

9. Огнева Е. А. Когнитивное моделирование концептосферы художественного текста / Елена Анатольевна Огнева. – Белгород : БелГУ, 2009. – 278 с.
10. Слышкин Г. Г. Дискурс и концепт / Г. Г. Слышкин // Языковая личность : институциональный и персональный дискурс : сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2000. – С. 38–45.
11. Шевченко И. С. Дискурс как мыслекоммуникативное образование / И. С. Шевченко // Вісник Харків. нац. ун-ту. – № 586. – 2003. – С. 33–39.
12. Щерба Л. В. Некоторые выводы из моих диалектологических лужицких наблюдений / Лев Владимирович Щерба. – Петроград, 1915.
13. Beaugrande R. de. New Foundation for a Science of Text and Discourse : Cognition, Communication and the Freedom of Access to Knowledge and Society / R. de Beaugrande. – Norwood : Ablex, 1997. – 130 p.
14. Bernárdez E. Social Cognition : Variation, Language and Culture / E. Bernárdez. – Logroño. – University of la Rioja, 2003. – P. 120–126.
15. Delisle J. L'analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction / J. Delisle. – Ottawa, 1984. – 180 p.
16. Steen G. Basic Discourse Acts : When Language and Cognition Turn into Communication / G. Steen. – Logroño. – University of la Rioja, 2003. – P. 98–106.
17. Горький М. В людях. – М. : Полиграфресурсы, 2000. – С. 207–527.
18. Модиано Р. Цирк идет. – Харьков : Фолио, 1999. – 192 с.
19. Мориак Ф. Тереза Дескейру. – М. : Радуга 1985. – 489 с.
20. Пастернак Б. Доктор Живаго. – М. : Сов. Россия, 1989. – 640 с.
21. Роллан Р. Кола Брюньон. – Л. : Художественная литература, 1986. – 390 с.
22. Сент-Экзюпери А. де. Ночной полет. – М. : Художественная литература, 1987. – С. 3–120.
23. Толстой Л. Н. Анна Каренина. – М. : Советская Россия, 1984. – 560 с.
24. Gorki M. En gagnant mon pain. – P. : Editions Fournier, 1946. – 303 p.
25. Modiano P. Un cirque passe. – P. : Gallimard, 1992. – 96 p.
26. Moriac F. Thérèse Desqueiroux. – M. : Edition du progress. 1975. – 320 p.
27. Pasternak B. Le docteur Jivago. – P. : Edition Gallimard, 1986. – 695 p.
28. Rolland R. Colas Breugnon. – M. : Edition en langues étrangères, 1948. – 224 p.
29. Saint-Exupéry A. de. Vol de nuit. – K., 1978. – 224 p.
30. Tolstoï L. Anna Karénine. – P. : Edition Gallimard, 1952. – 909 p.
31. Даль В. И. Толковый словарь живого Великорусского языка : в 4-х т. / Владимир Даль. – М. : Русский язык, 1999. – 2716 с.

POETIC TRANSLATION FROM LINGUOCULTURAL POINT OF VIEW

PANASENKO N.

University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, Slovakia;

Kiev national linguistic university, Ukraine

Narantsogt Baatarkhuu, Mongolia

Our article highlights problems connected with translation. Several years ago translations were based on purely linguistic principles [3; 7; 13]. A. Jameson allocates some phases or stages during translation [3] which can be described as follows: work on the initial text, recognition of the text, translation FROM the source language; work on the initial text, translation INTO a modern language; checking of the

actual material and stylistic editing; revealing of the most important aspects of the initial text, i.e. definition of “translator's priorities”. Very often in the process of translation transformations take place which reflect “the author's creativity and adequate embodiment of cognitive experience in the versified space” [11, c. 95]. There may be different vectors in translation connected with the problem of text understanding and interpretation [4].

Nowadays translation studies acquire some new distinctive features, namely linguocultural approach to the process of translation, which is very closely connected with growing number of cultural and language contacts between different nations. As Zh.T. Balmagambetova claims [1, c. 5], the basic obstacles during intercultural dialogue are national-specific features of contacting cultures. This new approach to translation broadens the borders of translation. And when we estimate the quality of translation, first of all we take into account context, cultural background, volume of information preserved in the new text, semantic space of the literary text and many other factors.

Consequently, as a result of the translation act specific dialogue between two contacting cultures is being carried out; during this dialogue culture-receptor is enriched with new ideas and the concepts. The perceiving culture gets other intellectual, figurative-emotional and literary-expressive features [2, c. 35].

Object of our research is the poetic text because in poetry the author's self-expression, one's world outlook, moral values, the level of spiritual culture is displayed more vividly and in a compressed form [7, c. 8]. A. Plisetskaya has the same opinion: “Translation, especially poetic translation, involves an unpredictable area of transformations in the probable projection of the source language onto the target language through the perception of the translator. Each translation is a dialogue of cultures, a kind of ‘cross-cultural communication’” [12, c. 433].

