

**METHODS OF TRANSMISSION OF THE UKRAINIAN  
NATIONALLY MARKED VOCABULARY IN THE RUSSIAN  
VERSION OF THE NOVEL “BLACK COUNCIL”  
BY PANTELEIMON KULISH**

**Melnyk L. V., Rodiuk N. Y.**

**INTRODUCTION**

One of the actual tasks of modern linguistics is the study of the language of writers in order to understand their contribution to the development of literary language. An important page of science, education, culture, formation of the literary language of the Ukrainian people is the creative heritage left by the writer, interpreter, ethnographer, sociologist, publicist, folklorist, literary critic, journalist, publisher, linguist, historian Panteleimon Kulish. The 200th anniversary of the birth of this outstanding universal individual was celebrated widely in Ukraine in 2019, because the ideas of P. Kulish, in particular his methods of translation, are still of interest.

Today there are a number of scientific works devoted to the study of Panteleimon Kulish's work as a linguist and the language of his works (O. Bandura, I. Hrytsyutenko, N. Krutikova, T. Larina, L. Lushpinska, O. Muromtseva, N. Rodiuk, L. Skrypnyk, V. Chaplenko, Y. Sheveliov, N. Yatsenko and others).

P. Kulish entered Ukrainian literature primarily as the author of the first historical novel “Black Council” (1857), which depicts the historical events in Nizhyn in 1663 – the era of Ruin. This work confirmed that the Ukrainian people have their ancient and respectable history, great culture, developed language. Notoriously, the historical prose reveals the most fully the facts of socio-economic life of society, and using rich lexical material of the Ukrainian language, especially non-equivalent and background vocabulary, helps to show it (as defined by L. Dyachenko, who made an attempt its functional and semantic characteristics)<sup>1</sup>.

The analysis of the national specificity of the lexical system of languages is presented in the works of such Ukrainian and foreign researchers as A. Vezhbyska, E. Vereshchagin, V. Kostomarov, V. Rusanivsky,

---

<sup>1</sup> Diachenko, L. M. (1997). Funktsionalno-semantychna kharakterystyka bezekvivalentnoi ta fonovoi leksyky suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy: *Candidate's thesis (Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01)*. Kyiv, Kyivskiy derzh. lnhvistychnyi un-t.

R. Zorivchak, V. Hoverdovsky, V. Telia, M. Tolstoy, J. Sternin, Y. Sorokin and others. For example, A. Vezhbytska in her monograph “Language, Culture, Cognition”<sup>2</sup> notes that each language is nationally specific one in its own way, it reflects not only the peculiarities of natural conditions or material and spiritual culture of the people, but also the originality of the national character of its speakers.

The dissertations of B. Gdovska<sup>3</sup>, O. Levchenko<sup>4</sup>, L. Melnyk<sup>5</sup> and others are devoted to the research of nationally colored vocabulary and phraseology on the basis of works of fiction, journalism and dictionaries. However, in our opinion, the nationally marked vocabulary on the material of P. Kulish’s historical prose needs separate study through the prism of linguistics and translation studies.

The purpose of our study is to identify ways of translational renaming of national and cultural vocabulary in the Russian version of P. Kulish’s “Black Council”, to find out the writer’s contribution to Ukrainian translation studies.

### **1. History of the origin of the Russian translation of P. Kulish’s novel “Black Council”**

The idea to write the novel about the events that took place during the Great Ruin in Ukraine arose in 1842, as P. Kulish told M. Pogodin in a letter dated October 15, 1843: “For a year I have the novel in my head, almost completely ready, but I don’t want to write it ... because I would like to study the historical epoch more deeply...”<sup>6</sup>.

Therefore, in 1843 the writer studied intensively historical sources, printed and manuscript chronicles, ancient documents, namely “History of Little Russia” by M. Markevich, “History of Little Russia” by V. Bantysh-Kamensky, Cossack chronicles of Samovydet and Grabianka. The writer’s appeal to historical sources, his immersion in the world of Ukrainian folk

---

<sup>2</sup> Vezhbickaja, A. (1996). *Jazyk, kul'tura, poznanie*. Moskva : Russkie slovari.

<sup>3</sup> Gdovska, B. (1993). *Leksika stranovedcheskih realij v hudozhestvennom tekste. Candidate's thesis (Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01)*. Kiev, Ukrainskij pedagogicheskij un-t im. M.P. Dragomanova.

