisition, interlanguage, code-switching, code-mixing, lexical borrowing, language transfer, crossmeaning and others. In reality all these terms are different and need to be explained.

In the period 1940s – 1960s *language acquisition* was studied on the basis of the systematic comparison of languages that was to delineate points of similarity and difference between native languages and target ones in order to improve pedagogy.

In the early 1960s behaviorists and linguists established an activity termed ‘contrastive analysis’, in which grammatical structures of languages were examined for their similarities and differences. The intention of this research was to be able to predict sources of difficulty in second language acquisition. The behaviorists viewed language acquisition as habit formation: through the linguistic input of their surroundings and positive ‘feedback’ for correct speech production, learners were said to develop their proficiency. In this process, L1A (Language one Acquisition) was regarded as the ‘building up of habits’, L2A (Language two Acquisition) as the process of relating and making good use of them where the two languages resemble each other, and overcoming these L1-habits where they differ. The theory assumes that learners rely on their L1-habits when acquiring a second language. According to the CAH (contrastive analysis hypothesis), structural similarities are learnt without difficulty, whereas differences between the codes often cause problems. The CAH has more or less been abandoned, as it both failed to predict all of the errors that occurred and falsely suggested errors that were never made. Yet it can hardly be doubted that a learner’s mother tongue has an impact on the acquisition of the foreign language. However, this phenomenon cannot simply be put down to ‘habits’; it is rather a systematic attempt by the learner to use knowledge already acquired in learning [5: 55].

The contrastive analysis hypothesis postulated the existence of positive transfer, resulting from similarity between languages, and negative transfer (or language interference), stemming from difference between languages. The serious limitations of the contrastive analysis hypothesis, which failed to predict some learner errors and predicted errors that did

not materialize, were nevertheless useful in that they focused researchers' attention on the explanation of learner errors rather than on their prediction.

In 1965, Noam Chomsky, a linguist, proposed the theory that all people have an innate, biological ability to acquire a language. He theorized that people possess a Language Acquisition Device (LAD), a sort of neurological wiring that, regardless of the language to be acquired, allows a child to listen to a language, decipher the rules of that language, and begin creating with the language at a very young age. With the LAD they are able to make or understand utterances that they have not previously heard. Their first language is acquired with no direct instruction, no practice, no drills and with no apparent difficulty. Chomsky suggests that, if provided with the correct input, the LAD predisposes all people to the acquisition of a second language in basically the same manner. Noam Chomsky brought to the fore the notion of universal grammar claiming that human learning in general and language acquisition in particular are explainable in terms of an innate human capacity aiding the generation of an infinite number of sentence patterns. Hence, it turned out that language acquisition is a product of rule formation because learners form hypotheses about target language rules and test them in practice [6: 42-50].

Chomsky's nativist theory paved the way for Error Analysis and it then became possible for S.P. Corder to point out '...that some at least of the strategies adopted by the learner of a second language are substantially the same as those by which a first language is acquired' [7: 260-261]. Learner errors can be categorized in terms of various criteria. *Interlingual errors* are said to occur due to L1 interference, whereas *intralingual errors* are committed regardless of L1. Corder makes a distinction between *expressive* and *receptive errors* which are manifestations of expressive and receptive behaviour and depend upon knowledge of the 'formation rules' of a language: 'Inadequate knowledge of these rules will therefore show itself in both sorts of behaviour. But it is much easier to detect imperfect knowledge in the case of expressive behaviour. Expression leaves traces transient, but recordable, in the case of speech, permanent in the case of writing.' [7: 261]. Moreover, Corder spells out the widespread 'belief' among teachers that learners' receptive abilities usually exceed their productive ones, which is probably due to the fact that failures in comprehension are easier to detect in expression rather than reception. As a result of this, it is difficult to establish the relations between expressive and receptive errors, so it might be that learners' receptive abilities are actually overestimated. Corder also made a distinction between learner mistakes, 'the selection of the wrong style, dialect or variety', and learner errors, which 'result in unacceptable utterances and appear as breaches of the code' [8: (3: 48)]. Learner mistakes and errors came to be viewed from a more positive perspective, as being an indispensable device for learning with the help of which learners test hypotheses and correct them in order to acquire a language. Corder outlines one way in which interference can be recast as a learner strategy. He suggests that the learner's L1 may facilitate the development process of learning an L2, by helping him to progress more rapidly along the universal route when the L1 is similar to the L2 [7: 262].