The article is based on the translation of the poem “The Arrow and the Song” by H. Longfellow into Ukrainian, Russian and Mongolian. We have analyzed 4 Russian, 3 Ukrainian and 8 Mongolian translations. As far as we want to trace how the essence of the poem is reflected in Mongolian, which is difficult for understanding, one of co-authors, Narantsogt has made eight back translations from Mongolian into English. We want to state how people belonging to different cultures understand the original, how features of the national character are reflected in the translation, how much importance is given to symbols of this or that culture. To find out these specific features we concentrate our attention on global text categories (GTC): facts, events, participants of the situation, time, space, evaluation and some others [9]. The key points in our analysis are: blue sky, song as a folklore and cultural element, weapon and friendship; they correspond to the majority of global text categories and are very important in text translation and further interpretation.

Thus, in our analysis we take into account some global text categories and “translator's priorities”. Comparison of three languages belonging to different groups gives us possibility to make contrastive analysis [5], considering linguocultural peculiarities either.

If we compare the English original and its Mongolian translations we see that adequate translation is impossible, because these two languages differ greatly, and information contained in rhythm, rhyme, some means of stylistic syntax, metaphor, etc.

is lost. Mongolian has vowel harmony and a complex syllabic structure that allows up to three syllable-final consonants. It is a typical agglutinative language that relies on suffix chains in the verbal and nominal domains. This is the poem under consideration.

In this poem we may single out such GTC as **event participants** (the hero and his friend), **event itself** (shooting and arrow, breathing out a song), **time** (events which took place later), **space** (the direction of the arrow and the song and their location later), **evaluation of the hero's act**.

THE ARROW AND THE SONG by Henry Longfellow

*I shot an arrow into the air, I breathed a song into the air.
It fell to earth, I knew not It fell to earth, I knew not where.
where.
For, so swiftly it flew, the sight For who has sight so keen and
strong,
Could not follow it in its flight. That it can follow the flight of a
song.*

*Long, long afterwards, in an oak
I found the arrow, still unbroke;
And the song from beginning to end,
I found again in the heart of a friend.*

Now let us see how these GTC are reflected in Mongolian, Ukrainian and Russian translations.

Event participants (the hero and his friend). The main idea of the poem is that friendship and a song are eternal. In all translations it is rendered properly, but in two Russian translations singular (a friend) is substituted by the plural: *А песню – ту, что создал я, / Поют сегодня мои друзья* (A. Deriabin) and *Звучание верное песни своей / Услышал я вновь на устах у друзей* (S. Cherfas).

Event itself and its instruments (shooting an arrow with the bow, breathing out a song). Here we come across several interesting facts. In the original the lyrical hero shoots the arrow into the air; it means that it has no definite aim. In many Russian translations (D. Mikhalovsky, S. Cherfas, Y. Krivchik) the air is not mentioned, but in Ukrainian ones the direction of the shooting is identified: *Пустив стрілу я в даль безкраю* (V. Maratch), *Пустив я стрілу у широкее небо* (V. Kykot).

Such an instrument as an arrow appeared to be very important for Mongols, as the bow was the primary weapon of the Mongol forces (the early 1200s) that were highly disciplined, superbly coordinated and brilliant in tactics.

Thus the arrow and its flight is described in details: *Мартагдсан сум хурдтайгаар нислээ* – **The forgotten arrow flew rapidly** (Enkhmunkh); *Би сумаа салхи зүсүүлэн тавьлаа / Тавсан сум үл мэдэх газар луу одлоо / Тэр сум хурдтайгаар хараанд үл гүйцэгдэн замхарлаа / Тэнэсэн сум хайшаа нисэх үл харагдана* – I let go the arrow (or bowstring) so that it **speed-dragged through the wind / The stray arrow...** / That arrow **faded rapidly...** / Where this **wandering arrow flying to is insensible** (Munkhtugs); *Маи хурдтай харвалаа* – [I] **shot off strong** (Bud); *Нүүгэлтэн шурганан нислээ* – [It] **flew, soaring and aviating** (Batjargal); *Харвасан сум харгуйд шунгиналаа* – Shot arrow **hissed in the darkness** (Solongo); *Эрчит сумаа би тэнгэр лүү харвалаа / Харах нүдэнд үзэгдэхгүй хурдаар / Халин*

шунган ниссэн болохоор – I shot my spry arrow.../ **With a speed invisible to an eyesight / Because it flew buzzing and soaring** (Narantsogt).

Song. Analyzing this instrument of the event we see from the translations that it can be characterized in such a way.

