

Andrii Kozachuk
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University
18/2 Vorovskoho Str., Kyiv 04053, Ukraine
a.mk@online.ua

LEXICOLOGICAL ASPECT OF UKRAINIAN-ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF SHORT PROSE OF THE LATE 19TH-EARLY 20TH CENTURIES

The paper concentrates mostly on ways of rendering Ukrainian proper names, nationally biased units of lexicon or realia and figurative phraseological expressions into English. The comparative analysis of four fiction texts by B. Hrinchenko and M. Kotsyubynsky and translation texts executed by Roma Franko has shown that most of Ukrainian national proper names have been transliterated. Due to the complex nature of the notion of realia, it is not always possible to detect all of them in the text. Besides that, a lot of them have been rendered by means of synthesis of several ways, for instance, transliteration + contextual translation, transliteration + comment, etc. No selected figurative phraseological expressions have been substituted by their corresponding equivalents in the target language.

In general, despite loss of some connotative meanings, the translator seeks the balance between representing the translation text in comprehensible way on the one hand and preserving national peculiarities of its components on the other one.

KEY WORDS: Ukrainian literature, proper names, nationally biased units of lexicon, idiomatic and phraseological expressions, rendering, transliteration, substitution.

When dwelling upon the problem of piece of fiction translation, one should pay attention to some essential facts. Firstly, any work is a part of a national culture with its style peculiarities. Secondly, the translator should take into account style peculiarities of the target language, which can be quite different from those of the source language. Thirdly, lack of correspondence of linguo-stylistic peculiarities of translation text and typical texts of national literature in the source languages can be put down to objective as well as subjective reasons.

Research in the field of lexicological aspect of fiction text translation is topical for system study of linguo-stylistic peculiarities of translation. Study of lexicological aspect of translation of Ukrainian short prose into English is helpful for further translation theory research.

In Ukraine, essential attention has already been paid to problems of translation (works by I. Korunets, V. Radchyk, Yu. Zhluktenko, R. Zorivchak, as well as T. Bakastova, E. Galapchuk, O. Mushnina, K. Zaytseva and others). The problems of translation from Ukrainian into English have been considered to a smaller extent than those of the English-Ukrainian direction.

The objectives of the present paper are:

1. To cover basic and peculiar points concerning translation of Ukrainian short prose of the late 19th-early 20th centuries into English.
2. To take into consideration main stylistic peculiarities of Ukrainian short prose works of the said period in the view of lexicology.
3. To analyse peculiarities of such translation documenting the said analysis by the texts of translation executed by Roma Franko.

The choice of Roma Franko's texts can be grounded by the fact that her activity as translator, publisher and public figure has not been studied well enough by European scholars yet. The research has been performed on the ground of four original Ukrainian short prose texts: "Brother against Brother" (first published in 1907) and "A Dearth of Grain" (1884) by Borys Hrinchenko as well as "The Unknown One" (1907) and "On the Road" (1907) by Mykhaylo Kotsyubynsky, also their translation texts executed by Roma Franko.

It has been planned to consider the lexicological linguistic phenomena producing most difficulties when translating and to confirm the theoretical points with the examples selected from the researched texts.

Some essential components of individual style of B. Hrinchenko and M. Kotsyubynsky have to be therefore considered.

Despite the same active period of the selected writers, most of philologists consider them to belong to different epochs. K. Sizova, a Ukrainian scholar, relates B. Hrinchenko to populism, but M. Kotsyubynsky to modernism. She affirms that linguistic peculiarities of portrayal of B. Hrinchenko's individual style are characterized by close links of the characters' social backgrounds and functions in the text (Sizova 2010, p. 187). Motivation of selecting proper names has been mentioned as a linguo-stylistic peculiarity (Sizova 2010, p. 194).

Concerning creative period of M. Kotsyubynsky, the scholar points to great number of features typical for literary impressionism and symbolism therein. She mentions also such features of his individual style as reiterated epithets, similes, symbolic implication and use of metaphors (Sizova 2010, p. 242, 246).

