

IV. МОВОЗНАВЧІ СТУДІЇ: ІСТОРІЯ І СУЧАСНІСТЬ

УДК 811.111'255.4:821.161.2'06–31

STRATEGIES OF HISTORICIZATION AND MODERNIZATION IN THE TRANSLATION OF OBSOLETE VOCABULARY (ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF VALERY SHEVCHUK'S NOVEL "THE MEEK SHALL INHERIT")

Polina Horielova

*Oles Honchar Dnipro National University
Department of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners
Nauky ave, 72, room 1314, 49010, Dnipro, Ukraine
phone: 097 260 59 92
e-mail: polina.gorelova23@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5538-4265>*

In this study, we consider the problems of translating Ukrainian historical prose into English. The relevance of the study is determined by the growing global interest in Ukrainian history which implies the need for the translation of Ukrainian historical prose into the languages of the world. The purpose of the work is to analyze the available strategies and means of translation used to translate Ukrainian obsolete lexical units (historicisms and archaisms) into English; the analysis is based on the material of Valerii Shevchuk's historical prose (the novel "The meek shall inherit") and its translation into English made by V. Kholmogorova. The purpose of the study involves completing such tasks as defining the translation strategies that can be applied to the translation of obsolete vocabulary; description of such strategies on a specific example (namely, the English translation of Valerii Shevchuk's novel "The meek shall inherit"); establishing a connection between translation strategies and means or transformations. The object of the study is the system of obsolete vocabulary units (archaisms and historicisms) in Valerii Shevchuk's novel "The meek shall inherit". Research methods that were used during the study include the descriptive method, classification, and comparative method. The scientific novelty of the study consists of the systematic analysis of the relationship between means of translation or translation transformations and translation strategies of obsolete lexical units. The practical significance is related to the possibility of using the materials of the research during further translations of historical prose by Ukrainian authors or in teaching translation studies. The results of the study consist of the determination of the dominant strategy in the translation of obsolete units in Valerii Shevchuk's novel "The meek shall inherit" and establishing the connection between strategies of modernization or historicization and translation transformations in the context of the study of the English translation of Valerii Shevchuk's novel "The meek shall inherit". The prospect of further research is the improvement of the procedure for identifying historicisms and archaisms in the literary text, as well as the search for additional regularities in the choice of means and strategies when translating obsolete vocabulary.

Key words: translation, obsolete vocabulary, archaisms, historicisms, realities, translation transformations.

DOI:

Formulation of the problem. Any language in the world is not homogeneous in its lexical system. The vocabulary of the world's languages can be divided according to various criteria, but the most obvious is its division into core and periphery. The core is the basis of the lexical system of the language – it includes words that can be used in any style and context. Peripheries are limited in usage according to various factors: usually, this is emotional coloring, social, territorial, or temporal limitations of usage [14 : 174].

The words limited in time of usage are represented by two large groups: new and obsolete words. New words (neologisms and occasionalisms), respectively, were invented recently and have not yet had time to become included in the language system, or were invented earlier (in particular, by a specific person in a certain context – if we are talking about the occasionalisms) and were used for a certain time, but never entered the core of the language. Obsolete and rarely used vocabulary, on the contrary, was quite actively used in the past, but is not actively used today because of different reasons, both intralinguistic and extralinguistic ones [12 : 31].

Therefore, there occur such problems as the identification of obsolete vocabulary, its classification, and translation. This issue was studied by such scientists as O. Ponomariv, M. Umudova, H. Haiduchenko, O. Romaniuk, P. Dudyk, etc.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The obsolete vocabulary itself can also be divided into several groups. If we use the classification that is the most popular among Ukrainian researchers, we can claim that all obsolete units can be divided into the categories of archaisms and historicisms according to the following principles (the classification is given following the work by M. Umudova [36 : 5898]):

1. Preservation of denotatum. Archaisms refer to concepts and things that exist in today's reality: for example, the word *палець* (the analog of 'палець', 'finger') is an archaism because the corresponding body part still exists in a human's body, but it is called differently. Historicisms denote everyday objects as well as socio-political and cultural realia, irrelevant to the modern world: for example, the word *спис* ('spear') as the name of a weapon, *купець* ('merchant') as the name of a type of activity, *літопис* ('annals') as the name of a written source for recording current and historical events.

2. Presence of synonyms. Due to the lack of a corresponding denotatum in modern objective reality, historicisms do not have any modern synonyms, while archaisms still have common counterparts, such as *ланіти – щоки* ('cheeks'), *красний – красивий* ('beautiful'). There remains, however, the problem of archaisms that do not have a common one-word equivalent: *правиця – права рука* ('right hand'), *шати – святковий одяг* ('festive clothes'). However, in this case, it is possible to refer to the first principle: if even a concept denoted by a phrase, not a word, still exists, its type can be referred to as an archaism.

3. The reason for the transition of the word to the obsolete category. For historicisms, such a reason will be extralinguistic: since there is no such thing in real life (for example, *гетьмани*, 'military commanders of Cossacks', are no longer elected, and *личаки*, 'bast shoes', are not worn), the lexeme that has such a denotatum will no longer be in active usage and will become a historicism. Archaisms arise as a result of the replacement of one lexical unit by another, which can be caused both by contact with other languages (for example, the usage of the word *турбкульоз*, 'tuberculosis', instead of *сухоти*), and, vice versa, by an inability to adopt a foreign language unit that leads to its replacement by a specific unit of this language (for example, in the Ukrainian language, modern speakers almost do not use the French word *фавор*, 'favor', saying *опіка* or *покровительство* instead), or even by processes within the same language, such as phonetic changes (for instance, the modern *поет*, 'poet', is used instead of the obsolete *ніім*). All these factors are poorly explainable since it is often impossible to determine exactly why this particular word was replaced by another – it seems to happen "by itself" [24 : 168].

