

*Maryanko Ya. H.,
PhD, Associate Professor,
Department of Foreign Languages
Odesa State Academy of Civil Engineering and Architecture*

*Bosa T. S.,
Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages
Odesa State Academy of Civil Engineering and Architecture*

*Stanchyk Ye. V.,
Senior lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages
Odesa State Academy of Civil Engineering and Architecture*

REPRODUCTION OF NATIONAL AND CULTURAL PECULIARITIES OF GOETHE'S WORKS IN THE ORIGINAL AND TRANSLATION: THE PROBLEM OF ADEQUACY IN TRANSLATION

Summary. The article is devoted to the reproduction of national and cultural peculiarities of original works of J. W. Goethe and their translations into Ukrainian by different authors. Particular attention is paid to the problems of adequacy. The article is devoted to the ways in which different semantic groups of realities are conveyed in German. Using the example of German translations of *Faust*, the author briefly analyses the main translation techniques in the interpretation of specific national elements. The analysis is carried out by comparing the original and translated texts in bilingual editions of the above-mentioned works. This problem has become extremely active in connection with the appeal to the works of the classics of German literature, the interest in which was quite significant even in the 19th century. The purpose of the article is to study the whole layer of Ukrainian literary criticism on the works of J. W. Goethe from the standpoint of a holistic, conceptual, generalising approach. The tasks of the article are to systematise and generalise the national and cultural peculiarities of Goethe's works, as well as to determine the adequacy of their reproduction in translation from German into Ukrainian. The relevance of the article is due to the consideration of such a translation technique as compensation. This technique allows the translator to reproduce the idea and stylistic features of the original in the best possible way. It is important for a translator to understand a work of fiction not only at the semantic level, but also at the poetic level, which means creating imagery. The common culture, experience, outlook, and intention of the author, and not just the use of stylistic devices, create a work of art in which each element acquires meaning and has a special power of influence. In translation, foreign language realities can be conveyed by replacing component parts – morphemes – or by using direct lexical equivalents in the target language (calquing). Another way is to convey the meaning of the original lexical unit with the help of expressions and phrases that reveal the features of the phenomenon (descriptive translation). Often, in order to achieve brevity of expression and reveal the semantics of a lexical unit, a translator combines different translation techniques.

Key words: translation, adequacy, national and cultural features, original, transliteration, transcription, Goethe, 'Faust', interpretation, realities, semantic adequacy, semantic equivalent, analogy.

The significance of translation in the history of human culture is enormous, but it is undeniable that the process of translation or interlingual transformation is an extremely complex phenomenon, as it involves not only the comparison of different language systems, but also the clash of different cultures and even civilisations. Taking into account the extremely important role of literary translation in the development of language and enrichment of the culture of a nation, it is undoubtedly paradoxical that such a widespread phenomenon as translation is still insufficiently studied.

The theory, history, and practice of translation have been studied by S. Vlahov, S. Florin, O. Kundzich, M. Rylsky, I. Franko, P. Tychyna, and M. Lukash. The problems of adequacy in the translation and interpretation of fiction are the subject of the works of such scholars as: T. R. Kyiaka, A. M. Naumenko, V. V. Demetska, O. D. Ogui, T. E. Nekriach, Y. P. Chala, I. V. Korunets, etc. Their research highlights extremely interesting issues of literary translation.

This research is devoted to the study of the possibility of transmitting national and cultural peculiarities in translations of Goethe's works. It should be noted that Goethe's works were translated into many languages, especially successful were the translations into Ukrainian created by I. Franko, M. Lukash, M. Orest, V. Stus, etc. The article examines the translations of the work *Faust* by I. Franko, D. Zahula, D. Nalyvaiko, and M. Ulezko.

The purpose of the article is to study the national and cultural peculiarities of Goethe's works and linguistic means and their reproduction in the original and translations.

The purpose led to the solution of the following **tasks**:

- 1) to systematise and summarise the national and cultural peculiarities of Goethe's works;
- 2) to identify the problems of adequate reproduction of the national and cultural peculiarities of Goethe's works in translation from German into Ukrainian.

Taking into account the objectives of the article, it would be advisable to consider such a means of lexical and grammatical translation transformations as compensation, which makes it possible to equally convey the meaning of the original. All of this has led to the relevance of the article. Thanks to compensation, the transla-

tor is able to fully reproduce the idea of the original work, the stylistic peculiarities of the original, preserve its beauty, and reproduce the life of the era and country to which the original belongs.

The characteristic features of fiction, the boundless variety of lexical, grammatical and syntactic means of language, the manifestation of the writer's individual artistic style in each case, the variety of combinations of written and spoken language – all this makes the problems and complexity of literary translation extremely difficult. When translating fiction, the task is always to reproduce the individual originality of the primary source.

