extended subject groups, and uncovers some limitations on its validity. The principle is found to work in cases of the possibility to reduce the subject group length and to be violated in cases of English extended indivisible subject groups. In this respect, translations by human translators and the improved Google automatic translator are compared to determine whether and to what extent the latter observes this usage principle. Discussed also are implications of the study for training qualified translators from the mother tongue.

Keywords: *end-weight principle in English usage, English speech, translation from Ukrainian into English, extended subject group transformations.*

В. И. **Карабан**, д-р филол. наук, проф.,
А. В. Карабан, канд. филол. наук, преп.
Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко (Украина)

Узусний принцип "большего веса второй половины предложения" в английской речи и украинско-английском переводе

Верифицируется гипотеза об узусном принципе большего веса второй половины предложения в английской речи и украинско-английском переводе больших групп подлежащего, а также определенные ограничения на его действие. Показывается, что этот принцип соблюдается в случаях возможности уменьшения длины подлежащего и имеет ограниченное действие в случае больших нераздельных групп подлежащих. В этом плане сравниваются также переводы переводчиком-человеком и усовершенствованным переводчиком Google Translate для выяснения того, насколько последний придерживается данного узусного принципа. Обсуждаются импликации знания его действия для подготовки профессиональных переводчиком с родного языка.

Ключевые слова: *английская речь, принцип большего веса второй половины предложения, перевод с украинского языка на английский, трансформации большой группы подлежащего.*

УДК 81′255.4:821.111 (73)

T.P. Andrienko, PhD (Philology), Associate Professor
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

HISTORICAL STYLIZATION OR ARCHAIZATION IN TRANSLATION?

This article studies the strategies of rendering chronological time and artistic time in translation based on the comparison of naturally aged and strategically archaized multiple translations. Archaization is studied in a

language (stylistic), cognitive and pragmatic aspects. The comparison exposes differences between naturally aged and strategically archaized translations, proving that archaization does not lie in mere imitation of the language features at its earlier stages, but in selective overuse of stylistically marked elements preserved in the modern language. Moderate archaization optimal for translation of a classical work is realized predominantly at the lingvo-stylistic level with inclusion of some historic concepts; however, basic cognitive and pragmatic structures are those of the modern time.

Key words: *literary-artistic translation, translation strategy, archaization, stylization, artistic time.*

Statement of the problem. The development of translation theory and translation practice opens new research perspectives and new problems to be studied. This article focuses on the problem of translation and time: chronological and artistic. The problem faced by the translators of historic texts involves the life of the text in chronological time and the qualitatively different (from the time of their creation) artistic time, specially created by the author, which results in the necessity to work out a strategy of dealing with the problem of rendering time and determines the **relevance** of studying the strategies of rendering the time distance. Our **aim** is to study translators' approaches to the artistic text depending on the temporal distance between the creation of the original and translation.

Materials and methods. Translations done a short time after the original may age over time, representing the natural state of language at the time of their creation, and may be used as a reference point for comparison with deliberately (strategically) archaized translations of later periods. Therefore, the research material is a series of translations of *A Christmas Carol in Prose* by Charles Dickens (1843) into Russian by L. Mei (supposedly before 1866 (the year of translator's death), published in 1898), by S. Dolgov (1891), S. Vrangel (1909), N. Pusheshnikov (1912) and T. Ozerskaya (1959). Our **hypothesis** is that differences between the texts of translations almost contemporary to the original and those distant in time will expose translation strategies, tactics and methods of recreating chronological or artistic time in translation. The research employs the

methods of linguo-stylistic, cognitive and pragmatic analyses, intralingual and interlingual comparison, and quantitative analysis.

Discussion of results. The the main attention of the researchers of historically distant text has so far been focused predominantly on their language features: archaic language or deliberate stylization [10; 24]. The solution of the problem of temporal distance is traced predominantly through the language features of the translated text: "… translations are deliberately, consciously archaic, full of such peculiarities of language that they are difficult to read and often obscure. No concessions are made to the reader, who is expected to deal with the work on its own term, meeting head-on, through the strangeness of the TL, the foreignness of the society that originally produced the text" [3, 73].

