

3. *Schlobinski P. / Siever T. "Textuelle und sprachliche Aspekte in deutschen Weblogs" // Schlobinski P. / Siever T. Sprachliche und textuelle Merkmale in Weblogs. Ein internationales Projekt – Hannover, 2005.*

4. *Schönberger K. "Weblogs: Persönliches Tagebuch, Wissensmanagement-Werkzeug und Publikationsorgan" // Schlobinski P. Von \*hdl\* bis \*cul8r\*. Sprache und Kommunikation in den Neuen Medien – Mannheim, 2006.*

Стаття подана до редакції 19.04.13

*В данной работе рассмотрены языковые и внеязыковые характеристики блоггинга и микроблоггинга. Сделан вывод о том, что Твиттер является одной из ведущих форм интернет-коммуникации.*

**Ключевые слова:** *блоггинг, микроблоггинг, Твиттер, фолловер, твит, ретвит, ответ, СМИ (средства массовой информации), блоггер, ссылка, гиперссылка, хэштег, интертекстуальность, гипертекст.*

*This paper presents the examination of the linguistic and extra linguistic features of blogging and microblogging. The conclusion is as follows Twitter is one of the leading forms of online communication.*

**Keywords:** *blogging, microblogging, Twitter, follower, tweet, retweet, reply, mass media, blogger, link, hyperlink, hashtag, intertextuality, hypertext.*

УДК – 81'373

**Fedayuk P. A.**, lecturer,  
Shostka Institute of Sumy State University

## **THE STRUCTURE OF LEXICAL FIELD OF WEATHER PHENOMENA NOTIONS**

*In the article different approaches (J. Katz and T. Fodor, P. Kay, G. Ipsen, W. Labov, R. Kempton and other) to represent the whole word-stock of any language as a highly organized and structured system are described. Few is known about the structure of lexical units denoting WEATHER PHENOMENA in present-day English. This article runs about semantic peculiarities of the given word-group. The author used a field approach of semantic grouping of words denoting WEATHER PHENOMENA. The analysis of the mentioned lexical group gives ground to make up the conclusion that among the components in the field structure of WEATHER*

*PHENOMENA* there are core and periphery zones. Their functions and characteristic features as being elements of some higher unit are given.

**Key words:** *seme, lexical field, semantic field, lexical word-grouping, hyponym, hyperonym.*

The state of research in present-day linguistics is characterized with immense variability and complexity of numerous approaches [Chomsky 1986, 3-14]. Up so far scholars have evolved different trends of investigation language functioning [Langacker 1973, 32]. The discourse-cognitive paradigm taken as prevalent defines basic questions of the linguistics in the 21<sup>st</sup> century [Кубрякова 1992, 25; Левицкий 2011, 3]. Its aim is to determine specifics of the nominative and communicative activities of people in the process of verbalization of the reality. Thus the focus lies upon informative, cognitive and communicative functions of the language as being of paramount importance, which consists in conveying and interchanging information.

People have elaborated different means of conveying their thoughts, feelings, desires and intentions. They may be classified into two groups lingual and extralingual. Language being a lingual means represents the sign system of our states, feelings and thoughts expressions. The expression is embodied into some particular words having the sense of their own in their content.

In the course of its development language undergoes different processes. A great deal of these changes takes place in such field of linguistics as lexicology. New words appear, replacing old and archaic. So the language is under constant change. It is especially particular of the English language, which is characterized by a very extensive vocabulary. A question naturally arises whether this enormous word-stock is composed of separate independent lexical units, or it should be regarded as a certain structuralized system made up of numerous independent and interrelated sub-systems or groups of words.

Words can be decomposed into the features they share; each shared feature manifests a crosscutting dimension, while intersections of dimensions constitute the system. As each term in the system is meaningful semantically. The cleanest definition of a term comprises only its semantic features and cross-reference to the other terms of the system or, in a well-wrought lexicon, reference to formal depiction of the system. For example, the definition of 'wind' consists of [air moving + of middle force + of moderate temperature] and differs from the definition of 'breeze' by the second feature or from 'cool' by the third,

but these definitions would subsume nothing about climatic zones where the winds are in force or speed of the wind. Such encyclopedic information is excluded from the dictionary as extrasystematic.

Let's consider the following sets of words:

1. zephyr, gust, puff, gale, typhoon, flurry, hurricane, vortex, swirl;
2. car, book, girl, bee, lion, tulip.

