



CHRONOTOPE FEATURES OF FANTASY: CROSS-CULTURAL AND TRANSLATIONAL ASPECTS

O. Shaposhnyk

Kherson State University, Ukraine
oksana.shaposhnik@mail.ru

Abstract. The paper highlights the problem of fantasy rendering and diverse conceptions of its genre stylistic dominant specified in different linguistic schools (British vs Ukrainian / Russian). Considerable distinctions are found out in the chronotope. For most Ukrainian and Russian scholars the presence of secondary fantastic world is considered to be the determinative spatial characteristic of fantasy. Instead British researchers regard a self-sufficient fantastic world as a variant chronotope feature; from this perspective in general any kind of presenting magic would be enough for identifying fantasy. Thus, according to chronotope features certain texts defined as fantasy by British scientists correlate in Ukrainian and Russian literature not with fantasy, but rather with the genre of literary fairy tale. Being ignored while trans-coding, these differences in conception of fantasy and its text-typological features in source and target culture could lead to producing inadequate translation.

Introduction

Determination of text-typological features of the source text and its further adequate rendering for target audience is one of the most essential objectives of the genre-based translation perspective. Complications that may occur while transcoding are caused more often by partial or complete discrepancy of not only culture specific information that is typical to any kind of cross-cultural communication, but what is more important – distinctions between source and target cultures' genre systems.

The problem of the genre stylistic dominant and its rendering is worked out by many prominent scientists: I.S. Alekseeva [1], V.V. Demetska [7], V.N. Komissarov [12], V.V. Koptilov [13], M.A. Novikova [], O.I. Cherednychenko [6], A.D. Schweitzer [26] and others. This notwithstanding the question of transcoding of fantasy genre text-typological features still remains not yet investigated, though highly urgent in modern translation studies.

Different conceptions of fantasy and its genre characteristics accepted by British scholars, on the one hand, and Ukrainian, Russian ones – on the other, definitely cause difficulties in rendering of this type of the text or in some cases it even becomes the reason for translation mistakes. Thus, it's necessary to single out the text-typological features defining fantasy in these very cultures. From this point of view chronotope characteristics will belong to the most urgent aspects.

The aim of the paper is to identify chronotope features invariant for fantasy as a text-type from a perspective of different linguistic schools (British vs Ukrainian / Russian), and on this basis to determine the ways for adequate rendering of fantasy.

Results and Discussion

The textual categories of time and space are the keynotes for study in works of many great scientists, among them N.D. Arutyunova [2], D.S. Likhachev [19], Yu.M. Lotman [20], Z.Ya. Turaeva [29]. However, the term “chronotope” in the meaning of “textual time-space” was first suggested by M.M. Bakhtin. He defined the chronotope as “the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature” [3, p. 234]. Besides, the chronotope has got a profound importance in identification of genres.

British scholars contrary to Ukrainian and Russian ones consider that fantasy as a genre comprises literary texts that extremely differ in chronotope features: place of actions, time of actions, patterns of

introducing magic into reality. In general notions these texts may depict only secondary (fantastic, fantasy, unreal, imaginary) world, or only primary world (reality), or coexistence of both. Thus, taking into account spatial characteristics British researchers distinguish several types of fantasy.

Maria Nikolajeva, a noted scientist in the field of children's literature, proposes 3 types of fantasy chronotope: *closed world*, *open world* and *implied world* [25, p. 26]. *Closed world* is an independent, self-sufficient secondary world that doesn't imply any contact with primary world (reality). *Open world* is also an integral secondary world, but unlike *closed world* it assumes contacts with reality. Besides, the main premise of such texts is the protagonist's transition between the two worlds. As an example M. Nikolajeva mentions of L. Carroll's "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland" and F. L. Baum's "The Wonderful Wizard of Oz" [23].

