A. Rolik
Associated professor of Mykola Gogol Nishyn State University

Pejorative vocabulary in the works of Mykola Gogol and its rendering in German translations

The article is dedicated to the contrastive analysis of the contstituents of insulting illocutionary acts in the discourses of the words by M. V. Gogol and their German translations. The main attention deals with lexical means of insulting however the dominance of the speaker's intention is to degradate the hearer.

The need for comparative study of speech acts, in particular on the material of translations of works of fiction, is determined by the accumulated volume of knowledge about speech acts and the need to separate the universal provisions of the theory of speech acts from nationally relevant ones.

The aim of the article is a comparative analysis of the constituents of illocutionary acts of insult in the discourse of works by M. V. Gogol and their German translations, as fiction models reality, and therefore the texts of fiction are the most accessible source for considering the features of these speech acts.

As one of the initial stages, a comparative study of speech acts presupposes the isolation of their invariant and variational parts. The invariant part of speech acts consists of the essential, characterological constituents, and the variational constituents are insignificant. Essential constituents are fixed, or preset, and nonessential ones are non-fixed, or not pre-set. In the descriptions of speech acts only fixed constituents are subject to specification. If some constituent turns out to be unspecified, this does not mean that it is not present at all, but it only testifies to the fact that this speech act is not sensitive to it, i. e. with respect to this speech act this constituent is not relevant. There are also such constituents which may remain non-actualized.

By insult we understand the inflicting of a heavy verbal grievance and thus it is this that differs it from a curse and ordinary abuse. After all, even if under certain circumstances something that is not directly addressed to the addressee can be perceived by him as offensive, then this happens despite the speaker's intention. And in the speech act of insult, the speaker realizes his emotionally motivated intention of humiliating the addressee. If the addressee is present, then if he does not silently take down the insult, then in this dialogical situation he will react either with a response insult or with protesting objections. In the absence of the addressee, this speech act will take the form of a monologue.

According to some researchers, the verbal act of insult is aimed specifically at its public implementation, in which the most complete communicative effect is achieved, because in the absence of witnesses, it is only a cathartic reaction to interpersonal relations with the goal of getting rid of negative emotions and redistributing the existing interpersonal status.

The speaker can insult a person by using various lexical means, endowing him with various negative qualities, attributing to him deviations from the generally accepted norms of behavior or by identifying him with something that is perceived by others unequivocally negatively. In this case, the lexical unit must have an appropriate denotative or connotative value components.

The possibilities for translating maledictory vocabulary are determined by its belonging to either absolute abusive words, which are fixed in dictionaries as such, or relative ones when they are only in a certain context.

Abusive and coarse-vernacular vocabulary carries an extremely large stylistic load. It is comparatively easier to find it's equivalent rendering, than that of proper or colloquial-vernacular words.

Objective factors which predetermine the choice of a proper equivalent are supplemented by subjective factors that depend on the translator's individuality, determined by his artistic perception, personal qualities and the peculiarity of the selection of linguistic means in the process of translation.

Key words: *contrastive analysis, illocutionary act, insult, translation, lexical means, speaker, hearer.*

The need for comparative study of speech acts, in particular on the material of translations of works of fiction, is determined by the accumulated volume of knowledge about speech acts and the need to separate the universal provisions of the theory of speech acts from nationally relevant ones. In addition, the relevance of such studies stems from the fact that the core of the theory of speech acts has a supranational character, and therefore it is possible to determine whether a statement is universal or nationally relevant only through comparative analysis.

The theory of speech acts is traditionally associated with the book of the English logician J. Austin "How to do things with words", although the problems of the study of speech acts were considered in the scholarly works of W. Humboldt, Ch. Bally, C. Buehler, E. Benveniste, L. Wittgenstein. J. Austin's ideas were developed by J. Serle and P. Stroson, who defined the concept of three levels of speech act: illocution, perlocution and locution. Further development of the concept of speech activity necessitated the construction of a general communicative theory and its concretization, which would take into account the experience and experimental studies of psycholinguistics, text theory and functional linguistics. This led to a transition from an analysis of the theoretical language constructor to a comprehensive study of communication in the aggregate of all its components [7, p. 130–131].