The words of set 1 refer to concepts that can be described as 'different types of air moving as a result of natural forces', while the words of set 2 denote concepts that have nothing in common with each other. The words of set 1 constitute a **lexical field (semantic field, lexical word-group)** – a set of words with identifiable semantic affinities [Finegan 1994, 164]. **Lexical group** is the subset of the vocabulary all the elements of which possess a given distinctive feature [Arnold 1986, 250]. **Semantic fields** are closely knit sectors of vocabulary each characterized by a common concept [Ginzburg 1966, 82]. **Lexical fields** are highly organized and integrated conceptual spheres whose elements mutually delimit each other and derive their significance from the system as a whole [Ginzburg 1966, 41]. Thus words can be classified into certain sets according to their meaning.

The principle is closely related to the componential analysis, which originated in the German tradition of word-field analysis (*Bedeutungsfeld* 'field of meaning'), specifically in the work of J. Trier [Trier 1931, 256]. Analysis of word fields arose under the stimulus of both Saussure's structuralism and Gestalt psychology and, thus, is systematic and language specific but mindful of extralinguistic psychological implications, especially when word fields of different languages are contrasted.

Word field analysis has profoundly shaped lexical semantics, not because words are related in any one way, but because words are related in many ways and such relations, whatever their nature, are inherent to most words. Yet the original practitioners of the word field school debated what the relations were.

G. Ipsen, who introduced the term, merely continued a trend among Indo-European etymologists to account for words in conceptual complexes rather than atomistically [Ipsen 1924, 38]. But later he defined a word field as a union of form and meaning [Ipsen 1924, 173]. Tightening of terms was in reaction to J. Trier, who coupled lexical (*parole*) and conceptual fields (*Ergon=langue*); the *Ergon* is divided by a lexical mosaic (*Wortdecke*) [Ipsen 1924, 76]. J. Trier

saw fields interlocking in progressively higher orders that ultimately involved the entire vocabulary of a language [Ipsen 1924, 125]. J. Trier's distinction of lexical and conceptual was problematic; as he insisted that clear meaning depends on abrupt demarcation of lower older fields, he vehemently denied that fields overlap and grade into each other [Trier 1931, 97].

K. Reuning, on the other hand, structures German and English fields of pleasurable emotions along sweeping scales, such as depth gradation, intensity and kinetic to static, to show how each language lexically elaborates different poles; he defers guardedly to national character [Reuning 1941, 144].

A. Lehrer states the fact that groups of words are brought together by virtually any underlying conceptualization [Lehrer 1974, 172].

In the same spirit Ch. Fillmore construed a frame consisting of a situation, a defendant, a judge, an addressee, a presupposition and a possible statement, among other constructs required to account for the relation among English verbs of judging. Ch. Fillmore credits the German field theorists as predecessors to this line of his research that over the following years was to evolve into his text semantics [Fillmore 1977, 17-35].

J. Katz and T. Fodor offered a componential theory of meaning, markers, that adapted to syntax the paradigmatic phonemic analogy of lexical semantics [Katz 1980, 285]. Any lexical meaning could be represented as a combination of semantic markers and distinguishers. Markers are equivalent to features of the kind illustrated above with the componential definition of 'wind'. Distinguishers serve to further differentiate between sense. Markers and distinguishers together enable syntagmatic semantic interpretation by constituting occurrence restrictions. D. Bolinger argues, further, that distinction between markers and distinguishers is not manifestly naturally; he offers examples that call for collapsing the classes into markers alone, which, again, overburdens the initial proposal [Bolinger 1961, 163]. Although markers can be formalized, it does not characterize mental process; its algorithmic application would hardly accomplish the astounding complicated task of semantic judgment.