The psychology of second language acquisition (SLA) was also studied from the vantage point of learner *interlanguage*, a notion referred to by Corder and Nemser as *idiosyncratic dialect* and *approximative system*, respectively.

Interlanguage, more easily visualized as a continuum between the native (L1) and the target (L2) language, was defined by L. Selinker as a 'psychological structure' which is 'latent

in the brain, activated when one attempts to learn a second language' [9, p. 229]. L. Selinker claimed that the mastery of a second language largely depends on the degree of *fossilization* of linguistic items, rules, and subsystems in learner interlanguage [9: 229]. He hypothesized that fossilization is a signature character of second language acquisition, tied to a unique cognitive mechanism – the latent psychological structure, 'an already formulated arrangement in the brain' [9: 229], which putatively prevents the learner from acquiring the target language norms in a permanent way. Selinker also maintained the existence of five central processes belonging to this latent psychological structure which bear upon second language learning: language transfer, transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication, and overgeneralization of target language linguistic material. The concept and conception of fossilization have not only remained viable to date, but have also substantially evolved. Thus, an interlanguage or fossilization is the particular phenomenon whereby a semi-developed linguistic form or construction shows permanent resilience to environmental influence and hence absence of further progression towards the target, is one of the most popular concepts among second language researchers and teachers. In fact, it was the empirical motivation for the inception of the field of study that is known today as second language acquisition (SLA).

Dulay et al define language interference as the *automatic transfer*, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language [1: 243]. H. Dulay and M. Burt refer to only one type of interlingual error which they call interference like goofs. They are defined as those reflecting mother tongue structure and which do not appear in the L2 acquisition data of the target language. Apart from these, they also recognize ambiguous goofs which are composed of those deviant forms that can be classified as interference-like goofs or L1 developmental goofs [10: 112].

D. Lott defines interference as 'errors in the learner's use of the foreign language that can be traced back to the mother tongue' [11: (37: 256)]. He proposes the classification of errors, and three types of interference errors are distinguished. The first one is defined as overextension of analogy; it occurs when the student misuses a vocabulary item because it is similar, either phonetically, orthographically, semantically or syntactically to another form in the L1. Transfer of structure deviant forms constitute the second group. These happen when the student commits a grammar error because the mother tongue rules are followed. The third type is called Interlingual / Intralingual. This group consists of the grammar or vocabulary errors students make because a word distinction, either lexical or grammatical, which is made in the L2 does not exist in their native language [11: (37: 260)].

When an individual's understanding of one language has an impact on his or her understanding of another language, that individual is experiencing language transfer. There can be negative transfers, otherwise known as interference, when the understanding of one language complicates the understanding of another language. Alternatively, there can be positive transfers such that knowing one language can aid in developing skills for a second language. Language interference is the effect of language learners' on their production of the language they are learning. It means that the speaker's first language influences his / her second or and his / her foreign language.

The effect can be on any aspect of language: grammar, vocabulary, accent, spelling and so on. Language interference is considered as one of error sources (negative transfer),

although where the relevant feature of both languages is the same it results in correct language production (positive transfer). The greater the differences between the two languages, the more negative the effect of interference are likely to be. It will inevitably occur in any situation where someone has not mastered a second language.

R. Ellis refers to interference as '*transfer*', which he says is 'the influence that the learner's L1 exerts over the acquisition of an L2'. He argues that transfer is governed by learners' perceptions about what is transferable and by their stage of development in L2 learning. In learning a target language, learners construct their own interim rules with the use of their L1 knowledge, but only when they believe it will help them in the learning task or when they have become sufficiently proficient in the L2 for transfer to be possible [12: (51: 36)]. Ellis raises the need to distinguish between errors and mistakes and makes an important distinction between the two. He says that errors reflect gaps in the learner's knowledge; they occur because the learner does not know what is correct. Mistakes reflect occasional lapses in performance; they occur because, in a particular instance, the learner is unable to perform what he or she knows [13: 51].

Albert and Obler claim that people show more lexical interference on similar items. So it may follow that languages with more similar structures, e.g. English and French, are more susceptible to mutual interference than languages with fewer similar features, e.g. English and Japanese. On the other hand, we might also expect more learning difficulties, and thus more likelihood of performance interference at those points in L2 which are more distant from L1, as the learner would find difficult to learn and understand a completely new and different usage [14: (14: 244)].