Sometimes two more principles of distinguishing between archaisms and historicisms are named:

4. Time-place attachment. According to H. Haiduchenko, historicisms are tied to a certain time (and, in some cases, place) much more than archaisms [7 : 67]. So, for example, if the writer uses the word *кріпак*, ‘serf’, to describe a certain character, we can at least roughly determine the time when the events of the text took place because we know that the “classic” serfdom was formed in the 14–16th centuries [1] and abolished on the territory of the Austrian and Russian Empires in the middle of the 19th century [2] (and, accordingly, we can say with the accuracy of a century, a decade, and sometimes even a year, when a certain lexeme became historicism). At the same time, there is no such certainty regarding archaisms: we cannot say exactly when, for example, the word *зело*, ‘herbs’, fell out of usage and why it happened, and similarly, the character who used the word *зело* in the text could have lived at almost any time, so the usage of the archaism will not become a time marker in the text.

5. Style. Some scientists, such as P. Dudyk, believe that the usage of both historicisms and archaisms is caused by a certain intention of the speaker (to create the flavor of a certain epoch, to differentiate the idiolect of different characters, or to add ironic pathos to the text), and both types of obsolete units are stylistically colored [9 : 173]. However, other authors, such as O. Ponomariv, emphasize that historicisms may not have a stylistic function when they are used in a purely nominative sense (because there are no newer synonyms to describe, for example, the socio-political system of Ukraine-Rus of the 10th century, and scholars must use the terms *князь*, ‘prince’, *княгиня*, ‘princess’, *жрець*, ‘priest’, etc.). But a stylistic function can also be included in them when they are used to create a certain atmosphere or in an ironic sense (for example, the historical term *орда*, ‘horde’, as a metaphor for an invasion which occurs even in our time). Archaisms, accordingly, are always stylistically marked (due to the possibility of using neutral synonyms instead of them) and create a humorous or literary style [15 : 85–90]. Some authors, for example, V. Madiyorova, generally say that historicisms perform an exclusively nominative function, and archaisms – both nominative and stylistic [32 : 182]. Other scientists, such as O. Rud and I. Horbatenko, also say that both historicisms and archaisms can be used to convey the author’s mood, their emotions, attitude to what is said [16 : 131], so that is the choice made by the author of the text (which, being purely individual, may not have as a prerequisite either stylistic or nominative needs, but rather be caused by the expressive function of a language).

In our research, we will use the concept by O. Ponomariv, according to which historicisms can perform both a purely nominative and a stylistic function, and archaisms are stylistically colored in any context of usage.

In general, we consider such classifications appropriate, but we note that they will differ greatly depending on the nature of a particular text: for example, for a novel about the life of a medieval monastery, the names of obsolete kinds of religious institutions, positions, and practices will be more important, and for a journalistic text about the achievements of archeology, the names of tools and household objects found during excavations will be necessary.

Undoubtedly, obsolete units will be a difficult task for translation, since archaisms become obsolete in different languages for various reasons and are often not comparable (for example, in English the word *thou* is obsolete, while the only Ukrainian analog, *mu*, is widely used nowadays and belongs to the core of the lexical system), and historicisms are often close to non-equivalent vocabulary when describing the realia of a certain nation’s life – but even in cases where a certain fact coincides in the culture of the source language and target language, finding an equivalent can need extra resources.

Taking into account the stylistic coloring of obsolete vocabulary, as well as the

inconsistency of the obsolete vocabulary system in different languages, we can claim that historicisms and archaisms will be a rather difficult task for the translator (since stylistically marked (such as archaisms) and non-equivalent vocabulary (part of which are historicisms, close to the realia of a certain territory) are usually difficult to translate [22 : 312]), especially when we consider the translation between languages of different groups that have different historical and cultural background (such as Ukrainian and English): in such cases, the reader of the translation will be distanced from the work both temporally and culturally [18 : 132].

Accordingly, a word-for-word translation will be possible for a very limited number of obsolete units – mainly historicisms, marked by the realia that were relevant both for the nation that communicated in the original language of the translated text and for native speakers of the translated language: for example, Ukrainian *чнуч* and English *spear* in their main meanings refer to one object – ‘a specific type of weapon’ that is no longer used by either Ukrainians or the British. Therefore, these words are historicisms (with an almost identical place in the language system, Ukrainian or English – these units are on the peripheries of the languages as obsolete) with the same primary meaning.

But we cannot claim that these words are absolutely identical in all characteristics: for instance, the Ukrainian word *чнуч*, ‘a type of weapon’, will have a homonym, *чнуч*, ‘an outdated name of the list’ [17]; the English *spear* does not have such a homonym, but there is another meaning – ‘a thin pointed stem or leaf’ [26] – that is absent in the Ukrainian unit; in addition, since the English language is more analytical, this word can also be a verb that can be translated into Ukrainian as *пронизувати списом*, ‘to pierce with a spear’; in such cases, word-for-word translation can be impossible. And even if the words are used in their primary meaning and the form of a noun, we cannot consider them to be equal in all cases – they can be a part of a pun, be a part of an intertextual reference, and so on. Accordingly, even obsolete words, which theoretically have a counterpart with the same stylistic characteristics and lexical meaning in a different language, may still require additional efforts by the translator who works with the text.

Archaisms, accordingly, do not always have direct counterparts [8 : 51] because words that do not name everyday or social realities, but denote more abstract concepts, as a rule, become obsolete in different languages for different reasons and at different times, mostly independently of each other. As we have already mentioned, the English language has an obsolete form of the second person singular (*thou*) [30], but there is no similar archaic word in the Ukrainian language: there is only a modern, widely used one – *mu*; as a consequence, the direct translation is impossible.

Therefore, the translation of both historicisms and archaisms will require various transformations: lexical, grammatical, and combined lexical-grammatical. Let us discuss all these categories separately.

