Angelika Peljak-Łapińska
Swansea University/ United Kingdom

A relevance-theoretical approach to *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*: translating the Belarusian language and culture

Abstract

A relevance-theoretical approach to *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*:
translating the Belarusian language and culture

This paper takes a relevance-theoretical approach to the English translation of *Дзікае па-
ляванне караля Стаха* (1964), the Belarusian novel written by Uladzìmìr Karatkevìč – *King
Stakh's Wild Hunt* (translated by Mary Mintz, 1989). In doing so, it proposes a different per-
spective on the alleged 'untranslatability' of minority literature. The analysis takes into account
various procedures applied to the different elements of the novel and reveals that Mintz makes
strategic choices aimed at choosing the best solution for each problem individually.

Keywords: Belarusian, Karatkievich, *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*, Relevance Theory, translation

Introduction

Researchers commonly describe the literature of minority languages in terms of
'untranslatability' (Keshavarzi 2016; Stojilkov 2018), often treating problems of
translation in a binary way. The translated texts from such a corpus are either radi-
cally adjusted to the features of the target language or, conversely, retain the char-
acteristics of the source language and culture. This approach reflects the domesti-
cation vs. foreignization distinction proposed by Venuti (1995). Despite its alleged
untranslatability, Mary Mintz's translation of *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* (Karatkevìč[1]

1| Belarusian words as well as bibliographic data of Belarusian sources are transliterated
according to the norm PN-ISO 9: 2000; exceptions are quotes from the source text which
were kept in the original Belarussian form.

1964, translated by Mintz, 1989) has been positively received by English-speaking readers. Khan recognized how rare it is for a translator to be able to make accessible "a story so contained within its own history, it threatens to alienate any reader outside of its cultural design" (Khan 2016: 1). Similarly Morgan (2012: 7) noted that "there is a cosy familiarity" to the text.

Relevance theory (henceforth, RT) might give some explanation of this phenomenon, as it offers a different perspective from other translation studies frameworks view on the issue of minority literature. RT claims that the problem does not lie in the text itself, but rather in the differences between the cognitive environments of the source and target audiences. This article uses a readercentred approach advertised in RT to analyze how Uladzìmìr Karatkevìč's novel *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* earned recognition among Anglophone readers, despite the minority Belarusian language of its composition and despite the presence of a number of cultural markers foreign to non-Belarusian speakers.

After an overview of the state of the Belarusian language and its minority literature, this article considers the specific application of RT in translation studies. RT provides the theoretical framework for the subsequent textual analysis of *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*, covering a range of elements that pose particular challenges for the translator, Mary Mintz. These include proper nouns, forms of address, locations of events, rituals and Belarusian traditions. The article concludes that the positive reception of *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* by the English-speaking target audience can be attributed to the translator's effective conveyance of the meaning of the Belarusian text while requiring only minimal effort on the part of the Anglophone reader.

1. Belarusian language and literature

Despite being one of the state languages in Belarus, Belarusian remains a minority language. In the latest census 53.2% of country's citizens have indicated Belarusian as their mother tongue, however only 23% of respondents use it at home. For the majority (70%), Russian is the main language of everyday contacts[2]. These numbers explain clearly why UNESCO regards the Belarusian language as vulnerable (Moseley 2010). Such a situation considerably influences literature written in Belarusian and its reception, not only within the country but also abroad. According to EvenZohar's theory of polysystem (1990) the Belarusian literature occupies a peripheral position in the European literary system, not merely due to

---

2| Cf. https://belstat.gov.by/en/perepis-naseleniya/perepis-naseleniya-2009-goda/main-demographic-and-social-characteristics-of-population-of-the-republic-of-belarus/population-classified-by-knowledge-of-the-belarusian-and-russian-languages-by-region-and-minsk-city/ (accessed: 7.09.2020).

the status of the language, but also by virtue of being translated. Thus a Belarusian text has very low chances to be published, let alone be wellreceived by the audience speaking a majority language.