<sup>4</sup> Levchenko, O. P. (1995). *Bezekvivalentna rosiiska i ukrainska frazeolohiia: Candidate's thesis (Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01, 10.02.02)*. Kyiv, NAN Ukrainy, In-t movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni.

<sup>5</sup> Melnyk, L. V. (2001). *Kulturno-natsionalna konotatsiia ukrainskykh frazeolohizmiv: Candidate's thesis (Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01)*. Luhansk, Luhanskyi nats. ped. universytet im. Tarasa Shevchenka.

<sup>6</sup> Lysty, P. Kulisha do M. Pohodina (1929). In: Kulish P. O. *Materialy i rozvidky*. Lviv : Nakladom Nauk. t-va im. Shevchenka. T. 22, Ch. 1, 11.

songs, Dumas, legends was stimulus to write the historical novel about bright events in the history of Ukraine.

The historical materials collected by the writer from the archives and folklore from the sincere Ukrainians allowed to clearly and realistically reproduce a number of specific historical events, heroes, show the interests and moods of various social groups of contemporary society – from peasants, so-called “blacks”, to Cossack officers and representatives of the Russian authorities.

Notoriously, P. Kulish began to write a novel-chronicle “Black Council” in Russian, but faced with problems while reproducing the vocabulary of the national spirit of Ukrainians he wrote the novel in Ukrainian, because he knew it much better “than in Russian – of course, in prose”<sup>7</sup>.

In 1846, two versions of the novel “Black Council” were completed (in Ukrainian and Russian), although the first chapters of the Russian edition of the novel began to be published in “Sovremennik” in 1845. P. Kulish planned to publish the novel in full in the Russian edition before going abroad in 1847 to study history, foreign languages and cultures. However, due to the slow progress of cases in the censorship committee, he failed to do so.

After going on scientific trip with his wife to Warsaw, he was arrested and convicted to administrative deportation to Tula with a prohibition on publishing. After the restoration of the right to publish his own works almost ten years later, P. Kulish re edited both Russian and Ukrainian versions of the novel. In 1857, the full version of the Black Council in Russian was published in “Russian Conversation”. In the same year it was published as a separate book in Moscow. The third time Russian text was published in 1860 in the four-volume edition of “Tales of P.A. Kulish “with some changes: almost everywhere it was corrected “Little Russians” to “Ukrainians”, “Little Russia” to “Ukraine”, changed the captions under some epigraphs (instead of “ancient song” – “Mazepa’s song”, instead of “Anonymous” – “Shevchenko”). Two years after P. Kulish’s death, the novel “Black Council. Chronicle of 1663 ”was republished once again in St. Petersburg (1869).

However, P. Kulish himself did not consider the Russian version of the novel as a translation, noting in the epilogue to the “Black Council” (“On the attitude of Little Russian literature to all-Russian”) that the translation has places that are not in the original, and vice versa, the original left much that is not included in the translation. The author suggests that “hence the original and the translation, reflecting the same thing, are, in tone and spirit,

---

<sup>7</sup> Aizenshtok, I. (1930). Lysty P. Kulisha do Izm. Sreznevskoho. *Literaturnyi arkhiv*, 1–2, 209.

two different works". In the original, the writer "submitted to the tone and taste of our folk rhapsodists and narrators". In an effort to introduce Russian readers to the world of Ukrainian life, the author adhered to the "established literary taste"<sup>8</sup>, so there are significant differences between the two editions of the same novel.

There is an example from the Russian edition of the novel, which describes in detail the Ukrainian folk costume, and which is completely absent in the Ukrainian version: "At this time, an oak door creaked with Adam and Eve painted on it in the middle of paradise, and the beautiful daughter of Cherevan entered the room. She dressed for the guests in a maidenish *kuntush* with a large rollout, revealing the entire bust, which passed through the thin folds of the shirt, and part of the chest, crossed by a gold lace on the shirt with coquetry, which nature itself teaches women. The bright green silk of the *kuntush*, the crimson corset visible almost entirely from under it, and the white stripe separating it with gold lacing, this garb was inspired to our great-grandmothers by blooming papaverous flowers!" (Book 6, 34–35).