As O. Romaniuk points out, lexical transformations are related to the difference between the lexical systems of the source and the target languages, as well as specific contexts when the word is not used in its primary meaning. Accordingly, O. Romaniuk describes such lexical (or lexical-semantic) transformations as generalization and concretization [34 : 88]: generalization involves expanding the meaning of a word (when a word or phrase in the translation has a broader meaning than the unit of the original text), concretization – narrowing the meaning (respectively, the unit in the translation has a more specific meaning than in the original). For example, if the Ukrainian word *меч*, ‘sword’, is translated into English as *weapon*, this will be the usage of generalization (since a sword is a specific type of *weapon*, a hyponym for a hypernym); if, vice versa, the

translator reproduces the word *weapon* according to the context as *меч*, ‘sword’, then this will be a concretization when a hypernym is translated as a hyponym.

S. Baranova and O. Rozhenko also name modulation among the lexical (or lexical-semantic) transformations [25 : 32]. It does not involve widening or narrowing the meaning, but a shift, a certain development of meaning. For example, if the word *меч*, ‘sword’ is translated into English as *saber*, we consider it a modulation: both words are hyponyms for the hypernym *weapon*, being specific types of cold weapons, but they are somewhat different – the sword is straight, and the saber is curved; a *sword* usually has a blade that is sharpened on both sides, a *saber* can be sharpened on one side only [17] [26]. Accordingly, these are words with approximately the same volume of meaning, but with slightly different characteristics, so we can consider this translation to be modulation.

If we consider grammatical transformations, we can use the research conducted by L. Dmytruk and S. Ostapenko who claim that the usage of such transformations is caused by grammatical and lexical reasons; however (that is obvious because of the name of this transformations’ category), grammatical reasons prevail: for example, English is a more analytical language, and Ukrainian uses more synthetic means of expressing grammatical meanings, so the translation between these languages will require corresponding transformations [28 : 253]. Most of these transformations (such as permutation and transposition) are of little interest to us in the context of this study, since they do not affect the translation of historicisms and archaisms both lexically and stylistically.

There are also grammatical transformations that we cannot ignore when talking about the translation of obsolete words. Those include, first of all, addition and omission. The addition of one or more words helps in cases where the grammatical or semantic component of the original unit cannot be expressed in the translation without this addition [31 : 305]: for example, in the Ukrainian language, it is clear without explanation that the word *уабау* in most cases denotes ‘a gathering of witches/wizards’; the English *Sabbath* has a more polysemantic nature and can denote the same thing as the Ukrainian *уабам*, ‘the religious practice of Jews’; therefore, phrases like *witch s/witches’ Sabbath* are often used to define a specific folklore concept typical for the medieval European worldview.

Omission (the opposite of addition, when a certain element is removed from the text) is often classified as a transformation caused by the grammatical redundancy of certain units of the original [31 : 306]; it is also possible to use omission to avoid tautology (for example, lexemes *хроніка* and *лімонік* are mostly translated into English in the same way – as *chronicles*; therefore, if these Ukrainian words are used in the same sentence or phrase, their direct translation may cause a tautology); but some personal decision of the translator is also possible, being not determined by any obvious grammatical or lexical factors.

Among combined lexical-grammatical translation transformations, there are such means as antonymic translation, explication, and compensation [27 : 107]. The opposite of compensation is neutralization [11 : 61].

The antonymic translation is the transfer of an affirmative unit to a negative one or vice versa, both with a change of meaning and with the preservation of the lexical meaning and a change of the form only [34 : 89] – for example, it is the translation of the word *безначальний* as *eternal* (the meaning is almost the same, but the negative prefix *без*, ‘without’, has been removed).

Explication, i.e. descriptive translation of a certain word or phrase, involves mainly the expansion of the original unit, but without any addition of extra components (that happens in the case of addition) – we can say that one unit is translated by several units, but the meaning

is not changed because the components of the meaning of the original simply “distribute” between translation units. For example, the translation of the word *умилосердитися* as *have mercy* is an example of explication: there is simply no one-word equivalent, so the translator will have to translate one word with a word combination, taking into account that only the whole word combination (and not its separated elements, such as *have or mercy*) will have the required meaning; we can say that the sum of the meanings of the words in the translation unit will be equal to the meaning of one original word.

Compensation and neutralization are often called stylistic transformations [11 : 61]; they are opposite to each other: although both preserve the lexical meaning, the compensation reproduces the stylistic meaning, but mainly through the mediation of a different word from the original (for example, the Ukrainian archaic word *аз* can be translated as a neutral one, *I*; however, in the same segment of the text, a neutral word, such as *ми*, will be translated by archaic *thou* to preserve the general impression of the text); as a result of neutralization, the unit loses its style, and it is not compensated in the text (for example, *аз* is translated as *I*, but the segment of the text lacks neutral words translated by obsolete ones).

A separate type of translation transformation can also be called realia translation tools. They are used mostly with historicisms, typical for the history of particular states and regions, and not for human civilization in general. For example, in the Ukrainian language, we can find such historicisms close to realia as *смерд*, ‘peasant’, or *кholop*, ‘serf’ – undoubtedly, the practice of paying tribute to feudal lords by peasants or social systems close to slavery were typical for many countries, but these words (with a certain etymology, developed figurative meanings, intracultural references, etc.) and a certain historical stage with its socio-political system, in the context of which the corresponding concepts have meaning, can be typical only for some Slavic lands – therefore, we cannot say that, for example, in the English or German language we can find full counterparts to such units. Accordingly, to translate such words, realia translation tools have to be used: namely, there are such means as transliteration, transcription, and calque.

Transliteration and transcription are sometimes combined under the name ‘transcoding’. Accordingly, transcoding is the transfer of the graphic and/or sound form of a word of one language by means of another. Performing transcription, the translator tries to reproduce the sound of the original unit using the symbols of the language of translation, and with the help of transliteration, the spelling of the word is reproduced, mainly with the help of stable counterparts to each sign and often without regard to the sounding of the word [33 : 52]. For example, if the Ukrainian historicism *nyd* is transcribed, in translation we will have such a unit as *pood* (the English letter combination *oo* sounds like Ukrainian *y*), but if it is transliterated, the translation will look like the word *pud* (*but the letter u* in this context sounds more like Ukrainian *a*). Accordingly, the translator has to choose whether the sound or graphic form of the word is a higher priority for their translation – although in some cases almost complete correspondence to the original in both aspects is possible.