The current situation of the Belarusian language stems from complicated sociohistorical circumstances. As Kohler and Navumenka (2012: 3) note,

> literature within today's Belarusian territory develops under conditions of a discontinued, even 'broken' cultural tradition, of multilingualism, of conflicting mono- versus multiculturalism, of absence (or rather: deficiency) of its 'own' cultural elites, of the lack of distinctive confessional self-identification, of a rural structure with an almost complete lack of urban centres.

The modern Belarus territory was incorporated into the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th to 17th centuries and into the Russian Empire in 1795, following the partition of Poland, and then assimilated into the Soviet Union. During these times the political and cultural influence of the governing powers secured the promotion, enforcement, and fashionable adoption of Polish and Russian in preference to Belarusian. This pushed the indigenous language as well as literature written in Belarusian to the peripheral zone. The Belarusian language started being associated with the province and with poorly educated people. These sociohistorical circumstances adversely impact on the chances of Belarusian texts being translated into other languages, particularly a major language, such as English. Karatkevìč's *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* is a notable exception. It is worth discussing what makes this text so suitable to translation into English in the first place.

Born in 1930, Uladzìmìr Karatkevìč published mainly in the 1960s and 1970s. His preferred style, however, is described as romanticism, emphasizing "the individual, the subjective, the irrational, the imaginative, the personal, the spontaneous, the emotional, the visionary, and the transcendental"[3]. Pavel Latushko, the former Minister of Culture of the Republic of Belarus, describes Karatkevìč's works as "the most profound representation of the very essence of Belarusianity, of being a Belarusian" (Latushko 2010: 566). Latushko underlines Karatkevìč's role in promoting knowledge of Belarusian history within the wider European context, predominantly among his fellow citizens, thus making them truly proud of descending from the Belarusian nation. This testimony is one among many that clearly state the special place of Karatkevìč's works within the Belarusian literature. Although he wrote a number of plays, essays, articles and even screenplays for short movies, he remains best known for promoting the Belarusian historical past, often via detective fiction and adventure stories, with *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* providing an excellent example of these two genres. The book, published in 1964,

---

3| https://www.britannica.com/art/Romanticism (accessed: 28.03.2020).

has been adapted for the cinema, has provided inspiration for an opera, and is continuously re-published in Belarus as well as abroad in translation.

What seems to be universally understood and appreciated in *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* is the structure of the novel. As specialists underline (Malaŭka 2015), Karatkevič creates an interesting detective story, with a welldeveloped storyline, all events involving just a handful of characters and taking place in a mysterious castle in the middle of deserted marshlands. The story is set in the 19th century but, despite expectations, the author uses no lengthy period descriptions, and yet he produces honest and lively representations of historical culture, everyday life, and mentality. In the case of *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* the reception of the events and their sociohistorical context is even more absorbing, as these are mediated by the main character, Andrej Biełarecki, who narrates the story. According to research in neuroscience the first-person marking is more immersive and yields a stronger reaction than the use of second or third person pronouns (Brilmayer/ Werner et al. 2019).

The structure of the novel, the way the characters are represented, and the importance of *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* within the Belarusian canon may easily attract international publishers. However, these factors alone cannot account for the English translation's success with the target audiences. RT, despite being rarely used in the context of minority language translations, provides us with means to look at the translated text through the audience's eyes, thus explaining how *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* gained appreciation of English-speaking readers.

2. Relevance Theory

First introduced in the mid-1980s by Deidre Wilson and Dan Sperber (1986), RT highlights an ability to express and recognize intentions as crucial for effective human communication. According to that theory, communication is *ostensive-inferential*, which means that the producer of the utterance (Speaker) ostensively shows her intention to communicate something and the receiver (Hearer) makes inferences about the intention of the communicator, as long as He presumes the statement to be *relevant*. A relevant statement is the one that modifies the Hearer's cognitive environment. These modifications, or benefits, are called *positive cognitive effects* and are defined as "a worthwhile difference to the individual's representation of the world: a true conclusion, for example" (Wilson/ Sperber 2004: 608). Therefore, a relevant statement has to yield cognitive effects in a given context.