From that very point it is quite clear that in a lexical field not all lexical items necessarily have the same status. Consider the following sets, which together form the lexical field of 'snow' (though there are other terms in the same field):

1. *snowfall, snowflake, snowstorm*
2. *avalanche, snowcap, snowfield*

The weather phenomena notions referred to by the words of set 1 are more 'usual' than those described in set 2. They are said to be less marked than those of set 2; therefore the words in set 1 are less marked members of the lexical field than the words in set 2. The less marked members in lexical field are usually easier to learn and remember than more marked members. Children learn term 'snowfall' before they learn the terms 'avalanche'. In other words less marked terms also tend to be used more frequently than more marked terms; 'snowfall', for example, occurs considerably more frequently in conversation and writing. The less marked member of a lexical field cannot be described by using the name of another member of the same field, while more marked members can be thus described ('snowflake' is a kind of 'snow'). Less marked terms are also often broader in meaning than more marked terms; 'snowfall' describes a broader range of weather phenomena notions than 'avalanche'. Finally, less marked words are not the result of the name of another object or concept, whereas more marked words often are (for example, 'scotch mist' is the fog in Scotland that lent its name to the mist).

W. Labov offers a model of denotation posing both stable and variable features to deal with interdependence and vagueness, two characteristics of categorization fundamental to linguistic meaning [Labov 1978, 153].

R. Kempton establishes that gradation exceeds the internal organization of categories to apply as well to relations between categories. W. Labov refers to R. Kempton's finding as a 'bulge', adding it to the problems that quantitative description of meaning fails to resolve [Kempton 1978, 117].

P. Kay's hypothesis integrates a continuous scale of physical, social and situational ratings with a cognitive schema, in this case a set of lexical categories; but schemata are broadly defined as any abstract organization capable of ascribing meaning to events [Kay 1978, 174].

Ch. Fillmore calls such events 'scene' and adds they should consist of any perception, memory, experience, actions, object or situation. People categorize such real experiences in reference to schemata and the prototypes therein. A schema, in turn, is associated with a frame of words that label its parts; the frame and the schema, or any word or part thereof may activate each other, and either side of the relation can initiate the activation. A universal hierarchy determines that animate arguments are more salient than inanimate arguments, which constrains how a scene will be focused upon in the nucleus of a sentence by

assigning its parts to case roles of agent, patient, instrument, goal, experiencer and location; the hierarchy governs to some extent which roles will occupy the nucleus and which will occur in the periphery. The perspective on a schema is constructed by both selections of words from a frame and by grammatical relations in a sentence. By linking different schemata and frames, both simultaneously and in sequence, people build text models that enable them to interpret discourse. One of Ch. Fillmore's major examples, a commercial frame, involves perspectives of 'buyer' and 'seller', as well as hundreds of other terms, 'price', 'money', 'discount', 'credit' to cite a few [Fillmore 1977, 17-35].

Ch. Fillmore's emphases on cognition precede the whetted elaboration of cognitive models in lexical semantics, called cognitive semantics [Fillmore 1977, 17-35]. Some of its milestones are L. Talmy's treatment of force dynamics, G. Lakoff and M. Johnson's analysis of metaphor and metonymy [Lakoff 1980, 376], L. Janda's insights regarding polysemous images, E. Casad and R. Langacker's recognition of conventional imagery and speaker point of view, and R. Langacker's account of subjectification [Langacker 1973, 159].

A. Wierzbicka brings into its twentieth year her program of substanding universal primes among lexical meanings, a mainstay of the field [Wierzbicka 1992, 241]. A. Lehrer and E. Kittay anthologize some of the most recent contributions from three approaches to lexical semantics, innovative and long established [Lehrer 1974, 131].

To sum it up, many linguists recognized that the thought producing semantic relations was infinitely more complex, varied and interesting than speaker intuitions about sentential truth conditions. In North America, the recognition had been forestalled by the behaviorist proscription against mentalism, while elsewhere interest in cognition unfolded mainly within the word-field school. But after 1950, linguists and, especially, linguistic anthropologists gradually incorporated cognition into their semantics, for example, the models of semantic components are patently cognitive. Once linguists directed this slowly moving heritage toward the fuller gamut of cognitive possibilities, lexical semantics expanded exponentially. In that climate, extended standard theory investigated a far-reaching chain of events by accentuating that simple language universals may underlie complicated surface usage.

A word as a language unit represents a hierarchy of semes one of which is being activated during our conversation, or communication, namely in some certain context.

Having used the above definitions of the lexical word grouping we have singled out such lexical subfields of weather phenomena notions as: "weather", "climate", "weather phenomena", "season", "precipitation", "temperature", "atmosphere", "rain", "snow" and "wind".

