

the developers to add similar words and their arguments and syntax into the system. Statistically trained systems are blind to these kinds of generalizations. Therefore, to test the generality of a linguistics-based, hand-crafted system, it is important to use a new text, written by other authors than those of the training material.

References

1. Baker M. In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation. – London: Routledge, 1992.
2. Biber D. Variation Across Speech and Writing. – Cambridge: CUP, 1988.
3. Bühler A. Vier Vorurteile über Hermeneutik – Eine Polemik // Hermeneutik und Naturalismus. – Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994. – S. 83–97.
4. Catford J. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. – Oxford: OUP, 1965.
5. Doherty M. Parametrisierte Perspektive // Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft. – 1993. – S. 3–38.
6. Flotow L. von. Translation and Gender. – Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.
7. Gerzymisch-Arbogast H. und Mudersbach K. Methoden des wissenschaftlichen. – UTB, Stuttgart: UTB, 1998. – 353 S.
8. Groff-Kfoury Carol Ann. Testing and Evaluation in the Translation Class // Translation Journal and the Author. – 2004. – Vol. 8. – № 3.
9. Halliday M.A.K. Spoken and Written Language. – Oxford: OUP, 1998.
10. Halliday M.A.K. and Hasan R. Language, Context and Text. – Oxford: OUP, 1989.
11. Hatim B. and Mason I. The Translator as Communicator. – London: Routledge, 1997.
12. Hickey L.(ed) The Pragmatics of Translation. – Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998.
13. Holliday A. Small Cultures // Applied Linguistics. – 1999. – P. 237–264.
14. House J. A Model for Translation Quality Assessment. – Tübingen: Narr, 1998.
15. House J. Contrastive Discourse Analysis and Misunderstanding. The Case of German and English // Contrastive Sociolinguistics (M. Hellinger and U. Ammon, eds). – Berlin, de Gruyter, 1997. – P. 345–361.
16. House J. Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited. – Tübingen: Narr, 1998.
17. House J. Politeness and Translation // The Pragmatics of Translation (L. Hickey, ed.), Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. – P. 54–72.
18. House J. and Koller W. An Introduction to Translation Theory and Criticism. – Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2001.
19. House J. Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation // Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal. – 2001. – Vol. 46. – № 2. – P. 243–257.
20. Ivir V. A Case for Linguistics in Translation Theory // Target. 1996. – P. 149–156.
21. Koller W. Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft – Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1979.
22. Nida E. Toward a Science of Translation. – Leiden: Brill, 1964.
23. Reiss K. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. – München: Hueber, 1971.
24. Reiss K. und Vermeer H. Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984.
25. Robinson D. Translation and Empire. Postcolonial Theories Explained. – Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.
26. Steiner E. A Register-Based Translation Evaluation: An Advertisement as a Case in Point // Target. – 1998. – P. 291–318.
27. Toury G. Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond – Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995.
28. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation. – London: Routledge, 1995.
29. Wilss W. Probleme und Perspektiven der Übersetzungskritik// IRAL. – 1974. – S. 23–41.

УДК 821.111(73)–3.09

NAGACHEVSKA O.O.
(Khmelnysky)

CONTEMPORARY INTERPRETATIONS OF GOTHIC LITERARY TRADITION

У статті розглядаються традиційні та новітні підходи до інтерпретації готичної літературної традиції, визначається вплив готичного роману на розвиток сучасної літератури.

Many linguists (*Edith Birkhead, Michael Sadlier, Montague Summers, Maggie Kilgore, Joseph Andriano, Frederick S. Frank, Robert Spector, Ellen Moers and others*) devoted their scientific works to the problem of interpretation of the Gothic novel which dominated English literature from its conception in 1764 with the publication of *The Castle of Ortanto* by Horace Walpole. It has been continually criticized by numerous critics for its sensationalism, melodramatic qualities, and its play on the supernatural. *The aim of our investigation* is to

analyze, compare and describe traditional and modern approaches to the study of the Gothic Novel and highlight the influence of the gothic literary tradition on the development of the modern fiction.

