

7. Ehlich K. On the historicity of politeness / Ehlich K. // *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* / [ed.: Watts R., Ide S., Ehlich K.]. – Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992. – P. 71–107.
8. Haugh M. Situating politeness // *Situated Politeness* / [ed.: Haugh M., Davies B.L., Merrison A.J.]. – London: Bloomsbury, 2013 – P. 1–23.
9. Heller M. Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity / M. Heller // *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. – 2003. – № 7. – P. 473–492.
10. Lakoff R. Civility and its discontents: or getting in your face // *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness* / [ed.: R.T. Lakoff, S.Ide]. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005. – P. 23–43.
11. Mills S. Impoliteness in a cultural context / S. Mills // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 2009. – № 41. – P.1047–1060.
12. Terkourafi M. Politeness in Cypriot Greek: a frame-based approach / M. Terkourafi. – University of Cambridge, 2001. – Режим доступу: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.121.3616&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
13. Trudgill P. *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change* / P. Trudgill. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002. – 197 p.
14. Turner B. S. Theories of globalization: issues and origins // *The Routledge International Handbook of Globalization Studies* / [ed.: B.S. Turner]. – London: Routledge, 2010. – P. 3–22.
15. Wheeler M. W. Politeness, sociolinguistic theory and language change / M.W. Wheeler // *Folia Linguistica Historica* – 1994. – № XV. – P. 149–174.

Summary. The article considers the extent to which global interconnectedness is reflected in the pragmatics of politeness by analyzing discursive changes it produces. It focuses on changes in polite devices used in service contexts.

Key words: pragmatics, positive politeness, negative politeness, globalization.

УДК 811.111'37

Н.В. Ситник

A TRANSLATION-THEORETIC APPROACH TO THE POETICS OF TOLKIEN'S MYTHOLOGY

У статті робиться спроба встановити зв'язки між творами британського письменника-міфотворця Д.Р.Р. Толкіна та його академічною роботою як професора давньоанглійської мови. Доводиться, що в інтерпретації творів автора, в літературознавчому чи перекладознавчому аспектах, слід керуватися тим, що Толкін був перш за все лінгвістом, а потім письменником, відтак лише знання витоків творчості автора та ретельний лінгвістичний аналіз його текстів може бути основою для можливих інтерпретацій та перекладів.

Ключові слова: джерела, лінгвістичний аналіз, інтерпретація, адекватний переклад.

What should one know before he/she attempts to translate J.R.R. Tolkiens creative works? The first thing to remember is that there were not two Tolkiens, one an academic and the other a writer. They were the same man, and the two sides of him overlapped so that they were indistinguishable. So if one is going to understand anything about his work as a writer he/she should spend some time examining Tolkien's scholarship.

Both Tolkien's academic career and his literary production are inseparable from his love of language and philology. He specialized in English philology at university and in 1915 graduated with Old Norse as special subject. He worked for *the Oxford English Dictionary* from 1918 and is credited with having worked on a number of words starting with the letter *W*, including *walrus*, over which he struggled mightily. In 1920, he became Reader in English Language at the University of Leeds. He gave courses in Old English heroic verse, history of English, various Old English and Middle English texts, Old and Middle English philology, introductory Germanic philology, Gothic, Old Icelandic, and Medieval Welsh. When in 1925, aged thirty-three, Tolkien applied for the Rawlinson and Bosworth Professorship of Anglo-Saxon at Pembroke College, Oxford, he boasted that his students of Germanic philology in Leeds had even formed a "Viking Club". He also had a certain, if imperfect, knowledge of Finnish.

The first thing to understand is why he liked languages. The fact that he was *excited* by the Welsh names on coal-trucks, by the ‘surface glitter’ of Greek, by the strange forms of the Gothic words in the book he acquired by accident, and by the Finnish of the *Kalevala*, shows that he had a most unusual sensitivity to the sound and appearance of words. They filled for him the place that music has in many people’s lives. Indeed the response that words awakened in him was almost entirely emotional.

But why should he choose to specialize in early English? Someone so fond of strange words would be more likely to have concentrated his attention on foreign languages. The answer is again to be found in his capacity for *excitement*. We know already of his emotional response to Finnish, Welsh, and Gothic, and we ought to understand that something equally exciting happened when he first realized that a large proportion of the poetry and prose of Anglo-Saxon and early medieval England was written in the dialect that had been spoken by his mother’s ancestors. In other words it was remote, but at the same time intensely personal to him.

