

УДК 811.111'373'42'255.4=161.2]:821.111-2 Шекспір

**PECULIARITIES OF REPRODUCTION OF SOMATIC LEXEMES FROM W. SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGEDY "KING LEAR" IN THE UKRAINIAN TRANSLATIONS****Kravtsova M.O., lecturer***Ivan Franko National University of Lviv*

У статті подано перекладознавчий аналіз Шекспірової трагедії «Король Лір» та її українських перекладів. Суб'єктом дослідження є соматичні лексеми з тексту-джерела та цільових текстів. Отримані результати уможливають створення класифікації методів перекладу соматизмів.

**Ключові слова:** соматизм, В. Шекспір, «Король Лір», українські переклади.

В статье подано переводоведческий анализ Шекспировой трагедии «Король Лир» и её украинских переводов. Субъектом исследования выступают соматические лексемы из текста-источника и целевых текстов. Полученные результаты делают возможным создание классификации методов перевода соматизмов.

**Ключевые слова:** соматизм, В. Шекспир, «Король Лир», украинские переводы.

**Kravtsova M.O. PECULIARITIES OF REPRODUCTION OF SOMATIC LEXEMES FROM W. SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGEDY "KING LEAR" IN THE UKRAINIAN TRANSLATIONS**

The article provides translation analysis of W. Shakespeare's tragedy "King Lear" and its Ukrainian translations. The object of this study is the somatic lexemes used in the source and target texts. The outcome of the results in the classification of the methods of translating somatisms.

**Key words:** somatism, W. Shakespeare, "King Lear", Ukrainian translations.

**The aim of the present article** is to concentrate on the peculiarities of reproduction of the somatic lexemes from W. Shakespeare's tragedy "King Lear" in the Ukrainian translations by P. Kulish, M. Rylskiy, Panas Myrnyi, Vasyl Barka and O. Hriaznov.

Somatic lexis is the specific class of words in the lexical system of a language. The Estonian scholar F. Vack was the first to introduce the term "somatic" to linguistics. Studying the phraseological units of the Estonian language, he concluded that names of body parts are one of the ancient fundamentals of phraseology. Indeed, the lexico-semantic group of somatisms amounts to a great number of phraseological units with these components and, as a result, the attention of scholars was mainly concentrated on the research of somatisms in the sphere of phraseology (N. Andreichuk, N. Vlasova, A. Isaiev, T. Fedulenkova, etc.). Nevertheless, somatisms were also discussed in paralinguistics, structural semantics (I. Kremenetskaia, Y. Bebchuk, L. Volkova, A. Kazakov, etc.), and linguo-cultural studies (Z. Ambartsumova, Z. Bogus, Y. Bashkatova, etc.). On the basis of the analysis of definitions provided by various scholars, as well as of our own observations, the following working definition was formulated, thus: *a somatic lexeme (or somatism)* [*< Greek soma – body*] is a simple (e.g. "head", "рука") or a compound (e.g. "lily-livered", "король-серце")

word that defines parts of body, bones and their unions, internal organs, blood circulatory system, organs of senses, diseases, illnesses of a human being, an animal or a fictional character (e.g. "monster's horns"). A somatism may be a component of a free word combination or of a phraseological unit and can belong to various parts of speech, e.g. "nose" (n), "to elbow" (v), "milk-livered" (adj.), etc.

In the present research we adhere to the classification of somatisms elaborated by R. Muhi [3, p. 14–15]. According to this scholar, the somatic lexemes can be differentiated on the basis of the character of their nomination and functions as follows:

- 1) somonimic lexis (*сомонімізми*) – names of parts of body;
- 2) osteonimic lexis (*остеонімізми*) – bones and their unions;
- 3) splanchnonimic lexis (*спланхнонімізми*) – internal organs;
- 4) angionimic lexis – blood circulatory system;
- 5) sensorimic lexis – organs of senses;
- 6) lexis that denotes diseases, illnesses.