Of course, reading the text of this kind, the Russian reader has some difficulties if he is not familiar with the material culture of Ukrainians, in particular with the realities of national dress, especially since the difficulties are due to the presence in the literary text of historical and national elements of XVII and XIX centuries: firstly, there are numerous mentions of historical events and phenomena of the XVII century, as well as references to the facts of material and spiritual culture, suggestion and allusions; secondly, it is a variety of words and phrases that reflect the specific social relations, features of contemporary life.

Thus, these words are lexical units that have in their semantics some national-cultural component, and therefore there is a big gap between the cultural fund of the Russian reader and the cultural fund of the author, in this case Ukrainian one, first of all, because there is the difference between the mentality of Ukrainian and Russian, secondly, because the words that were in active use in the XVII century, in modern lexicology have become historicisms and archaisms, and therefore they are not perceived by the modern reader with full meaning and they are interpreted by other concepts. Thus, words that are not equivalent to the Russian language represent the greatest difficulties for Russian readers of historical literary texts.

Speaking about his own translation of the novel "Black Council" in Russian, P. Kulish was dissatisfied with his work: if in the Ukrainian text he

---

<sup>8</sup> Kulish, P. O. (1990). *Chorna rada : Khronika 1663 roku. Opovidannia*. Kharkiv : Osnova, 159.

reflected correctly the spirit of the ancient Cossacks, in the translation “he tried vainly to replace the South Russian language with a literary language that was conventional in Russia”<sup>9</sup>.

Rereading the Russian version of the novel, P. Kulish felt that the reader would not get from the text an accurate idea of how the past was reflected in his soul, and therefore he will not be able to perceive his historical and Christian beliefs. He knew that the young artistic style of the Ukrainian language had not yet been developed, much less the style of the historical novel.

Thus, the problem of cultural and national component in the meaning of the word aroused great interest among writers of the XIX century, in particular P. Kulish, who discovered the connection between language and the inner nature of human, between language and culture, between language and writer’s mentality. The translation of the “Black Council” into Russian became an outstanding phenomenon not only in the field of Ukrainian translation studies, but also it marked a new stage in the development of the Ukrainian language in the XIX century.

## **2. Problems of transmission of national peculiarity of the original in the language of translation**

Translation is an act and the result not only of interlingual communication, interlingual nomination, but also of intercultural communication, in the process of which the cultural and national code of one language is adequately replaced by the code of another one. The problem of transmission the national and cultural specifics of language and speech activity by another language takes on the particular theoretical and practical interest in translation studies.

The original character of the vocabulary of each language is manifested due to the presence in the meanings of words of national and cultural features associated with the sphere of specific national culture of the people. This concept includes the categories of non-equivalent and background vocabulary.

Having made an attempt at semantic and theoretical analysis of the nationally marked vocabulary of the historical work, N. Rodiuk outlined the term non-equivalent vocabulary as words “whose conceptual semantic destinies reflect the idea of culturally specific objects of a certain people, ethnocultural reality and related concepts”, as well as historicisms that contain national content. Background vocabulary includes words

---

<sup>9</sup> Kulish, P. O. (1990). *Chorna rada : Khronika 1663 roku. Opovidannia. Kharkiv : Osnova, 178.*

“non-conceptual semas of which contain extralinguistic, cultural and mental information that arises in the human mind due to national and specific associations not directly related to the basic lexical meaning of the word”, as well as symbols<sup>10</sup>.

The most interesting group of words for translation studies are non-equivalent units, the main lexical meaning of which contains unique semas, which are not inherent in culture of another national-speaking community. Therefore, there is a “question of the transmission of national identity of the original, its special color associated with the national environment where it was created”, which “concerns the main problems of translation theory, on which depends the answer to the question of translatability”<sup>11</sup>.

In our opinion, the problem of transmission the national and cultural component in the meaning of a word causes difficulties in translating from one language to another, because the lexical system is closer than any other branch of language related to extralinguistic reality (especially non-equivalent vocabulary).

According to R. Zorivchak, the question of reflecting the extralingual reality of nationally marked vocabulary is one of the most difficult in translation studies. Firstly, there is the problem of translating words with a national and cultural component, because the language of translation doesn't have full or partial equivalent, because the native speakers don't have referent, denoted by this word. Secondly, there is a need to convey the connotations of national and historical coloring at the same time as the denotative meaning of the nationally marked word<sup>12</sup>.