The aim of the article is a comparative analysis of the constituents of illocutionary acts of insult in the discourse of works by M. V. Gogol

and their German translations, as fiction models reality, and therefore the texts of fiction are the most accessible source for considering the features of these speech acts.

As one of the initial stages, a comparative study of speech acts presupposes the isolation of their invariant and variational parts. The invariant part of speech acts consists of the essential, characterological constituents, and the variational constituents are insignificant. Essential constituents are fixed, or preset, and nonessential ones are non-fixed, or not pre-set. In the descriptions of speech acts only fixed constituents are subject to specification. If some constituent turns out to be unspecified, this does not mean that it is not present at all, but it only testifies to the fact that this speech act is not sensitive to it, i. e. with respect to this speech act this constituent is not relevant. There are also such constituents which may remain non-actualized.

Differences between languages in the field of speech acts are determined, first of all, by the following two points: 1) language differences and 2) cultural differences. The differences themselves are of two types: linguistic and non-linguistic. Language differences are reduced to the difference in the formed constituents of the speech act (i. e. utterances), and non-linguistic differences – mainly to the difference of forming constituents. The differences in the formed constituents are mainly determined by the differences between languages, and the differences in the forming constituents are due to the difference in cultures.

In view of the fact that speech acts are sensitive to the cultural component, it becomes possible to vary within the same language, but different cultures. So, for example, there is an act of speech duel, which is characteristic only of the Negro population of New York. It is a verbal contest and it boils down to mutual insult. The winner is chosen by the spectators as the one who more skillfully parries the "blows" of the opponent and deals "blows himself [6, p. 133–134].

Such speech acts are ritual and have been known since the days of Ancient Greece, where during the Eleusinian festivals, during the passage of a procession along a bridge, exchanges of jokes and tricks were made, which were called "hepherisms. A similar form of ritual insult can be found in ancient poetry, where they precede armed fights of heroes [Ibid].

However, unlike the ritual insults mentioned above, they should have hurt the enemy so emotionally that he was ready to move from a verbal confrontation to an armed one. A vivid example of such a ritual insult to the enemy before the start of a battle is given by Mykola Gogol in the story "Taras Bulba [2, p. 128–129]:

"Two Cossacks moved forward from the Zaporozhye ranks. One was still quite young, the other was older, both sharp-tongued at words, in fact they were not bad Cossacks either: Okhrim Nash and Mykita Golokopytenko. Demid Popovich, a stocky Cossack, rode after them ... And Popovich, he was strong at the caustic word:

"... You must be a brave army for sleepy people!" Golokopytenko said, glancing at the rampart.

"Just joy, we'll cut your forelocks! Others shouted from above.

"And I would like to see how they will trim our forelocks!"

Popovich said, turning on his horse in front of them. And then, glancing at his own people, he said: "Well, the Poles might be right. If they are led be the fat one, they'll be protected well enough".

"Why do you think it will be good protection for them? The Cossacks said, knowing that Popovitch, indeed, was already preparing to crack a joke.

"Well, because the whole army will hide behind him, and you'll never reach anyone with a spear because of his belly!

All Cossacks laughed...

"Retreat, retreat faster from the walls!" cried the leader. The Poles seemed unable to stand the caustic word and the colonel waved his hand.

As soon as the Cossacks stepped aside, there was a case-shot from the rampart".

By insult we understand the inflicting of a heavy verbal grievance and thus it is this that differs it from a curse and ordinary abuse. After all, even if under certain circumstances something that is not directly addressed to the addressee can be perceived by him as offensive, then this happens despite the speaker's intention. And in the speech act of insult, the speaker realizes his emotionally motivated intention of humiliating the addressee. If the addressee is present, then if he does not silently take down the insult, then in this dialogical situation he will react either with a response insult or with protesting objections. In the absence of the addressee, this speech act will take the form of a monologue.