The type of chronotope, defined in this classification as *implied world*, assumes solely the depiction of reality. Furthermore, secondary world doesn't directly appear in primary world. There may occur only accidental intrusions of magic or any other form of supernatural into a realistic recognizable world, for example, magical objects or magical beings like Marry Poppins [23; 25].

M. Nikolajeva also reveals postmodern fantasy. Its chronotope presents merging of fantastic secondary world and reality. But unlike fantasy with *open world*, in postmodern fantasy the boundary between reality and unreality becomes more elusive. The transition between these two worlds also becomes almost evanescent – there's no secret passage or portal anymore, and characters "don't expect to discover magical realms behind looking-glasses or inside wardrobes" [23].

According to M. Nikolajeva, the presence of magic or any other form of supernatural is in general the invariant chronotope feature of fantasy. But its forms and scope may vary from presenting a self-contained in every way secondary fantastic world to just only small magical bits that make a human to fly, to grow / shrink, to understand the language of animals [23].

Farah Mendelsohn, a British researcher, proposes a similar classification of fantasy. Taking into account chronotope characteristics she divides fantasy texts into *immersive fantasy*, *portal-quest fantasy*, *intrusion fantasy* and *liminal fantasy* [21]. *Immersive fantasy* presents exclusively an impervious, self-contained fantastic world where magic is valid. This secondary world operates according to its appointed rules and sets of assumptions. *Portal-quest fantasy* instead combines fantastic and real worlds with a portal between them. It enables the characters to move from reality to secondary world, then get safely back [21].

Chronotope features of *intrusion fantasy*, the third type in F. Mendelsohn's classification, assume the description of only primary world. Nevertheless, fantastic world, embodied in unexpected forms, breaks into reality bringing amazement or horror [21]. Thus, this type of chronotope correlates with the one named *implied world* in M. Nikolajeva's classification.

Farah Mendelsohn also specifies *liminal fantasy*. Here reality in some way may be or not influenced by magic. Fantastic world doesn't actually penetrate into real world as it happens in *intrusion fantasy*, but it "gives the ordinary world a touch of fantastic" [25]. The world of *liminal fantasy* that seems quite realistic on the outside in fact may turn out being uncanny – there may happen things devoid of logic and common sense. Things going on in the text could bewilder the reader and make him hesitate whether these events do really take place or it just seems to him.

Thus, both scientists, M. Nikolajeva and F. Mendelsohn, define almost similar types of fantasy, taking as a basis its spatial characteristics. Therefore, *closed world* (by M. Nikolajeva) correlates with chronotope features of *immersive fantasy* (by F. Mendelsohn), *open world* (by M. Nikolajeva) – with *portal-quest fantasy* (by F. Mendelsohn) and *implied world* (by M. Nikolajeva) accordingly responds to *intrusion fantasy* (by F. Mendelsohn).

However, there is another type of fantasy chronotope – *world-within-a-world* – that has exceptional peculiarities of arrangement. It is secondary fantastic world though delimited but still situated in the realm of reality. Here N. Gamble and S. Yates cite as an example the world of Hogwarts in the Harry Potter novels [8].

Consequently, from the point of view of British scholars chronotope characteristics of fantasy extremely differ. In most theoretical research issues spatial category varies from representation of solely a self-contained secondary fantastic world to coexistence of both fantastic and real worlds. A delimited imaginary world inside the real one is also supposed typical to fantasy. Furthermore, in general, any kind of introducing magic into reality would be enough for identification of fantasy from a perspective of foreign scientists.

Instead Ukrainian and Russian scholars in their theoretical research issues propose a different conception of fantasy and its text-typological features. Considerable distinctions are found out in the chronotope. For most Ukrainian and Russian researchers a determinative spatial characteristic of fantasy is exclusively the presence of secondary fantastic world. This world exists in accordance with its own set of assumptions which however may contradict the actual laws of nature and modern picture of the world in particular. Though being imaginary it looks extremely natural and realistic. Besides, magic is the integral part of this secondary world [9; 11; 16; 17; 18; 22; 27; 30].