In the process of translation, O. Schweizer says, there is “not only a comparison of different language systems, but also collision of different cultures and even civilizations”<sup>13</sup>. Categories of national and cultural specificity and socio-historical context of a certain era are contained outside of linguistics, in those conditions in which people live with all their cultural concepts, allusions, associations, and therefore with the concepts contained in nationally marked vocabulary.

---

<sup>10</sup> Rodiuk, N. (2020). Semantyko-teoretychnyi analiz natsionalno markovanoi leksyky istorychnoho tvor. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Seriya: Filolohiia (movoznavstvo): zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, Vyp. 31, 74–75.

<sup>11</sup> Fedorov, A. V. (1983). *Osnovy obshhej teorii perevoda: Lingvistich. probl.* Moskva : Vysshaja shkola, 279.

<sup>12</sup> Zorivchak, R. P. (1989). *Realiti i pereklad (na materialy anhlomovnykh perekladiv ukrainskoi prozy)*. Lviv : Vyd-vo pry Lvivsk. derzh. un-ti, 39.

<sup>13</sup> Shvejcer, A. D. (1970). K probleme lingvisticheskogo izuchenija processa perevoda. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, № 4, 36.

For translation studies, translations by the writer of his own works are interesting from the point of view of the transfer of the national peculiarity of the original by the language-receiver, especially such cases are rare. P. Kulish set himself the goal of proving the fullness and irreplaceability of the Ukrainian language, its suitability for the creation of fiction. He also aimed to provide better examples of translations of his own works to show that the best translation made by an author of work cannot replace the spirit and national peculiarities of the original text.

Being far from the problems of translation theory, P. Kulish, with his authorial feeling and writing experience, found out and solved difficulties in translation. In order to emphasize and strengthen the specific national and cultural color of the original, P. Kulish does not translate, but transcribes single lexical units. In the original language, they are familiar, organic and native to Ukrainian readers, to whom the text is intended, and in the language of translation they fall out of the general lexical environment, are distinguished by their foreignness, which is why they attract increased attention. Therefore, the author of the translation is faced with a choice: either to show the specifics and partially lose understanding of the text by foreign (Russian) readers, or to lose the specifics and coloring of the Ukrainian people and keep the habit without overloading the text with nonequivalent and background vocabulary. Such a contradiction can be overcome only by an experienced translator who knows perfectly the way of life, history, customs and rituals, language (written and folk) and expressive possibilities of the nationally marked word.

Undoubtedly, the author of the work is a unique translator, if he has a deep and perfect knowledge of the language of translation. P. Kulish mastered two languages perfectly, carefully studied historical sources and documents, personally got acquainted with the heritage of the Ukrainian word in its folk basis. The main tendency pursued by the writer is to preserve and emphasize the national specificity of his own work. Although words with a national and cultural component in their meaning are related to extralinguistic reality, the problem of translating such lexical units is purely linguistic.

Thus, the translation of words with national and cultural semantics in the Russian version of the "Black Council" can be divided into two categories. The first includes lexemes, concepts and referents of which are absent in the language-receiver, that is in the language of translation there are no names for them due to the fact that among the phenomena and objects of material and spiritual culture of this people there are no corresponding referents of extralinguistic reality. Such words include the lexemes bandura (Book 7, 42), banduryst (Book 6, 9), bulava (Book 6, 48), bunchuk (Book 7, 46), hetman (Book 6, 6), zhupan (Book 6, 44), zaporozhets (Book 6, 20), kobzar

(Book 6, 13), *kosh* (Book 7, 35), *koshevoy* (Book 6, 20), *kuntush* (Book 6, 44), *kuren* (Book 6, 83), *plahta* (Book 7, 82), *tabor* (Book 6, 45), *hutor* (Book 7, 13), etc.

P. Kulish was very attentive to the preservation of the peculiarities of Ukrainian culture in translation, so in his own translations he broadly and variously shows the Russian reader the wealth of the Ukrainian people, their rites, customs, household items, clothing and more. But the writer does not overburden the Russian work with Ukrainianisms, presenting several translations of the same word in the novel.