Thus, interference as one of the most essential features of bilingual speech has several approaches to this concept. Uriel Weinreich describes interference as 'those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact' [15, pp. 64-65]; it is thus the interference of structures, rules and elements from the source language in the production of the target language. In contrast to code-switching, interference is mainly regarded as a rather involuntary process; but this categorization has often been criticized, since there is evidence for both voluntary occurrence of all these phenomena.

U. Weinreich defines some factors that contribute interference [15: 64-65]:

1. Speaker bilingualism background. Bilingualism is major factor of interference as the speaker is influenced by both of the source and the target language.

2. Disloyalty to target language. Disloyalty to target language will cause negative attitude. This will lead to disobedience to target language structure and further force the bilingual to put uncontrolled structure of his first language elements to output in practicing words utterance both oral and written.

3. The limited vocabularies of TL mastered by a learner. Vocabularies of certain language mostly are about words of surroundings connected to life. Thus, a learner who is willing to master another language will meet new words differ from his native words. In order to be able to speak as natives of TL, Vocabularies take a big role. The more vocabularies someone has, the better he masters TL. Foreign language learner will try to put deliberately his native word to state some points when he cannot find the best words of TL.

4. Needs of synonyms. Synonym in language usage plays an important role as word chosen variation in order not to repeat similar word during the communication process. Implementing

synonym in a language contact will contribute to interference in the form of adoption and borrowing of new words from SL to TL. This need of synonym for certain word from SL to TL is seemingly aimed to intensify meaning.

5. Prestige and style. Applying unfamiliar words (foreign words) during a communication practice which dominant words are languages of both speaker and receiver is something else. Those unfamiliar words usage is aimed to get a pride. Interference will appear as there are certain words even though the receiver probably cannot catch the real idea of the speech. The usual unfamiliar words usage will become a style of the user. Unfortunately, the user sometimes does not understand the real meaning whether the meaning is denotative or connotative.

According to Lott, there are three factors that cause the interference [11: (37: 258-259)]:

1. The interlingual factor. Interlingual transfer is a significant source for language learners. This concept comes from contrastive analysis of behaviouristic school of learning. It stresses upon the negative interference of mother tongue as the only source of errors.

2. The over extension of analogy. Usually, a learner has been wrong in using a vocabulary caused by the similarity of the element between first language and second language, e.g. the use of cognate words (the same form of word in two languages with different functions or meaning).

3. Transfer of structure. There are two types of transfer: positive and negative. Negative transfer refers to those instances of transfer, which result in error because old habitual behavior is different from new behavior being learned. On the contrary, positive transfer is the correct utterance, because both the first language and second language have the same structure, while negative transfer from negative language is called interference.

Interference is the deviation of target language as a result of their familiarity with more than one language. Duley differentiates interference into two parts, the psychological and sociolinguistic. The psychological refers to the influence of old habits when new once are being learned, whereas sociolinguistic refers to interactions of language when two language communities are in contact [1: 98].

Interference may be viewed as the transference of elements of one language to another at various levels including phonological, grammatical, lexical and orthographical. Thus, the effects of the interference can be of two sides. The background of L1 for learning L2 has both advantages and disadvantages. The factor of 'language universal' helps in learning. All languages have tense system, number, gender, etc. This helps the learner in identifying these areas in the target language. But the interference of L1 in L2 leads to errors. One of the assumptions of the contrastive analysis hypothesis was that learners with different L1s would learn L2 in different ways, as a result of negative transfer imposing different kinds of difficulty.

To sum up it is necessary to admit that to a certain degree, the concept of interference seems rather indefinite. In the process of learning and translating, the determination of what interference is and what is not is therefore sometimes subjective and, in some cases, it can be individual-dependent. What someone considers as interference from the source language, someone else can perceive as a different kind of mistake or even as a perfectly acceptable solution in the target language. Nevertheless, in most cases, interference is evident at first sight. It is obvious that language interference influences in learning target. It has positive and negative effects. The greater the differences between the two languages, the more negative the effects of interference are likely to be. Generally speaking, in translating interference is a phenomenon that is common to many translations and its occurrence varies according to