In communicative aspect, solution of the problem of bridging the time gap is seen in the choice between formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence [15; 24, 30–31], where formal equivalence means reproducing the style of the archaic text, while dynamic equivalence is approximating the text to the target audience, recreating it in a different culture, i.e. modernizing it, although E. Nida believes that "Between the two poles of translating (i.e. between strict formal equivalence and complete dynamic equivalence) there are a number of intervening grades, representing various acceptable standards of literary translation" [15, 130]. While for many authors the choice between archaizing and modernizing the text lies in the same plane as exoticizing (foreignizing) and familiarizing (domesticating), U. Eco describes these as two differing oppositions which may interact or complement one another and analyses an example of the translator at once foreignizing the text and making it archaic [6, p. 28].

We claim that the problem of archaizing and modernizing an artistic text is much deeper than just rendering the style; the category of time in belles-lettres in translation aspect may be analyzed as a part of chronotope, or artistic time. M.M. Bakhtin sees literary-artistic chronotope as a merging of space and time features in a meaningful integrity, where time is condensed, becoming artistic and

visible; and space is intensified, is drawn into the movement of time, plot and history. The signs of the time are revealed in space, and the space is interpreted and measured by time… <>. Chronotope also determines to a considerable degree human images in literature; these images are essentially chronotopic [21, 234].

The concept of time in artistic translation is to be considered in at least two aspects: real time (the time of making the translation related to the time of creation of the original) and artistic time (a complex image of historic epoch created by the author in integrity with the place of setting). These aspects have been studied so far in connection with the problem of 'aging' of the language and deliberate stylization [24], or dealing with archaisms in translation [10, 40–56].

Lingvo-stylistic dimension of archaization comprises the surface, observable level of historical markedness of the texts. Through the perspective of polysystems theory it is studied at lexical (historic and archaic words and idioms), morphological and syntactic (archaic word forms and structures, 'structural archaisms' [10]) levels. Not so conspicuous but nonetheless important are cognitive and pragmatic dimensions. These so far have not acquired enough scholarly attention as a specific research topic, but even existing findings show how important they are for translation.

Cognitive dimension includes mental representations: concepts, frames, etc. which underlie the narration in historic texts and often remain unnoticed or are improperly understood by contemporary readers. In our interpretation of events, we almost inevitably rely on our own system of ideas and values: "Striving to find the key to understanding of the ethos of other nations, researchers often proceed from their own mentality, i.e., describe it through the world view of their own nation" [26, 133].

Cognitive scenarios represented in archaic texts may be also misinterpreted against the background of contemporary cultures which offer different values, different motivations, different behavioral reactions. As R. Hoyle observes, "Sometimes we are given clues to understand why characters act the way they do, but we do not spot them. Instead, we infer our own reasons, from our own

viewpoint" [7, 2]. K.A. McElhanon believes that construal based on the wrong cognitive foundation may result in misinterpretation of the meaning: "It is… an inappropriate hermeneutical practice for contemporary interpreters to impose their Western inferential patterns upon the biblical texts. The result is a skewing of the meaning, not a discovery of a deeper meaning" [14, 42]. The studies of evolution of concepts over time indicate difference in the worldviews: not only the concept structures but even the ways of conceptualizing the world differed [13; 2]. Ancient concepts are imbedded in our contemporary view of the world as represented by metaphors, images and other symbolic representations [ibid.], but we do not always decode them as such.

The third aspect, in which translation through the time is studied, is ***pragmatic*** – the rules of communication, the norms of speech behaviour, politeness, methods of influencing the interlocutor that undergo changes over time [27; 22; 20]. Due to the differences in norms and rules of behaviour, politeness strategies, the freedom of expressing emotions in remote periods, today's audience cannot be expected to understand and respond in the same way: to experience immediate impacts, feelings or emotions, the reader should be 'placed in the familiar environment'. Although basic emotions are universal [8], conventions regulating their manifestation may be imposed by the society in a specific historic period, therefore, in choosing the strategy of rendering aspects of speech behaviour in translation, the determining factor will be either the focus on rules and social conventions of the time, or exposing the reader to the pragmatic effect, which is only possible on the basis of the reader's own conventional behavioral experience. Thus, studying the strategies of rendering emotions in the translations of the archaic text, Aila Malkki concludes that 'we do not need to cross the bridge to the past, because distance gives us an opportunity for deeper, universal reading' [12, p. 10], while in most cases, direct translations of dialogues in the texts of the past have familiarized us with the style of communication in those days.

