

TRANSLATION STRATEGIES AND THE TERMINOLOGICAL REPRESENTATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE CROSS-BORDER PROJECT HICART I

OKSANA RIBA-HRYNYSHYN, MARIANA SHTOHRYN, PETRO MOZOLEVSKYI*

*Corresponding author: mariana.shtohryn@nung.edu.ua

Abstract. The article provides a comprehensive analysis of the translation of the text content of the cross-border cultural project HICART I as a tool for the international representation of the tangible and intangible heritage of the Carpathian region. The relevance of the study is determined by the growing role of digital cultural routes in shaping a positive image of regions, the intensification of cross-border cooperation, and the need to ensure terminological consistency, cultural adequacy, and communicative effectiveness of translation in a multilingual environment. In the context of Ukraine's European integration, the translation of cultural heritage is not only a linguistic transformation, but also a form of cultural mediation and a tool for intercultural communication. The aim of the article is to identify and systematise translation strategies and terminological solutions in the Ukrainian-English corpus of the HICART I project, taking into account their textual specificity and functional-discursive characteristics.

The empirical basis of the study is the bilingual texts of the HICART I web platform, which cover descriptions of more than 40 cultural heritage sites (including UNESCO World Heritage Sites), narrative route pages, promotional materials, navigation elements, interactive maps, and administrative and project documentation.

The research methodology is based on a combination of a functional approach to translation, terminological analysis, the method of continuous sampling, comparative analysis of Ukrainian and English versions of texts, and discourse analysis. This set of methods allows us to consider translation in a digital environment as an integrated system of interaction between verbal, visual, and cartographic components.

The study identified the dominant methods of translating cultural heritage terms: calquing, transliteration, descriptive translation (explication), functional equivalence, adaptation, and combined strategies. It has been proven that the choice of translation model depends on the genre register of the text (reference, marketing, educational), the communicative purpose and the expectations of the target audience.

The scientific novelty of the work lies in the systematic consideration of the translation of cultural heritage as a multi-level multimodal discourse within the framework of a cross-border digital route. The practical significance of the results is related to the possibility of their use for optimising translation strategies in the field of cultural diplomacy, tourism communication and international digital humanities projects.

Keywords: cultural heritage, translation, cross-border communication, terminology, digital cultural route, HICART I, Ukrainian-English translation, Carpathian region.

1. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary integration processes and the challenges of globalisation mean that the importance of Ukraine's cultural heritage as a factor in the spiritual development of society, national self-identification and intercultural communication must be reconsidered. Preserving and translating cultural heritage are important instruments of international cultural dialogue and of representing Ukraine on the global stage.

Cultural heritage encompasses tangible and intangible values transmitted from generation to generation, which possess historical, artistic, scientific or symbolic significance for a community.

Protecting cultural and spiritual heritage has been identified as one of the priorities of the *National Security Strategy of Ukraine*. In accordance with international documents ratified by Ukraine, including the 1992 *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage*, the 2003 *UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* and the 2005 *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, the protection of cultural heritage constitutes an international legal obligation of the state.

At the national level, a legislative framework has been established that defines the mechanisms for preserving and using cultural resources. This includes the Ukrainian laws "*On the Protection of Cultural Heritage*", "*On the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage*", and "*On the National Programme for the Preservation and Use of Cultural Heritage Sites*", among others (Aixelá, 1996; Venuti, 2017). Nevertheless, the task of conducting a comprehensive analysis of heritage as a resource for regional socio-economic and cultural development remains highly relevant.

The study **aims to** identify and systematise the translation strategies and terminological solutions used in the bilingual corpus of materials from the cross-border cultural project, HICART I. It also aims to determine the functional role of these strategies and solutions in representing the cultural heritage of the Carpathian region within the international digital communication space.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In contemporary scholarly discourse, translation is regarded as both a linguistic process and a complex mechanism of intercultural communication, ensuring the transmission of cultural meanings, values and narratives within the global information space. Consequently, the study of cultural heritage translation sits at the intersection of translation studies, cultural studies, linguo-cultural studies, multimodal studies and digital humanities.

The fundamental theoretical principles of translation studies were formed in the works of classical scholars: Jakobson R., Nida E. A. Newmark P., who developed the concepts of dynamic equivalence and communicative translation, emphasising the need to take into account the cultural context and the needs of the target audience. The further development of translation studies is associated with the works of Bassnett S. (Bassnett, 2014), Pym A. (Pym, 2020) and Venuti L. (Venuti, 2017), who consider translation in a broader sociocultural context and emphasise the role of the translator as an active participant in intercultural interaction.