The genre drew many of its intense images from the graveyard poets Gray and Thompson, intermingling a landscape of vast dark forest with vegetation that bordered on excessive, concealed ruins with horrific rooms, monasteries and a forlorn character who excels at the melancholy. *Gothic literature* as a movement was a disappointment to the idealistic romantic poets for the sentimental character idealized by Ann Radcliffe could not transcend into reality. The Gothic genre today has remained an elusive minor literary upheaval that has had immense influence on genres today. Literary critics though, have been slow to accept Gothic literature as a valuable genre. The first critics to examine the Gothic approached it reverently with historical interest. These critics looked at the presence of the text by examining it within a historical context. The original critical approach of *historical interpretation* allowed the text to validate the text, as it was a reaction to the age of reason, order, and politics of Eighteenth century England.

Today, a common literary approach to the Gothic is to examine the presence of the author through the application of *Freudian, Jungian and post-Jungian psychology* to Gothic trappings such as dark labyrinths and incestuous implications. Such readings tend to taint the text by ignoring the historical aspect of the work and focusing narrowly upon aspects that are beyond the intent of the author. The use of such literary devices when studying Gothic novels diminishes the validity of the text by focusing on aspects that are irrelevant and reduces the text to a device to perpetuate certain ideals that were not in the original text.

The rise in popularity of the Gothic novel in the twentieth century stems from an increased apprehension in the myths handed down from the age of enlightenment that we have hesitantly inherited. Critical examination of the Gothic novel began with an increased effort to preserve and recover the past. Critics such as *Edith Birkhead* and *Michael Sadlier* approached the genre with intrepidity and apologetic language. Early critics often examined the sentimentality and the melodramatic qualities of the text that culminated in emotions that thrill rather than the validity of the text itself. In his famous compilation of Gothic novels, *The Gothic Quest*, *Montague Summers* examined the Gothic novel within its historical background. Summers asserts that the gothic is escapist literature [1, p. 198].

Maggie Kilgore, in her book “The Rise of the Gothic Novel” states that: “For Summers, art offers a refuge from reality; but it can only do so as long as it is separate from reality. He denounces critics who confuse art and life when they claim that the gothic was as subversive as the French Revolution, reminding us, that “a revolution in literature is a very different thing from a social Revolution” [4, p. 219]. Often considered the modern Walpole, Summers was a scholar, antiquarian, and necromancer who raised the dead genre of the Gothic. He argued, correctly, that the richness of these novels lie in their historical language and value. The presence of the author is removed wholly from the text by the language. As in art, it is the separation from reality that accentuates the value of subjectivity of the text rather than the ambiguities of an author’s soul imprinted upon the text.

Summers’ approach to the text helps illustrate that the beauty and the necessity of a pure read of Gothic novels lies within the reader. However, there is a foe in Summers paradigm in the form of surrealism, which for him was the dark antithesis of gothic which stood for a confusion between art and life, but for Kilgore in her book *The Rise of the Gothic Novel* it “marked the turn to applications of emerging psychoanalytical theory to the gothic, which became examinable in a more orderly and scientific way as an example of the subconscious emerging, the repressed returning, to reveal a truth underneath the oppressive surface of appearances. Psychoanalytical vocabulary has often seemed helpful also in describing the oedipal nature of the gothic, obsessed as it is with family rivalry, and with a satanically ambiguous villain whose self-sufficiency is both his glory and his damnation. With its theory of an underlying reality, psychoanalysis helped give the gothic a new “profundity”, by seeing it as the revelation of a the private life of either the individual or his culture that had been buried by habit, the conscious will, and forces of individual and social repression” [4, p. 219–220].

As Gothic criticism began to incorporate psychoanalytical language as means to examine the tension of the text, the presence of the author began to invade the text. An analysis of the characters in relation to the author ensued. Such examinations, though pertinent to the criticism of the text, began to reflect the authors supposed “other-self” a mirror to of the soul, which happened to reflect the critics’ specific approach.

The validity of the text is diminished as irrelevant aspects of notions beyond the author are heaped onto the text. *Joseph Andriano* in his book *Our Ladies of Darkness*, stated that “a great discovery of Romantic Gothicism was the realization that even when a man is haunted by a feminine demon or ghost, he could still be encountering himself-or part of himself. The haunting Other may be a projection of the haunted Self: outer demon is inner daemon, a psychic entity unrecognized as such by the male ego” [2, p. 2].