the experience of a translator. In teaching it is important for teacher to know the differences and similarities between learner's native language and the target language. By knowing them teacher will be easy to decide what strategy, methodology or what material that will be used in teaching second or foreign language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Dulay H., Burt M. and Krashen S. *Language Two* / Heidi. C. Dulay. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982. – 315 pp.
2. Rutherford W.E. *Second language grammar: learning and teaching* / William E. Rutherford. – New York: Longman, 1987. – 179 pp.
3. Beardsmore H. B. *Bilingualism: basic principles* / Hugo B. Beardsmore. – Clevedon: Tieto, 1982. – 172 pp.
4. Bhela B. *Native language interference in learning a second language: exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage* / Baljit Bhela // *International Education Journal*, Vol. 1. – 1999. – No. 1. – Pp. 22-31.
5. Hoffmann C. *An introduction to bilingualism* / Charlotte Hoffmann. – Harlow: Longman, 1991. – 353 pp.
6. Chomsky N. *Language and thought* / Noam Chomsky. – Wakefield, Rhode Island: Moyer Bell, 1993. – 94 pp.
7. Corder S.P. *Introducing Applied Linguistics* / Stephen P. Corder. – Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin Books, 1973. – 280 pp.
8. Corder S.P. *Error Analysis* / Stephen P. Corder / *Techniques in Applied Linguistics. The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 3. – London: Oxford University Press, 1974. – Pp. 45-56.
9. Selinker L., Lakshamanan U. *Language transfer and fossilization: The Multiple Effects Principle* / Larry Selinker, Usha Lakshamanan // *Language transfer in language learning*. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co, 1992. – Pp. 197-216
10. Dulay H., Burt M. *You Can't Learn Without Goofing. An Analysis of Children's Second Language 'errors'* / Heidi. C. Dulay, Marina Burt / *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. – London and New York: Longman, 1974. – Pp. 95-123
11. Lott D. *Analising and Counteracting Interference Errors* / David Lott // *English Language Teaching Journal*, Vol. 37. – London: Oxford University Press. – 1983. – No 3. – Pp. 256-262.
12. Ellis R. *The empirical evaluation of language teaching* / Rod Ellis // *English Language Teaching Journal*, Vol. 51. – London: Oxford University Press. – 1997. – No 1. – Pp. 36-42.
13. Ellis R. *Second Language Acquisition* / Rod Ellis / *Oxford Introductions to Language Study*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. – 147 pp.
14. Albert M., Olber L. *The bilingual brain: Neuropsychological and neurolinguistic aspects of bilingualism*. / Martin L. Albert, Loraine K. Olber // *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 14. – New York: Academic Press. – 1980. – No 2. – Pp. 244-246.
15. Weinreich U. *Language in Contact* / Uriel Weinrich. – The Hauge-Paris, Mouton, 1970. – 467 pp.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 14.08.14

І. Короткова, ст. викл.

Університет імені Альфреда Нобеля, Дніпропетровськ

НАУКОВІ ПІДХОДИ ДО ПРОБЛЕМИ МОВНОЇ ІНТЕРФЕРЕНЦІЇ В ЗАРУБІЖНІЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ

У статті розглядаються проблеми мовної інтерференції, вивчається природа і різні підходи до цього явища в зарубіжній лінгвістиці. Автор також аналізує фактори, які можуть створювати мовну інтерференцію, і пояснює наслідки її виникнення.

Ключові слова: мовна інтерференція, цільова мова, інтермова, порівняльний аналіз, оволодіння мовою, помилки в результаті інтерференції, білінгв, білінгвізм.

ІІ. Короткова, ст. препод.

Університет імені Альфреда Нобеля, Дніпропетровськ

НАУЧНЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ПРОБЛЕМЕ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИИ В ЗАРУБЕЖНОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

В статье рассматриваются проблемы языковой интерференции, изучается природа и разные подходы к этому явлению в зарубежной лингвистике. Автор также анализирует факторы, которые могут создавать языковую интерференцию, и объясняет последствия ее возникновения.

Ключевые слова: языковая интерференция, целевой язык, интерязык, сопоставительный анализ, овладение языком, ошибки в результате интерференции, билингв, билингвизм.

УДК 81'373.2:81'373.4:811.111

Щербаков Я.І.

Київ, Україна

БУДДІЙСЬКІ ВПЛИВИ НА КИТАЙСЬКУ КУЛЬТУРНУ ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРНУ СПАДЩИНУ І ДРАМАТУРГІЮ ДОБИ ЮАНЬ (1271-1368)

В статті розглядається вплив буддизму на культуру та літературу за доби монгольського завоювання Юань(1271-1368).

Ключові слова: Юань, буддизм, Хубілай, цзацзюй, ченець, оповідання, сутра, драма, лотос.

Добу Юань (1271-1368) можна назвати періодом китайської історії, за якого відбувався процес об'єднання всієї території сучасного Китаю, активно проходили процеси культурного обміну та етнічної консолідації населення. Племена, які проживали на пів-

© Я. І. Щербаков, 2014