Context in RT is a set of assumptions in a particular situation. These, according to RT, are not given a priori but rather appear simultaneously with the process of interpretation. Consequently, what is relevant for one person in a particular situation might be the opposite for somebody else. The cognitive effects are just

one part of the equation in the notion of relevance and they must always be related to the *cognitive effort*, or the cost, essential to achieve the effects. That effort is lower if the right context is easily accessible in Hearer's cognitive environment, e.g. when Speaker and Hearer have the same cultural background.

Optimal relevance is thus achieved when Speaker communicates in a way that enables to obtain adequate positive cognitive effects, or to understand the message intended, without redundant processing effort required from Hearer. Communication or the communicative process in RT is seen as asymmetrical – it is Speaker who is responsible for producing a message that allows yielding the intended effects. It may be difficult because when Hearer arrives at the interpretation that fulfills the condition of optimal relevance, the processing of the utterance stops, and as everybody knows the first interpretation of the Speaker's message is often wrong, therefore miscommunication is an inherent element of human life.

Another key issue in RT is the distinction made between *descriptive* and *interpretive uses* of language. Utterances can be used *descriptively*, describing a situation or set of circumstances according to the facts, authentically; conversely, they can be used *interpretively*, that is, to resemble the utterance produced by another person. An example of interpretive use of language is literature review, for instance in an article. By saying "According to X…" a researcher summarizes somebody's ideas and that summary resembles the original text. Translation is thus an *interpretive use* of language in which the text resembles the original, and, importantly, it does so to a certain extent (Gutt 2000).

What follows from RT views of communication is that translators must correctly diagnose what Ernst-August Gutt (2010) calls the *congruity* between the cognitive environments, or the level of similarity between the cognitive environment of Speaker, who is in this case the original audience, and Hearer – the target text audience. Then the translator may decide to adjust the translation to the needs of the readers. Not only that, the translator, acting as a mediator between Speaker and Hearer, is also expected to correctly recognize the message intended to be communicated by the author of the original text.

It all adds up to a complex task. According to Gutt, readers' expectations toward translators may be unworkable; therefore a solution to the problem of incongruent cognitive environments (i.e. cultural gap between the original audience and the target text audience) may be sought in educating the translators, publishers and, above all, readers in terms of knowledge about communication itself and about the translation.

Despite the complexity and the challenges in communication between different cultures some translations, such as *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*, prove to be successful. The following section discusses the solutions implemented to achieve such an effect.

3. *King Stakh's Wild Hunt* – challenges and solutions

A variety of factors complicate the process of translation from Belarusian into English and into other languages. Firstly, morphology constitutes a major problem, as Belarusian is rich with suffixes, both diminutive and augmentative, which can be added to nouns, adjectives, and verbs. Moreover, Belarusian admits double diminutive forms, namely adding two diminutive suffixes to one word. Morphology poses an even greater challenge when applied to the names of people. A name in Belarusian can usually take about ten different forms, e.g. Элена (Èlena) – Альця (Aľcâ), Аліся (Alìsâ), Алена (Alena), Гальця (Gaľcâ), Галька (Gaľka), Гальшка (Gaľška), Галя (Galâ), Гэля (Gèlâ), Гэлена (Gèlena) (Barszczewska 2004: 49). Each of them conveys information about the approximate age of the addressee, as well as the relation between the interlocutors, and when an inappropriate form is deliberately used, the irony or humor is conveyed. The number of forms a name can take, as well as the subtle differences between them, are exceptional, even among other Slavonic languages.