Thus, the second group of words includes lexemes that are easy to translate, because not as much as the first ones, are carriers of special cultural specificity. They reflect only the peculiar properties of Ukrainian culture. In particular, the second group of words include the following lexemes:

- ukr. *boklaga* (BC, 132) – rus. *boklaga* (Book 6, 59), *posudyna* (Book 7, 58);
- ukr. *bratchyk* (BC, 45) – rus. *bratets* (Book 6, 15), *bratchyk* (Book 6, 49), *tovarisch* (Book 7, 3), *brother* (Book 7, 45), *zaporozhets* (Book 7, 46);
- ukr. *budynok* (BC, 104) – rus. *pokoii* (Books 7, 33), *khoromy* (Books 7, 44);
- ukr. *vecherya* (BC, 54) – rus. *vecherya* (Books 6, 36), *dinner* (Books 6, 38);
- ukr. *voevoda* (BC, 69) – rus. *voevoda* (Book 6, 86), *boyarin* (Book 7, 6), *authorized* (Book 7, 6);
- ukr. *glybka* (BC, 150) – rus. *temnitsa* (Book 7, 87), *podzemelie* (Book 7, 106), *prison* (Book 7, 109);
- ukr. *zillya* (BC, 49) – rus. *grass* (Book 6, 89), *drink* (Book 6, 101);
- ukr. *kyi* (BC, 130) – rus. *kyi* (Book 6, 66), *dubina* (Book 6, 98), *dubinka* (Book 7, 81);
- ukr. *kivsh* (BC, 121) – rus. *kubok* (Book 6, 92), *kovsh* (Book 7, 49);
- ukr. *cossack* (BC, 38) – rus. *cossack* (Book 6, 1), *knight* (Book 6, 104), *valiant* (Book 7, 55);
- ukr. *kozarlyuga* (BC, 38) – rus. *warrior* (Book 6, 1), *kozarlyuga* (Book 6, 82), *knight* (Book 6, 106), *cossack* (Book 7, 51);
- ukr. *korogva* (BC, 41) – rus. *flag* (Book 6, 11), *gonfalon* (Book 6, 31);
- ukr. *lykho* (BC, 39) – rus. *likho* (Book 6, 51), *gore* (Book 6, 73), *trouble* (Book 6, 99);
- ukr. *lyakh* (BC, 38) – rus. *lyakh* (Book 6, 3), *polyak* (Book 6, 7);
- ukr. *nyzovyk* (*nyzovets*) (BC, 79) – rus. *zaporozhets* (Book 6, 79), *nizovets* (Book 6, 90), *klevret* (Book 7, 93);
- ukr. *oboz* (BC, 101) – rus. *army* (Book 7, 13), *kosh* (Book 7, 38), *lager* (Book 7, 66), *tabor* (Book 7, 77);
- ukr. *obukh* (BC, 127) – rus. *obukh* (Book 7, 51), *ax* (Book 7, 114);
- ukr. *oseledets* (BC, 121) – rus. *forehead* (Books 7, 43);



ukr. *plyashka* (BC, 49) – rus. *flask* (Book 6, 30), *suleya* (Book 6, 44), *shtof* (Book 7, 58);

ukr. *sagaydak* (BC, 164) – rus. *sagaydak* (Book 6, 30), *luk* (Book 7, 108);

ukr. *sapyantsi* (BC, 123) – rus. *sapyantsy* (Book 7, 46), *boots* (Book 7, 82);

ukr. *svitlytsia* (BC, 40) – rus. *svetlitsa* (Book 6, 5), *pokoi* (Book 6, 94);

ukr. *siromaha* (BC, 59) – rus. *seromaha* (Book 6, 47), *lazy* (Book 7, 9), *siromaha* (Book 7, 18);

ukr. *shirt* (BC, 49) – rus. *shirt* (Book 6, 30), *vlasianitsa* (Book 6, 61);

ukr. *tabir* (BC, 50) – rus. *stan* (Book 6, 31), *tabor* (Book 6, 45), *oboz* (Book 6, 78), *lager* (Book 7, 65);

ukr. *thaler* (BC, 59) – rus. *thaler* (Book 6, 47), *ducat* (Book 6, 91);

ukr. *tovarystvo* (BC, 44) – rus. *gromada* (Books 6, 81), *tovarystvo* (Books 6, 82);

ukr. *charka* (BC, 46) – rus. *charka* (Book 6, 10), *kubok* (Book 6, 45);

ukr. *chupryna* (BC, 45) – rus. *chub* (Book 6, 65), *chuprina* (Book 7, 36);

ukr. *shliahta* (BC, 101) – rus. *shliahta* (Books 6, 6), *nedolyashki* (Book 7, 10), *panstvo* (Book 7, 59).