It is essential to note that "weather" proves to be a **hyponym**, the more abstract term, of this field structure, while "climate", "weather phenomena", "season", "precipitation", "temperature", "atmosphere", "rain", "snow" and "wind" are the **hyponyms** – referents which are totally included in the referent of the term "weather". Hyponyms are concrete referents, the relationships of the definite components ("weather phenomena", "season", "precipitation", "temperature", "atmosphere", "rain", "snow" and "wind") and the general one "weather" is that of hyponymy, as it is based on the notion of inclusion. Thus hyperonym "weather" includes hyponyms "weather phenomena", "season", "precipitation", "temperature", "atmosphere", "rain", "snow" and "wind" in such a way that we can state that "rain", "snow" and "wind" are some kind of "weather".

It is important to emphasize that in a lexical field hyponymy often exists at a more than one level. A term may at the same time both be a hyponym and hyperonym. That's why if we treat the above hyponyms ("weather phenomena", "season", "precipitation", "temperature", "atmosphere", "rain", "snow" and "wind") as central elements of their own fields, they appear to be hyperonyms of a new less abstract field structure, possessing hyponyms with more concrete meanings.

"Weather phenomena", "season", "precipitation", "temperature", "atmosphere", "rain", "snow" and "wind" are possible to be singled out as hyperonyms, each of which builds up its own word-field of the second level. Such hyperonyms as "temperature", "atmosphere", "rain", "snow" and "wind" have referents which in their turn may build up independent word-field of the third level on their own. Thus we obtain such subfields of the third level with such hyperonyms as "heat n", "heat v", "cold n", "cold v", "cold adj" (former referent – hyperonym – "temperature"); "air" (former referent – hyperonym – "atmosphere"); "snow n", "snow v" (former referent – hyperonym – "snow"); "wind n", "air", "storm", "windy adj", "stormy", "blow" (former referent – hyperonym – "wind"); "rain n", "moisture", "mist", "wet", "cloud", "rain v", "be wet", "moisten" (former referent – hyperonym – "rain"). It should be pointed out that the principle according to which hyperonyms of the third level are singled out is based on frequency of use of the

referents in speech and the belonging of this or that referent to some certain part of the language (either noun, verb or adjective).

Thus we obtained a hierarchy of terms related to each other through hyponymic relationships. The "lower" we get in a hierarchy of hyponyms, the more marked terms (referents, variants) of this particular field are.

To this I must add that the same lexical variant may refer to different subfields with various hyperonyms. For example, "storm" may be a hyponym of the hyperonym "wind", "snow", "air" and "rain" or "hot wind" may be a hyponym of the hyperonym of "heat", "wind" and "air". On this ground it is possible to put forward a supposition that these hyperonyms ("heat", "cold", "wet", "rain", "wind", "snow" etc.) interact with each other in such a way that they prove the existence of some higher, more abstract unit, which includes all these meanings or notions. In our case this term will be "weather".

It seems logically enough to treat "weather" as nucleus and hyperonyms of the second level ("climate", "weather phenomena", "season", "precipitation", "temperature", "atmosphere", "rain", "snow" and "wind") as more centred, having more abstract meaning and hyperonyms of the third level ("heat n", "heat v", "cold n", "cold v", "cold adj", "air", "snow n", "snow v", "wind n", "air", "storm", "windyadj", "stormy", "blow", "rain n", "moisture", "mist", "wet", "cloud", "rainv", "be wet", "moisten") as those which are in the periphery being more concrete. It is proved by the fact that to explicit the meaning of a word in a periphery we use words which are in the center and build up nucleus. For example:

Sunshine = heat of the sun;

Heat = high temperature;

Temperature = degree of heat or cold.

This very tendency explains wide usage of nucleus terms in everyday, colloquial speech by everybody. So, more centered lexical variants are used more frequently, while those which are in the periphery are used more rarely or in a very specific communicative situation. For example, let's consider the following sentences:

1. The **wind** *blows*.
2. The door *is opened* by a **slight whiff**.
3. **Violent storm** *destroyed* many houses.

These sentences describe various kinds of air moving as a result of natural forces, the only difference lies in the intensity of wind or types of wind.

It is of primary importance to stress that English speakers use the word to refer to at least two different referents, it explains why "weather" may be treated in several aspects: as a kind of season, climate, precipitation or weather phenomena.

