

# **The Comparative Analysis of the Operational Unit Peculiarities of the Creative Potential Realization of Literary Texts Translators and Future Translators.**

**Dyachuk Nataliya**

*The article deals with the comparative analysis of the operational unit peculiarities of the creative potential realization. The psycholinguistic model of the creative potential realization of the literary texts translators was taken for consideration. It includes the psychological and psycholinguistic components. The psychological components are the elements of translator's creative potential; the psycholinguistic components are the characteristics of the translated text itself. So, the works of the translators of the literary texts and future specialists of translation are analyzed. To guarantee the adequate and aesthetic variant of translation, the translator usually restores to some lexical and stylistic transformations.*

*Key words: the psycholinguistic model, creative potential, translators, literary texts, translation transformations, omission, addition, specification, generalization, antonymic translation.*

*В статье представлен сравнительный анализ особенностей операционального блока реализации творческого потенциала переводчиков художественных текстов и будущих специалистов в области перевода. За основу была взята психолингвистическая модель реализации творческого потенциала переводчиков художественных текстов, которая включает в себя психологические и психолингвистические элементы. Психологические компоненты – это составляющие творческого потенциала личности переводчика; психолингвистические компоненты – это характеристики текста перевода и его адекватности как результат деятельности переводчика. Итак, в статье произведен анализ работ переводчиков художественных текстов и будущих переводчиков. В статье также рассматриваются переводческие трансформации, которыми пользуется переводчик, чтобы достичь адекватного и эстетического перевода.*

*Ключевые слова: психолингвистическая модель, творческий потенциал, переводчики, художественные тексты, переводческие трансформации, опущение, добавление, конкретизация, генерализация, антонимический перевод.*

For deep analysis of the peculiarities of creative potential realization we have taken for consideration the psycholinguistic model of the creative potential realization of the translators of literary texts. The psycholinguistic model is used to reflect the phenomena of speech-and-thinking activity in so called simplified form to facilitate its theoretical and experimental study, says A. A. Leontev [6]. Belyanin, for example, believes that psycholinguistic model itself should obligatory include linguistic characteristics on the one hand and psychological features on the other hand [1]. The designing of translation psychological model should be based on formal verbal aspects, so called linguistic resources, the resources the translator operates with and non-verbal psychological resources of his thinking and memory mechanisms, his mental vocabulary and so on [9]. The psycholinguistic model in our research also has psychological and psycholinguistic components. Psychological components include the elements of translator's creative potential, and psycholinguistic components are the characteristics of the translated text itself and its adequacy as the result of translator's activity.

So, for analysis of the operational unit elements of the psycholinguistic model of translator's creative potential we have chosen the abstract from a well-known 'Smile' written by Ray Bradbury. The comparative analysis itself was accomplished with the help of translations made by three professional Ukrainian translators L. Kolomyiysya [2], A. Evsy [3] and Y. Veprynyaka [4]. To make the adequate translation of any literary text a translator, as a rule, should resort to some translation techniques, so called lexical and stylistic transformations. Such transformations are considered to be necessary to show author's individually estimating attitude towards objective reality. Besides, they exist to reflect author's outlook [5]. Miram proves that using various translation transformations helps a translator avoid word by word translation of literary texts and aids to represent the whole completeness of the translation [8].

The problem of the text analysis has been studied by many scientists, such as: Arnold, O. Morohovskyi, G. Miram, I. Galperin and others.

So, three translated abstracts are sure to be adequate from the point of view of translation, as both lexical and syntactic transformations were used by translators L. Kolomiets, A. Evs and Y. Veprynyak. Among the most used are addition, omission, generalization, specification, antonymic translation and integral conversion. It should be mentioned that sometimes different transformations are combined in a single whole and are called therefore compound complex transformations. That is because some transformations have controversial character: there is no distinct limit between various translation transformations, that's why the same transformations can be of the same type [7].