How it was performed and why: Mongolian translation – *Хичээн байж дуулсан тэр нэгэн дууг* – The song that I sang meticulously (Nomin); Russian translation – *С дыханием вырвалась песня моя* (Cherfas).

Where it was performed, where it was sent to: Mongolian translations – *Тэнгэрт би дуу дууллаа* – In the sky I sang a song (Batjargal); *Эзгүй талд явахдаа чиний тухай дуу зохиолоо.* – I composed a song about you as I walked through a steppe (Narantsogt); Russian translations – *На ветер песню бросил я* (Mikhalovsky); *Вдохнул я песню в простор небесный* (Deriabin); Ukrainian translations – *Послав я пісню в даль безкраю* (Maratch); *Я видихнув пісню в повітря прозоре* (Kykot).

Who the addressee of the song was and what it was about: in Mongolian translations only – *Хэн нэгэн нь сонссон л байгаа / Хэн нэгэн намайг гэсэн хүн нь* – Someone must have heard it. / Someone who cares about me (Nomin).

Where the song was found and what it looked like: Russian translations – *Свою же песню целиком/ Нашел я в теплом сердце друга* (Mikhalovsky), *Звучание верное песни своей/ Услышал я вновь на устах у друзей* (Cherfas); in all Ukrainian translations – *в серці друга*.

We see that much attention is given to the song itself and its properties in Mongolian translations. Among oriental nations Mongolia is famous for its rich folklore tradition. Even in the primitive stage of development during the struggle with nature and the domestication of wild animals, labour songs, and verses and melodies on livestock breeding emerged and came down to our day, evolving in accordance with our cultural development. The Mongolian folk song is one of the most ancient forms of musical and poetic art of the Mongols [14].

Time. This category is not very important in this text. Mainly we find its reflection in some Russian and Ukrainian translations: *Нашёл... годы спустя* (Krivchik); *І пісню теж, як час пройшов, Я в серці друга віднайшов* (Maratch); *А пісню я, стерши мільйон підошов, Усю до кінця в серці друга знайшов* (Kykot).

Space – the sky, the oak tree (the direction of the arrow and the song and their location later). We want to start with the sky because in most Mongolian translations the direction of the arrow has been specified and "the air" has been substituted by "the sky". The sky is very important for Mongolian culture. Shaman rituals from the early times have been dedicated to the sky, in which ninety-nine deities reside [10]. The philosophy at Chinggis Khaan's dynasty was based on the doctrine of monotheism, the eternal sky. It was directly correlated with uniting Mongols and intending to conquer the world [6].

In the original the arrow was found in an oak, in some Russian (Mikhalovsky) and Ukrainian (Kykot) translations the oak is being substituted by the pine tree. As far as this tree is not very popular in Mongolia it is substituted by the tree in general or a forest: *Уртаас урт царс моддын цаанаас* – From beneath the longest trees – (Uyanga); *Алсын тэртээх модноос* – From the trees far away (Solongo); *Нилээн хугацаа өнгөрсөний дараа ойгоос* – from a forest (Munkhtugs).

Here we have specification of size of the trees and their distance. Only a skillful archer may reach the target which is far away.

Evaluation of the hero's act (friendship). Friend and friendship. As we have already said, GTC we have found in the text are very closely interrelated. Location of the song (*in the heart of a friend*) is also connected with evaluation. Friendship is very important for Mongolians. It is reflected in some translations: *Өнө мөнхөд надтай хамт байх найзыгаа оллоо* – I found my friend that would be with me eternally (Nomin). The song sent by the hero now belongs to his friend: *Энэ нь тэгэхээр найзын хайрын дуу* – Therefore, this is a friend's song (Enkhmunkh); *Анд найзын маань сэтгэлд шингэснийг олж мэдлээ* – I discovered it has been absorbed into my friend's soul (Solongo); it helps better understand the friend: *Энэ нь найзын сэтгэлийг ойлгодог* – This understands friend's soul (Munkhtugs).

We see that all the translators render the general idea of the poem: weapon is doomed to be lost – the song lives forever in a friend's heart, though Mongolians add some information which has cultural character.

From the translations presented above we see that GTC are reflected in translations in a different way. The sky, as a part of Mongolian ancient religion and philosophy, becomes more important in translations as the target of the arrow, substituting the air from the original. The bow is a national Mongolian weapon and the skill in handling it goes back to ancient times. Thus many details concerning arrow's flight are reflected in translations. Russian people have inclination to collectivism, mass emotional experience and translations show that many friends are more important than one friend. All the translations under analysis are correlated with cultural traditions of their native country. We also have translations of this poem into other languages (Hindi, Bengal, and Vietnamese) and find it perspective to analyze them from cultural and translator's priorities point of view.

