

# **DYNAMICS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD SCIENCE**

Abstracts of V International Scientific and Practical Conference

Vancouver, Canada

22-24 January 2020

**Vancouver, Canada**

**2020**

**UDC 001.1**  
**BBK 87**

The 5<sup>th</sup> International scientific and practical conference “Dynamics of the development of world science” (January 22-24, 2020) Perfect Publishing, Vancouver, Canada. 2020. 1111 p.

**ISBN 978-1-4879-3791-1**

The recommended citation for this publication is:

*Ivanov I. Analysis of the phaunistic composition of Ukraine // Dynamics of the development of world science. Abstracts of the 5th International scientific and practical conference. Perfect Publishing. Vancouver, Canada. 2020. Pp. 21-27. URL: <http://sci-conf.com.ua>.*

**Editor**

**Komarytskyy M.L.**

*Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor*

**Editorial board**

Ambrish Chandra, FIEEE, University of Quebec,  
Canada  
Zhizhang (David) Chen, FIEEE, Dalhausie University,  
Canada  
Hossam Gaber, University of Ontario Institute of  
Technology, Canada  
Xiaolin Wang, University of Tasmania, Australia  
Jessica Zhou, Nanyang Technological University,  
Singapore  
S Jamshid Mousavi, University of Waterloo, Canada

Harish Kumar R. N., Deakin University, Australia  
Lin Ma, The University of Sheffield, UK  
Ryuji Matsuhashi, The University of Tokyo, Japan  
Chong Wen Tong, University of Malaya, Malaysia  
Farhad Shahnian, Murdoch University, Australia  
Ramesh Singh, University of Malaya, Malaysia  
Torben Mikkelsen, Technical University of Denmark,  
Denmark  
Miguel Edgar Morales Udaeta, GEPEA/EPUSP, Brazil  
Rami Elemam, IAEA, Austria

Collection of scientific articles published is the scientific and practical publication, which contains scientific articles of students, graduate students, Candidates and Doctors of Sciences, research workers and practitioners from Europe, Ukraine, Russia and from neighbouring countries and beyond. The articles contain the study, reflecting the processes and changes in the structure of modern science. The collection of scientific articles is for students, postgraduate students, doctoral candidates, teachers, researchers, practitioners and people interested in the trends of modern science development.

**e-mail:** [vancouver@sci-conf.com.ua](mailto:vancouver@sci-conf.com.ua)

**homepage:** <http://sci-conf.com.ua>

©2020 Scientific Publishing Center “Sci-conf.com.ua” ®

©2020 Perfect Publishing ®

©2020 Authors of the articles

**LITERARY TRANSLATION AS ONE OF COMMUNICATION POSSIBLE  
MODIFICATIONS**

**Cherednyk Liudmyla A.**

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor

**Bolotnikova Alla P.**

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor

**Hunchenko Yuliia V.**

Senior lecturer

National University

«Poltava Yuri Kondratyuk Polytechnic»

Poltava, Ukraine

**Annotation.** Translation studies peculiarities are being studied in the given paper. Linguistic features of literary translation as a modification of contemporary intercultural communication are investigated on the material of the famous Ukrainian translator Hryhorii Kochur's translations of William Shakespeare works.

**Key words:** figurative language, wordplay, puns, flexible equivalent, translation difficulties.

Translation studies have been very active in the recent years. In our view, this process is driven by the international community's desire for integration.

The most characteristic feature of today is constant exchange of information, scientific achievements and cultural heritage. Therefore, translation and especially literary translation is one of the most obvious manifestations of intercultural interaction.

It is worth noting that translated literature, which falls into the cultural space of every nation, enters into complex relationships with its original literature and thus

significantly complements the literary process, extends its thematic, genre-content and aesthetic boundaries.

Literary translation issues were of interest to a number of well-known linguistic scholars, namely: M. Aleksieiev, O. Biletskyi, M. Drahomanov, V. Koptilov, Yu. Levin, O. Potebnia, M. Rylskyi, A. Fedorov, I. Franko, O. Cherednychenko and others. Some aspects of the given problem were revealed in the works by A. Volkov, V. Zhyrmunskyi, N. Konrad, D. Lykhachov, V. Matviishyn, M. Khrapchenko and others. Despite extensive research, some issues of translation remain poorly studied. In particular, the role of translation as one of the important components of communication between representatives of different cultures.

The purpose of this article is to investigate the linguistic features of literary translation as a modification of contemporary intercultural communication on the material of Hryhorii Kochur's translations.

Let us note that any translation should first and foremost reflect the properties of communication process, since it is always created in a specific context for a particular recipient, based on the goals set by the author, taking into account characteristics of the transmission channel and feedback. Besides, translation, especially an artistic one, can become one of the important aspects of communication, which exemplifies the general patterns of this process, its structure, order of operation, and all components of the communicative model.