Let's see some examples of translation transformations. The initial phrase *the town square* is translated by Y. Veprynyak as *головний майдан* and L. Kolomiets translates the same phrase as *міський майдан*. These are the examples of generalization, as Bradbury's *square* has become more abstract and wide in Ukrainian variants (*майдан*). It shows here that the plot is developing in a small town where every dweller knows that the town square is the most important place in the town. Bradbury's phrase *there were no fires* is also the subject to generalization in the translations made by A. Evs and L. Kolomiets. The concrete English unit *fires* is changed into the phrase that conveys more abstract idea and is compared here with light: *ніде не світилося*. It should be mentioned that generalization is the type of translation transformation that is very often used to create logical thinking structure. The example of it is found in Y. Veprynyak's translated extract. So, the initial part of the sentence *... far out in the rimed country* undergoes serious changes in its Ukrainian variant, as English concrete element *country* is transferred into very abstract translation: *... за вибіленими полями*. One more example of the generalization is seen in the translation made by L. Kolomiets. She interprets Bradbury's sentence: *Down the road in twos and threes, more people were gathering...* in a way. So, Ukrainian variant for *in twos* is *парами*. It is more adequate here, as this is the best word in Ukrainian to speak about people who go in twos. Though Ukrainian word *парами* has its absolute English variant *in pairs*, L.

Kolomiets has decided to resort to generalization in her translation. Besides the previous example of generalization there is one more interesting case. The next sample of generalization in L. Kolomiets' fragment we can observe in such English part of the sentence: ... *and blew on his red chapped hands...* - *й хекав на свої червоні, обвітрені руки...* It's clearly seen that the concrete meaning of the English verb *blew* modifies considerably wider Ukrainian *хекав*. It should be admitted that it's much better tells that the boy really got frozen hard and is trying to warm himself.

An interesting example of generalization can be met in the translation of Y. Veprynyak where the translator uses a very abstract notion for the interpreting the English lexical unit *a boy*. According to the plot development Y. Veprynyak has taken the Ukrainian noun *дитина*. Compare: ... *a boy out of bed so early.* – *дитина, так рано, а він не спить*. Among the other examples of generalization there is the English verb *to disperse* that generalizes towards the noun *mist* – *туман*. So, the English unit *to disperse* gets in genitive touch with its Ukrainian correspondent *танути* in Y. Veprynyak's translation and its Ukrainian correspondent *зникати* in L. Kolomiets' translation. Though among English meanings of the verb *to disperse* we can easily find the appropriate meanings *розсіюватися, розвіюватися*, both translators refer to generalization to make the translation better.

In the original text *the brew bubbling in a rusty pan* the noun *brew* attracts the attention. The Ukrainian equivalent for it is *вариво*. But Y. Veprynyak uses generalization translating the initial part of the sentence as *юшка, що булькотіла у іржавій каструлі*. The same is about the translation of A. Evs. He interprets the noun *the brew* in another way: *рідина, що кипіла у іржавій каструлі*. One more example of generalization in his translations concerns the English phrase *some berry*. So, the English sentence: *It was made from some berry that grew on the meadows beyond town* is translated into Ukrainian this way: *її робили з диких ягід, що росли на луках за містом*. So, the existence of attribute expressed by the phrase *that grew on the meadowlands beyond town* in the English variant allows A. Evs to widen the meaning of the lexical unit *some berry* and interpret it as *дикі ягоди*.

The important sample for generalization is meant to be the English noun *wealth* in Bradbury's text. The Ukrainian equivalent for it is *багатство, достаток*. To

preserve stylistic norms of speech three Ukrainian translators treat the fragment *not many had the wealth* in a different way though all of them are considered to be appropriate and adequate towards the situation in the text. So, A. Evs translates it this way: *не кожен міг дозволити собі таку розкіш*, L. Kolomiets' variant sounds this way: *мало в кого вистачало на це грошей*. So, it's seen that the noun *wealth* is widely abstracted in both translations and it acquires its sense in its complete translation.

The translation of the same phrase by Y. Veprynyak: *мало кому дозволяла кишеня* doesn't resemble the original variant at all. The translator doesn't give word by word translation of any separate contextual unit. He interprets the whole phrase as a single one from the point of view of sense. This type of translation transformations is called integral conversion. This type of transformations is widely used in L. Kolomiets' translations. So, interpreting the phrase *out of bed so early* the translator doesn't take into consideration the separate lexical units meaning. He treats the whole phrase as a single one instead, thus translating it as *вже на ногах із самого ранку*. The English conversational phrase, for instance, *I sure am* doesn't coincide with its original version in its Ukrainian translation: *Ще й питаєте?* Finally, the English phrasal unit *I'll have you know* has absolutely changed its contextual meaning in its Ukrainian *зрозумів* (L. Kolomiets' variant) and *зрозуміло* (Y. Veprynyak's version).