On the basis of the quantitative analysis conducted, we have compiled the list of somatisms (somonimic, osteonimic, splanchnonimic, and sensorimic lexis) used in the tragedy "King Lear". Fig. 1 represents somonimisms and sensorimisms with the number of times they were used in the tragedy:



The last four lexemes in the table present a particular interest as far as they acquire contextual meaning of the somatism in the text. Moreover, there is still no unanimous opinion concerning the meaning of the lexeme “fork” in the line “*Whose face between her forks presages snow*” [13, p. 915]. Contextual analysis presupposes that the lexeme discussed stands for the part of body. In his “General Glossary to Shakespeare’s Works”, literary historian A. Dyce puts the following question: “does not *Whose face presages snow between her forks*, that is “Whose face presages that snow lies inter femora”, agree better than the other construction and explanation of the passage with what presently follows, – *Down from the waist, etc.?*” [11, p. 295–296]. An absolutely different meaning is proposed by Dr. Warburton [11, p. 295], who explicates the following meaning: the lady bashfully hides her face with the hand, however, in reality she is a cruel person. Panas Myrnyi’s translation reads: “*Сором ’язливо*

*очи / Потупила й обличчям видає, / Немов вона з гріхом не зналася ніколи*”; [8, p. 641]. Vasyl Barka provides the following translation: “*чий вид в розвилці зачіски віщує сніг*” [4, p. 120]. Other translators omit this image – P. Kulish: “*Подумаєш, що в неї сніг у жилах*” [7, p. 122], M. Rylskyi: “*Що на виду зима холодна в неї*” [6, p. 319], O. Hriaznov has not translated this stanza at all [5, p. 94]. In Fig. 2 the frequency of usage of osteonimisms and splanchnonimisms is provided, while in Fig. 3 we observe that W. Shakespeare also uses parts of animals’ body so as to refer to the parts of body of Goneril and Regan.

Moreover, it is throughout the entire play that the author compares king’s two elder daughters with wild animals. The reproduction of the somatisms from Figure 3 did not constitute difficulties for the translators.

In Renaissance, the human body was no more viewed as “the chains of soul”, and “cult

Fig. 1

Somatism	No	Somatism	No	Somatism	No
Eye	38	Lip	5	Back	1
Hand	30	Nose	5	Knee	1
Head	24	Leg	4	Sides	1
Arm	12	Belly	3	Toe	1
Face	10	Brow	3	Waist	1
Body	8	Cheek	3	To elbow (v)	1
Beard	7	Heels	3	<i>Costard (= head – applied derisively)</i>	1
Bosom	6	Chin	2	<i>Forks (= femora: A. Dyce “A General Glossary to Shakespeare’s works”; = “legs”: D. Crystal, B. Crystal “Shakespeare’s Words: a Glossary and Language Companion”; = hand with the fingers spread out by Warburton)</i>	1
Ear	6	Loin	2	<i>Top (= head)</i>	1
Foot	6	Nail	2	<i>Trunk (= body)</i>	1
Hair	5	Neck	2		

Fig. 2

Somatism	No	Somatism	No	Somatism	No
Heart	59	<i>Soul</i>	3	Stomach	1
Mouth	7	Bone	2	Throat	1
Tongue	7	Liver	2		
Tooth	5	Womb	2		
Brains	4	Germens	1		