Calque is a special type of translation that involves a component-by-component (and mostly direct) translation of each constituent unit of the original [29 : 550]. There is the example of using this mean: the translation of Ukrainian *книжник* as *bookman*; here the root *книж-* (‘книга’, ‘book’) is translated as *book*, and the suffix *-ник* (that describes a profession) is translated using the word *man*, which in the past was often a component of the names of professions in the English language (*policeman, fireman*).

Of course, in the Ukrainian language, which has a more inflectional nature, there are more inflections to express a certain meaning, and, therefore, in English, the translator

has to select whole words to get the corresponding meaning. We can conclude that the language level of the elements of the original unit often changes in the translation.

The part of the main issue that has not been studied enough is connected with the fact that the translator, especially while working with large texts, selects the means of translation not in a random way, but according to a certain strategy. Regarding the translation of obsolete units, it is appropriate to talk about such strategies as historicization (or archaization, sometimes also defined as temporal language stylization [10 : 46]) and modernization (also called actualization).

The tasks of our research are, therefore, to define these translation strategies, to describe the strategies on a particular example (namely, Valerii Shevchuck's novel "The meek shall inherit"), and to find the connection between strategies and translation transformations.

Presenting of the main material. Modernization involves the translation of an obsolete word by a unit that is more modern and understandable for the reader of the translation, while historicization requires the preservation of the style and obsolescence of the original unit [3 : 51]. For example, if the word *дiва*, 'a poetical/obsolete word for a girl', is translated into English as *maiden*, we can say that the strategy of historicization will be used; if the same unit is translated with neutral *girl*, it will be modernization.

If we are talking about a text that is temporarily distant from the reader, then the translation strategy will depend on whether the translator seeks to preserve the impression that the original text made on the contemporaries of the writing (then the necessary strategy will be modernization), or whether to leave it archaic for perception as it is for contemporaries of the translator (then historicization should be applied). As for historical papers or prose, which from the very beginning are written in such a way that they are archaic for perception, such a choice will certainly not occur due to the necessity to preserve the style of the text, so the translator will have to rely mostly on historicization. However, we note that the usage of historicization or modernization in their pure form is quite difficult because it will not be possible to translate all units using one strategy only. This is clearly manifested, for example, in the translation of works that S. Voronina calls archaic and at the same time archaized [6 : 131]: these are texts written quite a long time ago, which, however, reflect realia that were already outdated for the author of the text (for example, these are classicists' works of the 17th century, which depict ancient times [19]). Here the translator, for instance, can modernize the vocabulary that was neutral for the author of the text, and archaize/historicize the vocabulary that was already obsolete for the author.

We have to note that some translation experts distinguish other strategies. In particular, T. Lasinska talks about the existence of omission and leveling strategies as well [13 : 37]. Accordingly, in the case when an obsolete unit is completely removed from the text, we can talk about a strategy of omission, and when it is replaced by another one that does not correspond to the meaning or stylistic load of the original, we can consider it an example of leveling (for example, as when the word *knight* is translated as *він, чоловік* ('he', 'man'), etc., so some unit is present in the translation, but it does not fulfill its lexical and/or stylistic function).

In this research, we will also distinguish the translational transformation of omission (when it comes to the complete elimination of a lexical unit from the text) as a separate strategy for the translation of obsolete units, since it does not preserve the archaic or historical characteristics of the text (as historicization does), but at the same time does not modernize the text because it does not add any "modern" words (unlike modernization). However, we will not separate leveling into a special category due to its similarity to modernization (since both

modernization and leveling involve the preservation of a linguistic unit and certain components of its meaning, but allow the loss of the stylistic component and/or some aspects of the lexical meaning) and will be considered a manifestation of partial omission transformation.

As for the rest of the translation transformations and means of translation, it can only be stated that, firstly, the so-called “stylistic” lexical-grammatical transformations clearly belong to a certain strategy (neutralization is clearly related to the strategy of modernization, compensation – to historicization); secondly, such realia translation tools as transcription and transliteration belong rather to historicization (although they do not reproduce the obsolescence of the unit, but preserve its unusualness); thirdly, word-for-word, direct translation (possible mainly for historicisms that have exact counterparts in the realia of different cultures) belong to historicization.

As for such transformations as calque, addition, explication, generalization, concretization, and modulation, it can be said that they may belong to both modernization and historicization according to the style of the unit/units used in the translation. For example, if the word *міщани* is explicated as *town's people*, this word is translated with the use of modernization (because neither the word *town* nor the word *people* belong to obsolete units in the English language); if the word *капище* is explicated as the heathen temple, it can be described as historicization (because the word *heathen* is obsolete). Accordingly, the belonging of the units translated by these transformations and means to the objects of historicization and modernization should be determined in each individual case, taking into account the result of such translation.

In this study, we analyze the historical prose of Valerii Shevchuk who is a Ukrainian writer and translator, the author of numerous books those genres can be described as philosophical, intellectual, and historical prose. His creative work consists of about 80 books and includes collections of short stories and novels, among which the most famous are fantastic (“A House on a Mountain”) and historical (“The meek shall inherit”, “Eye of the Abyss”, etc.) books [4].

Here we analyze the novel “На полі смиренному” (“The meek shall inherit”). The basis of the novel is the Kyiv-Pechersk Patericum – a collection of stories about the monks living in the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, written between 1215 and 1230; the original edition is known from the letters of Bishop Symon and the monk Polycarp [20]. We can find the direct references in the novel: the main character, “the unworthy Simeon”, “was lost in thought” after reading “Polycarp’s Patericum, conceived for the edification of future generations” [21 : 6] and decided to write his own version of the document.