Among the mostly used translation transformations which are represented in the text of all Ukrainian translators is specification. Specification is absolutely contrary to generalization. It happens when the wide meaning of the initial lexical unit is transferred into the narrow one of the translated item. So, let's see some examples. Bradbury's fragment of the sentence *the queue had formed* is interpreted as *черга зібралась* by L. Kolomiets and A. Evs. Y. Veprynyak translates it as *черга постала*. As the English noun *the queue* expresses here the notion *люди* (*people*) it's absolutely logical that the verb *had formed* is concretized according to the main lexical element expressed by the noun *люди*. So, it sounds more adequate *черга зібралась або постала* than *черга сформувалась*. The example of specification is represented in Y. Veprynyak's translation where the English verb *to gather* is used in its narrow meaning because of the situation. So, Bradbury's part of the sentence *more*

*people were gathering* is seen by Y. Veprynyak's in this way: *до черги підшикувалися ще люди*. L. Kolomiets, for example, applies to specification translating a very wide in its meaning English noun *buildings*. According to the context she considerably concretizes the mentioned noun in her translation interpreting it in a very concrete way: *будинки*. Compare English variant: *All about, among the ruined buildings...* with its Ukrainian equivalent: *Тоді повсюди над зруйнованими будинками...* One more lexical unit conveys a very general meaning in English. It's a very spread word *line*. It is used in different situations and it always requires precise specification in its translation. So, L. Kolomiets has chosen a very concrete but the most suitable meaning of the English unit *line* according to the situation depicted. She interprets the English phrase *the long line of men and women* relevantly enough to preserve the right sense and context: *довга вервечка чоловіків та жінок*. The original context of the abstract of the text 'Smile' allows L. Kolomiets to concretize one more English noun *lad* transforming it in Ukrainian noun *малий*. To avoid often repetitions in the translation and make it rather aesthetic she chooses one of the narrowest meanings of the English unit *lad*.

It should be mentioned that English is the language containing a great amount of words with very wide meaning. Here belongs a lot of English verbs. The argument is seen in the translations made by L. Kolomiets. Here we meet the irregular verbs *to get* and *to make* which are concretized according to the situation. So, in the initial phrasal word-combination *got my place in line* the verb *got* is correlated with the rest of the phrase *my place in line*. Thus, the Ukrainian translation sounds: *зайняв місце в черзі*. In the next sentence ... *It was made from some berry...* the English verb *made* that possesses a wide meaning gets a very concrete one in the translation of the whole phrase: *Її запарили з якихось ягід*.

As it was mentioned above, there are many words with rich semantics in English that do not have full correspondents in Ukrainian. The example can be the English noun *man*. The specification of this lexical unit is widely represented in all Ukrainian variants of translation. The initial phrase: *looked up at the clothing of the men* is a good example for the comparison. So, Y. Veprynyak gives such a translation of the phrase mentioned: *позираючи на одягу сусідів*. A. Evs offers such a version

of the translation: *дивився на одяг тих, хто стояв перед ним* and L. Kolomiets suggests such a variant: *позираючи на одяг балакунів*. There is one more situation with the lexical unit *man* where the example of specification is represented. In the phrase: *a man was selling...* the noun *man* is transferred into indefinite pronoun *somebody* by L. Kolomiets and Y. Veprynyak: *хтось продавав*. As we can see, to translate such a wide element as the noun *man* it is absolutely necessary to take into consideration the information of the whole sentence or even the whole paragraph.

Among the most popular translation transformations that are met in Ukrainian variants of translation is addition. This is the phenomenon that provides the growth of words or even parts of the sentence. Different parts of speech such as nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbs etc can be added. For instance, interpreting the initial fragment of the sentence *more people were gathering in for the day of festival* Y. Veprynyak adds some more lexical elements in its translation to improve the perception and understanding of the whole phrase: *до черги підшиковувалися ще люди, яких приваблювало до міста свято та базарний день*. A. Evs uses the method of addition translating Bradbury's phrase *cracked cups – потріскані, щербаті чашки*. As we can observe, the Ukrainian version of translation consists of more lexical units, thus two synonymic Ukrainian adjectives help the translator express the poverty of that times better.

The growth of the lexical units is considerably seen in the translation made by L. Kolomiets. There are three episodes where the method of edition is used by her. The first one is: *said the man behind him* is translated as: *почувся чоловічий голос у нього за спиною*; the second is: *said the man ahead, suddenly turning* is transferred into *втрутився, різко обернувшись, один із чоловіків, які стояли попереду* and the third is: *the man behind* is interpreted as *чоловік, котрий стояв позаду*.