Secondly, syntax poses a difficulty in translation into English. Although the basic word order in Belarusian is the same as in English, that is subject-verb-object, it can be changed freely to underline certain elements and achieve interesting stylistic effects. Complex sentences with subject appearing at the end, after the main verb, are very common. Another syntactic peculiarity in Belarusian is the omission of the verb *to be* in the present tense, as *to be* has an almost exclusively auxiliary function. Additionally, synonymy is a difficult aspect of translating Belarusian, especially in the case of the close synonyms. They do not necessarily differ in register but convey subtle stylistic variations, e.g. verb *to love* can be expressed in Belarusian in two ways – *кахаць* (kahac') and *любіць* (lûbìc'). The difference is that the first variant is used in reference to people, while the latter in respect to objects and living creatures (Barszczewska 2004: 35). Moreover, Belarusian allows the tautological use of a synonym where synonyms occurring in pairs are used to express and emphasize emotions.

The above-mentioned linguistic features make the translation from Belarusian into English challenging, regardless of the content of the text. As we shall see in the following sections, language-specific problems paired with the particular meaning of the text can make the translator apply various methods in the case of similar phenomena. Over the years many translation techniques, especially for dealing with cultural items, have been identified and classified (Zarei/ Norouzi 2014). However, it must be noted that providing a systematic classification of the methods Mintz uses in her translation is beyond the scope of this article. Therefore the procedures she implemented are loosely described with the use of terms proposed by Newmark (1998) and the analysis itself is divided according to the type of problem rather than the translation solution.

3.1. Proper nouns

Transference (which can be understood as transliteration or transcription) has been applied to most of the proper nouns in the novel in order to convey the original connotations crucial to the overall meaning of the novel. Nevertheless, Mintz used *through-translation* in some cases, specifically for nicknames and place names deriving from topographic features or from past events, as opposed to other types of toponyms, e.g. deriving from surnames.

Examples of such a practice include the minor character's nickname *Little Man* (bel. *Малы Чалавек*, Малy Čałaviek) and the name of the estate where most of the events take place, *Marsh Firs* (bel. *Балотныя Ялiны*, Bałotnyja Jaliny). The nickname refers directly to the character's height and has no latent meaning. Owing to that there is no reason to retain the original proper noun as it would not enrich the cognitive environment of the reader and it would only increase the effort necessary for processing the information. The same concerns the second example which explicitly defines the geographical location of the estate.

3.2. Location of events

Considering the location of events, one must take into account a wider cultural context. As mentioned above, Marsh Firs, the isolated castle owned by the main character, is the place where most of the plot develops. However, the castle itself is located in a very specific geographical location – not in terms of position but in terms of cultural connotations.

> Гэта не была нават дрыгва […], не, гэта быў самы жахлівы, самы безнадзейны з нашых краявідаў: трафяныя балоты (Karatkevìč 2010: 25).

> [I]t was not even a quagmire […] this was the gloomiest, the most hopeless of our landscape: the peat-bogs (Karatkevìč 2010: 585).

The keyword in that description is *bogs* which is used to translate the term *балоты* (baloty). Merriam-Webster defines *bog* as "wet spongy ground"[4] and it reflects the basic meaning of the original; however, the Belarusian concept of *балоты* is much more complex. In the Skarnik dictionary one can find a metaphorical meaning of the word *балота* (singular of *балоты*): all that is characterized by stagnation, lack of activity, moral decline[5]; put differently, it is a place of a bad reputation. Belarusian traditional folklore gives *балота* an even more specific sense. A number of texts considers *балоты* to be the Belarusian version of chaos in classical cosmology, a space which existed even before the world was created (Vasìľčuk/ Šved 2012; Sadoŭskaâ 2015). Apart from that, *балоты* are

---

4| https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/bog (accessed: 28.03.2020).