Thus, the main condition for adequate translation from one language to another is a perfect and deep knowledge of nationally marked words. Therefore, undoubtedly, P. Kulish is even against the background of modern translation studies as an ideal translator of his own works.

### **3. Methods of translation renaming of nationally marked vocabulary in translation of P. Kulish's novel "Black Council"**

In modern translation studies, the question of developing a linguistic theory of translation remains relevant. Linguistic comparative analysis of texts in the original language and the language of translation, as noted by O. Palamarchuk, makes it possible to identify and describe the general principles and techniques of translation practice, to follow their textual implementation<sup>14</sup>. This practice gives great opportunities to the interpreter in reproducing the semantic and stylistic functions of vocabulary by means of the target language.

Special, close attention in translation should be paid to national and cultural vocabulary, which, in addition to reproducing non-existent referents in the extralingual reality of the target language, the substantive essence of reality, requires finding in the language of translation such tools that would accurately reflect national coloring, features of the national character and psyche of the people – the native speaker of the original language.

---

<sup>14</sup> Palamarchuk, O. L. (1997). Vidtvorennia bezekvivalentnoi leksyky yak problema perekladoznavstva. *Problemy zistavnoi semantyky*, 416.

There are still discussions about the translatability / non-translatability of nationally colored vocabulary. Some researchers believe that non-equivalent and background vocabulary is completely translated into the language-receiver. Others hold the opinion that to translate means to find a equivalent in the target language, and this is impossible to do, because there are no means to reproduce in the language of such words, referents, concepts and phenomena which are absent in material and spiritual ethnoculture. Thus, the main task of translation studies is the problem of reproducing the semantic and stylistic equivalent, or translational renaming of nationally colored vocabulary.

There is still no consentient opinion among translation theorists on this problem.

Thus, V. Shevchuk proposes to identify three ways of translational renaming of words with national and cultural specifics: 1) transliteration, 2) tracing, 3) explanatory translation<sup>15</sup>, L. Barkhudarov – five: 1) transcription; 2) tracing; 3) descriptive periphrasis; 4) approximate translation; 5) transformational translation<sup>16</sup>.

V. Vinogradov identifies four ways of transmission nationally marked vocabulary in another language: 1) transcription, 2) hyponymic translation, 3) assimilation, 4) periphrastic translation. He does not recognize such method as tracing at all, arguing that in the practice of literary translation tracing does not use any realias or phraseological units<sup>17</sup>. L. Sapogova proposes four ways of renaming: 1) transcription, 2) descriptive periphrasis, 3) combined renaming, 4) finding an approximate equivalent<sup>18</sup>.

In our opinion, the most complete classification was created by R. Zorivchak in the book “Realia and Translation”<sup>19</sup>. She identified nine ways of translational renaming of words with national semantics: 1) transcription (transliteration); 2) hyperonymic renaming; 3) descriptive periphrasis; 4) combined renomination; 5) tracing, complete and partial; 6) interlingual transposition at connotative level; 7) the method of

---

<sup>15</sup> Shevchuk, V. N. (1981). Otnositelno kalkirovaniia sovetskih voennyh realij na anglijskom jazyke. *Lingvisticheskie problemy perevoda* (ss. 60–74). Moskva : Izd-vo Mosk. gos. un-ta, 62.

<sup>16</sup> Barhudarov, L. S. (1975). *Jazyk i perevod (Voprosy obshhej i chastnoj teorii perevoda)*. Moskva : Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 95–104.

<sup>17</sup> Vinogradov, V. S. (1978). *Leksicheskie voprosy perevoda hudozhestvennoj prozy*. Moskva : Izd-vo Mosk. gos. un-ta, 102–104.

<sup>18</sup> Sapogova, L. I. (1978). *Realii: Sushhnost i funkci. Voprosy lingvisticheskoi semantiki* : Sb. nauch. tr. Vyp. 2, 77–78.

<sup>19</sup> Zorivchak, R. P. (1989). *Realii i pereklad (na materiali anhlomovnykh perekladiv ukrainskoi prozy)*. Lviv : Vyd-vo pry Lvivsk. derzh. un-ti, 93–141.

assimilation (substitution), 8) finding a situational equivalent (contextual translation), 9) contextual interpretation.

When translating the “Black Council” into Russian, P. Kulish used various methods to convey national cultural vocabulary. Consider them in more detail.