In the context of translating culturally specific units that reflect national traditions, historical realities, and sociocultural characteristics of a particular community, it is important to classify strategies for translating culturally marked elements, as proposed by Aixelá J. F. (Aixelá, 1996), which includes

methods such as calquing, transliteration, adaptation and descriptive translation. Similar issues are considered in the works of contemporary Ukrainian researchers who analyse the reproduction of culturally determined units in translation and the problems of intercultural interpretation of texts by Slavova L. L., Borysenko N. D. (Slavova & Borysenko, 2022); Solodka A. K. (Solodka, 2018); Stoianova T. (Stoianova, 2020).

The translation of texts related to cultural heritage, museum communication and cultural tourism, which combine informational, educational and representative functions and not only inform the audience about cultural objects, but also shape the international image of a region or state, requires special attention to cultural realities, historical contexts and specific terminology (Dehtiarenko, 2020; Zhang, 2024). An important guideline in this area is the international documents and recommendations of UNESCO (UNESCO, 1972; UNESCO, 2003) and ICOMOS (ICOMOS, 2008), which define the principles of interpretation, presentation and promotion of cultural heritage.

Digital cultural heritage platforms such as Europeana (Europeana PRO) and Google Arts & Culture (Google Arts & Culture) are also shaping new forms of cultural resource presentation and require effective multilingual communication strategies.

At the same time, an analysis of contemporary scientific literature reveals a certain research gap. Most works are devoted to general theoretical aspects of translating culturally specific units or museum texts, while the translation of multimodal content of digital cultural routes and cross-border cultural projects remains insufficiently studied. There is a particularly limited number of studies analysing translation strategies in multilingual digital platforms, where the informational, tourist and cultural-representative functions of the text are combined.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research into the peculiarities of translating cultural heritage is based on an interdisciplinary approach that combines the principles of translation studies, terminology, text linguistics, discourse analysis and multimodal studies.

The methodological framework provides for a functional-communicative approach (analysis of translation taking into account the target audience and pragmatic purpose of the text); a linguistic and cultural approach (interpretation of terms as carriers of cultural meanings); a corpus approach (processing of the HICART I project's array of text materials as a holistic discursive corpus); comparative analysis of Ukrainian and English versions of content.

The empirical basis of the study is formed by a corpus of materials from the **HICART I** project, which includes textual descriptions of more than 40 cultural heritage sites; reference and narrative pages of the route; navigational and cartographic elements; promotional materials; and administrative and project-related texts.

The corpus includes both informational and reference registers, as well as marketing and educational registers, ensuring that the material is representative for the analysis of various translation strategies.

The study uses a combination of general scientific and special linguistic methods:

1. Continuous sampling method – for forming a corpus of terminological units related to cultural heritage, tourism and cross-border cooperation.

2. Contrastive analysis – for comparing Ukrainian and English versions of texts in order to identify translation transformations.

3. Terminological analysis – to systematise and classify specialised vocabulary, determine methods of translation (calquing, transcription, explication, functional equivalent, adaptation, etc.).

4. Discourse analysis – to study communicative strategies for representing cultural heritage within the framework of tourist and institutional discourse.

The research was conducted in several stages:

The first stage involved the creation of the corpus: text and multimedia materials from the HICART I project were selected and systematised by type (descriptive, promotional, administrative, navigational).

The second stage was terminological inventorying: terms and culturally marked units related to tangible and intangible heritage, tourism and regional policy were identified.

The third stage involved the classification of translation strategies: examples were grouped according to translation methods (calquing, transcription, explication, adaptation, etc.) and their functional appropriateness was determined.

The fourth stage was the interpretation of results: the identified translation patterns were summarised, the role of the translator as a cultural mediator was defined, and prospects for improving terminological consistency in further phases of the project were outlined.

The representativeness of the study is ensured by a comprehensive analysis of the complete array of HICART I materials, as well as a combination of linguistic and multimodal methods. The novelty of the scientific research lies in the systematic consideration of the translation of cultural heritage as a multilevel discursive phenomenon within the framework of a cross-border digital route.