The illocutionary act of insult is preceded by a gross violation of the expected behavioral norm by one of the participants.

By means of an illocutionary act of insult, the speaker may pursue the following intentions regarding the addressee: 1) suppression of him, 2) humiliation, 3) insult, 4) irritation, 5) defeating him in a verbal duel. If the illocutionary act of insult occurs in public, then we can talk about the

intention to discredit and humiliate the addressee in the eyes of those present. In relation to the speaker himself, there is observed satisfaction of the need for self-expression and increasing personal status.

According to some researchers, the verbal act of insult is aimed specifically at its public implementation, in which the most complete communicative effect is achieved, because in the absence of witnesses, it is only a cathartic reaction to interpersonal relations with the goal of getting rid of negative emotions and redistributing the existing interpersonal status [12]. Interestingly, confirmation of it can be found in the works of Mykola Gogol, for example, the following excerpt:

"When, during the utterance of this word without witnesses, Ivan Ivanovich lost his temper and got into such anger, in which God forbid to see a man – what now, judge, my dear readers, what now, when this murderous word was uttered in the meeting, in which were a lot of ladies, before whom Ivan Ivanovich liked to be especially decent?..

He cast a glance at Ivan Nikiforovich – and what a glance! If executive power were attached to this glance, it would turn Ivan Nikiforovich into dust" [2, p. 218].

The speaker can insult a person by using various lexical means, endowing him with various negative qualities, attributing to him deviations from the generally accepted norms of behavior or by identifying him with something that is perceived by others unequivocally negatively. In this case, the lexical unit must have an appropriate denotative or connotative value component, which the speaker uses. The insult lexemes most frequently used in illocutionary acts in the works by M. V. Gogol analyzed by us can be divided into four main groups:

1) emotionally neutral lexical units, the meaning of which contains semes with conceptually negative appraisal elements: зверь (beast), бревно (log), сухарь (biscuit), лгунья (liar);

2) emotionally negatively colored LU, which do not contain evaluation elements: баба (a woman), дурак (a fool),сумасшедший (a madman);

3) emotionally colored LU containing semes with conceptually negative appraisal elements: негодяй (scoundrel), дрянь (rubbish), срамница (sham), негодница (rascal), пьяница (drunkard), сатана (satan), ведьма (witch);

4) swear words: скотина (cattle), сука (bitch).

Using the words of the first group, the speaker aims at giving a negative assessment to the addressee and humiliating him. Lexems of the second group, whose meaning is devoid of evaluation, convey

additional information about the speaker's emotionally negative attitude toward the referent. The addressee, in turn, must feel emotionally rejected and discredited. Accordingly, when using the words of the third group, negative evaluative conceptual elements may dominate, respectively, through which the speaker demonstrates either a negative evaluation or negative emotions towards the addressee. The words of the fourth group, in addition to showing on emotionally negative attitude towards the addressee, signal the intention of the speaker to insult and humiliate him.

The classic function of abusive words is to insult the addressee and at the same time release the speaker from negative emotions. However, in the absence of an addressee, only a part of this function is realized, namely, relieving him of negative emotions [5; 12].

The possibilities for translating maledictory vocabulary are determined by its belonging to either absolute abusive words, which are fixed in dictionaries as such, or relative ones when they are only in a certain context [5, p. 13].

Abusive and coarse-vernacular vocabulary carries an extremely large stylistic load. It is comparatively easier to find it's equivalent rendering, than that of proper or colloquial-vernacular words.

Objective factors which predetermine the choice of a proper equivalent are supplemented by subjective factors that depend on the translator's individuality, determined by his artistic perception, personal qualities and the peculiarity of the selection of linguistic means in the process of translation.