The review of translatologists' opinions on the problem of translating historically distant texts proves that temporal distance,

either objectively existing or artificially simulated by the author as a part of the complex mega-concept of the original text, creates a translation problem which may be solved by working out and implementing a translation strategy. The strategy governing the translation of the whole text is termed as a global translation strategy, and strategies of translation of particular fragments comprising translation problems are referred to as local strategies.

The strategy of rendering the style of historically distant texts in translation has been described as a strategy of historical stylization in a specialized study by E. Meshalkina [24]. Dealing with cognitive and pragmatic temporal differences has not been specifically studied yet, however comprising theoretical as well as practical interest. The researches of translation of historically distant texts point out the factor which is determinant in developing a translation strategy: whether the text was created to be perceived as archaic or whether it aged over time [9; 24]. It is the translator's choice to let the reader communicate with the author as his/her contemporary or maintain a temporal distance in the case of aging of archaic texts, but when creating the effect of remoteness in time was the author's intention, it is the translator's responsibility to render it faithfully. The alternative strategies of translating the texts with temporal distance are archaizing / archaisation and modernizing / modernisation [6; 24; 9].

Jones and Turner claim that the 'translator's communicative context is not bipolar but diachronic' [9, 162], which implies a spectrum of translation decisions termed by the authors after R. Lefere [11] as 'hyperarchaisation', 'time-matched archaisation', 'updated archaisation', 'superficial archaisation', 'minimal modernisation', 'violent modernisation' [9, 163]. In congruence with the real or artistic time gap between the original and translation, E. Meshalkina offers the following solutions: adequate modernizing strategy for the archaic texts, adequate archaizing for modern archaized texts and combining adequate modernizing and adequate archaizing for archaized archaic texts [24, 129].

The material of actual translations of the same original made in different periods may reveal different translation strategies chosen with the account of the temporal distance between the author and the

target audience. Charles Dickens' *A Christmas Carol in Prose* created in 1843 has enjoyed numerous translations into Russian (which shows its unceasing relevance for the target audience). While the original reads natural and quite understandable for the modern English-speaking audience (its language perceived not as 'old' but rather as 'classical'), the first Russian translation done by L. Mei supposedly before 1866 (the year of translator's death), but published in 1898, and translations by S. Dolgov published in 1891 and baroness S. Vrangel in 1909 are perceived as markedly old, or even outdated.

The impression of obsolescence results from the use of functional words, grammar structures and idiomatic expressions which are no longer natural, as well as reference to the phenomena of the life of contemporary Russia which do not exist or have changed today – historic nominations: *метрическая книга, причетник, вития; почти осязательный воздух* (Мей); *причетник, законъ о бѣдныхъ въ полномъ ходу* (Долгов) / *всѣ эти заведенія въ ходу* (Врангель); *душеприказчикъ, праздные люди* (Долгов) / *тунеядцы* (Врангель); *газопроводныя трубы* (Мей)/ *газовыя трубы* (Долгов) / *газовые провода* (Врангель), *угодно / благоугодно было подписаться* (Врангель, Мей) etc.

On the other hand, translation by N. Pusheshnikov includes some words that mark the beginning of the 20th century: *народ, народонаселение*. In contrast to archaic nominations, 19th century translations include literalisms, which today will be perceived as undue modernisms or anachronisms:

*He carried his own **low temperature** always about with him; he iced his office in the dog-days; and didn't thaw it **one degree** at Christmas.*

*Всегда и повсюду вносилъ онъ съ собою **собственную свою температуру – ниже нуля**, леденилъ свою контору даже въ каникулы и, ради самыхъ святокъ, не возвышалъ **сердечнаго термометра ни на одинъ градусъ**.* (Мей)

***Свою собственную низкую температуру** онъ всюду приносилъ съ собою: замораживалъ свою контору въ праздничные, не трудовые дни и даже въ Рождество не давалъ ей нагрѣться **и на одинъ градусъ**.* (Долгов)

Онъ всюду вносилъ съ ***собой свою низкую температуру****, леденилъ воздухъ своей конторы въ лѣтнее время и* ***ни на Іоту не согрѣвалъ*** *его въ дни рождественскихъ святокъ.* (Врангель)