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Translating cultural heritage materials involves not only linguistic transformation of the text, but also cultural mediation – conveying meanings, symbols, and contexts that do not always have direct equivalents in another language.

The HICART I project is a cross-border initiative implemented on the basis of the Carpathian Cultural Route programme (carpathianculturalroute.com) with the participation of the Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas. Its goal is to integrate the region's tangible and intangible heritage into a common digital space.

The HICART I project aims to promote the historical and cultural heritage of the Carpathian Euroregion, which covers the territories of Ivano-Frankivsk and Transcarpathian regions of Ukraine and Maramures County in Romania. The total grant amount is approximately €330,088.18 from the EU.

The HICART I corpus of materials consists of textual, visual and multimedia resources dedicated to more than 40 cultural sites, including 11 UNESCO World Heritage Sites. The platform is structured as an interactive route, where each site is accompanied by historical information, photographs, a map location and links to related sources:

The first (basic) level of the project is a descriptive database: for each point on the route, there is a brief historical overview, the functional purpose of the object, its cultural value and current status of use (museum, sacred building, public space, etc.). These descriptions are supplemented by fragments from the broader context of the region (museum collections from prehistoric artefacts to the present day; the

role of historic buildings as concert halls, galleries, cultural institutions), which makes the corpus not a set of 'isolated cards' but a comprehensive reference and narrative array about the Carpathians.

The second level is a register of objects with filters and navigation (Ukraine/Romania; types of monuments). This register highlights sacred wooden architecture (such as the Church of the Descent of the Holy Spirit in Rohatyn, a UNESCO World Heritage Site), museums, historical monuments, and miniature parks. This division structures the search and sets terminological categories for further analysis.

The third level is cartographic: interactive maps/diagrams linked to transport infrastructure and programme boundaries, which enhances tour planning and the spatial interoperability of descriptions.

Finally, the organisational and methodological section (description of the partnership, budget, implementation period) records the administrative metadata of the corpus (dates, funding, geography), which is important for replicating the experience and citing it in research. According to the official register of HUSKROUA/KEEP programmes, HICART (I) was implemented from 20 July 2021 to 19 July 2023 with a total budget of €366,764.66 (EU funding €330,088.18).

It should be noted that the HICART I project was coordinated within the framework of the EU cross-border programme and aimed to create a single cultural route for Ukraine and Romania. Materials from the official website and partner organisations (in particular, AEDIF Ivano-Frankivsk) demonstrate the practical implementation of translation solutions during the preparation of a trilingual multimedia guide.

The body of our research combines several media layers:

- 1) Textual: concise object cards, expanded 'About the route/History' pages that build a meta-narrative about the multiculturalism and historical stratification of the region (from folk crafts and ethnography to the complex periods of the 20th century).
- 2) Visual: contemporary and archival photos, sometimes panoramas; in some cases, references to 3D/VR visualisation as a goal for the development of digital presentation;
- 3) Cartographic: interactive maps and PDF route diagrams;
- 4) Educational and popular: materials for visitors that integrate information about crafts, local practices, and events;
- 5) Administrative/project: press releases, news, partners documenting the life cycle of the initiative.
- 6) Such media diversity also determines terminological multifunctionality: the corpus contains official reference vocabulary (for cards), marketing texts (for route promotion) and popular science descriptions (for contextualisation).

Christopher John Taylor emphasises the importance of a multimodal approach to translation, where text, images and interactive content interact. Therefore, the translator must ensure 'visual-textual coherence' – the correspondence of the translation of captions, labels, names and cartographic elements to the structure of the images.

HICART I materials address at least three user groups:

Firstly, travellers/tourists – for whom the corpus serves a navigational and informational function (selection of sites, route planning, expectations from visits).

Secondly, cultural heritage specialists and researchers – thanks to context descriptions, subject headings and links to international categories (UNESCO), this array is convenient as a starting point for inventorying and as a prototype metadata structure for local catalogues.

Thirdly, local communities/educational initiatives – the content strengthens local identity and promotes crafts, festivals, and educational practices; in the future, this component will be expanded in the next phase (HICART II), which is focused on enhancing the visualisation of the route and attracting visitors.