Thus it would not be a mistake to assume that lexical meaning is the reflection of a thing in our mind, hence, it presupposes the existence of mental image of a thing. But a thing represents itself not an abstract mass, but some unity of qualities (signs). In such a way the reflection of a thing in our mind should also be subdivided into some parts (components), each of them reflecting this or that sign of a thing (object). Thus the meaning of a word is the combination of two or more components. The component of the meaning of a word is called elementary meaning, semantic multiplier, differential sign, or **seme** [Степанов 1975, 24]. Each seme is represented in the explanation of lexical meaning by one or several words. For example: "cloudburst" = "weather phenomenon" + "rain" + "storm". The components of a meaning are taken out as the result of comparing two adjacent words of one lexico-semantic group or word-field. For example, as a result of comparing of a word "gale" and "snow" we get the differential sign "weather phenomenon", with the word "blizzard" the differential sign will be "severe and violent storm", with the word "mistral" the differential sign will be "strong wind".

There are nucleus (main) and periphery (subordinate) semes. Nucleus semes reflect permanent and obligatory signs of an object, periphery semes – those which are temporal and not obligatory. For example, in the meaning of a word "blizzard" semes "wind", "storm" and "snow" are nucleus and semes "severe", "strong" and "violent" are periphery. It should be noted that periphery semes are not fixed in the dictionaries, but it is with the help of them we create different and various metaphors, epithets and so on so that they may become set stylistic means or devices.

To some it up, in a lexical field of weather phenomena notions we can distinguish less marked (nucleus, centered) and more marked (periphery) words (lexical variants of this field).

Less marked members of the lexical field of weather phenomena notions are more usual, wide spoken in colloquial speech. The less marked member of a lexical field denote a greater variety of notions (meanings) than more marked members: we can use the word *rain* for groups of notions (*smirr*, *wet*, *drizzle*, *storm*) as each of them is a kind of rain.

## LITERATURE

1. *Кубрякова Е. С.* Проблемы представления знаний в современной науке и роль лингвистики в решении этих проблем // *Язык и структуры представления знаний / Е. С. Кубрякова.* – М., 1992. – С. 4-38.
2. *Левицкий А. Э., Потапенко С. И., Белехова Л. И. и др.* Язык и пространство: проблемы онтологии и эпистемологии: [монография] / *Левицкий А. Э., Потапенко С. И., Белехова Л. И. и др.; под ред. А. Э. Левицкого, С. И. Потапенко.* – Нежин: Издательство НГУ имени Николая Гоголя, 2011. – 483 с.
3. *Степанов Ю.С.* Методы и принципы современной лингвистики / *Ю.С. Степанов.* – М.: Наука, 1975. – 312 с.
4. *Arnold I.V.* The English Word / *I.V. Arnold.* – М.: Higher School Publishing House, 1986. – 295 p.
5. *Bolinger D.* Generality, Gradience, and the All-or-None / *D. Bolinger.* – The Hague: Mouton, 1961. – 324 p.
6. *Chomsky N.* Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin and Use / *N. Chomsky.* – N.Y.: Praeger, 1986. – 309 p.
7. *Fillmore Ch.* Topics in Lexical Semantics // *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory / Ch. Fillmore.* – L., 1977. – P.17-35.
8. *Finegan E.* Language, its Structure and Use / *E. Finegan.* – Philadelphia: South California University Press, 1994. – 536 p.
9. *Ginzburg R.S., Khidekel S.S.* A Course in Modern English Lexicology / *R.S. Ginzburg, S.S. Khidekel.* – М.: Higher School Publishing House, 1966. – 271 p.
10. *Ipsen G.* Der alte Orient und die Indogermanen / *G. Ipsen.* – Heidelberg: Winter, 1924. – 237 p.
11. *Katz J., Fodor J.* The Structure of a Semantic Theory / *J. Katz, J. Fodor.* – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980. – 249 p.
12. *Kay R.* Tahitian Words for Race and Class / *R. Kay.* – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1978. – 193 p.
13. *Kempton R.* Category Grading and Taxonomic Relations: a Mug is a Sort of a Cup / *R. Kempton.* – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. – 65 p.
14. *Labov W.* Denotational Structure // *Papers from the 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society / W. Labov.* – Chicago: Academic Press, 1978. – 260 p.
15. *Lakoff G., Johnson M.* Metaphors we Live by / *G. Lakoff and M. Johnson.* – Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980. – 238 p.

16. *Langacker R.W.* Language and Its Structure. Some Fundamental Linguistic Concepts / R.W. Langacker. – N.Y.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973. – 275 p.