Contemporary Ukrainian researcher H. Shemuda suggests that there are always two basic criteria in the translation process: “the criterion of truthfulness and the criterion of sincerity. The first - as faithfulness to reality, the second - as faithfulness to oneself” [1, p. 164]. It is difficult to disagree with the author, who believes that “communicative intention always leads a translator to desired communicative goal if both criteria are met” [1, p. 165]. This means that artistic imagery of the work represented by translator not only corresponds to the original, but also reflects both the author's vision of reality and the attitude of the translator himself.

Particular importance for translation is transferring in the work of art not only explicit phenomena embodied in semantics, stylistics or syntax, but also original color of the

original work, presence of individualized vision of objective realities by the author, that is, at first glance, at first glance from the eye. Provided that all these aspects are preserved, literary translation will be a prime example of interaction and mutual interaction of cultures.

It is known from translation theory that poetic works are much more difficult to translate since they are not only ‘a coherent system of linguistic elements (content-formally-social in nature)’ [2, p. 515], but also ‘a holistic emotional-sensual way, aimed by the author directly at emotional state of the reader-recipient, and is intended to make a specific impression, to cause emotional states programmed by the imagery’ [2, p. 517]. This aesthetic-expressive orientation distinguishes literary language in general and language of poetry in particular from other types of speech communication, the primary core and priority of which is transmission of informative content.

The material of our research are Ukrainian translations of English authors, made by prominent Ukrainian translators Hryhorii Kochur (1908 - 1994).

Researchers of the artist's creative heritage point out that H. Kochur, as a rule, “professed the principle of source-oriented translation” [3, p. 120], which foresees “the closest possible approximation of the reader of translation to the original” [3, p. 126]. Moreover, this principle was applied by him in the translations of both ancient and modern literature works. The essence of this principle is that “the translator is limited in the images of his own” I “and is forced to accurately imitate the figurative and semantic structure and style of the original” [3, p. 169].

M. Novikova in the article “The World of Hrigory Kochur Translation” rationally notes that Kochur, “calling himself an adept of the neoclassic” [4, p. 3], relied on the tradition of Zerov - Rylskyi. “Similar to Rylskyi, who shied away from risky stylistic experiments, but possessed impeccable taste, erudition, extended and organic knowledge of his native language, Kochur was also most afraid of “extensive brightening up of “his translations, replacing the original with a free rewrite, in decorative “Ukrainian attire” [4, p. 10]. This explains the extreme accuracy and specificity of H. Kochur's figurative language, which is close to original, attention to

figurative detail, verbal economy, desire to diversify the poetic vocabulary at the expense of direct foreign language borrowing.

H. Kochur's translations of W. Shakespeare's works are extremely vivid and expressive. H. Kochur is known to have performed the Ukrainian translation of "Hamlet" in 1964 dedicated to the 400th anniversary of W. Shakespeare. This translation is still considered to be a canonical one. Still this play was first released in Lviv only in 1996.

Many scholars note that the texts of the great English artist of the Renaissance, and in particular the tragedy of "Hamlet" are considerably difficult to translate because they are filled with wordplay, puns, subconscious allusions. Therefore, the key to successful translation of Shakespearean texts is the skill of a translator who can find the same flexible equivalent in his native language.

For example, let us compare some words and their translation from the dialogue between Ophelia and Polonius (scene 3, act I, lines 98 - 103), the word "tender" (gentle, affectionate) is used twice as a noun and twice as a verb. Besides, the translator saves three repetitions (in view of the morphology of the Ukrainian language): *освідчувавсь, освідченням, освідчивши*. And then the ambiguous Shakespearean "Tender yourself more dearly" [5, p. 148] in H. Kochur translation becomes «*Ти себе дорожче цінуй*» [6, p. 58].

Shakespeare often uses a wordplay, based on etymologically related words that H. Kochur perfectly reproduces in Ukrainian. A striking example is translation of the conversation between Polonius and Hamlet (scene 2, act VI, lines 109-110):

### **W. Shakespeare**

*POLONIUS: I did enact Julius Caesar. I was killed i'th Capitol. Brutus killed me.*

*HAMLET: It was a brute part of him to kill so capital a calf there* [5, c. 38].

### **Г. Кочур**

*ПОЛОНІЙ: Я грав Юлія Цезаря. Мене вбивали на Капітолії. Брут убивав мене.*

*ГАМЛЕТ: То велика брутальність -- убивати таке капітальне теля* [6, с. 4].

In the above example, the minor wordplay (“*part*” means both action and theatrical role) has disappeared, but the main puns of *Capitol/capital* і *Brutus/brut(ality)* are preserved.