Ukrainian and Russian scientists suppose that the verisimilitude of the secondary fantastic world of fantasy is attained due to references to its history, geography, cultural heritage thought-out by an author. This imaginary world is founded on mythology that is fully or partially derived from those existing. To construct a self-contained secondary world authors apply artificially originated language, fictitious literary heritage, popular traditions, rites and rituals, superstitions, even proverbs and riddles [11; 27]. Secondary world of fantasy is delimited and may be situated on other planet or in parallel dimension [9; 10; 27].

Approving the notion of a self-sufficient secondary fantastic world as a crucial chronotope feature O. Kostrova also distinguishes other characteristics of spatial category. In her opinion, fantastic world, being accessible to the select few, could co-exist with reality, or from time to time interact with it through a portal [14]. This peculiarity of the chronotope – combination of both fantastic and real worlds – is also confirmed by other researchers of Ukrainian and Russian fantasy [9; 22].

Speaking about another component of fantasy chronotope – temporal category, the scientists state that its immanent feature is adventure time (by M.M. Bakhtin) [4; 9; 14]. According to M.M. Bakhtin, “all moments of this infinite adventure-time are controlled by one force – chance. [...] Adventure “chance time” is a specific time of interference of irrational powers into human’s life” [3, p. 245]. Coincidence has the exceptional importance in a course of events.

Consequently, from a perspective of Ukrainian and Russian scientists presence of solely secondary fantastic world or coexistence of both fantastic and real worlds with a portal between them belongs to the invariant chronotope feature of fantasy. Magic and supernatural elements are also obligatory here. Besides, mythology is one of the most sufficient components of secondary world. Imaginary world should be described in detail in order to make the reader believe in it. To intensify its verisimilitude the authors appeal to the history of the secondary world, its language, traditions, customs and social order. The more considered and self-contained the imaginary world is, the greater artistic value the text has.

After consideration of fantasy and its chronotope features accepted as invariant in different linguistic schools, there appear important distinctions between conceptions of this genre. The decisive difference consists in the scope of introducing magic into reality and profoundness of secondary fantastic worlds. From a perspective of British scientists a text with any inclusion of magic into reality is identified as fantasy. Instead Ukrainian and Russian scholars suppose that the defining criterion is exclusively secondary fantastic world as the only one in the text’s chronotope, or in correlation with reality.

These distinctions in conception of fantasy as a text-type in different linguistic schools acquire primary significance from translational perspective. Theoretically the target text should correspond with text-typological stereotypes of the target language and target audience. It means that any TT defined as “fantasy” must be recognized by the target audience – Ukrainian readers, as this very genre, but not as any of related text-types like literary fairy tale or science fiction.

The problem lies in the fact that not all texts regarded as fantasy by British scholars in translation respond to the genre stylistic expectations of Ukrainian and Russian readers. The discrepancy is considerable to such an extent that certain texts of foreign fantasy according to its text-typological features, chronotope features in particular, correlate with literary fairy tale in Ukrainian and Russian genre systems. That’s why at the stage of pre-translation analysis the type of the text should be identified in terms of not the source, but target culture. Thus, in order to satisfy the target audience’s expectations a translator could resort to appropriate translation transformations or possess the TT another genre definition.

For comprehensive investigation of fantasy rendering from English into Ukrainian, it is necessary to ascertain the kind of correlation of fantasy and literary fairy tale.

The genre of literary fairy tale is considered to be a related one to fantasy in Ukrainian and Russian literature, though this type of the text isn’t distinguished by British researchers. Texts with genre stylistic

features of literary fairy tale – a well-known text-type among Ukrainian and Russian readers – foreign scientists refer to fantasy, thereby taking a broad view of the fantasy genre.