Having analyzed the role of obsolete vocabulary units in Val. Shevchuk’s novel “The meek shall inherit”, we can summarize that they contribute to the creation of the atmosphere of the described epoch and historical authenticity, the personalization of the characters’ idiolects, as well as the creation of a certain pathos. The text of the novel includes mostly archaisms since the religious theme described in the book implies a rather high level of conservatism, so the characters encounter the historical realia of society and everyday life relatively infrequently – mostly during trips outside the monastery or in references to their “secular” past. Archaisms, therefore, help to create certain stylistics of the text and make the speech of the characters, their idiolects more authentic.

Valerii Shevchuk’s novel “На полі смиренному” was translated from Ukrainian into English by V. Kholmogorova. The translation was published by the Dnipro publishing house in 1989 under the title “The meek shall inherit” [35]. This title is obviously a paraphrased quote from the Bible (Matthew 5–11) – “Blessed Are the Meek, for They Will Inherit the Earth” [23] (in the Ukrainian version of this phrase, the word *смиренні*, ‘meek’, is also present [5] – so the meaning of the original name is conveyed quite accurately, and, besides, the expected

effect of the translation on the reader has been preserved – they can immediately understand the religious theme of the text). So, already from the title, we can see the serious work on the translation – but we are also interested in the text, namely the means and transformations used to adapt obsolete vocabulary.

In the context of the translation of Valerii Shevchuk's novel "The meek shall inherit", we can discover the predominance of such means as neutralization (dominates both in general and among stylistic transformations), modulation (ranks first among lexical transformations and second among all the translation tools), as well as the selection of traditional equivalents (is the third in general and the first among the realia translation tools). Most tools are universal for obsolete vocabulary of various types, and their choice depends only on the specific unit and the context of its usage; however, for example, transliteration can be used only for historicisms, and partial compensation – for archaisms.

As for translation strategies (namely, historicization/archaization, which for the sake of terminological unity we will call simply historicization, and modernization), that are used while working with the texts with obsolete vocabulary, it can be argued that only a limited number of transformations always involves the specific strategies. Thus, modernization definitely includes neutralization, as well as incomplete omission (when a word is left, but its entire lexical meaning is removed – for example, in the translation of a word combination with an archaism in it, *мають осілля* [21 : 13], with the linking verb and preposition *are in* [35 : 18]), as well as an antonymic translation (only on the material of the analyzed novel, because it is theoretically possible to apply this translation transformation with partial compensation for obsolescence), since these means clearly provide the elimination of the stylistic and temporal aspect. Among the historicization means, we can name compensation, both full and partial, as well as the traditional equivalent translation, transcription, and transliteration (since transcoding means preserve the unusualness of the unit for the reader of the translation and often require additional explanations: for example, the translation of historicism *тисяцький* [21 : 111] with a word *tysyatsky* [35 : 168] is explained at the end of the page: "a captain of a 'thousand', a military unit of levies" [35 : 168]) to it. The rest of the transformations and means of translation, which are applied to obsolete vocabulary, can theoretically belong to both historicization and modernization, depending on the specific lexemes used in the translation.

Such transformations and means as calque, concretization, and modulation can be used in the context of historicization, especially with historicisms. For example, calquing the word *князівський* [21 : 22] as *the Prince's* [35 : 93] involves the selection of a traditional equivalent for the root of the word, so it preserves the obsolescence of the unit. The same process happens with the word *книжник* [21 : 103] that was translated as *scribe* [35 : 154]: here both the original unit and the translation are historicisms, but the word *scribe* is a slightly more specific term for a copyist [26], so it is specified how exactly the character named by this word interacts with books. On the other hand, modulation can convey the meaning of a unit not very accurately, but preserves its temporal aspect: for example, we have found out that the translation *князівський отрок*, 'the Prince's warrior' [21 : 22], as a *young prince* [35 : 31] is not accurate enough, but the translated unit also contains the historicism *prince* in it (in the meaning 'the title of the ruler of Ukraine-Rus', this word is obsolete in the English language [26]).

These translational transformations and means, however, are not tied to the historicization strategy, as they can sometimes be involved in modernization as well. For example, the same word *отрок* [21 : 22] in another case was modulated as *his friend* [35 : 52]: here not only the lexical meaning of the word is changed (the focus is shifted from the

position of the character to his relationship with another character), but also the temporal attachment is eliminated because the translation unit is completely neutral.

As for other translational transformations (such as generalization, addition, explication), we can claim that they, with rare exceptions, tend to belong to modernization. For example, the explication *пака* [21 : 53] as *an open niche* [35 : 77] uses only neutral units for translation.

Therefore, in connection with the percentage predominance of translation means and transformations tending to modernization, we can define its dominance in the translation of the novel. However, in accordance with the presence of means and transformations that involve historicization, as well as a complete omission that does not belong to either historicization or modernization, we can define a mixed strategy in the translation of the novel, which involves the situational preservation or elimination of the stylistic and temporal aspect of obsolete units according to the context of their usage and the nature of the units themselves.

Conclusions. Therefore, we can conclude that modernization is the transformation of the text with obsolete vocabulary that makes it more modern, while the term ‘historicization’ refers to the preservation of obsolescence. According to the analysis of the English translation of Valerii Shevchuk’s novel “The meek shall inherit”, we can conclude that numerous transformations (lexical, grammatical, lexical-grammatical, stylistic) were used to adapt obsolete units in this translation, as well as specific means used for the translation of realia (no-equivalent vocabulary). All in all, the strategy of translating obsolete vocabulary tends to modernization but also contains elements of historicization and omission, so it can be called mixed. Among the translation transformations tending to modernization, we can name neutralization, partial omission, antonymic translation, and (in most cases) addition, generalization, and explication. The transformations and means of historicization include compensation, traditional equivalent, transcription, transliteration, and (sometimes) calque, concretization, and modulation. We have to mention that this classification can only be true for this novel because, for instance, antonymic translation will not always be a mean of modernization – it is not implied. The prospect of further research is the improvement of the procedure for identifying historicisms and archaisms in a literary text, as well as the search for other rules in the choice of means and strategies during the translation of obsolete vocabulary.