The study of high-frequency polysemantic colloquial words of the poem "Dead Souls мошенник "swindler, подлец scoundrel and дрянь "trash (each having 20 usages) indicates that their completely equivalent reproduction in German translation is rare. As a rule, they acquire a rather long list of partial and relative equivalents representing them in translation. Some of them are also repeated, some are used singly. For example, for the 20 instances of usage of the word подлец "scoundrel in the original there are also 20 in translation, of which the absolute majority (14) belongs to the full equivalent Schurke, four partial equivalents Schelm, Spitzbube, Schuft and two lexical substitutions.

A different situation is observed with two other words мошенникscam and дрянь trash.

In the original, the word мошенник swindler occurs 20 times, in translation – 15. At the same time, the equivalent of Spitzbube accounts for only half of the translations used (7), and the rest are distributed

among four partial ones Schelm (1), Bösewicht (2), Schuft (1), Schurke (4). In five cases lexical changes are observed, in most cases the invariant value is transferred to another element of the message.

As for the lexeme дрянь trash, in the original of the poem we registered 19 word – usages, which in the translation correspond to only three equivalents (Nichtigkeit). In other cases, there are different types of translation transformations.

The use of a complex methodology for studying the lexeme, taking into account and generalizing the ability of the word as a unit of nomination of the reflected area of reality and the property of designating a single referent in a particular situation, allows us to deeper penetrate into the semantic potential of a given word.

The semantic structure of the word дрянь trash consists of 10–12 lexico-semantic variants (LSVs) with expanded definitions. There are three main meanings in it, that are fixed by dictionaries as LSVs:

I. What is unprofitable and unnecessary; rubbish, nonsense. II. What is bad, naity, of poor quality. III. About a bad, worthless, nasty person.

In the German translation, the implementation of these variant meanings, organized by these archesemes, is observed, cf., for example:

I) 1. … а умершие души в некотором роде совершенная дрянь.

... and the dead souls are in some way perfect trash [3, p. 49].

... daß aber todte Seelen, sozusagen, völlige Nichigkeiten wären [11, p. 49].

2. … а поступил как бы совершенно чужой, за дрянь взял деньги.

... and acted as if completely alien, he took money as if it were rubbish [3, p. 108].

... er benahm sich wie mit einem ganz Unbekannten, für Nichts nahm er Geld! [11, p. 150].

3. … наговорил такую дрянь, что даже им обоим сделалось совестно.

... heuttered such rubbish that even they both became ashamed [3, p. 196].

... und solchen Unsinn sprach, daß sie sich Beide schämen mußten [11, p. 304].

II) 4. Селифан … вытащил тут же из-под козел какую-то дрянь из серого сукна, надел ее в рукава …

Selifan ... pulled out from under the coach-box some rubbish made of gray cloth, put it into his sleeves ... [3, p. 52].

Selizhan ... warf rasch eine Art von Mantel um, den er hinter dem Bocke hervorgezogen ... [11, p. 56].

5.   … в вино мешает всякую дрянь.

... he adds all sorts of rubbish to the wine [3, p. 71].

... er fälscht den Wein mit gebrannten Stöpseln, mit geriebenem Flieder [11, p. 91].

6.   … сегодня за обедом объелся всякой дряни…

... today at dinner I ate all sorts of rubbish ... [3, p. 197].

... ich habe heute bei Tische, der liebe Himmel weiß was zusammengegessen, ich fühle schon ein Gepolter im Magen [11, p. 304].

III)   7. – Такая дрянь! – говорил Ноздрев, стоя перед окном и глядя на уезжающий экипаж. – Вон как потащился! Да ведь с ним нельзя никак сойтиться …

"Such a rotter!" – said Nozdryov, standing in front of the window and looking at the departing coach. "See how he departs! ...

I cannot meet him half-way ... " [3, p. 81].

"Abscheulicher Kerl! Sagte Nosdrew, am Fenster stehend und dem Wagen nachsehend [11, p. 108].

8. – Дрянь же ты!

– The rotter! [3, p. 84].