T. Zhadanova distinguishes a certain amount of texts in the English language fantasy that correspond with literary fairy tale in Ukrainian and Russian genre systems according to its text-typological characteristics. The researcher defines them *Victorian fantasy / fantasy of the 19th century* in contrast to *modern fantasy / fantasy of the 20th century* [30]. Unlike a considered secondary world in *modern fantasy*, spatial category of *Victorian fantasy* consists of ‘an imagined microcosm’, into which inserted fragments or authors remarks intrude” [30, p. 32]. That’s why this type of the chronotope could not be regarded as a self-contained fantastic world that assures the reader in its existence.

While distinguishing spatial characteristics of *Victorian fantasy* in her research issue T. Zhadanova appeals among other texts to L. Carroll’s “Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland” that is supposed to be a classic example of literary fairy tale for Slavic readers. According to T. Zhadanova, the chronotope of this text constitutes “only a series of locations and encounters inside of which motion occurs” [30, p. 33], but by no means secondary fantastic world that as a rule completely or partially occupies the space of *modern fantasy*.

In general, the chronotope of literary fairy tale is divided into magical and real ones, though there isn’t a distinctive opposition between them [28]. Furthermore, magical and real worlds intersect, cooperate or superimpose [5; 15; 28]. This peculiarity is affirmed by a great amount of historical and national realia in description of magical space. Thus, in comparison with a self-contained secondary world accepted as invariant for fantasy by Ukrainian and Russian scholars, magical chronotope of literary fairy tale is considered to be to a certain extent a real world but with magical or supernatural elements. Besides, mythological motives are non-obligatory for literary fairy tale in contrast to fantasy where mythology is the invariant chronotope feature [28].

Consequently, literary fairy tale is a related genre to fantasy in Ukrainian and Russian genre systems. Distinctions between them in the chronotope consist in arrangement of fantastic world and scope of introducing magic into reality. For Ukrainian and Russian readers the criterion for identification of fantasy is supposed to be solely a self-contained secondary fantastic world. It is constructed on the mythological basis and completely or partially occupies the text’s space. Instead in literary fairy tale spatial category is represented only by certain magical surroundings into which personages are taken for some period of time. The chronotope of literary fairy tale also could be represented entirely by real world that in its turn experiences magical intrusions.

Then, with a view to its chronotope features, literary fairy tale corresponds with several types of fantasy distinguished by British researchers. Thereby, certain texts that fall under *open world fantasy*, *implied world fantasy* (by M. Nikolajeva), or, for example, *portal-quest fantasy*, *intrusion fantasy* and *liminal fantasy* (by F. Mendelsohn), would be recognized by Ukrainian and Russian readers as literary fairy tales, but not fantasy according to its text-typological features, chronotope features in particular. In other words, certain texts of fantasy which chronotope is represented by not a completed secondary fantastic world based on mythology, but just real world with fantastic and magical elements in it, would correlate with genre stylistic features of literary fairy tale in Ukrainian and Russian genre systems.

This conclusion of our investigation is immensely important from translational perspective. Diverse conceptions of fantasy and its text-typological characteristics, especially chronotope characteristics accepted in different linguistic schools definitely cause considerable difficulties in rendering of this text-type. Being ignored while trans-coding, they could prevent from producing the adequate translation. If a Ukrainian TT according to its chronotope features would resemble literary fairy tale, despite its genre definition – “fantasy”, this TT would be considered pragmatically inadequate. And in general, such TT would disappoint the genre stylistic expectations of the recipient culture.

To avoid such sufficient mistakes while rendering the translator must take into consideration the specified distinction of fantasy and its chronotope characteristics accepted in source and target genre systems. And the most important is to render the text-typological features invariant to this genre precisely in the recipient culture. Thus, the ST could be changed to a certain extent.