Quite the opposite type of the translation transformation is omission. This is the method of translation that provides the reduction of redundant words. Omission is considered to be the result of absolutely different sentence structures of both languages (English and Ukrainian). So, the result of omission is met in the translations of L. Kolomiets and A. Evs when they omit such lexical unit as *immediately* in their translations. Compare: *the small boy stood immediately behind*

*two men... - Хлопчина стояв у черзі за двома чоловіками...* Though the lexical element *immediately* was elided, the meaningfulness of the translated extract was entirely preserved.

Judging the Ukrainian versions of translation, the first paragraph of Bradbury's work 'Smile' contains a great amount of examples of omission: *In the town square the queue had formed at five in the morning, while cocks were crowing far out in the rimed country and there were no fires. All about, among the ruined buildings, bits of mist had clung at first, but now with the new light of seven o'clock it was beginning to disperse. Down the road, in twos and threes, more people were gathering in for the day of marketing the day of festival.* The first example is seen in Y. Veprynyak's translation when he drops the initial unit *in the morning* – *На головному майдані черга постала ще о п'ятій годині.* Then he omits the adverbial modifier *at first* – *Тоді, довкола, серед розбитих будівель, пасмами висів туман.* It must be admitted that the Ukrainian translation has not become worse of it but the translator managed to avoid the stylistic load for the reader. L. Kolomiets elides the lexical element *at first* with the same stylistic proper: *Тоді повсюди над зруйнованими будинками висіли кланті туману.* Interpreting the third sentence of the paragraph mentioned she deliberately omits the phrasal unit *down the road* that doesn't convey any meaningful function: *Дорогою, парами, втрюх, іще йшли люди – був саме ярмарковий та святковий день.*

Translating the same first paragraph A. Evs tries to evade the excessiveness of unnecessary information, so he uses the method of omission on the level of some sentences: *Черга на міській площі зібралась о п'ятій годині ранку, коли ніде ще не світилося, а далеко в навколишніх селищах співали півні. О сьомій, коли розвидніло і почав розходитися туман, стало видно руїни будинків і постаті людей, які по двоє, по троє ішли на ринок і на фестиваль.* So, here we observe the volume abridgement of the whole paragraph. L. Kolomiets' variant of translation also contains the example of omission: *It was made from some berry that grew on the meadowlands beyond town. – Її запарили з якихось ягід, зібраних за містом.* So, It is even visually seen that the Ukrainian translation is a bit shortened.



Sometimes the meaning of the omitted words is easily understood in its translation. For example, *the man behind* is transferred by Y. Veprynyak as *задній*. Due to existence of the main lexical unit *man* here the omission of the rest of the words is absolutely possible to diversify the text of the translation. The English phrase *I just thought* is translated by Y. Veprynyak as: *Просто зважив*. In order to avoid the repetitions of the personal pronoun, he allows himself to drop the subject of the sentence because the previous one: '*I was joking... I just thought*' gives us the full information about it.

The context of the original text '*Got my place in line, I have*' doesn't forbid A. Evs to reduce the translation to: *Стою в черзі*. The fact that somebody is in the queue means that somebody has lined it up sounds absolutely logic. So, the omission of the lexical unit *I have* is restored by the context on the level of the whole sentence. Interpreting the spoken speech, A. Evs easily drops the words of the direct address in his translation because of the context of the sentence. Let's see: '*Tom here is going to spit clean and true, right Tom?*' – *Том збирається плюнути сильно і влучно, правда ж?* Here we observe one more example of omission, this is the omission of so called synonyms of a pair *clean and true*. To eliminate the excessiveness of the translated version L. Kolomiets combines two synonyms to find one suitable meaning: *Наш Том не схибить, плюне, як слід....*

The same sentence contains one more type of the translation transformations that is known to be called antonymic translation – the change of the positive form of the initial unit into the negative one and vice versa. The translation made by L. Kolomiets is rich for the examples of the method of antonymic translation. The first sample is seen in the positive English part of the question '*... right, Tom?*' that is transferred into the negative form of the translation: "*Чи не так, Том?*". The second example is found in the initial utterance '*Leave the boy alone*' that has the negative correspondent in Ukrainian version of translation: *Не чінай хлопця*. Finally, interpreting the initial sentence '*Whyn't you run off, give your place to someone who appreciates*' the translator changes the negative part into the positive one: *Ти б краще віддав своє місце комусь тямущому, а сам забрався б геть!*

The way Y. Veprynyak translates the same sentence is very similar. Let's see: *'Whyn't you run off, give your place to someone who appreciates? – Біг би ти, хлопче, звідси та поступився своїм місцем тому, хто знається на цій справі!'* But you can notice here the appearance of the additional lexical unit *хлопче*. So, Y. Veprynyak interprets the sentence using not just antonymic translation but addition as well. Thus, let us sum up everything with the help of the table.