According to *Camille Paglia* in her book *Sexual Personae*, the “The Gothic novel is sexually archaic: it withdraws into chthonian darkness, the realm of Goethe’s Mothers” [3, p. 265].

Today we have such works as *Frederick S. Frank’s* “The First Gothics”, *Robert Spector’s* “The English Gothic: A Bibliographic Guide to Writers From Horace Walpole to Mary Shelley”, *Dan McNutt’s* “The Eighteenth Century Gothic Novel”, and *Ann Tracy’s* “The Gothic Novel: 1790–1830” to lead us through the labyrinth of the Gothic and provide us with a clear reflection and evolution of this genre.

Ellen Moers wrote of the “Female Gothic” in “Literary Women” in 1977 and coined a new term. She laid the foundation for a new way of thinking about women and the Gothic genre [5]. Certainly, generically gendered distinctions had been made before Moers’ book; eight years earlier, *Hume* had distinguished between “the novel of terror” and “the novel of horror,” positing *Ann Radcliffe’s* books as epitomizing the former and *M.G. Lewis’* the latter. *Hume*, however, focused his piece on the male-dominated horror-gothic, dismissing *Radcliffe* and her many emulators as “not serious”.

So, we can conclude that the Gothic novel is no longer escapist literature, it is full of latent eroticism which draws the reader into a daemonic and archaic womb which is distinctly the author’s. The subjectivity of the text as well as the reader is diminished by the supposed actualization of the author’s intent. The validity of the text is then subject to a critic’s language not the presence of the reader. In psychoanalytical criticism, the Age of Enlightenment gave birth to sexual misgivings and sadism in individuals and Gothic literature is an offspring of its harsh order and its scientific ideals. Despite its marginal position in the past Gothic literature requires further deeper investigations.

References

1. Summers M. Gothic Quest. – Gordon Press Publishers, 1972. – 234 p.
2. Joseph Andriano. Our Ladies of Darkness. (Feminine Daemonology in Male Gothic Fiction). – Pennsylvania St. Univ., 1993. – 182 p.
3. Camille Paglia. Sexual Personae. – Yale: Yale University Press, 1990. – 237 p.
4. Kilgour M. The Rise of the Gothic Novel. – London, 1997. – 342 p.
5. Ellen Moers, Literary Women. – New York: Anchor Press, 1977. – 301 p.

УДК 811.111’42

YESYPENKO N.H.
(Chernivtsi)

A LEXICAL SEMANTIC APPROACH TO THE CONCEPT REALIZATION IN LITERARY TEXT

У статті пропонується концептуальний та лексико-семантичний підхід до лінгвістичного опису поняття лексикалізації у художньому тексті, який базується на кількісно-якісному аналізі великого текстового масиву. Концептуальний та статистичний аналіз авторського вокабуляру дає змогу побудувати авторську картину світу з урахуванням системи його знань, вірувань та ієрархії концептів у авторському світосприйнятті.

Modern linguistics emphasizes the role of semantics as a bridge between the theory of language and the theories of other cognitive capacities such as visual perception and motor control. It develops the position that the study of semantics of natural language is the study of the structure of thought, and that the person’s idiomatic style offers a much more important source of evidence for the theory of cognition than is often supposed by linguists, philosophers, psychologists, or computer scientists. In cognitive linguistics an extremely detailed and scrupulous attention is paid to the concepts restructuring and the way concepts are verbalized in the text.

The present research focuses on the lexical semantic peculiarities of the text, the verbal reflection of concepts in the adventure novels by different authors created in different time periods. The proposed article addresses the notions of: concept; writer’s language world view; text.

A language is the means of the organization, processing and transferring the information with a support on studying of categories and concepts. Cognitive semantics is the basis of cognitive linguistics which concentrates on studying and understanding the process of conceptualization and categorization of the world, metonymicalness and metaphoricalness of thinking [1, p. 124]. Conceptualization comprises principles of perception and judgement of a person and the phenomena of the world around – the events occurring in it.