The argument for the completeness of HICART I establishes a close link with further development (HICART II). Official announcements by IFNTUOG and the Interreg NEXT programme state that HICART II (2025–2026), with a budget of €318,301.20 (EU contribution €286,471.08), is to develop the visibility and analytics of the existing route: sociological surveys of visitors, research on objects, communication and educational activities. This indicates that HICART I has already done the groundwork of collecting and systematising objects, and the next phase is aimed at deepening representation and audience engagement (visual improvements, events, cross-border training).

Thus, the HICART I corpus is a multi-level collection of descriptive, visual and cartographic materials, supported by administrative metadata (dates/budget/partnerships) and clear registry logic (40 objects/11 UNESCO sites). Its structure corresponds to the objectives of a cross-border cultural route: to ensure the inventory of heritage, provide navigation tools and form a communication narrative for different user groups. For further translation and terminology analysis, this means working with several text registers (reference/marketing/educational), checking terminological consistency between the languages of the route, and comparing local names and categories with international classifications (UNESCO; categories of object types), which is particularly relevant at the HICART II development stage.

The text content of the Carpathian Cultural Route project is an example of cross-border communication that combines elements of cultural discourse, tourism marketing and institutional representation of the region. The translation of such texts performs not only an informative function, but also a cultural interpretation function: it is designed not simply to reproduce the content, but to convey the values, symbolism and style of communication characteristic of the Carpathian region. This integrative approach allows us to view translation as a multifaceted and complex activity in which the interconnection between language and culture, as well as the role of the translator, takes on a new interpretation.

Within the scope of this analysis, let us consider the terminology, translation of cultural concepts, and stylistic features of the content using the example of the Ukrainian-English version of the route website and related information materials.

First of all, the project's terminology system is characterised by a combination of professional vocabulary from the fields of cultural heritage, tourism, and regional policy.

In the translation of terms denoting elements of tangible and intangible cultural heritage, various translation methods are used, depending on the genre of the text, the target audience and the desire to preserve authenticity.

In order to systematise the material and gain a deeper understanding of translation strategies, we present below a generalised classification of the main methods of translating terms in the cultural heritage texts under study:

1. Calquing – this translation technique ensures formal accuracy and is often used for terms that have established international equivalents in the field of cultural policy, for example: *cultural heritage* – *культурна спадщина*, *cross-border cooperation* – *транскордонна співпраця*, *sustainable tourism* – *сталий туризм*, *heritage interpretation centre* – *центр інтерпретації спадщини*, *traditional crafts* – *традиційні ремесла*.

2. Transcription/transliteration – used for ethnocultural names, local realities, geographical names and terms without an exact English equivalent. Allows national and cultural specificity to be preserved, for example: *hutsul pottery* – *гуцульська кераміка*, *Kosiv painted ceramics* – *Косівська мальована кераміка*, *lemko traditions* – *лемківські традиції*, *hutsul wedding rituals* – *гуцульські весільні обряди*. Transcription creates an effect of authenticity and local relevance, often accompanied by a brief explanation (*hutsul pottery* – *traditional folk ceramics from the Carpathians*).

3. Descriptive translation (explication) – used for terms that have no direct equivalents or require cultural explanation, for example: *hutsul highlander festival* – *Свято полонин (традиційне свято пасухів Карпат)*, *custodians of heritage* – *носії культурних традицій та охоронці спадщини*, *revitalization of folk culture* – *відродження і сучасне переосмислення народної культури*, *heritage clusters* – *мережі об'єктів, об'єднаних спільною культурною темою*.

4. Functional equivalent – used for terms the meaning of which is conveyed through concepts closer to the cultural experience of the target audience, for example: *Майстер-класи народних ремесел* – *hands-on workshops in traditional crafts*, *Гастрономічна спадщина* – *culinary heritage / local food traditions*, *Відчуй дух Карпатської спадщини* – *experience the spirit of Carpathian heritage*. Here, the translator does not copy the form, but conveys the function of the expression – to arouse interest, create an image of participation, and make the text attractive to tourists.

5. Combined translation (transcription + explanation) – a combination of two strategies – authentic title with clarification of content, most effective for promotional and cultural texts, for example: *hutsul pottery (traditional folk ceramics from the Carpathians)* – *гуцульська кераміка (традиційна народна кераміка Карпат)*, *Kolomyia Museum of folk art* – *Коломийський музей народного мистецтва (етнографічна колекція Гуцульщини)*, *Kosiv craft fairs* – *Косівські ремісничі ярмарки (центри народного мистецтва)*. This strategy preserves the ethnocultural marker while explaining it to foreign readers, which is in line with the principle of 'dynamic equivalence'.