1. The method of transcription (transliteration) is considered the most concise in translation studies. It creates a certain expressive potential: in the context the transcribed word stands out as a stranger, gives the object it denotes, the connotations of the unusual, originality<sup>20</sup>.

In P. Kulish’s historical novel “Black Council”, words with national and cultural semantics, translated into Russian by transcription, make up 56 percent of the total nationally marked vocabulary. For example, the lexeme *bratchyk* in the Ukrainian text: “The Sich bratchyky also came to our senses” (BC, 60) is translated by the word *bratchyk* in the Russian version: “The Sich bratchyky also looked back at us” (Book 6, 49). The words *bulava*, *bunchuk* in Ukrainian and Russian texts: “On the table Bryukhovetsky’s bulava with bunchuk and korogva lay” (BC, 146), “On the table Bryukhovetsky’s bulava with bunchuk and gonfalon lay” (Book 7, 80).

The lexemes *voit*, *magistrat*, *raitsa* in the Russian language are preserved in translation: *viyt*, *magistrat*, *raitsa*: “Having sat down in their magistrates, in the town hall, the cossack sergeant wields them with viits, burmystrs and raitsi, like a devil with sinful souls” (BC, 111), “Sitting down in their magistrates and town halls, your foreman wields them with voyts, burgomisters and raitsy, like the devil with sinful souls” (Book 7, 30).

The words *gaiduk* and *marshalok* also fully correspond to the Ukrainian lexemes: “Look: not gaiduky, not marshalky cover my table” (BC, 107), “Not gaiduky, not marshalky cover my table with a tablecloth” (Book 7, 24).

The nomination *garbuz* is used in the text when recreating the Ukrainian pre-wedding ceremony, when the pumpkin was given as a sign of refusal in matchmaking. P. Kulish does not explain the meaning of this word in translation, assuming that the reader should guess from the context about the purpose of the pumpkin: “Or maybe the garbuz will give! “Garbuz?” No, it doesn’t smell like a garbuz here, when she gave a ring to the viyt” (BC, 133), “Or maybe she will give a garbuz. “Garbuz!” No, not a garbuz when she gave the ring herself” (Book 7, 60).

The lexeme is marked by productivity ukr. *hetman* – rus. *hetman*: “Already the Shram with the hetman, having bypassed the ravine, jumped to that battlefield, and she does not care” (BC, 92), “Shram and the hetman

---

<sup>20</sup> Zorivchak, R. P. (1989). *Realia i pereklad (na materiali anhlomovnykh perekladiv ukrainskoi prozy)*. Lviv : Vyd-vo pry Lvivsk. derzh. un-ti, 93.

have already galloped over the bayrak and reached the place of the battle, but she does not notice anything” (Book 7, 1).

The word *gorilka* in the Russian version of the novel “Black Council” has four equivalents (rus. *gorilka, vodka, vyshnevka, nalivka*), one of which (*gorilka*) completely coincides with the phonetic sound of the Ukrainian noun: “The poor man was tied up so that he could turn in all directions, and his right hand was left free, so that the poor man could get a kivsh to drink med or gorilka” (BC, 125); “He was tied so that he could turn in all directions; even one hand was left free so that he could take a kovsh and drink med or gorilka” (Book 7, 48–49).

The following lexemes of the novel “Black Council” are translated by the method of transBCiption (transliteration): ukr. *zhupan* – rus. *zhupan* (Book 6, 44), ukr. *zaporozhets* – rus. *zaporozhets* (Book 6, 20), ukr. *zloty* – rus. *zloty* (Books 6, 7), ukr. *kyi* – rus. *kyi* (Books 7, 90), ukr. *kobenyak* – rus. *kobenyak* (Book 7, 107), ukr. *kobzar* – rus. *kobzar* (Books 6, 13), ukr. *cozzack* – rus. *cozzack* (Book 6, 1), ukr. *kolyska* – rus. *kolyska* (Book 7, 2), ukr. *konovka* – rus. *konovka* (Book 6, 30), ukr. *korogva* – rus. *horugv* (Book 6, 31), ukr. *koryak* – rus. *koryak* (Book 6, 81), ukr. *kurin* – rus. *kuren* (Books 7, 53), ukr. *osaul* – rus. *osaul* (Book 7, 6), ukr. *oslin* – rus. *oslon* (Book 6, 80), ukr. *perchakivka* – rus. *perchakivka* (Book 7, 39), ukr. *hata* – rus. *hata* (Books 6, 44), etc.