M. Kotsyubynsky's being a modernist writer can be proved by the N. Hooti's paper as well. It states that the language of modernism fiction is characterized chiefly by increasing number of various specific experimental elements and flouting existing literary forms (Hooti 2011, p. 327).

When considering essential for lexicology basic aspects of translation, the classification of translation aspects by I. Korunets have been used as the basis. According to it, among the basic lexicological aspects there is translation of proper names, international lexicon (or internationalisms), nationally biased units of lexicon and idiomatic/phraseological and stable expressions (Korunets 2003, p. 5).

It can be stated, that specific character of the analysed Ukrainian texts results in lack of international lexicon, though being the typical texts of the epoch, they contain most of other above-stated types of lexical units. The populist peculiarity of texts by B. Hrinchenko is selection of lexical units, which must be simple and easily understood by the masses. Such word-stock must contain a lot of nationally biased units, dialect words, idiomatic and stable expressions which are to demonstrate the "living" speech. The modernist texts by M. Kotsyubynsky display peculiar literary composition, comparatively greater number of symbols, foreign borrowings, etc. Both types of texts can be also characterized by motivation of proper names selection, as well as wide integration of non-Ukrainian text and dialect lexical units.

As it is hard to perform a research of high quality in the dimension of one article, it has been decided to concentrate mostly on such aspects as proper names, nationally biased units of lexicon and idiomatic or phraseological expressions as specified by I. Korunets.

When considering rendering proper names, the scholars can mention two main ways of the said process: a) translation proper (that is substitution of the proper name with its corresponding equivalent in the target language); and b) transcription or transliteration.

For instance, Y. Galapchuk comments on substitution of the proper names with their corresponding equivalents as possible due to global existence of "conventional equivalents". They cover such semantic fields as the name of supreme pontiff, royal families' representatives, Christian names, as well as the names of literary characters of world-wide known tales and legends (Galapchuk 1999, p. 11). The proper names that have acquired connotative meaning are also subject to substitution with corresponding equivalents (Galapchuk 1999, p. 12).

Transcription and/or transliteration of Ukrainian proper names in English faces very topical contemporary problem that lies in lack of transcription rules uniformity. O. Pelypenko states that most problems occur when trying to transliterate such letters as *й, ь, я, ю, є, і*. It is basically put down to the reason that even Ukraine's official regulations admit existence of spelling invariants. Moreover, Ukrainian passport offices often use their own domestic transliteration instruments (Pelypenko 2005, p. 27-29).

The paper on literary character nomination raises the complex problem. On the one hand, when translating proper names, it is of great essence to take into account all their connotative meanings; on the other hand, it is of no less essence to preserve the name's phonetic representation. These aspects

reflect on both national colour and the author's individual style (Zaytseva, Bakastova, Kuznetsova, Todorova 1986, p. 59).

Considering the same problem, I. Shama proves that the proper names of literary characters are selected due to various reasons and never by chance. That is that they are connected with the plot, the character's function in the composition, etc. The scholar names such phenomenon the "proper names symbolism" (Shama 2005, p. 116).

The study of specific examples can show the following. The "Brother against Brother" text by B. Hrinchenko contains such proper names as: a) anthroponyms – *Koretsky Yevhen Petrovych* (with invariant *Henya*), *Talya* (with invariant *Natalya Mykolayivna*), *Petro*, *Yakiw* and others; b) toponyms – *Kyiv*, *Ladyinka* and others. The invariants' existence is caused by peculiarities of Ukrainian national culture and language as well as availability of diminutive forms in the latter. Grammatical structure of the Ukrainian language enables a number of derivatives, among which there are the ones serving as means of expressing genitive relations (*Демидова [рука]*, *ладинська [школа]* and others).