For comparison, later translations render this metaphor by a conventional Russian metaphor:

Он вносил с собой этот ***холод*** *повсюду;* ***холодом дышала*** *его контора – и такой же была она и в рождественские дни* (Пушешников)

Он всюду вносил с собой ***эту леденящую атмосферу****. Присутствие Скруджа замораживало его контору в летний зной, и он не позволял ей* ***оттаять ни на полградуса*** *даже на веселых святках.* (Озерская)

Some obsolescent expressions sound officialese, e.g.: ***въ качествѣ адвоката*** *святокъ* (Мей): *не желаю* ***содѣйствовать*** *радости тунеядцевъ* (Врангель), which makes the text stylistically incongruent.

The translation by T. Ozerskaya, which has become classical in modern Russian literature, appeared more than a hundred years later; it reads natural and fluent today. However, the translation does not produce an impression of a modern text.

Analyzing archaization of translation at the lingvo-stylistic level, we focused on the translators' use of the words which do not name historic facts or refer to culture specific concepts – pronouns, conjunctions or prepositions etc., – to distinguish this level of analysis from the cognitive level. Where the modern Russian language offers oppositions of neutral (modern) and stylistically marked (archaic) elements, e.g.: *весьма/очень; сей/этот; посему/поэтому; столь/так* etc., T. Ozerskaya often gives preference to the marked element. It would be natural to expect such elements in the earlier translations, but the quantitative analysis shows the opposite tendency: in translation by T. Ozerskaya (1959) *весьма* is used 7 times, while in translation by L. Mei (1866/1898) – it does not occur, S. Dolgov (1891) uses it 2 times, S. Vrangel (1909) – 2 times, N. Pusheshnikov (1912) – 3 times. The same tendency is observed with other oppositions: *столь* is not used in the oldest transaltion by Mei, is used 6 times by Dolgov, 1 by Pusheshnikov and 17 times by Ozerskaya; *сей* instead of *этот* is used only in the oldest transaltion by Mei and the newest by Ozerskaya; *посему* – by Pusheshnikov and

by Ozerskaya, while older translations use *поэтому (потому)* – the words existing in the modern Russian without any specific stylistic colouring. Older translations do not make use of a word with a notable archaic connotations – *дабы*, using neutral *чтобы*, while later translations give preference to the archaic word – Pusheshnikov (once) and Ozerskaya (9 times).

Table 1

The use of stylistically marked words in translations

Translator, year ***Archaic/modern***	Mei (1866)	Dolgov (1891)	Vrangel (1909)	Pusheshnikov (1912)	Ozerskaya (1959)
весьма/очень	0 / 22	2 / 48	2/46	3 / 48	7 / 28
сей / этот; посему/ поэтому (потому)	1 / 188; 0/1/12	0 / 180; 0/0/18	0 / 340 0 / 5/12	0 / 134; 1/2/4	1 / 235; 1/1/5
столь / так (такой)	0 / 101	6 / 243	17 / 190	1 / 115	17 / 128
дабы / чтобы	0 / 32	0 / 39	0 / 84	1 / 49	9 / 41

This comparison of the use of pronouns and functional words (which do not name concepts) shows a difference between archaic and deliberately archaized translations. Translators of *A Christmas Carol* working in the 19th – early 20th centuries did not perceive the original text as archaic. They attempted to create a text contemporary to their audience, sometimes modernizing it; their choices of functional words show the tendencies of usual usage at the time. A 1912 translation by Pusheshnikov and especially 1959 translation by Ozerskaya, so far unsurpassed, make much wider use of obsolescent words with connotations of solemnity creating a 'classical' style and atmosphere of spirituality. The comparison proves that stylistic means of archaization do not lie in imitating the language or style of the epoch, but rather in overusing elements characteristic of some distant state of the target language, which are perceived by the target audience as such because in the modern language they have neutral counterparts.