Список використаної літератури

1. 160 років від скасування кріпацтва в Наддніпрянській Україні. URL : <https://nmiu.org/tsoho-dnia/2258-160-rokiv-vid-skasuvannia-kripatstva-v-naddnyprianskii-ukraini> (дата звернення: 15.03.2024)
2. 1848 – скасування кріпацтва на Буковині. URL : <https://uinp.gov.ua/istorychnyy-kalendar/serpen/9/2367> (дата звернення: 15.03.2024)
3. Бойко Я. В. Когнітивний стиль перекладача: “модернізація” vs. “історизація” часово віддаленого першотвору (на матеріалі українських ретрансляцій трагедій У. Шекспіра). *Міжнародний філологічний часопис*. 2011. Vol. 12. № 3. С. 50–56.
4. Валерій Шевчук. URL : <https://lib.kam.gov.ua/valeriy-shevchuk> (дата звернення: 26.03.2024)
5. Від Матвія 5. URL : <https://www.bible.com/uk/bible/204/MAT.5.UMT> (дата звернення: 09.03.2024)
6. Вороніна С. Лексична архаїзація мовлення персонажу та проблема її перекладу (на матеріалі детективних історій про Шерлока Холмса А. К. Дойла). *Актуальні проблеми філології*. Чернівці, 2016. С. 130–133.
7. Гайдученко Г. Історизми та архаїзми як основні виражальні засоби історичної стилізації. *Науковий вісник ХДУ. Серія : Лінгвістика*. Херсон, 2009. С. 65–68.

8. Гуменна К. О. Проблема відтворення архаїзмів як елементів лінгвопоетики франкомовного історичного роману (на матеріалі “Легенди про Уленшпігеля” Шарля де Костера). *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*. 2017. Вип. 59. С. 46–52.
9. Дудик П. С. Стилістика української мови : навчальний посібник. Київ : Видавничий центр “Академія”, 2005. 368 с.
10. Жижомо О. О. Хронологічно маркована лексика у зівставному аспекті (на матеріалі перекладів повісті Миколи Гоголя “Тарас Бульба”). *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія : Філологія*. 2019. № 42. Т. 3. С. 45–48.
11. Задорожна А. Перекладацькі трансформації як засіб досягнення еквівалентності перекладу. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*. 2020. Вип. 27. Т. 2. С. 57–63.
12. Зайцева О. В. Ремарки “застаріле” та “рідковживане” у словниках української мови другої половини ХХ ст. *Магістеріум. Мовознавчі студії*. 2009. Вип. 37. С. 30–37.
13. Ласінська Т. А. Загальні принципи перекладу архаїчної лексики. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*. 2017. № V(35). Iss. 125. С. 36–39.
14. Познанський Р. В. Принципи виокремлення ядерної, напівпериферійної, периферійної та запериферійної зон в структурі дієслівного семантичного поля “аграрне виробництво (рослинництво)”. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія : Філологія*. Харків, 2016. Вип. 74. С. 173–176.
15. Пономарів О. Д. Стилістика сучасної української мови : підруч. для студ. гуманіт. спец. вищ. закл. освіти. Тернопіль : Навчальна книга – Богдан, 2000. 246 с.
16. Рудь О. М., Горбатенко І. С. Застаріла лексика в поетичних текстах Сергія Жадана: функціонально-семантичний аспект. *Науковий вісник ХДУ. Серія : Германістика та міжкультурна комунікація*. 2021. № 1. С. 130–137.
17. Словник української мови: в 11 томах. URL : <http://sum.in.ua/> (дата звернення: 15.03.2024)
18. Ткачівська М. Р. Особливості перекладу історично маркованої лексики в романі Ю. Андруховича “Коханці Юстиції”. *Закарпатські філологічні студії*. 2022. Вип. 25. Т. 2. С. 130–136.
19. Художня культура: Класицизм. URL : http://www.zhu.edu.ua/mk_school/mod/book/view.php?id=16363&chapterid=321 (дата звернення: 16.03.2024)
20. Чижевський Д. Києво-Печерський патерик. URL : <http://litopys.org.ua/yushkov2/yush12.htm> (дата звернення: 27.03.2024)
21. Шевчук В. Птахи з невидимого острова: Роман, повісті. Київ : Радянський письменник, 1990. 470 с.
22. Шум О. Особливості відтворення стилістично маркованої лексики в перекладі (на прикладі німецькомовного варіанта роману О. Забужко “Польові дослідження з українського сексу”). *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*. 2020. Вип. 31. Т. 2. С. 311–315.
23. “Blessed Are the Meek, for They Will Inherit the Earth” (Matthew 5:5). URL : <https://www.theologyofwork.org/new-testament/matthew/the-kingdom-of-heaven-at-work-in-us-matthew-5-7/the-beatitudes-matthew-51-12/blessed-are-the-meek-for-they-will-inherit-the-earth-matthew-55/> (Last accessed: 09.03.2024)
24. Ahieieva-Karkashadze V. O. Archaic words of the English language: types, functions and translation. *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія : Філологія. Журналістика*. 2022. Т. 33 (72). № 3. С. 165–169.
25. Baranova S., Rozhenko O. Problem of transformations in translation of English-language national anthems. *Філологічні трактати*. 2018. Т. 10. № 2. Р. 25–34.
26. Cambridge dictionary. URL : <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/spear> (Last accessed: 16.03.2024)
27. Denysiuk Yu. I., SamoiloVA Yu. I. The methods of lexical and lexico-grammatical transformations in the field of military translation. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія : Філологія*. 2021. № 47. Т. 3. Р. 106–109.