Comparative analysis of the original text and that of the translation proves, that on the one hand, most of points in the transliteration regulation of Ukrainian committee on legal terms problems have been taken into consideration. For instance, initial *ε* is represented as *ye*, *u* as *y* (*Євген – Yevhen*, *Петрович – Petrovych*), though the surname of *Корецький* is represented as guided by simplified spelling rules – *Koretsky* (Нормативна таблиця... 1996):

(1a) *Учитель ладинської школи Євген Корецький, прокинувшись ... згадав, що сьогодні якраз виходить два місяці, відколи він попавсь у неволю* (Hrinchenko 1991, p. 300).

(1b) *As soon as Yevhen Koretsky, the schoolteacher from Ladyinka, awoke ... it occurred to him that it was exactly two months to the day since he had been incarcerated* (Franko 2010, p. 162).

(2a) *Навчав, як знайти його самого в Києві* (Hrinchenko 1991, p. 336).

(2b) *He told them how they could contact him in Kyiv* (Franko 2010, p. 214).

At the same time, one can notice some flouting the rules, when final *в* in Ukrainian given name of *Яків* is represented as *w*, which is closer to phonetic transcription than to transliteration:

(3a) *... другою Корецький стискав руки Петрові і Якову ...* (Hrinchenko 1991, p. 314).

(3b) *... Koretsky used the other one to shake hands with Petro and Yakiw ...* (Franko 2010, p. 182).

If I. Shama's above-mentioned opinion is true, then the proper names have some symbolism and have close ties to the plot. In this context, it may be conceded, that the main character's closest friends and associates bear the given names of *Петро* and *Яків* which are Ukrainian equivalents for Peter and James (the apostles). As these names have been transliterated, their symbolic connotative meaning may be lost when read by an average English-speaking reader if he/she is not familiar to Ukrainian language and culture.

The synonymy in proper names usage is of great interest as well. For instance, if the main character's full name appears in the text only once, the reader gets an idea of its bearer from the context:

(4) *... he is here, standing before you – Yevhen Petrovych Koretsky* (Franko 2010, p. 174),

but when the diminutive invariant is used:

(5a) *Ах, Геню!* (Hrinchenko 1991, p. 312)

(5b) *Oh, Henya!* (Franko 2010, p. 179),

the translator applies transliteration with the reference to the glossary entry, which is included to the same volume going: "endearing diminutive form of Yevhen" (Franko 2010, p. 401).

The text of “A Dearth of Grain” tale contains such traditional Ukrainian anthroponyms as *Петро* and *Горпина*:

(6a) *Нічого не сказала Горпина, замовк і Петро* (Hrinchenko).

(6b) *Horpyna didn't respond, and Petro also remained gloomily silent* (Franko 2008, p. 105).

In example 6, the names are transliterated without any flouting the rules (Normatyvna tablytsia... 1996), but are worth considering due to another detail. V. Nikonov's book on proper names goes about social class division of given names in Russian Empire, to which Ukraine used to belong during the studied period (Nikonov 1974, p. 15). This fact states the connotative meaning of *Horpyna* name – the bearer may belong to only possible social class of peasants. Such connotation may be also lost when the name is transliterated.

At the same time, one may notice the occurrence of substituting proper names with their equivalents (examples 7-8 from “On the Road”, a tale by M. Kotsyubynsky):

(7a) *Тепер вже напевно: Варвара, Настя, Оксана, Марія...* (Kotsyubynsky 1979, p. 220).

(7b) *Well then, it must be: Barbara, Nastya, Oksana, Mariya...* (Franko 2010, p. 296).

Roma Franko substitutes Ukrainian name *Варвара* with its corresponding and more familiar to an English-speaking reader equivalent *Barbara*, but in the same sentence, the name of *Марія* is transliterated, though it also has a corresponding equivalent in English being *Mary*.

The text of the tale also contains some non-Ukrainian names worth consideration:

(8a) *«A Rebour» Гюїсманса...* (Kotsyubynsky 1979, p. 229).

(8b) *Huysmans' Against the Grain...* (Franko 2010, p. 296).