Cognitive level (as represented by some notional words referring to historical concepts as well as frames, scenarios, metaphorical mappings) also comprises certain differences in the compared translations. Although all of them faithfully represent the valorative (axiological) and evaluative layer of the text concept (its main moral essence), their conceptual structures differ in associative and sometimes even in denotative aspects. The earliest translations sometimes misinterpret facts:

Что касается собственно Скруджа, ему и въ голову не приходило вычеркнуть ***изъ счетныхъ книгъ*** *имя своего* ***товарища по торговлѣ****: много лѣтъ послѣ смерти Мэрлея, надъ входомъ въ ихъ общий магазинъ красовалась еще вывѣска съ надписью: "Скруджъ и Мэрлей". Фирма торговаго дома была все та же: "Скруджъ и Мэрлей". Случалось иногда, что нѣкоторые господа, плохо знакомые съ торговыми оборотами, называли* ***этотъ домъ****:* ***Скруджъ – Скруджъ****, а иногда и просто: Мерлей;* ***но фирма всегда готова была откликнуться*** *одинаково на то, или на другое имя.* (Чарльз Диккенс "Скряга Скрудж: Святочная песня в прозе" Пер. Л. Мей, 1898)

Фирма его дома была извѣстна подъ двойнымъ именемъ: Марли и Скруджъ. Нѣкоторые же люди, новички въ торговомъ домѣ ***называли ее иногда "Скруджъ и Скруджъ"****, а иногда и* ***просто "Марли"****. Но ему и то и другое имя было безразлично и онъ охотно отзывался на оба.* (Чарльз Диккенс "Рождественская пѣснь въ прозѣ" Пер. С. Врангель, 1909)

Sometimes it results in incongruence, as in the second translation (compare with the original: *The firm was known as Scrooge and Marley. Sometimes people new to the business called* ***Scrooge Scrooge, and sometimes Marley****, but* ***he answered to both names.*** *It was all the same to him*.)

Considerable differences are observed in interpreting *'to astonish his son's weak mind*': *окончательно разстроить* ***поврежденные умственные способности*** *своего возлюбленного сына* (Мей), *перепугать своего* ***трусливаго*** *сына* (Долгов), *поразить и безъ того* ***слабый умъ*** *своего сына* (Врангель), *поразить своего* ***сла-***

боумного *сына* (Пушешников), *поразить и без того* ***расстроенное воображение*** *сына* (Озерская). As this fragment of the original contains an allusion to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, differences in translations also refer to another cognitive entity – the image of Hamlet in the Russian literature and culture.

In all translations we observe some facts of socio-political life of Russia of the time: *сочельник, святки, фирма торгового дома, причетник, конторщик / писец, полушка, грош.* Some metaphors added by earlier translators are evidently domesticated: *Старикъ Мэрлей* ***вбитъ былъ въ могилу, какъ осиновый колъ*** (Мей) (Cf., the original: *Old Marley was* ***as dead as a door-nail***); ***Такъ человѣколюбивый жерновъ все еще мелетъ на основаніи закона****?* (Мей) (Cf., the original: *Are they* ***still in operation****?*). Once Mei adds a vivid Biblicism not used in the original: *Не мое дѣло! ...* Довлѣетъ дневи злоба его. *А у меня собственныхъ дѣлъ больше, чѣмъ дней* (Мей). All these features make the text archaic at the cognitive level, however, this archaization cannot be considered a strategy chosen by the translator – it is a result of natural aging of language and cognitive structures. A translation by T. Ozerskaya which is strategically moderately archaized, represents cognitive structures of the past through the use of historicisms – the names of objects of the past historic epochs, such as: *конторка, перо, острог, работный дом.* At the same time, more complex and abstract cognitive structures are quite in line with the modern worldview, which makes them easy for the target audience to perceive.

On the other hand, English culture-specific concepts in earlier translations are supplied with explanations in the text: *pudding, holly {Пудингъ – необходимое рождественское блюдо англичанъ, какъ остролистникъ – обязательное украшеніе ихъ комнатъ на святочныхъ вечерахъ.}*. (Долгов); *{Падубъ, остролистникъ (flex aquifolium) обрядовое рождественское дерево въ Англіи.}* (Врангель). These explanations show the need to familiarize the target audience with culture-specific phenomena at that time unknown to them. In later translations no explanations are given, as the Russian audience is already familiarized, through cultural contacts, with the most common English Christmas traditions. This lets us conclude

that the aging of translations results not only from language evolution, but also from changes in competence and cognitive needs of the target audience. Strategic archaization bases predominantly on the modern cognitive structures, introducing only some historical concepts to maintain the atmosphere of the past, natural for communication with the author who lived more than a century ago.