In recent years, linguistics has seen the emergence of scientific works devoted to Goethe's work (O. Biletskyi, Y. Boyko-Blohin, N. Bondarenko, V. Zhyla, D. Zatonyskiy, A. Naumenko, E. Necheporuk, M. Novyko, L. Rudnytskyi, B. Shalaginov, K. Shakhova, etc.), as well as studies that characterise the interconnections of Ukrainian literature with German literature (H. Pestriy-Koshelets, H. Verves, V. Lukianova, V. Hladkyi, O. Panchenko). These works investigate and characterise the sources of Ukrainian-German literary ties and their significance for the development of the world literary process.

Regarding the problems of translating J. W. Goethe's works into Ukrainian, special attention should be paid to the works of Y. Boyko-Blohin. Y. Boyko-Blohin notes that M. Lukash's translation of Goethe's proverbs and aphorisms in *Faust* deserves a special positive assessment, since the author of the translation managed to accurately, concisely and expressively convey the sharpness of the German poet's thought. For example, Faust's aphorism from the third act of the second part of the tragedy is quite famous:

*Nur der verdient die Gunst der Frauen,
Der kräftig sie zu schützen weiß.*

M. Lukash translates it in these words:

*Лиш той любові жінки вартий,
Хто вмів захистить її.*

It is a well-known fact that the language of the German poet in *Faust* is marked by the layering of different linguistic strata. The work shows significant and multifaceted trends in the development of the German language, from Lessing, Herder and the Weimar court to the burghers and maids. And the Ukrainian translator has managed to capture and convey all this complexity of the language, its multilayered nature. The scholar's undoubted praise goes to Lukash's newly created neologisms, which are quite common, especially in the second part of the translation of the tragedy. These are mostly words with two roots: "красоприхильник", "красолюбця", which, in the critic's opinion, is quite successful.

In the realities found in Goethe's works, the closeness between language and culture is clearly demonstrated: the emergence of new realities in the material and spiritual life of society leads to the emergence of corresponding words in the language. A distinctive feature of reality is the nature of its visual content. As a linguistic phenomenon most closely related to culture, these lexical items respond quickly to all changes in the development of society. Among them, you can always distinguish realities – neologisms, historicisms, archaisms, and each type of reality requires an individual approach to translation [1, p. 178]. For example, the alliteration in the words of the Evil Spirit in his dialogue with Gretchen (scene 'The Cathedral') is quite accurately conveyed:

*Aus dem vergriffnen Büchelchen
Gebete lalltest.*

And translated by M. Lukash into Ukrainian:

*З пошарпаної книжечки
Молитва лебеділа.*

The sound effect is the alliteration of the consonant sound 'l', which is very strong in both texts: the original and the translation. This is a sound-image that is very important from a stylistic point of view; it differs from other sounds in its vivid expressiveness, overlapping and shading other smooth sounds.

Faust is a profound philosophical treatise, the philosophical construction of which requires reader's knowledge of the basics of Kant's philosophy, which replaced the empiricism and scepticism that had dominated before. It is these two philosophical trends that embody the main antipodes of the tragedy: Faust is an idealist who seeks the meaning of life and eternal truths, while Mephistopheles seeks only momentary sensual pleasure and tries to persuade Faust to do the same.

In the original, philosophical thoughts intersect with obscene language. The characters of *Faust* in M. Lukash's translation are no longer Germans, their images are infused with elements of Ukrainian mentality. This can explain the translator's selectivity in softening some of the original's lines. In the scene 'The Prison', Gretchen sings a song taken from a German folk tale about a girl who was murdered by her evil stepmother:

'*Meine Mutter, die Hur*' [2, p. 261]. M. Lukash translates '*die Hur*' as 'ледащо,' although other translators used the words 'курва' (I. Franko [3, p. 344] and D. Zahul [4, p. 131–132]), 'шлюха' (M. Ulezko [5, p. 281]). M. Lukash could not follow the path of other translators, because it would mean a complete erasure of the image of the Gretchen he portrayed in the first part. That is why in his translation we read 'Моя мати, ледащо' [6, p. 174].

At first glance, because of the ease with which M. Lukash's translation is read, it is difficult to feel the painstaking work and attention to detail that create this coherence and harmony:

*Faust (allein). Wie nur dem Kopf nicht alle
Hoffnung schwindet,
Der immerfort an schalem Zeuge klebt,
Mit gierger Hand nach Schätzen grabt,
Und froh ist, wenn er Regenwürmer findet!* [2, p. 150].