In example 8, the literary work author's name is represented with substitution followed by a short comment in the glossary (Franko 2010, p. 401), the work's title being translated. This method may be considered better for this particular case, as neither the mentioned literary work nor its author belong to Ukrainian national culture, so there is no need to impart any Ukrainian spirit to them. At the same time, the work's title («A Rebour») is perceived by Ukrainian reader as something foreign, a part of another culture. Roma Franko's way of rendering it may be considered another example of connotation loss.

Another example is return to original spelling of the proper name primarily borrowed from English into Ukrainian in the tale of “The Unknown One” by M. Kotsyubynsky:

(9a) *Він звався коротко: браунінг* (Kotsyubynsky 1979, p. 195).

(9b) *He had a short name: Browning* (Franko 2010, p. 312).

Thus, the total number of proper names in the considered texts is 79. Of these, 60 (or 76%), have been transliterated or represented as transcription. They are mostly Ukrainian and Russian national anthroponyms, toponyms and one zoonym. The other 19 (24%) have been substituted by corresponding equivalents. These are mostly non-Ukrainian anthroponyms, toponyms, as well as ethnonyms and chrematonyms.

One of essential lexicological aspects of the translation of fiction texts is the problem of translating so-called nationally biased units of lexicon. In this respect, R. Zorivchak states, that the term of “nationally biased units of lexicon” or “realia” is used for indication of material objects and distinctive national traditions. In other words, the scholar notes that the term *realia* corresponds not to the lexical units proper, but to national distinctive objects. From the point of view of linguistics, nationally biased lexical units should be regarded not as words but as verbal complexes (Zorivchak

1989, p. 46-47). In this context, the word *verbal* is used not as the *verb* derivative, but as that of the Latin *verbum* meaning *word*.

According to N. Fenenko, realia are complex notions that possess their own structure. They consist of the object (an extralingual phenomenon), the concept (its cultural equivalent) and the lexeme or phraseme (means of its lingual nomination) (Fenenko 2001, p. 17).

Nationally biased lexical units are classified. Studying this problem, I. Livytska analyses various definitions and concludes that there is no common opinion among linguists as to the definition of realia, but these lexical units definitely belong to the non-translatable lexicon. The classes of the lexical system that constitute non-translatable realia include terms, interjections, exotic words, acronyms, forms of address, proper names, idioms, etc. (Livytska 2009, p. 175).

As there are different types of realia, it is very logical to suppose that, as a rule, each particular type affects the choice of the way of its translation. For instance, according to B. Kielar, there are the following ways of rendering realia in foreign languages as generalized translation, functional definition, description and transliteration (Kielar 1998, s. 92).

I. Livytska takes the list of ways of rendering realia elaborated by S. Vlahov and R. Florin as a principle. The said list includes transcription or transliteration, translation or substitution, neologisms, rough translation, contextual translation (Livytska 2009, p. 176).

However, there is another specific way of translation that may be added to the list. For instance, H. Tykhonovska distinguishes a specific sort of description called *translator's comment*. According to her, the translator's comment is usually placed at the footnote of the same page or in the glossary or note list, usually at the end of the volume (Tykhonovska 2010, p. 30).

L. Tsybina maintains the idea of frequent combination of transliteration with translator's comment. Thus, transliteration of a nationally biased unit of lexicon does no harm to its full perception by the reader even if it bears great semantic load and appears in the text repeatedly. All the translator has to do is placing the short comment or explanation accompanying the unit's first appearance in the text (Tsybina 1988, p. 137).

The following examples show that realia are often rendered by means of several ways simultaneously. For instance, the text of "A Dearth of Grain" contains such sentences:

(10a) *Забавила Горпина дитину, положила, ... борщу та картоплі наварила* (Hrinchenko).

(10b) *Horpyna lulled the infant to sleep and put him back in his cradle, and then ... made some borshch and boiled a few potatoes* (Franko 2008, p. 103).