6. Adaptation (cultural transformation) – used for promotional phrases and slogans where it is important to reproduce the emotional effect rather than the structure of the original, for example: *Проведи вихідні в Карпатах!* – *Spend a weekend discovering Carpathian heritage!*, *Доторкнись до традиції!* – *Discover authentic Carpathian crafts!*, *Де оживають традиції!* – *Where traditions come alive!* The adaptation preserves the communicative function of the text – encouragement, invitation, engagement of the reader – and takes into account the stylistic norms of the English-speaking audience.

7. Generalisation and concretisation – used in cases where a concept has no direct equivalent, and the translator chooses a broader or more precise word to preserve the meaning, for example: *heritage valorisation* – *популяризація спадщини / підвищення її цінності (generalisation)*, *folk art* – *народне мистецтво / декоративно-прикладне мистецтво (specification)*.

This variety of translation strategies ensures a balance between accuracy, authenticity and communicative effectiveness, and the translation itself becomes a tool for cultural interpretation and interlingual representation of the Carpathian region. The translator acts as a mediator between local

tradition and the international reader. The proposed practice not only promotes understanding of the content, but also supports the cultural visibility of the region, contributing to the formation of a positive image of the Ukrainian Carpathians in the global cultural space.

Translating the text content of the Carpathian Cultural Route requires a combination of linguistic accuracy, cultural sensitivity and an understanding of marketing logic. The translator acts not only as an intermediary between languages, but also between cultures, promoting the integration of Ukrainian cultural products into the international arena. The successful transmission of terms and cultural concepts ensures authenticity and, at the same time, makes the texts accessible to a wider audience. Stylistic consistency between languages shapes a coherent image of the Carpathians as a region of heritage, traditions and modern tourism opportunities. That is why translation in this case becomes an act of cultural mediation – a tool that not only informs but also shapes the perception of Ukrainian culture in the European context.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The study confirmed that the translation of text content for the cross-border cultural project HICART I is a complex, multi-level process that combines linguistic transformation, terminological standardisation and cultural mediation. In this context, translation performs not only an informative function, but also a representative and image-building one, contributing to the integration of regional cultural heritage into the international communication space.

Analysis of the corpus of materials has shown that the project's terminology system is formed at the intersection of several discursive spheres – cultural heritage, tourism, regional policy, and institutional communication. Within the Ukrainian-English comparison, the dominance of such translation strategies as calquing, transliteration, explication, functional equivalence, adaptation, and their combined models has been established. The choice of strategy is determined by the genre register of the text, the pragmatic orientation of the message, and the expectations of the target audience.

Thus, the translation of cultural heritage within the framework of a digital cross-border route emerges as a tool for cultural diplomacy and intercultural communication. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the systematic analysis of translation as a multimodal discursive phenomenon, and its practical significance lies in the possibility of applying the results obtained to improve translation practices, terminological unification, and the development of standards for the presentation of cultural heritage in international digital projects.

Prospects for further research lie in expanding the corpus of materials (in particular, taking into account the implementation of HICART II), quantitative analysis of terminological variability, and studying the reception of translated content by different user groups.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aixelá, J. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 52–78). Multilingual Matters.
- [2] Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation studies* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- [3] Dehtiarenko, M. (2020). Features of translating Ukrainian museum terminology into English. *Scientific Bulletin of the National Museum of Ukrainian History*, 6, 524–527.
<https://visnyk.nmiu.org/index.php/nv/article/view/438> (in Ukrainian)

- [4] Europeana PRO. (n.d.). *Europeana Data Model (EDM) documentation*. <https://pro.europeana.eu/page/edm-documentation>
- [5] Google Arts & Culture. (n.d.). *Platform overview for cultural heritage partners*. <https://artsandculture.google.com>
- [6] ICOMOS. (2008). *Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (Ename Charter)*. Paris.
- [7] Pym, A. (2020). *Exploring Translation Theories* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [8] Slavova, L., & Borysenko, N. (2022). Reproduction of culturally specific units in translation: confrontation of cultures. In *Current state and prospects of linguistic research and translation problems*, 60–63. (in Ukrainian)
- [9] Solodka, A. (2018). Research on the influence of culturally determined factors on the translation process. *Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University. Series "Linguistics,"* 31, 231–236. (in Ukrainian)
- [10] Stoianova, T. (2020). Features of translating Ukrainian-language culturally specific texts into English. *Scientific Bulletin of K. D. Ushynsky National Pedagogical University*, 31, 419–434. (in Ukrainian)
- [11] UNESCO. (1972). *Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage*. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext>
- [12] UNESCO. (2003). *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage*. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention>
- [13] Venuti, L. (2017). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [14] Zhang, X. (2024). Cultural heritage translation and cross-cultural communication. *Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Science*, 6(3), 142–149.