5| https://www.skarnik.by/tsbm/8886 (accessed: 28.03.2020).

regarded as a channel of contact with another world (Vasìlčuk/ Šved 2013: 480), as well as the center of 'unclean' force, where people would throw desecrated things such as clothes of a deceased and in some regions even the body of a deceased who died in an impure way, e.g., by committing a suicide (Vasìlčuk/ Šved 2013: 481). The picture of *балоты* emerging from these descriptions seems to be negative; however, in Belarusian folk tradition *балоты* are also described as a point of beginning, a source of life, and thus they appear in a positive context at times.

All these additional meanings of the novel's setting are not evident to an English-speaking reader. Moreover, because Mintz uses a functional equivalent, the target audience might have connotations particular for their culture. However, having read the text, the audiences will most likely enrich their cognitive environment by creating cognitive connotations between the *bogs* and spooky events taking place there. The context associated with this word will therefore change and come much closer to the set of assumptions characteristic to Belarusian readers.

3.3. Forms of address

Mintz applied functional equivalents also to the forms of referring to other characters. The most frequent elements of this group are the official forms of address: *пан* (pan) and *панì* (panì) translated as *sir* and *miss* accordingly. These seemingly straightforward forms are, however, problematic due to their historical and social connotations. At the time of the narrative Belarus was already incorporated in the Russian Empire; however, just before that it had been under the reign of Poland for years. During that time Belarusians commonly used the Polish words *pan* and *pani* as form of address, especially towards the members of gentry who were regarded as the oppressor. The negative connotations of this form of address were strengthened due to the fact that in its second meaning *pan* denotes a person having power over something or someone, thus being equivalent to an English *master*. The novel is set in times when gentry is already in decline, and this fact, as well as the general aversion to the nobility, are clearly visible in the *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*, e.g. in a statement by Nadzieja, one of the main characters:

> If you could know how much blood, and dirt, how many murders, orphans' tears are on every coat-of-arms of the gentry! […] We haven't the right to exist […]. The blood in our veins is not blue, it's dirty blood. […] We were indifferent to the people that suffered tortures side by side with us and from us, we considered the people cuttle, we poured out wine, while they shed their blood (Karatkevìč 2010: 608).

This self-critical statement was actually the reason why the main character decided to help the young lady and commented that it was only then when she changed "into a real person".

The official forms of address could have been translated with corresponding period equivalents, and such a solution would require less effort on the part of audience; however, in the English version the characters of the novel set in the 19th century refer to each other in a modern way. This choice is justified, firstly by the threat of the reader inferring wrong connotations, characteristic of the English form of address rather than Belarusian, and secondly by the possibility of improving the audience's cognitive environment. Like in the case of *балоты*, the original meaning of *пан* and *пані* unveils itself in the text, and the reader does not need to be aware of them from the very beginning to understand the message intended.

3.4. Other forms of referring to people

Apart from the official forms of address, characters refer to each other by using common nouns, frequently diminutives and augmentatives. *Dear lady* is used to translate the word *цётка* (cëtka) and its diminiutive *цётухна* (cëtuhna). Translated literally it means *aunt* and *auntie* and is a common form of addressing elderly women in a polite way, both in reference to well-known, as well as unacquainted persons (Kaptsiuh 2014). Mintz's translation, apart from being a polite form of address, is also old-fashioned. This is an addition to the meaning of the original form and it may underline the historical settings of the novel, and, unlike modern variants, be regarded as more natural thus minimizing the processing effort of the reader.

Дзядзька (dzâdz'ka) and its diminutive *дзядзечка* (dzâdzečka) is translated as *Uncle* (capitalization original) and *dear uncle*. These words are used by the main character, Nadzieja, when addressing her relative Mr Dubatoŭk, and it is a male form of address corresponding to the form from previous example. Mintz translates it literally, which is justified by the fact that the family connection between the two characters is explained to a newcomer, when Mr Dubatoŭk is first mentioned in the story. The literal translation of the term defining the relation is consistent with the information the reader receives. Otherwise, using a generic form of polite address might potentially have confused the reader as to the level of familiarity between the characters.