"So bist du ein Esel! [11, p. 114].

9. Из нее все можно сделать, она может быть чудо, а может выйти и дрянь, и выйдет дрянь!

Everything can be done out ofher, she can be a miracle, and she can turn no be rubbish, and there will be rubbish! [3, p. 94].

"Aus ihr läßt sich nun Alles formen, ein Prachtwerk, oder ein verkrüppeltes Wesen! [11, p. 128].

Thus, the three lexemes under consideration, giving 59 usages in the original poem by M. V. Gogol "Dead Souls are represented in the German translation by the use of 20 lexemes (the total number of usages is 54). The average frequency of their use is, respectively, 20 in the original and only 2. 7 in translation. Such a sharp decrease in the average frequency of using a lexical unit constantly distinguishes the text translated, which is characterized simultaneously by a sharp increase in the vocabulary due to synonymous series.

As regards the metaphorical pejorative vocabulary, it should be borne in mind that a metaphor based on a specific vocabulary is not derived from the meaning of the word and not even from the logical concept, but rather from the current ideas about the class of realities, because of the conventioned established usage.

In the translation of metaphors, all the tasks inherent in the translation are concentrated and clearly manifested, namely, they are aimed at bringing the reader of the translation as close as possible to the native speaker of the source language so that he can draw the full depth of meaning and associations embedded in the given linguistic figure. Being a means of complex information, a metaphor in translation naturally requires complete preservation of all its informativeness, otherwise there is a threat of loss of its semantic complexity. In this case, it is necessary to achieve an unambiguous presentation for a foreign reader. At the same time, in the metaphor itself, ambiguity, a secondary meaning, which is often of paramount importance, has already been in salled. In addition, the metaphor causes a certain associative chain in the mind, proceeding from the basic lexical image, to recreate which in translation can be very difficult due to cultural differences and, mainly, due to the discrepancy of the lexical-semantic volume of meaning in this pejorative lexicon [1; 4].

Having expounded briefly the main difficulties in translating the metaphorical pejorative vocabulary, let us now turn to the concrete examples of the implementation of translation tasks by comparing the German translations of M. Gogol's works "The Nose, "The Night Before Christmas and "The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikiforovich with the originals. After the analysis we have identified the following main methods:

1) preservation in the target language of the image of the source language, for example:

– "А вы, Иван Иванович, настоящий гусак".

"– And you, Ivan Ivanovich, are a real goose" – "Und Sie, Iwan Iwanowitsch, sind ein richtiger Gänserich" [10, p. 19].

"Вы, Иван Никифорович, разносились со своим ружьем, как дурень с торбою".

"You, Ivan Nikiforovich, are so crazy about your rifle, like a good-sounding chopper, ..." – "Iwan Nikiforowitsch, Sie versteigen sich mit Ihrem Gewehr wie der Narr im Märchen mit dem aufgemalten Futtersack" [10, p. 18–19].

"Где это ты, зверь, отрезал нос? – закричала она с гневом. – Мошенник! Пьяница! Я сама на тебя донесу полиции. Разбойник какой!

– Стой, Прасковья Осиповна! …

– И слушать не хочу! … Сухарь поджаристый! Знай умеет только бритвой возить по ремню, а долга своего скоро совсем не состоянии будет исполнять, потаскушка, негодяй! Чтобы я стала за

тебя отвечать полиции? Ах ты, пачкун, бревно глупое! Вон его! Вон! Неси куда хочешь! Чтобы я духу его не слыхала!"

"Where did you, beast, cut off the nose? she screamed in anger.

– The swindler! drunkard! I'll report you to the police. The robber! "Stop, Praskovya Osipovna! ...

"And I don't want to listen! The roast cracker! You only know how to sharpen a razor against a belt, and you will not be able to perform your debt at all, a slut, a scoundrel! So should I answer for you to the police? Oh, you sloven, stupid log! Get out! Out! Take it where you want! So that I wouldn't hear of him!