In this case, nationally biased unit of lexicon *борщ* is rendered by means of transliteration and contextual translation thus even if the reader is not familiar to this dish, he/she understands from the context, that the story goes on cooking.

(11a) *Він тихо пройшов до чийогось тину...* (Hrinchenko).

(11b) *He crept up quietly to a fence ...* (Franko 2008, p. 110).

This is the typical example of translation being substitution of the word with its corresponding equivalent.

(12a) *На вершечках, жовтих, як ананаси, лежали чорні корони, мов волохаті паначи* (Kotsyubynsky 1979, p. 221).

(12b) *On their tips, yellow like pineapples, dark crowns perched like shaggy Caucasian fur caps* (Franko 2010, p. 297).

This way of rendering (example 12) can be called approximate translation or description.

(13a) *Копу заробиш за тиждень, а на карбованця з'їси* (Hrinchenko).

(13b) *So you earn sixty kopyky in a week, but what you eat costs a karbovanets* (Franko 2008, p. 104).

In this case, one can observe a synthesis of transliteration and a translator's comment in the glossary. The point that draws special attention is the way of representing the word *kopyka* in its plural form – the authentic Nominative Case plural inflection *kopyky* is preserved in transliteration (it is not *kopykas*), which is also subject for commenting in the glossary. Though the word's

meaning is explained by means of a conventional equivalent *a kopeck* (Franko 2008, p. 402), the transliteration proves B. Kielar's idea that such way of rendering realia is often good for emphasizing its national authenticity and specific character (Kielar 1998, s. 94).

Thus, 67 nationally biased units of lexicon have been selected from the 4 researched texts. 13 of them, making 19 per cent, have been transliterated, the others translated. But due to the lack of uniformity in approaches to realia definition and hence to their detection criteria, it is considered, that the attempt to state their exact number meets more problems than stating exact number of proper names.

For instance, there exists a word *oven*, a conventional translation equivalent for Ukrainian *піч* on the one hand, but on the other hand, when reading the sentence:

(14) "*Horpyna was working silently by the oven*" (Franko 2008, p. 114),

there is no full certainty that an average English-speaking reader will imagine traditional Ukrainian oven of the verge of the 19th-20th centuries. Besides that, the above-mentioned opinion of I. Liviyska on simultaneous belonging of lexical units to the classes of realia and proper names can be proved by the example of *National Duma* (Franko 2010, p. 162). This nationally biased unit of lexicon is a proper name, and it is rendered by means of synthesis of translation proper, transliteration and the translator's comment, though the comments can be sometimes disputable.

When analyzing rendering idioms and phraseological expressions, one should pay special attention to some theoretical aspects. For instance, V. Dykan affirms that denotative distinction between such expressions in different languages is natural, though different nations have similar way of thinking, which is, however, formed by different notions (Dykan 1999, p. 19).

What concerns different ways of rendering idiomatic and phraseological expressions in different languages, O. Mushnina asserts that rendering gives great chance for illustrating their peculiarity. According to her paper, there exist so-called *figurative* and *non-figurative* phraseological expressions. When rendering those of the first type, the translator usually manages to find another expression in the target language which has rather close denotative and connotative meaning in comparison with that of the source language. Non-figurative expressions are usually translated in traditional way by means of words or non-bound phrases. Thus, the greatest problem for the translator is detection of idiomatic and phraseological expressions in the text (Mushnina 2003, p. 183-184).

The researched texts give a little supply of figurative idiomatic expressions:

(15a) *Ага, ось воно й вилізло шило з мішка* (Kotsyubynsky 1979, p. 220). Literally: *the awl has come out of the sack*.

(15b) *Aha, so now the truth has come out* (Franko 2010, p. 296).

(16a) *Урвалася вже їм ниточка!* (Hrinchenko 1991, p. 312). Literally: *their thread has broken*.

(16b) *Their days are over!* (Franko 2010, p. 179).

(17a) *Хоч ти йому коляку на голові теши, а він усе – дай та дай!* (Hrinchenko).