Another form of address translated with a functional equivalent is *a woman* and *the old woman* which stand for *бабуля* (babulâ) and its diminutive *бабулька* (babul'ka). This form is used by characters when referring to the housekeeper, the Belarusian originals literally mean *grand-mother* and *granny*, and are common forms of addressing old women in a polite way. Mintz translates it in a neutral way, in some instances adding an adjective indicating the age of the housekeeper, as understanding the general term definitely requires less effort from the reader. However, the cognitive effect is not achieved, because the English language lacks an equivalent conveying a positive, caring attitude that is inherent to the addresses used in the original. Nevertheless, this latent information about how Nadzieja

treats her servant is not crucial for the plot and additionally it can be inferred from the main character's behavior.

On the other hand, the housekeeper refers to herself as an *old woman* (*старая баба*, staraâ baba). While *старая* means literally *old*, *баба* is a colloquial general term for woman, and it may regarded as a method to underline the fact that the housekeeper is one of the 'simple people', not the gentry. Although, similarly to the previous example, this detail is latent in original and lost in translation, the reader may infer the information about the distinctiveness of the housekeeper's speech from the narrator's comments. At one point the narrator notes the woman "moaned and lamented, spoke with that expressive intonation of the people" (Karatkevìč 2010: 592) in the presence of gentry. *People* in the cited fragment is the term used to describe representatives of the lower social class.

Minimizing the reader's processing effort is evident also in the case of Mr Dubatoŭk referring to his relative Nadzieja as *доня* (donâ), *донька* (don'ka) and *донечка* (donečka). These are dialectical forms; however, they are used solely to indicate the possible location of events. Mintz translated the first form with general term *daughter* and diminutive forms with phrase *my dear*, revealing the affection towards the character. Using any English dialectal form in translation would cause readers to employ an inappropriate cultural context and would be possibility confusing; consequently the translator's decision has resulted in a minimized processing effort.

The last form of address exemplifying Mintz's pursuit of the optimal relevance is *дурненкае дзяўчо* (durnenkae dzâŭčo) translated as *foolish little girl*. It is how the narrator, Biełarecki, refers to Nadzieja at the early stage of their acquaintance. This particular form of address consists of a colloquial term denoting a teenage girl, and a diminutive adjective describing a stupid, narrowminded and naive person. The phrase *little girl* might suggest a child rather than a teenager but stylistically it fits better to the adjective *foolish* and therefore it is easier to process by the reader, conveying at the same time the narrator's feeling of superiority over Nadzieja.

3.5. Rituals and customs

Even though Mintz used functional equivalents most frequently, in relation to a number of elements, the forms of referring to other characters, both formal and informal, conveyed the most latent connotations and were most challenging in terms of retaining the balance between the processing effort and cognitive effect on the reader. Using functional equivalents in some of the cases and throughtranslation in the other proved to be the most suitable options for the audience's understanding of the text. Nevertheless, in a handful of instances a more extensive rendering of the original was unavoidable.

Descriptive equivalent and more detailed procedure, namely *paraphrase* are solutions Mintz uses least frequently. They are applied exclusively for conveying

strict cultural terms with no English equivalents, thus not evoking even remotely similar associations. A notable example is *цырымонія з заломам* (cyrymonìa z zalomam) translated as:

> the ceremony, an extraordinarily important one called in Belarusian „zalom", that is, if an enemy wished to bewitch somebody's field, he tied together a bunch of wheatears into a knot (Karatkievič 2010: 583).

What is described in this fragment is actually a dictionary definition of *залом* and it explains the concept in such a way that it allows achieving the cognitive benefit and it also improves the reader's cognitive environment by providing background knowledge about Belarusian culture and customs. The same concerns *пакудзелле* (pakudzelle) translated as *gatherings of women spinners*. It is a long-standing tradition in Belarusian culture, quite complex and involving a specific code of conduct. Mintz's translation only partially conveys the full meaning of the original name, however it is sufficient for comprehending the text without unnecessary effort.