Ivan Yakovlevich stood absolutely dead. He thought and thought – and did not know what to think" [2, p. 221–222].

"Wem hast du diese Nase abgeschnitten, du Vieh? kreischte sie wütend. "Du Gauner! Du besoffener Kerl! Ich werde dich selber bei der Polizei anzeigen. So ein Räuber! ...

"Halt, Praskowja Osipowna! ...

"Davon will ich nichts hören! ... Du angebrannter Zwieback! Kann nichts anderes, als sein Messer am Riemen abziehen, und wird bald überhaupt nicht mehr imstande sein, seinem Geschäft nachzugehen, der Herumstreicher, der nichtsnutzige! Ich soll mich deinetwegen vor der Polizei verantworten? ... Ach, du Sudler, du dummer Klotz! Hinaus mit ihr! Hinaus! Bring sie, wohin du willst! Daß ich kein Sterbenswörtchen mehr von ihr höre!"

Iwan Jakowlewitsch blieb wie zerschmettert stehen. Er überlegte, überlegte – und wußte nicht, was er denken sollte [8, p. 83].

2) replacement of a standard image of the source language by a standard image of the target language, for example:

"– чтобы я духу его не слыхала!"

"– So that I wouldn't hearing you!" – "daß ich kein Sterbenswörtchen mehr von ihr höre!" [8, p. 83].

3) translation using an identical metaphor plus a semantic explanation, for example:

"– Так это ты, сука, – сказала дьячиха подступая к ткачихе, – так это ты, ведьма, напускаешь ему туман и поишь нечистым зельем, чтобы ходил к тебе?"

"– So it's you, bitch, said the deacon, approaching the weaver, "so you're a witch, stuperfying him and treating him to an unclean potion to make him come to you? – "Du bist das, du Hündin! Schrie die Frau Vorsängerin und trat vor die Weberin hin. "Du bist das also, du Hexe, die ihm Nebel vor die Augen legt und ihm Tee aus Hexenkräutern einflößt, damit er zu dir kommt? [9, p. 85].

3) semantic translation of the metaphor, for example:

"– Мне странно, Иван Иванович: вы, кажется, человек известный ученостью, а говорите как недоросль".

"It's strange to me, Ivan Ivanovich: you seem to be a man known for learning, but you speak like an ignoramus. – "Das ist doch seltsam, Iwan Iwanowitsch! Man kennt Sie doch, meine ich, als einen gelehrten Menschen, aber Sie reden wie ein unmündiges Kind daher [10, p. 18].

4) omitting the metaphor, for example:

"– Как же вы смели, сударь, позабыв и приличие и уважение к чину и фамилии человека, обесчестить таким поносным именем?"

"– How did you dare, sir, having forgotten both decency and respect for the rank and surname of a person, dishonor such a name?

"– Wie konnten Sie es wagen, sehr geehrter Herr, den Anstand und die Achtung vor dem Rang und dem Namen eines Menschen zu vergessen und ihn mit einem schimpflichen Namen zu belegen? [10, p. 19].

The difficulties in translating maledictory vocabulary are due primarily to cultural taboos, value systems and stereotyped ideas, as many researchers note [5, p. 14] and point out its intensive national specifisity. The search for equivalents in translation should therefore be carried out taking into account the following criteria: a) intensity, b) nature (absolute, relative), c) frequency, d) stylistic colouring.

Література

1. Баран Я. А., Зимомря М. І., Білоус О. М., Зимомря І. М. Фразеологія: знакові величини: навч. посіб. для студ. факультетів іноз. мов. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2008. 256 с.

2. Гоголь Н. В. Повести; Ревизор. Москва: Худож. лит., 1984. 352 с.

3. Гоголь Н. В. Мертвые души: поэма. Москва: Просвещение, 1982. 256 с.

4. Кияк Т. Р., Огуй О. Д., Науменко А. М. Теорія та практика перекладу (німецька мова): підручник для студентів вищих навчальних закладів. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2006. 592 с.