To some extent, translation difficulties may be related to grammatical differences. Thus, in scene 1, the sentries and Horatio keep on talking about the ghost in neuter gender:

### **Shakespeare**

*What, has this thing appeared again tonight* (сцена 1, дія I, рядок 21) [5, с. 10].

*Tush, tush `twill not appear* (сцена 1, дія I, рядок 30) [5, с. 11].

*Thou art a scholar, speak to it, Horatio* (сцена 1, дія I, рядок 42) [5, с. 12].

And only once (scene 1, act I, line 43) Bernardo uses a dialect variant *he*, in other cases the Ghost remains nonhuman *it*, until lines 189-191 scene 1, act I, where Horatio proclaims:

### **Shakespeare**

*My Lord, I think I saw him yesternight... the King your father* [5, с. 65].

As we can see, the use of another pronoun is extremely important here: after all, the ghost ceases to be an unknown visitor from another world, and seems “like” a dead king.

Translator H. Kochur managed to preserve the neuter gender of the word “*ghost*”:

H. Kochur

*Ну, знов приходило цієї ночі?* (scene 1, act I, line 20) [6, p. 8].

Wordplay in the scene at the cemetery ((scene 1, action V) is even more complicated.

We read the Ukrainian translation by H. Kochur:

*1-й гробокон. Тим-то й ба. Прикро, та й дуже, що теє панство має на цім світі більше прав топитись та вішатись, ніж прості християни. Дай-но мені лопату. Нема панства стародавнішого за садівників, землеконів та гробарів. Бо їхнє ремесство - з самого Адама.*

*2-й гробокон. А він хіба ж був пан?*

*1-й гробокон. Таж він перший у світі озброївся заліззям.*

*2-й гробокон. Ніякої зброї в нього не було.*

*1-й гробокон. Ба, ти хто, поганин, чи що? А як ти тямии святе письмо? У святому письмі мовиться: «Адам копав». Чим би він копав без заліза? Я тобі загадаю ще одну загадку. Як не вгадаєш, то хутчій сповідайся і...*

*2-й гробокон. Іди ти... [6, с. 27].*

In the translation, Kochur introduces the triple pun of *Гробокон* about *Adam's arms* (*arms, coat of arms, hands*) to a simple interpretation of weapons as an instrument (*a prelude from Grobokop's song*), rather than a weapon of his own - in fact, turning the pun into a simple metaphor. Triple Hamlet pun is based on the word *fine* with additional finality overtones – “*finality*”.

Sometimes W. Shakespeare's wordplay is hidden. In this case, the translator has to skillfully rely on ingenuity in order to convey an important meaning for the image of the subtext. For example, Hamlet's words (scene 2, act III, lines 297-300):

### **Shakespeare**

*For thou dost know, O Damon dear.*

*This realm dismantled was*

*Of Jove himself, and now reigns here*

*A very, very pajock. [5, с. 65].*

### **In H.Kochur's translation:**

*Тут царював, Дамоне мій,*

*Юнітерів орел,*

*Тепер царем в державі цій*

*Справжнісінький... навич... [6, с. 89].*

G. Kochur here interprets the incomprehensible word “*pajock*” as “*peacock*” and the replacement of Jupiter, the king of the gods with a bird traditionally associated with him - the eagle, seems an elegant solution: the royal bird of Jupiter contrasts with a bright but vain peacock. One cannot help but notice how well Kochur uses the Ukrainian language: he translates the English “*very, very*” with the adjective “*справжнісінький*” with the additional derogatory-diminishing implicit meaning in the word “*peacock*”.



According to the researchers, the inversion in the second line hints that the order of the words is changed for the sake of the next rhyme, which quite often happens in English poetry. It is known that Shakespeare further proposes the Horace reaction:

***Shakespeare***

*You might have rimed* [5, c. 69].

That is, “*pajock*” in the original is an ironic euphemism for some derogatory term, rhyming with the word “*was*”. And, as many critics have pointed out, there is one obvious word that at the time the pronunciation was a perfect rhyme for *was*, namely *ass*, and Kochur's eagle hints at the donkey as well.

One of the complex problems of Ukrainian translation from English is the fact that in most cases Ukrainian words are much longer. Therefore, if the translator believes that the presentation of the poem's form is as important as the content, the difference in word length often requires some compression or reduction of the original in order to preserve the prosody.

An example of this is Marcellus's monologue about the bird of the dawn (scene 1, action I, lines 158-164):

***Shakespeare***

*Some say that ever 'gainst that season comes  
Wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated  
This bird of dawning singeth all night long,  
And then, they say, no spirit dare stir abroad,  
The nights are wholesome, then no planet strikes,  
No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm,  
So hallowed and so gracious is the time* [5, p. 17].