(17b) *You can hew a square peg on his head, but he just keeps on saying – give me and give me!* (Franko 2008, p. 103).

It is obvious, that all these phrases are integrated into the direct speech or so-called consciousness flow to display "living" speech. But they are in no case substituted with corresponding figurative idiomatic expressions in the translation text. In examples 15-16, the sense of the phrase is rendered in rather exact way, in example 17 there is a literal translation, which may result in the reader's misunderstanding the text, as the expression actually means "*You are as stubborn as a mule!*"

Thus, it can be summarized that when translating Ukrainian literary prose fiction into English, Roma Franko renders a lot of Ukrainian national proper names and realia by means of transliteration and transcription. It should be also noted, that in a lot of cases of realia rendering it is impossible to detect

the only single way of such rendering, for there is often the synthesis of several methods (transliteration + contextual translation, transliteration + comment, etc.). Such diversity expands the reader's facilities of better understanding and perception of the translated text.

Despite of loss of connotative meaning in some cases, it can be certainly stated, that, in general, the translator seeks the balance between representing the translation text in comprehensible way on the one hand and preserving national peculiarities of its components on the other one.

References

- DYKAN V., 1999. Konnotatyvna nerivnotsinnist anhliyskykh ta ukrayinskykh frazeolohichnykh odynts. *Metodolohichni problemy perekladu na suchasnomu etapi: Zb. nauk. pr.* Sumy: Vydavnytstvo SumDU, p. 19-21. (In Ukrainian).
- FENENKO N., 2001. Yazyk realiy i realii yazyka. Voronezh, Voronezhskiy gos. un-t., 140 p. (In Russian).
- FRANKO R. (transl.), MORRIS S. (ed.), 2010. *Desperate Times: A Trilogy – Volume I: Brother against brother: selected prose fiction.* Toronto: Language Lanterns Publications, 416 p.
- FRANKO R. (transl.), MORRIS S. (ed.), 2008. *From days gone by: selected prose fiction.* Toronto: Language Lanterns Publications, 416 p.
- GALAPCHUK Y., 1999. Pyeryevod sobstvyennykh imyen. *Metodolohichni problemy perekladu na suchasnomu etapi: Zb. nauk. pr.* Sumy: Vydavnytstvo SumDU, p. 11-12. (In Russian).
- HOOTI N., 2011. Oscillation between Modernism to Postmodernism in Shakespeare's Hamlet. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies. Vol: 1 Issue: 4.* p. 327-336.
- HRINCHENKO B. Bez khliba, <http://ukrlit.org/Hrinchenko_Borys_Dmytrovych/Bez_khliba/> Access date 3 May 2012. (In Ukrainian).
- HRINCHENKO B., 1991. *Tvory: V 2 t. – T.2. Povisti. Dramatychni tvory.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 608 s. (In Ukrainian).
- KIELAR B., 1998. *Tłumaczenie i koncepcje translatoryczne.* Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 135 s.
- KORUNETS I., 2003. *Theory and practice of translation.* Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha Publishers, 448 p.
- KOTSYUBYNSKY M., 1979. *Tvory v tryokh tomakh. Tom druhyi.* – Kyiv: Dnipro, 288 s. (In Ukrainian).
- LIVYTSKA I., 2009. Problema definitsiyi ta perekladu realiy v khudozhnyomu teksti. *Naukovi zapysky. – Vypusk 81 (4).* Kirovohrad: RVV KDPU im. V.Vynnychenka, p. 173-178. (In Ukrainian).
- MUSHNINA O., 2003. Osoblyvosti vidtvorennia frazeolohichnykh odynts pry perekladi naukovoyi ta khudozhnyoyi prozy. *Mizhkulturna komunikatsiya. Teoriya i praktyka perekladu.* Kyiv: Vydavnychi Dim Dm. Buraho, p. 182-190. (In Ukrainian).
- NIKONOV V., 1974. *Imia i obshestvo.* Moskva: Nauka, 278 p. (In Russian).
- NORMATYVNA TABLYTSYA dlya vidtvorennia ukrayinskykh vlasnykh nazv zasobamy anhliyskoyi movy. *Rishennya Ukrayinskoyi komisiji z pytan pravnychoyi terminolohiyi №9 – Protokol №2 vid 19 kvitnya 1996 r.,* <<http://www.brama.com/art/transliterationu.html>> Access date: 3 May 2012. (In Ukrainian).
- PELYPENKO O., 2005. Problemy peredachi vlasnykh nazv pry perekladi z ukrayinskoyi movy. *Materialy Vseukrayinskoho schorichnoho nauково-praktychnoho seminaru z pytan praktyky perekladu ta pidvyschennya konkurentospromozhnosti perekledetskykh posluh.* Kyiv: VHO "Asots. perekladachiv Ukrayiny", p. 27-31. (In Ukrainian).
- SHAMA I., 2005. *Perevod – iskusstvo ponimat.* Zaporizhya: Prosvita, 240 p. (In Russian).
- SIZOVA K., 2010. *Lyudyna u dzerkali literatury: transformatsiya pryntsyviv portretuvannya v ukrayinskiy prozi XIX - pochatku XX st.: monohrafiya.* Kyiv: Nasha kultura i nauka, 356 p. (In Ukrainian).
- TSYBINA L., 1988. Problema perevoda realiy (na materiale italyanskih realiy v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke). *Perevod i interpretatsiya teksta: Sb. nauch. tr.* Moskva: In-t yaz-zn. AN SSSR, Odessk. un-t im. I.I.Mechnikova, p. 132-140. (In Russian).
- TYKHONOVSKA H., 2010. *Ukrayinski realiyi na poznachennia lyudyny ta yiyi pobutu ta sposoby yikh perekladu rosiyskoyu ta anhliyskoyu movamy.* *Visnyk LNU imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. - №14 (201), Ch. II, 2010.* Luhansk: Vyd-vo LNU, p. 28-33. (In Ukrainian).
- ZAYTSEVA K., BAKASTOVA T., KUZNETSOVA O., TODOROVA N., 1986. *Nominatsiya zaglavnogo personazha v originale i perevode hudozhestvennogo proizvedeniya. Kontrastivnoye issledovaniye originala I perevoda hudozhestvennogo teksta: Sb. nauch. tr.* Odessa: OGU, p. 51-62. (In Russian).
- ZORIVCHAK R., 1989. *Realia i pereklad (na materiali anhlo-movnykh perekladiv ukrayinskoyi prozy).* Lviv: Vyd-vo pry Lviv. un-ti, 216 p. (In Ukrainian).