Oksana Riba-Hrynyshyn, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Philology, Translation and Interpreting of Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7579-0903

Address: Oksana Riba-Hrynyshyn, Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, 15 Karpatska St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025 Ukraine.

E-mail: oksana.riba-hrynyshyn@nung.edu.ua

Mariana Shtohryn, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Philology, Translation and Interpreting of Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8654-1486

Address: Mariana Shtohryn, Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas, 15 Karpatska St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025 Ukraine.

E-mail: mariana.shtohryn@nung.edu.ua

Petro Mozolevskyi, Research Fellow, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland, Institute Integration and Participation, Olten, Switzerland.

ORCID ID: 0009-0007-7912-5402

Address: Petro Mozolevskyi, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland, Institute Integration and Participation, 16 Riggengbachstrasse, Olten, 4600 Switzerland.

E-mail: petro.mozolevskyi@fhnw.ch

Received: January 29, 2025; **revised:** March 23, 2025; **accepted:** April 16, 2025; **published:** December 22, 2025

Оксана Ріба-Гринишин, Мар'яна Штогрин, Петро Мозолєвський. Стратегії перекладу та термінологічне представлення культурної спадщини в транскордонному проєкті HICART I. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника. Філологія*, 12 (2025), 70–79.

У статті здійснено комплексний аналіз перекладу текстового контенту транскордонного культурного проєкту HICART I як інструменту міжнародної репрезентації матеріальної й нематеріальної спадщини Карпатського регіону. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена зростанням

ролі цифрових культурних маршрутів у формуванні позитивного іміджу регіонів, активізацією транскордонної співпраці та необхідністю забезпечення термінологічної узгодженості, культурної адекватності й комунікативної ефективності перекладу в багатомовному середовищі. У контексті європейської інтеграції України переклад культурної спадщини постає не лише як лінгвістична трансформація, а як форма культурної медіації та інструмент міжкультурної комунікації.

Метою статті є виявлення та систематизація перекладацьких стратегій і термінологічних рішень в українсько-англомовному корпусі матеріалів проєкту HICART I з урахуванням їхньої текстової специфіки та функціонально-дискурсивних характеристик.

Емпіричну базу дослідження становлять двомовні тексти вебплатформи HICART I, що охоплюють описи понад 40 об'єктів культурної спадщини (зокрема пам'яток, включених до списку ЮНЕСКО), нарративні сторінки маршруту, промоційні матеріали, навігаційні елементи, інтерактивні карти та адміністративно-проєктну документацію.

Методологія дослідження ґрунтується на поєднанні функціонального підходу до перекладу, термінологічного аналізу, методу суцільної вибірки, зіставного аналізу українських та англійських версій текстів та дискурс-аналізу. Такий комплекс методів дозволяє розглядати переклад у цифровому середовищі як інтегровану систему взаємодії вербальних, візуальних і картографічних компонентів.

У результаті дослідження виокремлено домінантні способи перекладу термінів культурної спадщини: калькування, транслітерацію, описовий переклад (експлікацію), функціональний еквівалент, адаптацію та комбіновані стратегії. Доведено, що вибір перекладацької моделі залежить від жанрового регістру тексту (довідковий, маркетинговий, освітній), комунікативної мети та очікувань цільової аудиторії.

Наукова новизна роботи полягає у системному розгляді перекладу культурної спадщини як багаторівневого мультимодального дискурсу в межах транскордонного цифрового маршруту. Практичне значення результатів пов'язане з можливістю їх використання для оптимізації перекладацьких стратегій у сфері культурної дипломатії, туристичної комунікації та міжнародних проєктів цифрової гуманітаристики.

Ключові слова: культурна спадщина, переклад, транскордонна комунікація, термінологія, цифровий культурний маршрут, HICART I, українсько-англійський переклад, Карпатський регіон.