Let us compare this line in H.Kochur's translation:

*Говорить дехто, ніби перед святом  
Різдва Христового, цей птах світанку  
Співає, не вгаваючи, всю ніч.  
Тоді не сміє жоден дух блукати,  
Цілющі ночі, приятні планети,*

*Прихильні зорі, відьми не чаклують,*

*Такий це час святий та благодатний* [6, с. 64].

As we can see, the translation does not contain “*No fairy takes*”, and with it the parallelism “is witch” (*to which I will return*), but the overall mood of the passage is well reproduced.

Although it is certainly not always easy to reduce text for size, it may be advisable. For example, the scene at the cemetery (scene 1, action V, lines 229-132):

**Shakespeare**

*LAERTES: Lay her i'th'earth,*

*And from her fair and unpolluted flesh*

*May violets spring. I tell thee, churlish priest,*

*A ministering angel shall my sister be*

*When thou liest howling.*

*HAMLET (aside to Horatio): What, the fair Ophelia?* [5, с. 148].

**Н. Kochur** translates this passage in the following way:

*ЛАЕРТ: Спусти́ть труну! Хай на весні фіалки*

*Із тіла чистого її ростуть.*

*Знай, підлий поне, – ангелом у небо*

*Вона злетить, тобі ж у пеклі вити.*

*ГАМЛЕТ: Це що? Невже Офелія?* [ 6, р. 125].

In the original, Hamlet's question (***What, the fair Ophelia?***) is full of shock and distrust: he knows that Laertes only has one sister, Ophelia, and therefore realizes who died, but does not want to believe it. Likewise, Kochur's “***Невже Офелія?***” makes the same impression. Hamlet subconsciously attributes “*she*” to the only woman close to Laertes and to anyone he himself. And of course, the viewers will immediately understand this fragment.

Studying the innovation of Kochur in the interpretation of poetic suggestion, the literary researcher A. Hryzun believes that Ophelia's heartfelt song, which requires considerable creative effort, has a kind of inspiring force. After all, the translator must preserve the minor figurative image and the suggestive power of the song and at

the same time make it a fact of Ukrainian singing poetry. In his opinion, H. Kochur managed to do it perfectly:

*Ой умер він, люба пані,*

*Вмер, не ожива.*

*У ногах у нього камінь,*

*В головах трава* [ 6, с. 138].

A. Hryzun concludes: "The translator clearly writes his version in the register of Ukrainian folklore: exclamation "ой", repetitions-clarification "умер він, вмер, не ожива", figurative antithesis "У ногах у нього камінь,/ В головах трава". All these are the features of our native folklore" [7, p. 173 - 174].

Therefore, in our opinion, translation is one of the varieties of interlingual communication, receptive and productive speech activity.

Translation as a communication act is based on the gradual and parallel communication of the author, the translator as producers and the potential reader as the recipient of the finished product - the text of the translation.

Literary translation is one of the possible modifications to the communication process, which is quite common now. It is based on establishing and maintaining contacts between members of a social group belonging to different ethnic and cultural backgrounds and, in turn, shaping the process of communication between representatives of different nations.

## REFERENCES

1. Shemuda M. H. *Khudozhnii pereklad yak vazhlyvyi chynnyk mizhkulturnoi komunikatsii // Naukovi zapysky. Seriia «Filolohichni nauky» (Nizhyn Mykola Hohol State University)*/ editor-in-chief Professor H.V.Samoilenko. – Nizhyn : M.Hohol NDU, 2014. – Issue. 1. – P.164-168.
2. Kyiak T. *Teoriia ta praktyka perekladu* / T. Kyiak, A. Naumenko, O. Ohui. – Vinnytsia : Nova knyha, 2006. – 592 p.
3. Kyiak T. *Teoriia ta praktyka perekladu* / T. Kyiak, A. Naumenko, O. Ohui. – Vinnytsia : Nova knyha, 2007. – 248 p.

4. Novykova M. Perekladatskyi svit Hryhoriia Kochura / Kochur H. Tretie vidlunnia: Poetychni pereklady. – K.: Rada, 2000. – 552 p.
5. Shakespeare William. Two Tragedies. Hamlet. Macbeth. – Moscow, Vyshaya Skola. 1985. – 286 p.
6. Kochur H. Literatura ta pereklad: Doslidzhennia. Retsenzii. Literaturni portrety. Interviu / Uporiad. A. Kochur ta M. Kochur. – K.: Smoloskyp, 2008. – Issue 1. – 612 p.
7. Hryzun A. Novatorstvo Hryhoriia Kochura v interpretatsii frantsuzkoi, anhliiskoi (amerykanskoi) ta rosiiskoi poetychnoi suhestii ukrainskoiu movoiu / Hryhorii Kochur i ukrainskyi pereklad: Materials of international scientific and practical conference, K.; Irpin. 27—29 October 2003 / Editor-in-chief O. Cherednychenko. – K.: Irpin: VTF «Perun», 2004. – P. 171 – 176.