Considering the decisive importance of the chronotope in identification of any genre we can specify the algorithm of translational actions. If the ST in chronotope features corresponds with the invariant genre characteristics of fantasy accepted by Ukrainian researchers – that is presentation of a completed secondary

fantastic world – this text would not cause difficulties while trans-coding it into Ukrainian. Then it would be necessary just to render the text-typological features of fantasy on other levels like personage and lexico-semantic ones.

There also could occur an opposite situation. The ST having the genre characteristics relevant to fantasy in source culture could be specified according to chronotope features as literary fairy tale in the recipient culture. In such a case the TT should get the other genre definition – “literary fairy tale” and therefore should have the features of this genre on all levels of the text. In fact, in children’s literature there are several well-known texts by L. Carroll, F. Baum, P. Travers that are defined as fantasy by source audience and researchers, but in Ukrainian and Russian literature they are identified as literary fairy tale.

Conclusions

The conclusion of our investigation lies in the fact that due to generic proximity of several fantastic genres and modern authors’ liking for genre mixtures there occur complications in identification of genre stylistic features of different text-types. With the aim to avoid mistakes while rendering a translator should know not only genre characteristics of a particular text-type, but what is more important – should be aware of distinctions in its genre stylistic dominant specified by scholars of source and recipient cultures.

Thus, while trans-coding from English into Ukrainian the ST of fantasy could be changed to a certain extent in order to correspond to the genre stylistic expectations of the recipient culture, or the TT could get other genre definition.

In perspective we are going to study other peculiarities of fantasy rendering with dependence on its text-typological features in other contexts – personage context, lexical and semantic context and others.

References

1. Alekseeva I.S. Vvedenie v perevodovedenie / Alekseeva I.S. – Moscow : Akademia Publishers, 2004. – 352 p.
2. Arutyunova N.D. Yazyk i mir cheloveka / Arutyunova N.D. – Moscow : Yazyki russkoy kultury, 1999. – 896 p.
3. Bakhtin M. Voprosy literatury i estetiki / Mikhail Bakhtin. – Moscow, 1975. – 504 c.
4. Belousova E.G. Osnovnie kharakteristiki khudozhestvennoy kartini mira, reprezentiruemoy v proizvedeniyakh zhanra fentezi / Belousova E.G. Web address : <http://www.moluch.ru/archive/27/3008/>.
5. Braude L.Yu. Skandinavskaya literaturnaya skazka / Braude L.Yu. – Moscow : Nauka, 1979. – 195 p.
6. Cherednychenko O.I. Pro movu i pereklad / Cherednychenko O.I. – Kiev : Lybid, 2007. – 248 p.
7. Demetska V.V. Teoriya adaptatsii: kros-kulturni ta perekladoznavchi problemy / Demetska V.V. – Kherson : Nord, 2006. – 378 p.
8. Gamble N. Exploring Children’s Literature / Nikki Gamble, Sally Yates. – London : SAGE Publications, 2008. – 217 p. – Web address : <http://books.google.com.ua/books?id=pMRQI04mIzQC&pg=PA124&dq=Eoin+Colfer+fantasy&hl=ru#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
9. Greido E. Khudozhestvenniy mir fentezi. Mir fentezi kak virtualnaya realnost / Estel Greido. – Web address : http://samlib.ru/e/estell_gd/fantasy2.shtml.
10. Greido E. Sootnoshenie zhanra fentezi s drugimi zhanrami fantasticheskoy literatury / Estel Greido. – Web address : http://samlib.ru/e/estell_gd/1223.shtml.
11. Gusarova A.D. Tip povestvovaniya fentezi (Sverkhlestvennost kak zhanrovyy kriteriy) / Gusarova A.D. – Web address : <http://www.proza.ru/2010/06/06/972>.
12. Komissarov V.N. Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty) / Komissarov V.N. – Moscow : Vysshaya shkola, 1990. – 253 p.
13. Koptilov V. Teoriya i praktyka perekladu / Viktor Koptilov. – Kyiv : Yunivers, 2002. – 280 p.
14. Kostrova O.A. Prostranstvenno-vremennaya organizatsiya khudozhestvennogo mira v proizvedeniyakh J.K. Rouling / Kostrova O.A. Web address : http://www.pglu.ru/lib/publications/University_Reading/2009/II/uch_2009_II_00006.pdf.
15. Kovtun E.N. Elementy folklornoy volsheynoy skazki v slavyanskoy literaturnoy skazke i skazochnoy fantastike / Kovtun E.N. – Web address : http://slavcenteur.ru/Proba/Kovtun/kovtun_folkskazka.pdf.