This is the beginning of Faust's second monologue, when he criticises Wagner. Wagner and Faust are both scholars, but Wagner is convinced that all wisdom is in books and that they can answer all questions; he is not interested in real life, he is convinced that he knows almost everything and can teach anyone, and he respects Faust only because he is a recognised authority. Faust, in contrast to Wagner, is more interested in reality and takes a more global view of life; he realises that, although he has read many books, he knows very little about life. This monologue of Faust's was not present in *Prafaust*, that is, it is already a reinterpretation of life by a more mature Goethe. Let's compare:

Фавст (сам). *І як лиш голова йому не трісне,
Що в ню раз в раз таке терміття тисне,
За скарбами так покванно гребє,
А радуєсь, як хробака найде!* [3, р. 199]

Фавст (сам). *Як цієї голови ще держаться надії,
Що над обгризками куняє по куткам,
Жадібною рукою шукає скарбів там, –
А знайде черв'яка, – Бог знає, як зрадіє!* [4, р. 32]

Фауст (сам). *І як в цій голові не зникне вся надія!..
Вік лине до хламіття витхлого й сидить,
Жадливою рукою хоче клади рить,
А нагребє дощовиків, то вже й радіє...* [6, р. 71]

We find inconsistencies already at the phonetic level. Translators add extra stanzas and thus change the very mood of the poem. Only M. Lukash's translation preserves the rhyme and rhythm in full, just as in the original:

Фауст (сам). *Іще його не зрадила надія;
Копасться в гноїську, скарб шука,
А знайде часом черв'яка,
То, дурень, і тому радіє...* [6, р. 42]

At the lexical level, we can also identify certain differences between the images of Faust in the original work and its translations. Thus, Ivan Franko's Faust speaks the language spoken by the inhabitants of Western Ukraine at that time. This is evidenced by such word forms as 'ню' – 'неї' and 'радуєсь' – 'радіє'. In his preface to *Faust*, Ivan Franko explains this as follows: 'Я поклав головно вагу на зрозумілість і ясність бесіди, уникаючи по змозі менше вживаних провінціалізмів, окрім хіба тих немногих місць, де того вимагало окремішне забарвлення в самім оригіналі' [4, р. 180]. In M. Ulezko's and D. Zahul's versions of Faust, the beginning of this monologue does not sound as respectful as in the original, since they replaced J. W. Goethe's four- and five-line iambic pentameter with six-line pentameter, and thus the tone of the poem changed: where J. W. Goethe's poem is full of drama and despair, the translators' is full of reflection. Of course, they tried to compensate for this with expressive vocabulary, such as: 'обгризками', 'хламіття витхлого'.

To make the characters' monologues more humorous, J. W. Goethe used short feet. Thus, in Monkey's monologue, a two-footed iambic meter is used, which gives the poem a 'dancing' rhythm. Although at the lexical level it sounds respectful, due to the fact that it is spoken by Monkey and in iambic pentameter, the reader will not take these threats seriously:

Der Kater, Das ist die Welt: / Sie steigt und fällt/ Und rollt beständig; / Sie klingt wie Glas – / Wie bald bricht das! – / Ist hohl inwendig. / Hier glänzt sie sehr/ Und hier noch mehr: / "Ich bin lebendig!" – / Mein lieber Sohn, / Hall dich davon!/ Du mußt sterben: / Sie ist von Ton, / Es gibt Scherben! [2, р. 200].

Here, a nine-line stanza with the rhyme aabvbtb is used, followed by a five-line stanza with the rhyme aabab. All translators tried to preserve the iambic pentameter. But in the original, Goethe introduces a chorus in the five-line stanza: 'Du mußt sterben' to enhance the effect of drama at the lexical level. M. Lukash reproduced the accents of the original in full, observing the size, placing the lexical and semantic load exactly where Goethe did: 'І сам за те ж/ Тоді помреш ти'. Yet the 'mußt' that

conveys the certainty of the end, that is, that 'ти мушиш помрети' is not reproduced in the translation. This passage sounds more like a warning, i.e. there is a way to avoid death, which is not in the original, e.g.

Мавній. *Оце земля: /летить, кружля, / Не знає вину; / Бряжчить, як скло, / Бо в ній дупло / На всю нутрину; / Блищить, мигтить, / Кругом ряхтить, – / Гляди, мій сину, / За рухом стеж, / Бо розіб'єш / Її до решти / І сам за те ж/ Тоді помреш ти* [6, р. 98–99].

A comparative analysis of the translations by Ivan Franko, D. Zahul, M. Ulezko, and M. Lukash shows that *Faust* in the translation by M. Lukash meets the requirements of the time most of all. His understanding of the philosophical content of *Faust* is confirmed by his thorough commentaries, deep erudition, well-read and understanding of the spirit of the original work.