Tolkien was deeply attached to the West Midlands because of their associations with his mother. Her family had come from the town of Evesham, and he believed that this West Midland borough and its surrounding county of Worcestershire had been the home of that family, the Suffields, for countless generations. He himself had also spent much of his childhood at Sarehole, a West Midland hamlet. That part of the English countryside had in consequence a strong emotional attraction for him; and as a result so did its language.

He once wrote to W.H. Auden: ‘I am a West-midlander by blood, and took to early West-midland Middle English as to a known tongue as soon as I set eyes on it.’ [1, 137] *A known tongue*: something that already seemed familiar to him. One might dismiss this as a ludicrous exaggeration, for how could he ‘recognize’ a language that was seven hundred and fifty years old? Yet this was what he really believed, that he had inherited some faint ancestral memory of the tongue spoken by distant generations of Suffields. And once this idea had occurred to him, it was inevitable that he should study the language closely and make it the centre of his life’s work as a scholar.

This is not to say that he only studied the early English of the West Midlands. He became well versed in all dialects of Anglo-Saxon and Middle English and (as we have seen) he also read widely in Icelandic. Moreover during 1919 and 1920 when he was working on *the Oxford Dictionary* he made himself acquainted with a number of other early Germanic languages. In consequence by the time he began work at Leeds University in 1920 he had a remarkably wide range of linguistic knowledge.

Tolkien never lost his literary soul. His philological writings invariably reflect the richness of his mind. He brought to even the most intricate aspects of his subject a grace of expression and a sense of the larger significance of the matter. Nowhere is this demonstrated to better advantage than in his article (published in 1929) on the *Ancrene Wisse*, a medieval book of instruction for a group of anchorites, which probably originated in the West Midlands. By a remarkable and subtle piece of scholarship, Tolkien showed that the language of two important manuscripts of the text (one in a Cambridge college, the other in the Bodleian Library at Oxford) was no mere unpolished dialect, but a literary language, with an unbroken literary tradition going back to before the Conquest. He expressed this conclusion in vivid terms – and it should be appreciated that he is here really talking about his beloved West Midland dialect as a whole: “It is not a language long relegated to the “uplands” struggling once more for expression in apologetic emulation of its betters or out of compassion for the lewd, but rather one that has never fallen back into “lewdness”, and has contrived in troublous times to maintain the air of a gentleman, if a country gentleman. It has traditions and some acquaintance with books and the pen, but it is also in close touch with a good living speech – a soil somewhere in England” [5, 374].

This kind of writing, forceful in its imagery, characterized all his articles and lectures, however abstruse or unpromising the subject might seem [2; 4]. In this respect he almost founded a new school of philology; certainly there had been no one before him who brought such humanity, one might say such emotion, to the subject; and it was an approach which influenced many of his most able pupils who themselves became philologists of distinction.

It ought also to be said that he was immensely painstaking. Broad and powerful statements such as that quoted above may have characterized his work, yet they were no mere assertions, but the product of countless hours of research into the minutiae of the subject. Even by the usual scrupulous standards of comparative philology, Tolkien was extraordinary in this respect. His concern for accuracy cannot be overemphasized, and it was doubly valuable because it was coupled with a flair for detecting patterns and relations. ‘Detecting’ is a good word, for it is not too great a flight of fancy to picture him as a linguistic Sherlock Holmes, presenting himself with an apparently disconnected series of facts and deducing from them the truth about some major matter. He also demonstrated his ability to ‘detect’ on a simpler level, for when discussing a word or phrase with a pupil he would cite a wide range of comparable forms and expressions in other languages. Similarly in casual conversation he delighted in producing unexpected remarks about names, such as his observation that the name ‘Waugh’ is historically the singular of ‘Wales’.