16. Kovtun E.N. "Istinnaya realnost" fentezi / Kovtun E.N. – Web address : http://www.slavcenteur.ru/Proba/Kovtun/kovtun_istrealnost.pdf .
17. Kovtun E. Poetika neobychnogo: khudozhestvennie miri fantastiki, volshebnoy skazki, utopii, pritchi i mifa (na materiale evropeyskoy literatury pervoy poloviny XX veka) / Elena Kovtun. – Moscow, 2000. – 308 p. Web address : <http://www.fedy-diary.ru/html/052011/13052011-06a.html> .
18. Leonenko O.S. Zhanr fentezi v ukrainskii prozi kintsya XX – pochatku XXI stolittya : abstract of a PhD thesis : 10.01.01"Ukrainian Literature" / O.S. Leonenko. – Cherkasy, 2010. – 19 p.
19. Likhachev D.S. Poetika drevnerusskoy literatury / Likhachev D.S. – Moscow : Nauka, 1979. – 359 p.
20. Lotman Yu. Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta / Yuriy Lotman. – Web address: <http://www.gumer.info>.
21. Mendlesohn F. Rhetorics of Fantasy / Farah Mendlesohn. – Web address : <http://books.google.com.ua/books?id=8nVglcu53QYC&printsec=frontcover&dq=fantasy&hl=ru#v=onepage&q=fantasy&f=false>.
22. Nazarenko M. Opyt klassifikatsii fantasticheskikh zhanrov / Mikhail Nazarenko. – Web address : <http://nevmenandr.net/nazarenko/sf.php>.
23. Nikolajeva M. Fairy Tale and Fantasy: From Archaic to Postmodern / Maria Nikolajeva. – Web address : <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/marvels/vol17/iss1/8> .
24. Novikova M A., Lebed O.N., Lukinova M.Yu., Lyubchenko T.N., Makarenko E.I., Skorokhodko S.A. Stil avtora i stil perevoda. – Kiev, 1988. – 84 p.
25. Salminen J. Fantastic in Form, ambiguous in content: secondary Worlds in soviet children's Fantasy Fiction / Jenniliisa Salminen. – Finland : Painosalama Oy – Turku, 2009. – 212 p. – Web address : <http://www.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/43575/AnnalesB317Salminen.pdf?sequence=1>.
26. Schweitzer A.D. Teoriya perevoda: Status, problemy, aspekty / Schweitzer A.D. – Moscow : Nauka, 1988. – 215 p.
27. Shemyakina S.V. Literatura fentezi: differentsiatsiya ponyatiya i zhanrovaya kharakteristika. – Web address: <http://www.philology.bsu.by/documents/>.
28. Sorokotenko O.V. Literaturnaya skazka: sopostavitelnyy i tipologicheskyy aspekty : a PhD thesis : 10.02.15 / Sorokotenko Oksana Vladimirovna. – Simferopol, 1995. – 199 p.
29. Turaeva Z.Ya. Lingvistika teksta (Tekst: struktura i semantika) / Z.Ya. Turaeva. – Moscow : Prosveshchenie, 1986. – 127 p.
30. Zhadanova T.V. Khristianskaya fentezi v XX veke / Zhadanova T.V. – Web address : <http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/natural/Vsntu/2010/filolog/102-SevNTU/102-07.pdf> .