28. Dmytruk L. A., Ostapenko S. A. Grammatical transformations application in the translation of “Matilda” by Roald Dahl into Ukrainian. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія : Філологія*. 2022. № 56. P. 255–256.
29. Erie E. How is cultural terminology handled in translation? The Legend of the Thousand Bulls. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araotermalarə Dergisi*. 2019. № 16. P. 545–558.
30. Haugland K. E. Thou and You in Early Modern English Dialogues: Trials, Depositions, and Drama Comedy (Pragmatics and Beyond New Series 158). URL : <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00138380802583212> (Last accessed: 16.03.2024)
31. Khodzhaeva G. D. Types of grammatical transformations and translation of articles from English into Uzbek. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*. 2021. Vol. 12. P. 303–306.
32. Madiyurova V. The problem of classification of archaisms. *EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)*. 2022. Vol. 7 Iss. 6. P. 181–183.
33. Minkovska I. I. Transcoding as one of the methods of transferring Ukrainian onyms and realia in Latin. *Закарпатські філологічні студії*. 2019. Вип. 9. Т. 3. С. 50–57.
34. Romaniuk O. M. Lexical and semantic transformations applied in the Ray Bradbury’s short stories. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія : Філологія*. 2019. № 40. Т. 3. P. 87–90.
35. Shevchuk V. The meek shall inherit Kyiv : Dnipro Publishers, 1989. 303 p.
36. Umudova M. Types of Obsolete Words (Archaisms and historicisms). *International Journal of Social Science And Human Research*. 2022. Vol. 5. Iss. 12. P. 5897–5900.

References

1. 160 rokov vid skasuvannia kriptatstva v Naddnyprianskii Ukraini. URL : <https://nmiu.org/tsoho-dnia/2258-160-rokiv-vid-skasuvannia-kriptatstva-v-naddnyprianskii-ukraini> (data zvernennia: 15.03.2024)
2. 1848 – skasuvannia kriptatstva na Bukovyni. URL : <https://uinp.gov.ua/istorychnyy-kalendar/serpen/9/2367> (data zvernennia: 15.03.2024)
3. Boiko Ya. V. Kohnityvnyi styl perekladacha: “modernizatsiia” vs. “istoryzatsiia” chasovo viddalenooho pershotvoru (na materialii ukrainskykh retransliatsii trahedii U. Shekspira). *Mizhnarodnyi filolohichnyi chasopys*. 2011. Vol. 12. № 3. S. 50–56.
4. Valerii Shevchuk. URL : <https://lib.kam.gov.ua/valeriy-shevchuk> (data zvernennia: 26.03.2024)
5. Vid Matviiia 5. URL : <https://www.bible.com/uk/bible/204/MAT.5.UMT> (data zvernennia: 09.03.2024)
6. Voronina S. Leksychna arkhazatsiia movlennia personazhu ta problema yii perekladu (na materialii detektyvnykh istorii pro Sherloka Kholmsa A. K. Doila). *Aktualni problemy filolohii. Chernivtsi*. 2016. S. 130–133.
7. Haiduchenko H. Istoryzmy ta arkhazizmy yak osnovni vyrazhalni zasoby istorychnoi stylizatsii. *Naukovyi visnyk KhD. Seriia : Linhvistyka*. Kherson, 2009. S. 65–68.
8. Humenna K. O. Problema vidtvorennia arkhazizmiv yak elementiv linhvopoetyky frankomovnooho istorychnoho romanu (na materialii “Lehendy pro Ulenshpihelia” Sharlia de Kostera). *Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu*. 2017. Vyp. 59. S. 46–52.
9. Dudyk P. S. Stylistyka ukrainskoi movy : navchalnyi posibnyk. Kyiv : Vydavnychiy tsentr “Akademiia”, 2005. 368 s.
10. Zhyzhoma O. O. Khronolohichno markovana leksyka u zistavnomu aspekti (na materialii perekladiv povisti Mykoly Hoholia “Taras Bulba”). *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seriia : Filolohiia*. 2019. № 42. Т. 3. S. 45–48.
11. Zadorozhna A. Perekladatski transformatsii yak zasib dosiahnennia ekvivalentnosti perekladu. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*. 2020. Vyp. 27. Т. 2. S. 57–63.
12. Zaitseva O. V. Remarky “zastarile” ta “ridkovzhyvane” u slovnykakh ukrainskoi movy druhoi polovyny XX st. *Magisterium. Movoznavchi studii*. 2009. Vyp. 37. S. 30–37.