Table 1

№	Transformation types	The amount of the transformations in A. Evs' translation (%)	The amount of the transformations in L. Kolomiets' translation (%)	The amount of the transformations in Y. Veprynyak's translation (%)	The general amount of the transformations (%)
1.	Generalization	33,3% (4)	20,7% (6)	22,2% (4)	23,7% (14)
2.	Specification	16,7% (2)	27,6% (8)	27,8% (5)	25,4% (15)
3.	Addition	8,3% (1)	10,3% (3)	11,1% (2)	10,7% (6)
4.	Omission	41,7% (5)	20,7% (6)	22,2% (4)	25,4% (15)
5.	Integral conversion	0	10,3% (3)	11,1% (2)	8,5% (5)
6.	Antonymic translation	0	10,3% (3)	5,6% (1)	6,8% (4)

The future specialists of translations (183 students of Zhytomyr state university named after Ivan Franko) were also offered to translate the abridged extract of the literary text 'Smile' written by Bradbury. Having analyzed their works, we have found that they fall into three groups. The first group of the students is those who use such translation transformations as addition and omission more often than other methods. The result of addition can be the appearance of different parts of speech:

nouns, verbs, adjectives, pronouns etc. There are some examples of addition in the students' variants of translation: *town square* (головна площа міста), *shook* (тряхнув головою), *looked up* (підвів очі вгору), *more people* (все більше і більше людей), *so early* (в таку ранню пору). Among the examples of omission there is the dropping of the possessive pronouns: *your*, *his*, *my* and direct address *Tom*. For instance: *my place in line* (місце в черзі), *put his hand* (поклав руку), *to warm their stomachs* (зігріти шлунок), *blew on his ... hands* (хекав на руки). Some other examples are the word-combination: *clung of mist* (туман) and the sentence: 'What're you doing out so early?' (Що робиш тут так рано?) etc.

To the second group belong the students who apply to generalization and specification wider. It should be mentioned that among the most interesting examples of specification in the works of future students are the sentences containing such lexical units *as had formed* (вишикувалася, з'явилася, утворилася, була), *to run off* (ніти), *ruined buildings* (руїни), *was made* (варити). There are also some examples of generalization: *light* (промені), *lad* (друже, парубче, юнак), *brew* (напій, кипіння, бульбашики), *wealth* (фінанси, гроші, кошти), *blew* (хекав), *there were no fires* (не горіло світло, вогні ще не горіли).

And the third one is the group that contains the students who use different methods of translation. Besides the easiest methods (addition or omission) and more difficult techniques (generalization or specification) a very small amount of students use antonymic translation: *Whyn't you run off ...* - Чого ж ти тут стоїш?

So, most students use addition and omission in their variants of translation. Not many of them resort to generalization and specification and only a very small percent can combine all the methods. Thus, our further task lies in the training program development stimulating future specialists of translation to make their translation more adequate, meaningful and aesthetic.

## REFERENCES

1. Belyanin V. P. *Psikholingvistika (Psycholinguistics)*. Moscow: Flinta, 2008. 232 p.

2. Bradbury R. 'The Smile'. per. z angl. L. V. Kolomiets. – Kyiv: Pedagogichna presa. 1999. no 3. pp. 11-12
3. Bradbury R. 'The Smile'. per. z angl. A. Evs. – Kharkiv: FOP Spivak V. L. 2011. pp. 374-381
4. Bradbury R. 'The Smile'. per. z angl. Y. Veprynyak. – Ternopil: Navchalna knyga, Bogdan. 1999. pp. 296 - 300
5. Galperin I. R. Ocherki po stilistike angliyskogo yazuka. (Studies of English Stylistics). Moscow. 1958. 528 p.
6. Leontev A. A. Osnovy psikholingvistiki. (The Basics of Psycholinguistics). Moscow: Smysl; Akademiya, 2005. 288 p.
7. Lvovskaya Z. D. Sovremennaya problema perevoda. (The Topical Problem of Translation). Moscow: URSS, 2007. 220 p.
8. Miram G. S. Osnovy perevoda. (The Basics of Translation). Kyiv: Elga, Nika – Tsentr. 2002. 248 p.
9. Zasekin S. V. Psycholingvistychni universalii perekladu khudozhnogo tekstu. (The Psycholinguistic Decrees of Literary Text Translation). Lutsk: Volynskyy Nats. Univ. Lesi Ukrainky. 2012. 276 p.