Fig. 3

Somatism	No	Somatism	No	Somatism	No
Horns	2	Beak	1	Fang	1

of beauty” becomes the dominant topic in literature. Still, in “King Lear”, W. Shakespeare did not use somatisms so as to praise the beauty of his characters. It was not peculiar for his works generally: just to recollect his Sonnet 130 [13, p. 1241]. However, what we observe is that he still uses a great variety of somatic lexemes. According to L. Zhdanova, “functional loading of somatic lexemes in various types of discourse is different. Thus, in the medical text, the advertising or in the sport commentary, the nominative usage of somatisms is the predominant one” [2, p. 39]. While in the artistic work, according to this scholar, they can have two functions: 1) the description of the appearance, and 2) the expression of emotions, state of mind, psychological characteristics. However, to our viewpoint and on the basis of the analysis of the text in question, the somatic lexemes may also exercise the function of intensification of the symbols of the text, for instance the physical blindness versus the metaphorical blindness. Moreover, there are some excerpts in the text where such usage unveils certain folklore motives and traditions and, therefore, should be reproduced in the target text. Thus, for instance, somatisms “*lily-livered*” [13, p. 897], “*milk-livered*” [13, p. 911] describe the villain. According to T. Thiselton-Dyer, “cowards are said to “have livers as white as milk [...]” Macbeth, too, (v. 3) calls one of his frightened soldiers a “lily-liver’d boy”. And in “King Lear” (ii. 2), the Earl of Kent makes use of the same phrase. In illustration of this notion Mr Douce quotes from Bartholomew Glantville, who says – “Reed clothes have been layed upon deed men in remembrance of theyr hardynes and boldnes, whyle they were in theyr bloudd”. The absence of blood in the liver as the supposed property of a coward, originated, says Dr Bucknill, in the old theory of the circulation of the blood” [14, p. 449]. Another sample is the mutilation of Gloucester’s beard (the lexeme that was used in the tragedy 7 times) that was considered an irreparable outrage.

On the basis of the quantitative analysis conducted, we came to the conclusion that there are two lexemes – “*eye*” (used 38 times) and “*heart*” (59 times) – that serve as the sym-

bols in the present play and, therefore, should be correspondingly reproduced in the translations. In Fig. 4 there is the number of times these lexemes are used in other Shakespeare’s tragedies.

Fig. 4

Shakespeare’s Tragedy	“Heart”	“Eye”
Antony and Cleopatra	53	22
Coriolanus	48	16
Hamlet	36	23
Julius Caesar	39	14
King Lear	59	38
Macbeth	29	11
Othello	39	12
Romeo and Juliet	40	30
Timon of Athens	34	16
Titus Andronicus	46	15
Troilus and Cressida	43	32

What we observe, is that the present play contains the largest number of them. The motif of love (symbolized by the somonism “*heart*”) and the ability to see it, as well as the true state of things (symbolized by the somonism “*eye*”) is also met in Sonnet 46 “*Mine eye and heart are at a mortal war*” [13, p. 1230]. In the tragedy, King Lear addresses Cupid with the words: “*No, do thy worst, blind Cupid; I’ll not love*” [13, p. 915] that echo with the lines from “*A Midsummer Night’s Dream*”: “*Love looks not with the eyes, but with the mind; / And therefore is wing’d Cupid painted blind*” [13, p. 281]. “Both Lear and Gloucester are the victims of filial ingratitude; the blinding of Gloucester is the physical equivalent to the madness of Lear; and both, as a result of their terrible experiences though in very different degrees achieve more wisdom at the end than they had at the beginning” [12, p. 137]. The lexeme “*eye*”, one of the symbols of the tragedy, is used throughout the play. The following excerpts illustrate Lear’s failure to *see* the reality. He believes sweet words of love of Goneril and Regan. Kent tries to warn him: “*See better, Lear*” [13, p. 887], he asks him to remain “*true blank of thine eye*” [13, p. 887]. In response Lear dismisses Kent: “*out of my sight*” [13, p. 887]. The Fool summarizes: “*So, out went the candle, and we were*

Fig. 5

	Heart	Eye		Heart	Eye		Heart	Eye
Original	59	38	P. Kulish	63	44	Vasyl Barka	46	50
Panas Myrnyi	68	62	M. Rylskyi	59	33	O. Hriaznov	23	38