5. Німецько-український словник лайливих слів / укладач О. Гаврилів. Львів: Апріорі, 2005. 144 с.

6. Почепцов О. Г. Речевые акты: универсальное и национально-специфическое. Сопоставительное изучение структурно-семантических и коммуникативных единиц иностранного и родного языков. Киев: КГПИИЯ, 1985. С. 130–134.

7. Селіванова О. О. Актуальні напрями сучасної лінгвістики. Київ: Видво Українського фітосоціологічного центру, 1999. 148 с.

8. Gogol Nikolaj. Die Nase. Petersburger Novellen. München: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag, 1984. S. 82–117.

9. Gogol Nikolai W. Die Nacht vor Weihnachten. Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag, 1981. 93 S.

10. Gogol Nikolaj. Die Geschichte, wie sich Iwan Iwanowitsch mit Iwan Nikiforowitsch zerstritt. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun, 1983. 75 S.

11. Gogol Nikolai. Die toten Seelen. Diogenes Verlag AG Zürich. 368 S.

12. Schumann H. B. Sprecherabsicht: Beschimpfung. ZPSK. 1990. Heft 2. Band 43. S. 259–281.

References

1. Baran, Ja. A., Zimomrja, M. I., Bilous, O. M. & Zimomrja, I. M. (2008). *Phraseology: signs and magnitudes* [Frazeologija: znakovi velichini. Navchal'nij posibnik dlja studentiv fakul'tetiv inozemnih mov]. Vinnytsa: Nova Knyha Publ., 2008. 256 p.

2. Gogol, N. V. (1984). *The story; The Inspector* [Povesti; Revizor]. Moskow, Art. Lit. Publ., 1984. [in Ukrainian].

3. Gogol, N. V. (1982) *Dead Souls: Poem* [Mertvye dushi: pojema]. Moscow, Education Publ., 1982. [in Ukrainian].

4. Kiyak, T. R, Oguy O. D., Naumenko A. M. Theory and practice of translation (German) [Teorija ta praktika perekladu (nimec'ka mova): pidruchnik dlja studentiv vishhih navchal'nih zakladiv]. Vinnitsa, Nova knyha Publ., 2006. 592 p.

5. German-Ukrainian dictionary of maledictory words / O. Havryliv [Nimec'ko-ukraïns'kij slovnik lajlivih sliv / ukladach O. Gavriliv]. Lviv, Apriori Publ., 2005. 144 p.

Pocheptsov, O. G. Speech acts: universal and nationally specific [Rechevye akty: universal'noe i nacional'no-specificheskoe]. *Comparative study of the structural and semantic and communicative units of foreign and native languages [Sopostavitel'noe izuchenie strukturno- semanticheskih i kommunikativnyh edinic inostrannogo i rodnogo jazykov]*. Kyiv, KGPIIYA Publ., 1985. P. 130–134.

7. Selivanova, O. O. *Current Affairs and Directions* [Aktual'ni naprjami suchasnoï lingvistiki]. Kyiv, 1999. 148 p.

8. Gogol Nikolaj. Die Nase. *Petersburger Novellen*. München, Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag Publ., 1984. P. 82–117.

9. Gogol Nikolai W. Die Nacht vor Weihnachten. Frankfurt am Main, Insel Verlag Publ., 1981. 93 p.

10. Gogol Nikolaj. Die Geschichte, wie sich Iwan Iwanowitsch mit Iwan Nikiforowitsch zerstritt. Stuttgart, Philipp Reclamjun, 1983. 75 p.

11. Gogol Nikolai. Die toten Seelen. Diogenes Verlag AG Zürich. 368 p.

12. Schumann H. B. Sprecherabsicht: Beschimpfung. ZPSK. Band 43. 1990. Heft 2. P. 259–281.

_____

А. Ролік
доцент кафедри германської філології Ніжинського державного університету
імені Миколи Гоголя

Пейоративна лексика в творах М. В. Гоголя та її передача в німецьких перекладах

Мета статті полягає в порівняльному аналізі конституентів ілокутивних актів образи в дискурсах творів М. Гоголя та їхніх німецьких перекладах. Основна увага

при цьому приділяється лексичним засобам, оскільки у намірі мовця домінує інтенція принизити адресата.