4. Conclusions

This study has examined *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*, the English translation by Mary Mintz, through the lens of the RT, treating reader cognition and the audience's ability to access to the author-intended context as crucial to the reception of the translation. Readers arrive at the first relevant interpretation automatically, therefore it is the translator's task to identify the assumptions available within readers' cognitive environments, that is assumptions which will most likely be selected to understand the message conveyed. The key challenge is to optimize the process, namely to maximize the positive cognitive effect while maintaining the lowest possible processing effort. In the case of *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*, translator's task is further complicated by the minority status of the Belarusian language, which makes cultural contexts less readily recognizable, and by Belarusian's grammatical and stylistic intricacies, which have no direct equivalents in English. Nevertheless, the translation of Karatkevič's classic is a notable example of how these problems can be overcome.

Mintz has employed various translation solutions across the text, often applying different procedures in the case of elements from the same category when required. Her approach to the names of people and places provides a good example of how she adapts her technique to the needs of the target audience, as some of these were transcribed from Belarusian (that is translated with the use of transference procedure, in Newmark terms) while others were rendered with the use of functional equivalents. In contrast, the functional equivalent procedure has been applied to all forms of address. It allowed to minimize the processing effort

ARTYKUŁY • ARTIKEL • ARTICLES

of the audience to decode their meaning. Even though the positive cognitive effects have not been maximized in all instances, the reader is able to understand the meaning of the original forms of address, that is the type of relations between the characters, by inferring that meaning from the plot rather that the forms themselves. Mintz used descriptive equivalent and paraphrase only to convey the names of rituals and traditions which cannot be simply transcribed or translated word-to-word as there is no English equivalent.

The fact that *King Stakh's Wild Hunt*, a novel written in a minority language and strongly embedded in a history and culture virtually unknown to the English-speaking reader, has been translated into English, re-published several times and positively received by the Anglophone audience contradicts the notion of untranslatability. Mintz does not consequently implement one strategy (i.e. domestication or foreignization); instead, she considers gains and loses making particular decisions, and the whole body of these decisions does not have to form one strategy. An analysis within the relevance framework finds that the careful examination of the target audience's cognitive environment and the recognition of the author-intended message are the keys to successful translation. While further research could assess translations between other language pairs, it is clear that Mintz's approach toward translation works for Belarusian and English.

Acknowledgements

References

Primary references

Karatkevič, Uladzìmìr (2010). *Dzìkae palâvanne karalâ Staha/ King Stakh's Wild Hunt*. Minsk. (Multilingual edition, Belarusian version, pp. 6–193, English version trans. by Mary Mintz, pp. 566–755).

Secondary references

Barszczewska, Nina (2004). *Belaruskaâ emìgracyâ — abaronca rodnae movy*. Warsaw. Pp. 15–58.

Brilmayer, Ingmar/ Werner, Alexandra/ Primus, Beatrice/ Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, Ina/ Schlesewsky, Matthias (2019). "The Exceptional Nature of the First Person in Natural Story Processing and the Transfer of Egocentricity". In: *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*. 34(4). Pp. 411–427.

Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990). "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem". In: *Poetics Today.* 11(1). Pp. 45–51.

Gutt, Ernst-August (2000). *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context.* 2nd edition. Oxford.

Gutt, Ernst-August (2010). "Relevance and Translation: On the Value of a Good Theoretical Foundation of Translation". In: Wałaszewska, E./ Kisielewska-Krysiuk, M./ Piskorska, A. (eds.) *In the Mind and across Minds: A Relevance-Theoretical Perspective on Communication and Tranlation.* Newcastle. Pp. 292–310.