*left darkling*” [13, p. 893]. In the end of the play King states: “*Who are you? / Mine eyes are not o’ the best: – I’ll tell you straight*” [13, p. 923]. The following are some other cases of such usage: Goneril orders to pluck out Gloucester’s eyes [13, p. 908]. And later in the play Gloucester says that he arranged for Lear to be sent to Dover “*Because I would not see thy cruel nails / Pluck out his poor old eyes*” [13, p. 909]. Another case is when the Old Man says that Gloucester cannot see his way, the latter answers: “*I have no way, and therefore want no eyes*” [13, p. 910], however then he changes his mind: “*O dear son Edgar [...] / Might I but live to see thee in my touch, / I’d say I had eyes again!*” [13, p. 910]. The present somonism is also used in the description of crying Cordelia: “*guests were in her eyes*” [13, p. 912], or “*The holy water from her heavenly eyes*” [13, p. 912], or “*with washt eyes*” [13, p. 888]. Mad Lear, who meets Gloucester without his eye sockets says: “*I remember thine eyes well enough*” [13, p. 915], however then he states: “*No eyes in your head, nor no money in your purse? Your eyes are in a heavy case, your purse in a light: yet you see how this world goes*” [13, p. 915], or later in the play: “*A man may see how this world goes with no eyes*” [13, p. 915], etc. This predominance of the somonism, even in lines where its meaning is implied by means of non-somatic lexis, e.g. “*So, out went the candle, and we were left darkling*” [13, p. 893], makes us assume its importance as a symbol of the tragedy decoded by the SL author. Therefore, a translator should pay particular attention to its reproduction.

Another somonism “*heart*” is used in the play 59 times. We are positive that the very name of the youngest daughter already contains the present splanchnonimism. The Latin lexeme “*cor*” is translated as “*heart*”. It may also be the modification of the Latin lexeme “*cordolia*” (Nominative / Accusative / Vocative case, Plural) – “*anguish of body and mind*”, “*heart-grief*”. The central motive of the “*heart*” can be observed in the translation of the last passage of the play that can be viewed as the quintessence of the tragedy. Let us consider the translations: “*Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say*” [13, p. 923], “*казати – що на серці, а не – що належить*” [4, p. 150], “*Говоримо, що серце наше чує, / Не те, що випадало б говорити*” [7, p. 159], “*То вилиймо ж у слово серця жар*” [6, p. 343], generalization applied in the translations by Panas Myrnyi and O. Hriaznov [8, p. 682; 5, p. 125]. As it has already been mentioned, the appropriate reproduc-

tion of the somonism in question is important from the viewpoint of adequate reception of the target audience and proper decoding of author’s encoded symbol.

In *Figure 5*, the results of the comparative quantitative analysis of usage of somatims “*heart*” and “*eye*” in the original and translations are provided. What we observe is that in O. Hriaznov’s translation they are used rarely – the possible reason is that in the translation one of the dominant strategies is the generalization technique; the closest number is in the translation by M. Rylskyi, while the translation where the lexemes outnumber is the one done by Panas Myrnyi, who used somatims mainly as components of Ukrainian phraseological units.

The results of the analysis have shown that King Lear uses somatic lexemes in his speech mainly in curses to his daughters and nature that, according to Shakespearean scholars symbolizes a woman. Therefore, we observe the negative attitude to women as those, who give life to “*ingrateful*” people: “*Into her womb convey sterility! / Dry up in her the organs of increase*”; [13, p. 894], or “*Strike flat the thick rotundity o’ the world!*” [13, p. 903] (meaning pregnancy), or “*Down from the waist they are Centaurs, / Though women all above*” [13, p. 915].

The splanchnonimism in the phrase “*child of spleen*” [13, p. 894] was translated in the following ways: O. Hriaznov omits the lexeme “*spleen*” [5, p. 27], Vasyl Barka translates it as “*маруда*” [4, p. 46], while other translators view it as the adjective that bears the pejorative connotation – “*виродка презлючого*” [8, p. 548], “*дитину злюцу*” [7, p. 34], “*хирляву потвору*” [6, p. 298]. “*Spleen*” is the somatism that was regarded in medieval physiology as the seat of morose feelings and bad temper. “*The spleen stood for malice and spite and bad temper, an overly evil emotions [...]*” [9, p. 186]. The same idea is expressed by D. Crystal in “*Shakespeare’s Words: a Glossary and Language Companion*”: spleen “*1. temper, spirit, passion [part of the body seen as the source of both gloomy and mirthful emotions]*” [10, p. 413]. Thus, the somatic lexeme contains the implied additional connotation that might not be inferred by the target audience due to the cultural and historic differences, therefore needs closer attention on the side of a translator. The similar usage is observed with the somatism “*liver*” which refers to “*cowardice*”.