The study has led to the following conclusions:

1) the text of a work of fiction is perceived by the translator not only on the semantic level, but also on the so-called poetic level. The author creates imagery, a special power of influence, without necessarily resorting to unusual metaphors or any other stylistic devices. In verbal and artistic creativity, each element acquires meaning, it is conditioned by the entire context of a particular work of art and, more generally, by culture, i.e. experience, worldview, and the author's intention;

2) when tracing, foreign language realities are conveyed by replacing their constituent parts – morphemes, or by direct lexical correspondences in the target language. In contrast to the above, descriptive translation reveals the meaning of the original lexical unit with the help of extended phrases that show the essential features of the phenomenon denoted by this lexical unit;

3) translators often use a combination of two techniques – transcription or tracing and descriptive translation, presenting the latter in the commentary. This makes it possible to combine the brevity and economy of expression inherent in transcription with the disclosure of the semantics of a particular unit achieved through descriptive translation.

We see the prospect of the study in the analysis of linguistic and extralinguistic aspects of translation and in expanding the boundaries of further research on the problem of translation.

Bibliography:

1. Клименко О. Л. Про переклад субстандартної лексики / О. Л. Клименко // Методологічні проблеми перекладу на сучасному етапі. Суми: СумДУ, 1999. 195 с.
2. Goethe J. W. Faust. Gesamtausgabe / J. W. Goethe; Leipzig : Insel-Verlag. 1969. 651 S.
3. Франко І. "Фавст" Гете / І. Франко // Зібрання творів у п'ятдесяти томах. Т. 13. К.: Наукова думка, 1978.
4. Гете Й. В. Фауст. – [Перекл. з нім. Д. Загула] / Й. В. Гете. Київ-Відень : Верни гора, 1919. -Ч. I. – 1919. 136 с.
5. Гете Й. В. Фауст: Трагедія. Перекл. з нім. М. Т. Улезко / Й. В. Гете. Харків : Держвидав України, 1926. – 4. I. 331 с.
6. Гете Й. В. Фауст; Лірика : Пер. з нім.; Передм. Д. Наливайка "Поет національний і всесвітній", С. 5-22. / Й. В. Гете. К.: Веселка, 2001. 478 с.
7. Чередниченко О. І. Оказіональні відповідники і переклад на різних рівнях еквівалентності / О. І. Чередниченко // Теорія і практика перекладу. К.: Вища школа, 1981. 177 с.
8. Nida E. Principles of Correspondence. Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden : Brill, 1964. P. 156-171. (Reprinted in Venuti 200; P. 126-140).

Мар'яно Я., Боса Т., Станчик Є. Відтворення національно-культурних особливостей творів Гете в оригіналі та перекладі: проблема адекватності при перекладі

Анотація. Стаття присвячена відтворенню національно-культурних особливостей оригінальних творів Й. В. Гете та їх перекладів українською мовою різними авторами. Особлива увага приділяється проблемам адекватності. Стаття присвячена способам передачі німецькою мовою різних семантичних груп реалій. На прикладі німецьких перекладів «Фауста» коротко проаналізовано основні перекладацькі прийоми в інтерпретації специфічних національних елементів. Аналіз здійснено шляхом порівняння текстів оригіналу та перекладу у двомовних виданнях вищезгаданих творів. Ця проблема надзвичайно активізувалася у зв'язку зі зверненням до творчості класиків німецької літератури, інтерес до якої був досить значним навіть у 19 столітті. Мета статті – дослідити цілий пласт української літературної критики про творчість Й. В. Гете з позицій цілісного, концептуального, узагальнюючого підходу. Завданнями статті є систематизування і узагальнення національно-культурних особливостей творів Гете, а також визначення адекватності їх відтворення при перекладі з німецької мови

українською. Актуальність статті зумовлена розглядом такого перекладацького прийому, як компенсація. Цей засіб надає перекладачу можливість найкраще відтворити ідею і стилеві особливості оригіналу. Важливим є сприйняття перекладачем художнього твору не тільки на семантичному рівні, але також і на поетичному, що означає створення образності. Завдяки загальній культурі, досвіду, світогляду, задуму автора, а не тільки вживанню стилістичних прийомів, створюється художній твір, у контексті якого кожний елемент набуває смислу та має особливу силу впливу. У перекладі іншомовні реалії можуть передаватись шляхом заміни складових частин – морфем, або використання прямих лексичних відповідників в мові перекладу (калькування). Інший шлях дозволяє, за допомогою виразів та словосполучень, що розкривають ознаки явища, передати значення лексичної одиниці оригіналу (описовий переклад). Найчастіше, з метою досягнення стислості засобів вираження та розкриття семантики лексичної одиниці, перекладач поєднує різні прийоми перекладу.

Ключові слова: переклад, адекватність, національно-культурні особливості, оригінал, транслітерація, транскрипція, Гете, «Фауст», інтерпретація, реалії, семантична адекватність, семантичний еквівалент, аналогія.