Studying the pragmatic level of archaic and archaized translations, we observe some differences in translators' approaches where norms of communication differ in the source and target cultures, in space or over time. Thus, the first translation by L. Mei tends to literalism thus turning the original Christmas greeting into a blessing which in the Russian culture was normally used after a farewell:

"A merry Christmas, uncle! ***God save you****!" cried a cheerful voice.*

– Съ праздникомъ, дядюшка, ***и да хранитъ васъ Богъ****!* (Мей)

S. Dolgov and S. Vrangel substitute it with a wish normally accompanying a greeting. These domesticated translations seem archaic today because of the change of norms of communication in the Russian culture:

– Съ праздникомъ, дядюшка! ***Богъ вамъ на помощъ****!* (Долгов)

– ***Богъ помощь дядя****! Съ праздникомъ!* (Врангель)

Later translations (Pusheshnikov 1912; Ozerskaya 1959) modernize and domesticate it at the same time, using typical Christmas or New Year wishes:

– С праздником, дядя, ***с радостью! Дай вам Бог всех благ земных!*** (Пушешников)

– С наступающим праздником, дядюшка! ***Желаю вам хорошенько повеселиться на святках****!* (Озерская)

Another problem – representing an invective and euphemism in translation – reveals a similar tendency in translator's approaches. 19th century translations tend to euphemism and literalism or explication:

Scrooge said that he would see ***him – yes, indeed he did. He went the whole length of the expression, and said that he would see him in that extremity first****.*

Скруджъ ему отвѣтилъ, ***чтобы онъ пошелъ къ… Право: такъ и сказалъ, все слово выговорилъ, – такъ-таки и сказалъ: пошелъ… (Читатель, можетъ, если заблагоразсудитъ, договорить слово)****.* (Мей)

Тутъ Скруджъ, ***не стѣсняясь****, предложилъ ему* ***убраться подальше****.* (Долгов)

На это милое приглашеніе Скруджъ ***послалъ племянника къ... Представьте, онъ дѣйствительно произнесъ это пожеланіе все цѣликомъ, нимало не стѣсняясь****.* (Врангель)

Later translations are modernized and appear to be more dysphemistic, in line with less demanding rules of communication in the modern time:

Скрудж, в ответ на это, ***послал его к чёрту****.* (Пушешников)

Скрудж отвечал, что ***скорее он наведается к... Да, так и сказал, без всякого стеснения, и в заключение добавил еще несколько крепких словечек****.* (Озерская)

Thus, at the pragmatic level we observe a consistent tendency to adaptation to the contemporary norms of speech behaviuor; with only some confusing literalisms at the earlier stages of translation, all translators appear to modernize the text. The explanation may be the fact that the readers will understand implicatures, intentions and motivations in the speech behaviour of the characters only on the basis of their experience, their internalized communication principles and rules. In interactional communication theory [1; 4; 5] the reader is viewed as a co-creator, not a recipient of the message; thus, the translation should be a sufficient basis for the reader to complete the artistic image of the original.

The research leads to the following **conclusions**:

The problem of temporal distance in translation exists where a translation is done a considerable time later than the original, or where the artistic time of the original is past, and should be re-created as an integral part of the chronotope. To solve this problem, the translator develops a translation strategy, the most typical choice being between archaizing and modernizing.

The texts may be archaized or modernized at the lingvo-stylistic, cognitive and pragmatic levels. The strategic archaization is not a simple imitation of the style, worldview or manners of the respective period in the target culture, but rather a creation of a new artistic image which will be perceived by a modern audience as the 'chronotopic past'.

At the level of language style, strategic archaization is realized through the use of lexical means (inter alia, functional words and pronouns) and grammar structures, which are perceived as archaic and have neutral counterparts in the modern language, more frequently than in the translations of approximately the same time as the original; keeping a common literary vocabulary with some inclusion of historic nominations.

At the cognitive level archaized translations base mostly on the worldview of the modern audience; only simple concepts comprising historic phenomena and material objects are introduced to maintain the historic atmosphere. Relying on the present-day worldview gives the audience a key to understanding the characters and events appropriately.

At the pragmatic level translations represent the rules and norms of communication in the target culture at its modern stage of development. Comparison with earlier translations into the same language show the tendency to simplification and dysphemization of the Russian-language communication, which is also manifested in translations into this language.