Андрей Козачук

Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка

ЛЕКСИКОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ ПЕРЕВОДА УКРАИНСКОЙ МАЛОЙ ПРОЗЫ РУБЕЖА XIX-XX ВВ. НА АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК

Резюме

В статье уделяется внимание главным образом способам передачи средствами английского языка украинских национальных имён собственных, реалий и образных фразеологизмов. Сопоставительный анализ четырёх художественных текстов Б. Гринченко и М. Коцюбинского, а также их переводов, выполненных Ромой Франко, показал, что большинство украинских национальных имён собственных переданы переводчицей при помощи транслитерации. Комплексная природа определения понятия реалии усложняет процесс полной идентификации всех реалий в тексте. Кроме того, в большинстве случаев при переводе на английский язык реалии переданы при помощи синтеза нескольких способов, например транслитерация + контекстуальный перевод, транслитерация + комментарий переводчика и др. Среди избранных фразеологизмов не были замечены случаи их замены эквивалентами в языке перевода.

В целом, несмотря на частичную потерю коннотации при переводе, переводчица старается достигнуть равновесия между стремлением представить текст перевода в понятном для читателя виде с одной стороны и сохранить национальный аутентичный колорит его отдельных компонентов с другой.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: украинская литература, имена собственные, реалии, фразеологизмы, передача, транслитерация, замена.