Besides being responsible for teaching and administration, professors at Oxford as elsewhere are expected to devote much of their time to original research. Tolkien's contemporaries had high hopes of him in this respect, for his glossary to *Sisam's book*, his edition with E.V. Gordon of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, and his article on the *Ancrene Wisse* manuscripts demonstrated that he had an unrivalled mastery of the early Middle English of the West Midlands; and it was expected that he would continue to contribute important work in this field. He himself had every intention of doing so: he promised an edition of the Cambridge manuscript of the *Ancrene Wisse* to the *Early English Text Society*, and he did a great deal of research into this branch of early medieval English, this language 'with the air of a gentleman, if a country gentleman' which he loved so much [1]. But the edition was not completed for many years, while the greater part of his research work never reached print. Lack of time was one cause. He had chosen to devote the major part of his working life at Oxford to teaching, and this in itself limited what he could do in the matter of original research. But besides this there was the matter of his perfectionism.

Parallel to Tolkien's professional work as a philologist, and sometimes overshadowing this work, to the effect that his academic output remained rather thin, was his affection for constructing languages. The most developed of these are *Quenya* and *Sindarin*, the etymological connection between which formed the core of much of Tolkien's *legendarium*. Language and grammar for Tolkien was a matter of aesthetics and euphony, and *Quenya* in particular was designed from "phonaesthetic" considerations; it was intended as an "Elvenlatin", and was phonologically based on Latin, with ingredients from Finnish, Welsh, English, and Greek. A notable addition came in late 1945 with *Adûnaic* or *Númenórean*, a language of a "faintly Semitic flavour", connected with Tolkien's Atlantis legend, which by *The Notion Club Papers* ties directly into his ideas about inability of language to be inherited, and via the "Second Age" and the story of Eärendil was grounded in the *legendarium*, thereby providing a link of Tolkien's 20th-century "real primary world" with the legendary past of his Middle-earth.

Tolkien considered languages inseparable from the mythology associated with them, and he consequently took a dim view of auxiliary languages: in 1930 a congress of Esperantists were told as much by him, in his lecture *A Secret Vice*, "Your language construction will breed a mythology", but by 1956 he had concluded that "Volapük, Esperanto, Ido, Novial, &c are dead, far deader than ancient unused languages, because their authors never invented any Esperanto legends" [5, 235].

The popularity of Tolkien's books has had a small but lasting effect on the use of language in fantasy literature in particular, and even on mainstream dictionaries, which today commonly accept Tolkien's idiosyncratic spellings *dwarves* and *dwarvish* (alongside *dwarfs* and *dwarfish*), which had been little used since the mid-19th century and earlier. (In fact, according to Tolkien, had the Old English plural survived, it would have been *dwerrow*.) He also coined the term *euclatrophe*, though it remains mainly used in connection with his own work [3].

Tolkien had a passion for perfection in written work of any kind, whether it be philology or stories. This grew from his emotional commitment to his work, which did not permit him to treat it in any manner other than the deeply serious.

This fact should be kept in mind by anyone who attempts to interpret Tolkien's works. If the author chose a definite word for something, there must have been a reason for that. Tolkien used words meaningfully, thoroughly picking them out of all possible synonyms, "tasting" the way they collocate and sound. The interpreters should take the same approach, which is possible under two conditions: 1) the interpreter should "feel" the language the same way Tolkien did; 2) the interpreter should have the same philological background the author had.

What I am going to suggest now might need some argumentations. Before one starts interpreting or translating Tolkien's works, he or she should read what Tolkien read before creating the Middle-Earth. This challenging task might take a life time of work, but this the only way to recognize in the texts the author's intentions and not to lose or distort them in one's own translations.

References

1. Carpenter Humphrey. J.R.R. Tolkien. A Biography / Humphrey Carpenter. — London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995. — 288 p.
2. Day David. A Guide to Tolkien / David Day. — London, Chancellor Press, 2001. — 272 p.
3. Drout Michael D.C. Tom Shippey's "J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century" and a look back at Tolkien criticism since 1982 / Michael D.C. Drout, Hilary Wynne // *Envoi*. — 2000. — Vol. 9, № 2. — P. 101—134.
4. J.R.R. Tolkien Encyclopedia. Scholarship and Critical Assessment / [ed. by Michael D.C. Drout]. — New York: Routledge, 2007. — 774 p.
5. Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien: A Selection / [edited by Humphrey Carpenter, with the assistance of Christopher Tolkien]. — London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981. — 463 p.