Archaization in translation aims at the truthful representation of chronotope of the original work and maintaining an illusion of real communication with the author who is not the reader's contemporary. Thus archaization strategy may be described as a means of optimizing communication across time and cultural borders.

The **prospect** for further research is unveiling differences in strategic archaization vs. modernization in translation at the stylistic, cognitive and pragmatic levels.

REFERENCES

1. *Bangerter A.* Interactional theories of communication. In P. Cobley & P. J. Schulz (Eds.), Theories and Models of Communication: Handbooks of Communication Science [HoCS] / *A. Bangerter, E. Mayor*. – Berlin ; Boston : De Gruyter Mouton, 2013. – P. 257–272.

2. *Baryshnikov P*. Metaphorical cognition and actualization of archaic concepts in the daily discourse / P. Baryshnikov. In Journal of International Scientific Publication: Language, Individual & Society. – Vol. 4, part 1. – P. 152–159.

3. *Bassnett S.* Translation Studies, third ed. – New York and London : Routledge, 2002.

4. *Clark H. H.* Using language. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1996.

5. *Clark H. H., & Schaefer E. F.* Contributing to Discourse. In Cognitive Science 13 / *H. H. Clark, E. F. Schaefer*, 1989. – P. 259–294.

6. *Eco U.* Experiences in Translation / U. Eco. – Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 2000.

7. *Hoyle R. A*. Scenarios, Discourse, and Translation: The scenario theory of Cognitive Linguistics, its relevance for analysing New Testament Greek and modern Parkari texts, and its implications for translation theory / Richard A. Hoyle. – SIL International : SIL e-Books, 2008.

8. *Izard C. E*. The Psychology of Emotions / Carroll Ellis Izard. – New York : Plenum Press, 1991.

9. *Jones F. R.* Archaisation, Modernisation and Reference in the Translation of Older Texts / Jones Francis R, Turner Allan. Across Languages and Cultures. – 2004. – № 5(2). – P. 159–185.

10. *Kharmandar M. A.* Exploring archaism in translation theory and modern Persian poetics: Towards a Persian translation paradigm / *M. A. Kharmandar* In Iranian Journal of Translation Studies. – 2014. – № 12(46). – P. 40–56.

11. *Lefere R.* La Traduction Archaïsante: Cervantes D'Après M. Molho. Meta / R. Lefere. – 1994. – Vol. 39. – № 1. – P. 241–249.

12. *Malkki A.* Translating Emotions Across Time: Lewis Carroll's Alice's Adventures in Wonderland / Aila Malkki. In The Electronic Journal of the Department of English at the University of Helsinki, 2009. – Vol. 5.

13. *MacDonald P. S.* Palaeo-Philosophy: Complex and Concept in Archaic Patterns of Thought / MacDonald Paul S. In Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy https://www.questia.com/read/1G1-170414880 /palaeo-philosophy-complex-and-concept-in-archaic.

14 *McElhanon K. A.* (2005). From Word to Scenario: The Influence of Linguistic Theories Upon Models of Translation / Kenneth A. McElhanon. In Journal of Translation. – 2005. – Vol. 1. – № 3. – P. 29–67.

15. *Nida E.* Principles of Correspondence. First published 1964. In: Venuti, L. (ed.) The Translation Studies Reader / E. Nida. – London : Routledge, 2000. – P. 126–140.

16. *Schleiermacher F.* On the different methods of translating. In Translation /History/Culture: a sourcebook/[tr. and ed.] André Lefevere / *F. Schleiermacher*. – London ; New York : Routledge, 1992. – P. 141–166.

17. *Steiner G.* After Babel: Aspects of language and translation / *G. Steiner*. – London ; Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1998.

18. *Venuti L.* The translator's invisibility: A history of translation / L. Venuti. – London ; New York : Routledge, 1995.

19. *Wilkes-Gibbs D.* Coordinating Beliefs in Conversation / *D. Wilkes-Gibbs, H. H. Clark* In Journal of Memory and Language. – 1992. – № 31. – P. 183–194.

20. *Андриенко Т. П.* Речевой акт иронии в английском языке (на материале художественной литературы XVI и XX веков) : дис... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04 / Т. П. Андриенко. – Х., 2002.