13. Lasinska T. A. Zahalni pryntsyropy perekladu arkhachnoi leksyky. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*. 2017. № V(35). Iss. 125. S. 36–39.
14. Poznanskiy R. V. Pryntsyropy vyokremlyennia yadernoi, napivperyferiinoi, peryferiinoi ta zaperyferiinoi zon v strukturi diieslivnoho semantychnoho polia “ahrame vyrobnytstvo (roslynnytstvo)”. *Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Seriiia : Filolohiia*. Kharkiv, 2016. Vyp. 74. S. 173–176.
15. Ponomariv O. D. Stylistyka suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy : pidruch. dlia stud. humanit. spets. vyshch. zakl. osvity. Ternopil : Navchalna knyha – Bohdan, 2000. 246 s.
16. Rud O. M., Horbatenko I. S. Zastarila leksyky v poetychnykh tekstakh Serhiia Zhadana: funktsionalno-semantychnyi aspekt. *Naukovyi visnyk KhDU. Seriiia : Hermanistyka ta mizhkulturna komunikatsiia*. 2021. № 1. S. 130–137.
17. Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy: v 11 tomakh. URL : <http://sum.in.ua/> (data zvernennia: 15.03.2024)
18. Tkachivska M. R. Osoblyvosti perekladu istorychno markovanoi leksyky v romani Yu. Andrukhovycha “Kokhantsi Yustytsii”. *Zakarpatski filolohichni studii*. 2022. Vyp. 25. T. 2. S. 130–136.
19. Khudozhnia kultura: Klasysyzm. URL : http://www.zhu.edu.ua/mk_school/mod/book/view.php?id=16363&chapterid=321 (data zvernennia: 16.03.2024)
20. Chyzhevskiy D. Kyievo-Pecherskyi pateryk. URL : <http://litopys.org.ua/yushkov2/yush12.htm> (data zvernennia: 27.03.2024)
21. Shevchuk V. Ptakhy z nevydymoho ostrova: Roman, povisti. Kyiv : Radianskyi pismennyk, 1990. 470 s.
22. Shum O. Osoblyvosti vidtvorennia stylistychno markovanoi leksyky v perekladi (na prykladi nimetskomovnoho varianta romanu O. Zabuzhko “Polovi doslidzhennia z ukrainskoho seksu”). *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*. 2020. Vyp. 31. T. 2. S. 311–315.
23. “Blessed Are the Meek, for They Will Inherit the Earth” (Matthew 5:5). URL : <https://www.theologyofwork.org/new-testament/matthew/the-kingdom-of-heaven-at-work-in-us-matthew-5-7/the-beatitudes-matthew-51-12/blessed-are-the-meek-for-they-will-inherit-the-earth-matthew-55/> (Last accessed: 09.03.2024)
24. Ahieieva-Karkashadze V. O. Archaic words of the English language: types, functions and translation. *Vcheni zapysky TNU imeni V. I. Vernadskoho. Seriiia : Filolohiia. Zhurnalistyka*. 2022. T. 33 (72). № 3. S. 165–169.
25. Baranova S., Rozhenko O. Problem of transformations in translation of English-language national anthems. *Filolohichni traktaty*. 2018. T. 10. № 2. P. 25–34.
26. Cambridge dictionary. URL : <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/spear> (Last accessed: 16.03.2024)
27. Denysiuk Yu. I., SamoiloVA Yu. I. The methods of lexical and lexico-grammatical transformations in the field of military translation. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Ser. : Filolohiia*. 2021 № 47. T. 3. P. 106–109.
28. Dmytruk L. A., Ostapenko S. A. Grammatical transformations application in the translation of “Matilda” by Roald Dahl into Ukrainian. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seriiia : Filolohiia*. 2022. № 56. P. 255–256.
29. Erie E. How is cultural terminology handled in translation? The Legend of the Thousand Bulls. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araotermalarə Dergisi*. 2019. № 16. P. 545–558.
30. Haugland K. E. Thou and You in Early Modern English Dialogues: Trials, Depositions, and Drama Comedy (Pragmatics and Beyond New Series 158). URL : <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00138380802583212> (Last accessed: 16.03.2024)
31. Khodzhaeva G. D. Types of grammatical transformations and translation of articles from English into Uzbek. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*. 2021. Vol. 12. P. 303–306.
32. MadiyoroVA V. The problem of classification of archaisms. *EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)*. 2022. Vol. 7 Iss. 6. P. 181–183.

33. Minkovska I. I. Transcoding as one of the methods of transferring Ukrainian onyms and realia in Latin. *Zakarpatski filolohichni studii*. 2019. Vyp. 9. T. 3. S. 50–57.
34. Romaniuk O. M. Lexical and semantic transformations applied in the Ray Bradburys short stories. *Naukovi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seriya : Filolohiia*. 2019. № 40. T. 3. P. 87–90.
35. Shevchuk V. *The meek shall inherit Kyiv* : Dnipro Publishers, 1989. 303 p.
36. Umudova M. Types of Obsolete Words (Archaisms and historicisms). *International Journal of Social Science And Human Research*. 2022. Vol. 5. Iss. 12. P. 5897–5900.

СТРАТЕГІЇ ІСТОРИФІКАЦІЇ ТА МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЇ У ПЕРЕКЛАДІ ЗАСТАРІЛОЇ ЛЕКСИКИ (НА ПРИКЛАДІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДУ РОМАНУ ВАЛЕРІЯ ШЕВЧУКА “НА ПОЛІ СМІРЕННОМУ”)

Поліна Горєлова

*Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара
кафедра перекладу та лінгвістичної підготовки іноземців
пр. Науки, 72, ауд. 1314, 49010, Дніпро, Україна
тел.: 097 260 59 92
ел. пошта: polina.gorelova23@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5538-4265>*

У цьому дослідженні ми розглядаємо проблематику перекладу української історичної прози англійською мовою. Актуальність дослідження обумовлена зростаючим загальносвітовим інтересом до української історії, який передбачає потребу у перекладі української історичної прози мовами світу. Мета роботи полягає в аналізі наявних стратегій та засобів перекладу англійською мовою українських застарілих лексичних одиниць (історизмів та архаїзмів) на матеріалі історичної прози Валерія Шевчука (а саме роману “На полі смиренному”) та його перекладу англійською мовою, здійсненого В. Холмогоровою. Мета дослідження передбачає виконання таких завдань, як: визначення перекладацьких стратегій, що можуть бути застосовані для перекладу застарілої лексики; опис таких стратегій на конкретному прикладі (а саме англійському перекладі роману Валерія Шевчука “На полі смиренному”); встановлення зв’язку між перекладацькими стратегіями та засобами чи трансформаціями. Об’єктом дослідження є система одиниць застарілої лексики (архаїзмів та історизмів) у романі Валерія Шевчука “На полі смиренному”. Методи дослідження, які були використані під час його проведення, включають: описовий, класифікаційний, порівняльний. Наукова новизна дослідження полягає у системному аналізі зв’язку між засобами перекладу чи перекладацькими трансформаціями та стратегіями перекладу застарілих лексичних одиниць. Практичне значення пов’язане з можливістю використання матеріалів роботи під час подальших перекладів історичної прози українських авторів чи у викладанні перекладознавчих дисциплін. Результати дослідження полягають у визначенні домінантної стратегії перекладу застарілих одиниць у романі Валерія Шевчука “На полі смиренному” та встановленні зв’язку між стратегіями модернізації чи історифікації та перекладацькими трансформаціями у контексті дослідження перекладу. Перспективу подальших досліджень становить удосконалення процедури ідентифікації історизмів та архаїзмів у художньому тексті, а також пошук додаткових закономірностей у виборі засобів та стратегій під час перекладу застарілої лексики.

Ключові слова: переклад, застаріла лексика, архаїзми, історизми, реалії, перекладацькі трансформації.

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 29.03.2024
доопрацьована 05.04.2024
прийнята до друку 10.04.2024*