Необхідність порівняльного вивчення мовних актів, зокрема на матеріалі перекладів творів художньої літератури, визначається вже накопиченим обсягом знань про мовні акти і необхідністю відокремити універсальні положення теорії мовних актів від національно релевантних. Крім цього, актуальність подібних досліджень випливає з того, що ядро теорії мовних актів має наднаціональний характер, а отже, встановити, чи є певний стан універсальним або національно-релевантним, можна лише за допомогою порівняльного аналізу.

Як один із вихідних етапів порівняльне вивчення мовних актів передбачає виділення їх інваріантної і варіативної частин. Інваріантну частину мовних актів складають істотні, характерологічні конституенти, а варіативну – несуттєві. Істотні конституенти є фіксованими, або заданими, а несуттєві нефіксованими, або незаданими. В описах мовних актів специфікації підлягають лише фіксовані конституенти. Якщо якийсь конституент виявляється неспецифікованим, то це ще не означає того, що він взагалі відсутній, а свідчить лише про те, що цей мовний акт до нього не чутливий, тобто стосовно до даного мовного акту цей конституент не є релевантним. Існують і такі конституенти, які можуть залишатися неактуалізованими.

Під образою розуміють нанесення тяжкої словесної образи, і таким чином саме цим вона відрізняється від прокляття і звичайної лайки. Адже навіть якщо за певних обставин щось, що не адресоване безпосередньо адресату, може бути сприйнято ним як образливе для нього, то це відбувається незалежно від інтенції мовця. А в мовному акті образи адресант реалізує свою емоційно мотивовану інтенцію приниження адресата. У разі присутності адресата при цьому, якщо він не буде мовчки зносити образу, у цій діалогічній ситуації він буде реагувати або відповідною образою, або протестуючими запереченнями. У разі відсутності адресата даний мовної акт матиме форму монологу.

На думку деяких дослідників, мовний акт образи спрямований саме на його публічну реалізацію, при якій досягається найбільш повний комунікативний ефект, адже в разі відсутності свідків йдеться тільки про катарсичні реакції на міжособистісні відносини з метою звільнення від негативних емоцій і перерозподілу існуючого міжособистісного статусу.

Інтенцію образити кого-небудь мовець може реалізувати за допомогою різних лексичних засобів, наділяючи адресата різними негативними якостями, приписуючи йому відступи від загальноприйнятих норм поведінки або ж ідентифікуючи його з чимось, що сприймається оточенням однозначно негативно. При цьому лексична одиниця повинна мати відповідний денотативний або конотативний компонент значення, який і використовує мовець.

Можливості перекладу маледиктивної лексики визначаються її належністю або до абсолютних лайливих слів, які зафіксовані в словниках як такі, або до відносних, коли вони є такими лише в певному контексті. Щодо метафоричної пейоративної лексики, слід мати на увазі, що метафора, яка базується на конкретній лексиці, випливає не із значення слова і навіть не із логічного поняття, а скоріше з уявлень, які існують про клас реалій в силу регламентації сталим слововживанням.

Складнощі перекладу маледиктивної лексики обумовлюються, в першу чергу, культурними табу, системами цінностей і стереотипними уявленнями, що відзначають багато дослідників, вказуючи на інтенсивну національну специфіку таких одиниць. Тому пошук еквівалентів при перекладі повинен проводитися з урахуванням певних критеріїв: а) інтенсивності, б) природи (абсолютні, відносні), в) частотності, г) стилістичної забарвленості.

Ключові слова: порівняльний аналіз, ілокутивний акт, образа, переклад, лексичні засоби, мовець, адресат.