LITERATURE

1. Балмагамбетова Ж. Т. Межкультурные проблемы переводческой коммуникации / Ж. Т. Балмагамбетова // Вісник ЛНПУ імені Тараса Шевченка : Філологічні науки. – 2008. – № 13 (152). – Ч. I. – С. 5–9.
2. Владова И. М. Перевод как межкультурная коммуникация / И. М. Владова // Президиум МАПРЯЛ : 2003–2007 : сб. науч. тр. – СПб. : Изд. дом “МИРС”, 2007. – С. 35–42.
3. Джеймсон Э. Теория практического перевода / Э. Джеймсон // Президиум МАПРЯЛ : 2003–2007 : сб. науч. тр. – СПб. : Изд. дом “МИРС” 2007. – С. 99–102.
4. Коломієць Л. В. Віршовий переклад як метапоетичне письмо : проблема творчого методу перекладача / Л. В. Коломієць // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу : зб. наук. пр. – К. : Київ. ун-т імені Тараса Шевченка, 2002. – С. 245–254.
5. Кочерган М. П. Основи зіставного мовознавства : [монографія] / Михайло Петрович Кочерган. – К. : Академія, 2006. – 424 с.
6. Мөнх тэнгэрийн философи. – Режим доступу : <http://mn.wikipedia.org/wiki>
7. Панасенко Н. И. Комплексный анализ художественного текста (лексический, стилистический, фонетический и гендерный аспекты) / Н. И. Панасенко // Типологія мовних значень у діяхронічному та зіставному аспектах : зб. наук. пр. – Вип. 18. – Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2008. – С. 110–122.

8. Панасенко Н. И. Поэтический текст в зеркале культурологии (на материале русской и словацкой поэзии 19-20 вв.) / Н. И. Панасенко, Я. Влнка // Вісник Луганського національного педагогічного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. – № 13 (152). – 2008. – С. 215–224.
9. Папина А. Ф. Текст : его единицы и глобальные / Аза Феодосиевна Папина. – М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2002. – 368 с.
10. Сампилдэндэв Х. Монголын зан үйл, баяр ёслолын товчоон / Х. Сампилдэндэв, Н. Уртнасан, Т. Дорждагва. – 2007. – 145 с.
11. Швачко С. О. Перекладацькі трансформації у поетичному просторі / С. О. Швачко // *Studia Germanica et Romanica*. Іноземні мови. Зарубіжна література. Методика викладання : Наук. журнал. – Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2005. – Т. 2. – № 1 (4). – С. 90–95.
12. Plisetskaya A. Translating as a linguistic, cognitive and communicative process (taken as example glossy media) / A. Plisetskaya. *Text Processing and Cognitive Technologies*. – № 11. – 2005. – P. 433–438.
13. Robinson D. *Becoming a Translator. An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Translation* / D. Robinson. – L. : Routledge, 2003. – 301 p.
14. Shandagdorji D. *Introduction to Mongolian Art, Folk Tradition and Music* / D. Shandagdorji, P. Khorloo, N. Zantsannorov. – Режим доступу : [http://www. soundtransformations. btinternet.co.uk/ MongolianmusicShandagdorj.htm](http://www.soundtransformations.btinternet.co.uk/MongolianmusicShandagdorj.htm)

МЕХАНИЗМЫ АКТУАЛИЗАЦИИ И ПЕРЕВОД: МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ

ПЕТРОВИЧ М. А.

Пермский государственный педагогический университет

В настоящей статье представлена методика сопоставительного анализа способов актуализации реалий в текстах сказок на македонском (“Облогот со принцезата”) и болгарском языке (“Неволята”) и их переводов на немецкий язык. Перевод текста сказки с македонского языка на немецкий осуществлен Г. Димитровским, Е. Косаревой и И. Наумовской, а с болгарского на немецкий – Б. Ангеловым.

Под **реалиями** понимаются объекты мира, отображенные в тексте. Мы считаем возможным расширение спектра значений, приписываемых термину “реалия” в современных науках о переводе. Так, Н. Г. Гарбовский под реалиями понимает “предмет... действительности, существующий в мире исходного языка и не имеющий точных аналогов в культуре языка переводящего” [1, с. 232, 404]. Такое понимание реалии тождественно понятию “лакуна”, широко используемому в сопоставительных исследованиях языков. Наше же понимание реалии связано с этимологией этого слова. Этимологически слово “реальный” связано с латинским словом *res*, которое обозначает “вещь, предмет”, “факт, действительность”. Исходя из этого, подчеркнём, что предлагаемое нами толкование реалии исходит из относительного изоморфизма текста и мира. Объекты реальности получают отображение в тексте и функционируют в нём в виде объектов “возможного” (текстового) мира. Таким образом, реалия – это объект “возможного мира” и одновременно знак, замещающий объект реальности. Для практи-