The analysis has shown that the somatic lexemes in the speech of the Fool are used as simple words not marked by any stylistic device,

in contrast to such usage by other characters, especially by King Lear (e.g. “*marble-hearted*” [13, p. 893], “*brazen-faced*” [13, p. 897], “*the eye of anguish*” [13, p. 913], etc.), therefore, they did not pose difficulty for the translators. Nevertheless, such usage is viewed as the implicature of certain meanings and allegory.

Another compound word that contains the somatic element in “King Lear” is “*dog-hearted*” [13, p. 912] – the adjective that the Earl of Kent uses so as to characterize Lear’s daughters. Let us consider the translations: “*другим двом дочкам, / В котрих, мов в вовка, хиже серце*” [8, p. 630], “*Собакосерді*” [7, p. 112], “*Недобрі дочки*” [6, p. 360], “*Собакосерді дочки*” [4, p. 113], “*Старші сестри*” [5, p. 86]. The constituent “*heart*” was translated by P. Kulish and Vasyl Barka, who preserved the compound word of the original. Panas Myrnyi transforms it into a simile, however, substitutes the lexeme “*dog*” with the lexeme “*вовк*”. M. Rylskyi explicates the meaning – in the dictionary by D. Crystal “*dog-hearted*” means “cruel, callous, malevolent” [10, p. 137], and O. Hriaznov omits the evaluative seme – instead of the description of their traits, i.e. their cruelty, the translator introduces the description of their age. Thus, the poetization of the lexeme “*heart*” and its usage as the symbol are lost.

In the tragedy, King Lear enumerates names of dogs – “*Tray, Blanch, and Sweetheart*” [13, p. 908] – thus referring, in accordance with Shakespeare’s scholars, to his three daughters. As far as the constituent “*Sweetheart*”, to our viewpoint, refers to Cordelia, the component “*heart*” should be reproduced in translation. According to Z. Bogus, “onims that are shaped on the basis of names of body parts and that can be defined as *somatonims* are referred to the anthropocentric sphere that forms the semantics of onims” [1, p. 20]. Thus, “*Sweetheart*” is viewed as the somatonim that is formed from the somatic lexeme “*heart*” and the characteristics on the basis of which the nomination is given with the help of the formula “a qualitative adjective + a somatic lexeme”. Let us consider the translations: “*Білка, й Рябка, й Любка!*” [8, p. 608], “*Кудлай, Біляк, Любимчик*” [7, p. 91], “*Трей, Бляни, Мільянка*” [4, p. 97], “*Трей, Бляни і Мілька*” [5, p. 69], the somatonims were not reproduced [6, p. 343].

Panas Myrnyi and P. Kulish reproduce the seme “*love*” that fits the content, however, while in Panas Myrnyi’s translation names refer to feminine gender that is appropriate as far as they refer to King’s daughters, then in P. Kulish’s

translation they are of masculine gender. We did not find the lexeme “*Мільянка*” in any dictionary to which we had access, however, the lexeme can be the modification of the lexeme “*милий*” and the ending – *a* shows that it is of feminine gender. The lexeme “*Мілька*” does not bear the meaning “*sweetheart*” and does not contain the component “*heart*”, and is rather the modification of the lexeme “*мілький*”, i.e. “small, shallow”.

On the basis of the analysis conducted, the conclusion can be drawn that all Ukrainian translators have relatively successfully reproduced the somatic lexemes of the original, nevertheless, it is rather often that the stylistic devices used are not preserved, but for the translation by Vasyl Barka. In the translation by O. Hriaznov the method of generalization predominates and omissions of not only somatisms, but also certain stanzas of the source text are detected. The quantitative analysis has shown that the number of usage of the somatism “*heart*” in the target text is equal to the one in the source text in the translation by M. Rylskyi, and of the lexeme “*eye*” in the translation by O. Hriaznov. While in the translation by Panas Myrnyi such numbers almost double, nevertheless, it can be explained by the fact that his translation is larger than the source text.