Kaptsiuh, Iryna (2014). "Tradycyjnyâ formy zvarotu da subâsednìka ŭ belaruskaj move". In: *Adeptus. Pismo Humanistów* 4. Pp. 52–64.

Keshavarzi, Abdollah (2016). "Cultural Translatability And Untranslatability: A Case Study Of Translation Of *Roastam And Sohrab*". In: *Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science* 6(3). Pp. 138–147.

Khan, Imran (2016). The Hunted and the Haunted in "King Stakh's Wild Hunt". In: *PopMatters.* (https://www.popmatters.com/the-hunted-and-the-haunted-in-king-stakhs-wild-hunt-2495420230.html, accessed: 28.03.2020).

Kohler, Gun-Britt/ Navumenka Pavieł Ivanavič (2012). "Interference of Autonomization and Deautonomization in the Belarusian Literary Field. Indication of *Smallness*, or Something Different?". In: *Vesnìk Belaruskaga Dzâržaŭnaga Unìversìtèta. Seryâ 4: Fìlalogìâ. Žurnalìstyka. Pedagogìka* 3. Minsk. Pp. 3–11.

Latushko, Pavel (2010). "On Reading Uladzimir Karatkievich Works!". In: Karatkievič, Uładzimir. *King Stakh's Wild Hunt.* Minsk. Pp. 566–567.

Malaŭka, B. A. (2015). "Raskryccë taâmnìcy ŭ apovescì U. Karatkevìča «Dzìkae palâvanne karalâ Staha»". In: Tananuška, K.A. (ed.) *Mova ì lìtaratura: matèryâly 72-j navuk. kanf. studèntaŭ ì aspìrantaŭ fìlal. f-ta BDU, Mìnsk, 28 kras. 2015 g.* Minsk. Pp. 73–76.

Morgan, Ann (2012). Belarus: Ghosts of Christmas Past. *A Year of Reading the World.* (https://ayearofreadingtheworld.com/2012/12/24/belarus-ghosts-of-christmas-past/, accessed: 28.03.2020).

Moseley, Christopher, ed. (2010). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger.* 3rd ed. Paris.

Newmark, Paul (1988). *Approaches to Translation.* Hertfordshire.

Sadoŭskaâ, H.D. (2015). "Balota ŭ lûstèrku belaruskaj movy ì ètnakul'ury". In: Tananuška, K.A. (ed.) *Mova ì lìtaratura: matèryâly 72-j navuk. kanf. studèntaŭ ì aspìrantaŭ fìlal. f-ta BDU, Mìnsk, 28 kras. 2015 g.* Minsk. Pp. 117–122.

Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Oxford.

Stojilkov, Andrea (2018). "Is *Fajront* in Sarajevo the Same as *Closing Time* Elsewhere? On the Translatability of the Yugoslav Age of Rock and Roll into English". In: Large, D./ Akashi, M./ Jóźwikowska, W./ Rose, E. (eds.) *Untranslatability. Interdisciplinary Perspectives.* New York/; London. Pp. 179–198.

ARTYKUŁY • ARTIKEL • ARTICLES

Vasìlčuk, A. A./ Šved, I. A. (2012). "Vobraz balota âk čynnìk pryrodna-landšaftnaga koda belaruskaga fal'kloru". In: Žuk, A. I. (ed.) *Sbornik naučnyh rabot studentov Respubliki Belarus' "NIRS 2011"*. Minsk. Pp. 478–82.

Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility*. London/ New York.

Wilson, Deirdre/ Sperber, Dan (2004). "Relevance Theory". In: Horn, L./ Ward, G. (eds.) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford. Pp. 607–632.

Zarei, Rouhollah and Somayeh Norouzi (2014). "Proper Nouns in Translation: Should They Be Translated?". In: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 3(6). Pp. 152–161.

Angelika Peljak-Łapińska
Swansea University
Modern Languages, Translation and Interpreting
Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP, Wales, UK
angelika.peljak@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000–0001–6102–1815