21. *Бахтин М. М.* Формы времени и хронотопа в романе: Очерки по исторической поэтике / М. М. Бахтин // Вопросы литературы и эстетики. – М. : Худ. лит., 1975. – С. 234–407.

22. *Безуглая Л. Р.* Историческая динамика речевого акта квеситива в немецком и английском языках : дис... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04 / Л. Р. Безуглая. – Х., 1998.

23. *Ланчиков В. К.* Китайцы на маскараде, или Худло от Настика / *В. К. Ланчиков, Е. Н. Мешалкина* // Журнал переводчиков Мосты. – 2008. – № 3 (19). – С. 12–23.

24. *Мешалкина Е. Н.* Стратегии исторической стилизации в художественном переводе (на материале англоязычной художественной литературы XVIII–XX вв.) : дис. … канд. филол. наук: 10.02.20 / Е. Н. Мешалкина. – М., 2008.

25. *Некряч Т. Є.* Стилізація як перекладацька проблема ("Саломея" Оскара Уайльда в українському перекладі) / Т. Є. Некряч, Т. Л. Гуртова // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу. – К. : ВПЦ "Київський університет", 2002. – С. 65–62.

26. *Приходько А. М.* Концепти і концептосистеми в когнітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі лінгвістики / А. М. Приходько. – Запоріжжя : Прем'єр, 2008.

27. *Шевченко И. С.* Историческая динамика прагматики предложения: английское вопросительное предложение XVI–XX вв. : монография / И. С. Шевченко. – Харьков : Константа, 1998.

Надійшла до редколегії 17.05.16

Т. П. Андрієнко, канд. філол. наук, доц.
Інститут міжнародних відносин
Київського національного університету
імені Тараса Шевченка (Україна)

Історична стилізація чи архаїзація в перекладі?

Досліджуються стратегії передачі хронологічного й художнього часу в перекладі на основі зіставлення застарілих і стратегічно архаїзованих множинних переказів. Архаїзація вивчається в мовному (стилістичному), когнітивному та прагматичному аспектах. Порівняння виявляє відмінності між застарілими і стратегічно архаїзованими перекладами, доводячи, що архаїзація полягає не в імітації мовних особливостей більш раннього періоду, а у вибірковому використанні стилістично маркованих елементів, що збереглися в сучасній мові. Оптимальна для перекладу класичного твору помірна архаїзація реалізується переважно на лінгво-стилістичному рівні з включенням деяких історичних реалій; проте основні когнітивні та прагматичні структури є сучасними.

Ключові слова: *художній переклад, стратегія перекладу, архаїзація, стилізація, художній час.*

Т. П. Андриенко, канд. филол. наук, доц.
Институт международных отношений
Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко (Украина)

Историческая стилизация или архаизация в переводе?

Исследуются стратегии передачи хронологического и художественного времени в переводе на основе сопоставления устаревших и стратегически архаизированных множественных переводов. Архаизация изучается в языковом (стилистическом), когнитивном и прагматическом аспектах. Сравнение выявляет различия между устаревшими и стратегически архаизированными переводами, доказывая, что архаизация заключается не в имитации языковых особенностей более раннего периода, а в избирательном использовании стилистически маркированных элементов, сохранившихся в современном языке. Оптимальная для перевода классического произведения умеренная архаизация реализуется преимущественно на лингво-стилистическом уровне с включением некоторых исторических реалий; однако основные когнитивные и прагматические структуры являются современными.

Ключевые слова: *художественный перевод, стратегия перевода, архаизация, стилизация, художественное время.*

УДК 81'25

М. С. Дорофеєва, канд. філол. наук, доц.
Інститут філології
Київський національний університет
імені Тараса Шевченка (Україна)

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНО-ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКИЙ АНАЛІЗ У СИНЕРГЕТИЦІ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ (ДОСВІД ПРАКТИЧНОГО ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ)

Представлено синергетично-інформаційну методику виконання порівняльно-перекладацького аналізу спеціального тексту на базі синергетично-інформаційної моделі системи спеціального перекладу. На матеріалі фрагмента німецького науково-технічного тексту, його множинних перекладів та перекладу-еталона українською мовою продемонстровано механізм аналізу та доведено ефективність останнього. Виявлено, що послідовне виконання етапів синергетичного аналізу сприяє об'єктивності оцінювання результатів перекладу та мінімізації власних перекладацьких помилок.