17. *Lehrer A.* Semantic Fields and Lexical Structure / A. Lehrer. – Elsevier: Holland, 1974. – 273 p.

18. *Reuning K. A.* Comparative Study of the Linguistic Field of Pleasurable Emotions in English and German / K.A. Reuning. – Swathmore: College Book Press, 1941. – 246 p.

19. *Trier J.* Der Deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnerbezirk des Verstandes / J. Trier. – Heidelberg: Winter, 1931. – Bd. 1. – 347 S. 19. *Wierzbicka A.* Semantics, Culture and Cognition / A. Wierzbicka. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. – 487 p.

Стаття подана до редакції 19.04.13

**Федаюк П.А.**, препод.,

Шосткинський інститут Сумського державного університету

### **СТРУКТУРА ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОГО ПОЛЯ "ПОГОДА"**

*В статье показаны попытки филологов систематизировать и структурировать лексические единицы языка (Й. Кац и Т. Фодор, П. Кей, Г. Ипсен, В. Лабов, Р. Кемптон и другие). Автор выделил особенности понятий, обозначающих ПОГОДНЫЕ ЯВЛЕНИЯ в современном английском языке, и представил все компоненты структуры поля с его ядерными и периферийными компонентами, определил их функции и характерные черты, смоделировал структуру лексических единиц, которые обозначают погодные явления на основании определения ядерных и периферийных компонентов согласно принципу семантического, или лексического поля.*

**Ключевые слова:** сема, лексическое поле, семантическое поле, лексическая группа, гипоним, гипероним.

**Федаюк П.О.**, викл.,

Шосткинський інститут Сумського державного університету

### **СТРУКТУРА ЛЕКСИЧНОГО ПОЛЯ "ПОГОДА"**

*У статті показані спроби філологів систематизувати і структурувати лексичні одиниці мови (Й. Кац і Т. Фодор, П. Кей, Г. Іпсен, В. Лабов, Р. Кемптон та інші). Автор виділив особливості понять, що позначають ПОГОДНІ ЯВИЩА в сучасній англійській мові, і представив всі компоненти структури поля з його ядерними і периферійними компонентами, визначив їх функції і характерні риси, змоделивав структуру лексичних одиниць, які позначають погодні*

явища на підставі визначення ядерних і периферійних компонентів за принципом семантичного, або лексичного поля.

**Ключові слова:** сема, лексичне поле, семантичне поле, лексична група, гіпонім, гіперонім.

УДК 336.714(477)

**Ференс Н.**, асп.,

Інститут філології КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка

## **ЄЙТС УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ ТА РОСІЙСЬКИЙ: ПОЕТИЧНІ ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЇ**

*У статті подано узагальнений аналіз українських та російських перекладів поетичних творів В.Б.Єйтса, виконаних різними перекладачами, зокрема, О.Мокровольським, О.Зуєвським, М.Стріхою, Г.Кружковим та А.Блейз. Оцінка доробку цих перекладачів базується на трьох засадах: переклад розглядається як самостійний текст, для якого розміщення на літературній "мапі" культури-приймача важить більше, ніж зв'язок з оригіналом; утверджується множинність перекладів; та утверджується право перекладача на творче перетлумачення оригіналу. Такий підхід відповідає актуальним парадигмам перекладознавчої науки.*

**Ключові слова:** поетичний переклад, інтерпретація, Єйтс.

Існує чимало перекладів поетичних та прозових творів ірландського класика В.Б.Єйтса українською та російською мовами (зазначмо, що ми включаємо російськомовні переклади до поля своїх зацікавлень із тих міркувань, що більшість носіїв української мови володіє також і російською мовою – а отже, російськомовні тлумачення доступні українському читачеві і можуть порівнюватися з українськими перекладами). І хоча про вичерпність наявних тлумачень В.Б.Єйтса, особливо українською мовою, говорити поки що зарано – однак вже на теперішньому етапі української та російської єйтсіани помітна значна гетероглосія перекладів. У цьому розмаїтті наявні як системні переклади, підкорені "філософії Єйтса" – тобто концептуальному підходу до тлумачення творів В.Б.Єйтса – конкретними інтерпретаторами, так і переклади епізодичні, "вільні", підлеглі меті, яка не має прямого зв'язку з оригіналом.