On the basis of the analysis of peculiarities of reproduction of somatic lexemes in five Ukrainian translations, we came up with the following classification of the methods of somatisms’ translation:

1) full equivalent – a somatic lexeme is preserved in the target text and is represented with the same part of speech and the same stylistic register;

2) partial equivalent:

a) a somatic lexeme is preserved in the target text and is represented with the same part of speech, however the register of the source text lexeme and the target text lexeme differs;

b) a somatic lexeme of one semantic field is substituted with a somatic lexeme of another semantic field;

c) a somatic lexeme is represented in the translation, however a different part of speech is used;

d) a somatic lexeme is translated with the lexeme that represents the meaning of the somatic word, however is not a somatism itself;

e) a lexeme that represents the meaning of the somatic word, however is not a somatism itself, is translated with a somatism or a collocation that contains the somatic lexeme.

3) zero equivalent – the translator omits the somatic element.



## REFERENCES:

1. Богус З.А. Соматизмы в разносистемных языках: семантико-словообразовательный и лингвокультурологический аспекты (на материале русского, адыгейского и английского языков) : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.02 «Языки народов Российской Федерации (кавказские языки)», 10.02.20 «Сравнительно-историческое, типологическое и сопоставительное языкознание» / З.А. Богус ; Адыгейский государственный университет. – Майкоп, 2006. – 25 с.
2. Жданова Л.А. Соматизмы в языке и в художественном тексте / Л.А. Жданова // Текст. структура и семантика : Доклады VIII Междунар. конф. МГОПУ им. М.А. Шолохова. – 2001. – Т. 2. – С. 36–42.
3. Мугу Р.Ю. Полисемантизм соматической лексики (на материале русского и немецкого языков : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 «Русский язык», 10.02.20 «Сравнительно-историческое, типологическое и сопоставительное языкознание» / Р.Ю. Мугу ; Адыгейский государственный университет. – Майкоп, 2003. – 23 с.
4. Шекспір В. Король Лір / В. Шекспір ; пер. Василя Барки. – Штутгарт – Нью Йорк – Оттава : На горі, 1969. – 151 с.
5. Шекспір В. Король Лір / В. Шекспір ; пер. О.А. Грязнова // В. Шекспір : трагедії та хроніки. – К. : Задруга, 2008. – Кн. 2. – С. 3–125.
6. Шекспір В. Король Лір / В. Шекспір ; пер. М. Рильського // Вільям Шекспір : у 6-ти т. – К. : Дніпро, 1986. – Т. 5. – С. 235–343.
7. Шекспір У. Король Лір / У. Шекспір ; пер. П.А. Куліша. – Львів : Українсько-руська видавнича спілка, 1902. – 164 с.
8. Шекспір. Король Лір / Шекспір ; пер. Панаса Мирного // Панас Мирний (П.Я. Рудченко) : Зібрання творів у семи томах. – К. : Наукова думка, 1970. – Т. 6. – С. 511–682.
9. Berman J.A. Understanding Surgery: a comprehensive guide for every family / J.A. Berman. – Boston : Branded Books, 2002. – 494 p.
10. Crystal D. Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary and Language Companion / D. Crystal, B. Crystal. – London : Penguin Books, 2002. – 676 p.
11. Dyce A. A General Glossary to Shakespeare's Works / A. Dyce. – Boston : Dana Estes and Company Publishers, 1904. – 438 p.
12. Spencer T. Shakespeare and the Nature of Man: Lowell Lectures / T. Spencer. – New York : Macmillan Company, 1961. – 233 p.
13. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. – Hertfordshire : Wordsworth Editions, 1996. – 1263 p.
14. Thislton-Dyer T.F. Folk-lore of Shakespeare / T.F. Thislton-Dyer. – New York : Harper and Brothers, 1884. – 559 p.