Summary. *The article attempts to connect J.R.R Tolkien's mythological works with his academic activities as a professor of Old English. We argue that the interpretation of his heritage, both literary-theoretic and linguistic, should be guided by the fact that for Tolkien, the linguistic aspect always took priority over the literary aspect. Therefore, an adequate interpretation and translation of his texts will only be possible if they are based on the knowledge of the sources of this author's creativity and a thorough linguistic analysis of his texts.*

Key words: *sources, linguistic analysis, interpretation, adequate translation.*

УДК 821.111-3.09

А.С. Сімаковська

ОПОЗИЦІЯ «СВОЄ – ЧУЖЕ» В ХРОНОТОПІ ОПОВІДАНОЇ РЕД'ЯРДА КІПЛІНГА

Статтю присвячено дослідженню опозиції «своє – чуже» в малій прозі Ред'ярда Кіплінга. Аналізується вплив даного протиставлення на формування просторово-часових характеристик оповідань «Without Benefit of Clergy» та «The Brushwood Boy».

Ключові слова: *Р. Кіплінг, хронотоп, опозиція, художній час та простір.*

Опозиція «своє – чуже» має свій універсальний характер в культурі та мистецтві. За останні роки саме ця антитеза стає предметом дослідження вчених різної наукової спеціалізації. Вивчення опозиції отримало широке розповсюдження і в літературі. Це питання вивчалось багатьма літературознавцями, зокрема М. Бахтіним [1], Н. Копистянською [2; 3], Ю. Лотманом [4].

Основним завданням статті є дослідження опозиції «своє – чуже» в художньому світі оповідань Кіплінга.

В оповіданні Кіплінга «Without Benefit of Clergy» («Без благословення церкви», 1890) опозиція «своє – чуже» прослідковується чи не найяскравіше, оскільки автор описує стосунки білого чоловіка та темношкірої дівчини. Джон Холден та Аміра неодружені, так як це заборонено законом: «He was an Englishman, and she a Mussulman's daughter bought two years before from her mother, who, being left without money, would have sold Ameera shrieking to the Prince of Darkness if the price had been sufficient» [6] (Він був британцем, а вона донькою мусульманина, яку він купив два роки тому у її матері, яка залишилася без грошей і була ладна продати її самому Принцу Темряви, якби той запропонував за неї прийнятну ціну (*тут і далі переклад наш. – А.С.*)).

Далі події розвиваються як у звичайному житті звичайних людей. У закоханих народжується син, що приносить у сім'ю багато радості, любові та щастя, яке виявляється нетривалим. Помирає від лихоманки маленький син, а згодом і сама Аміра.

Простір, у якому відбуваються описані події, обмежений стінами будинку, у якому живуть закоханих: «He had taken a little house overlooking the great red-walled city, and found, – when the marigolds had sprung up by the well in the courtyard and Ameera had established herself according to her own ideas of comfort <...> – that the house was to him his home» [6] (Він орендував маленький будинок, що стояв на окраїні, з якого відкривався вид на огорожене цегляною стіною місто, і, коли зацвіли нагідки у внутрішньому дворі та Аміра облаштувалася відповідно до своїх власних уподобань, він зрозумів, що цей дім став для нього своїм). Для Холдена та Аміри місце, в якому вони починають жити разом, є дуже близьким і своїм простором. Проте ненадовго. Коли у будинок приходиться біда та забирає життя найрідніших людей, Холден вже по-іншому його сприймає: «Then he thought that before he departed he would look at the house wherein he had been master and lord» [6] (Потім він подумав, що перед від'їздом йому слід подивитися на будинок, у якому він був майстром і лордом). «Свій» простір існування змінюється на «чужий». Джон вважав цей дім своїм сімейним вогнищем, захищеним простором, але в певний момент помітив, що воно як «своє» – втрачене і залишилося тільки у пам'яті. «Свій» простір став «чужим» локально, але у душі все ще залишається «своїм». Нонна Копистянська пояснює: «Углублённая психологизация достигается тогда, когда утраченное, перестав быть своим, не стало полностью чужим, потому что за него не перестаёт болеть душа <...>. В воспоминаниях всё приобретает большую силу, чем в прямом изображении действия» [3, 92].

Холден і справді хотів би залишити будинок за собою, проте господар розпоряджається по-іншому, планує його зруйнувати, сказавши: «When the birds have gone what need to keep the nest? It shall be pulled down, and the Municipality shall make a road across, as they desire, from the burning-