2. The method of hyperonymic renaming is a fairly common type of translation of nationally marked vocabulary in modern translation studies, associated with the basic concepts of lexical transformations<sup>21</sup>. It is based on the phenomenon of hypo-hyperonymic connections between words.

In quantitative terms, the method of hyperonymic renaming is much smaller than the previous one and is 9 percent of the total number of words with national and cultural specifics used in the historical novel by P. Kulish “Black Council”. For example, ukr. *baidak* – a kind of boat: “Even twelve years Shram did not count, as in that unfortunate Brest year Radziwill came to Kiev with Lithuanians, burned everything and looted, and the townspeople, sitting in baidaks, had to flee to Pereyaslav” (BC, 57); “After the unfortunate Battle of Brest, Radziwill and his Lithuanians poured out all their revenge on Kiev: the city was plundered and scorched without mercy, and the inhabitants, saved from the sword and flames, boarded boats and went down the Dnieper to Pereyaslav” (Book 6, 43); ukr. *mazha* is a kind of cart: “... they will redeem how much mazha there will be with fish, and they will scatter it all over the city: “Eat, good people!”” (BC, 64); “When he met

---

<sup>21</sup> Zorivchak, R. P. (1989). Realiia i pereklad (na materialii anhlomovnykh perekladiv ukrainskoi prozy). Lviv : Vyd-vo pry Lvivsk. derzh. un-ti, 105.

a chumak with a cart of fish, he bought all the goods from him and told him to scatter them on the street, saying: “Eat, good people, remember the farewell!” (Book 6, 60); ukr. *syrivets* – a kind of kvass: “We will live among people in a human way, and who does not have us inside, let him go to Sich to eat dry fish with syrovets” (BC, 160); “... and we will live among people in a human way; and whoever does not like us, go to Sich to eat dry fish with kvass” (Book 7, 102); ukr. *shlyk* – a kind of Zaporizhya hat: “He entered the house without removing the shlyk, took sides and looked at Shram, covering his lip” (BC, 74), “He entered the room without taking off his hat, sideways, and, closing his mouth on one side, looked mockingly at the Shram” (Books 6, 77) and so on.

3. The method of descriptive periphrasis is used in translation studies for descriptive translation of nationally colored vocabulary. In the translation of “Black Council”, P. Kulish uses only 5 percent of words to translate nationally marked units using descriptive periphrasis. For example, ukr. *varenuhka* – rus. *boiled gorilka*: “My panimatka did not run after him, as in that song, did not grab the stirrups, did not ask to return, drink varenuhka, put on a blue zhupan and at least once again look at his sweetheart” (BC, 83); “My mother did not run after him, as in that song, did not grab the stirrups, did not beg to return to drink boiled vodka, dress in a blue robe and look at her once more” (Book 6, 92); ukr. *gony* – rus. *a few steps*: “After passing gony, he began to think so” (BC, 86); “After a few steps, his thoughts took a different direction” (Book 6, 98); ukr. *karmazyn* – rus. *red zhupan*: “Quote, quote, throaty crows! – some of the responded karmazyns responded here ” (BC, 133); “Shut up, shut up, throaty crows! – said one of the red zhupans” (Book 7, 59–60); ukr. *kobzar* – rus. *blind singer*: “Drowning their eyes, leaning on sticks or mowing, old holtyapaks listen to the kobzar” (BC, 121); “... in another, the old men with drooping heads surrounded the blind singer” (Book 7, 42–43); ukr. *serdyuk* – rus. *bodyguard*: “He served me for the tongue, for the spy, for the serdyuk- and all just for the sake of a kind word and a bucket of gorilka” (BC, 83); “He was my herald, a spy, a bodyguard, he fought for me like a madman – and all this for a cup of liqueur and for a good word” (Book 6, 92); ukr. *shlyahych* – rus. *patrimonial panok*: “It is rare for a shlyahych to get involved in Ukraine, joining the Cossacks, and now you can’t list them!” (BC, 102); “At the Khmelnytsky era, it is rare for a patrimonial panok to stay in Ukraine and join the Cossacks, and now you can’t count them!” (Books 7, 14) and so on.

4. The method of combined renomination involves combining two other methods of renaming: most often transcription with descriptive periphrasis. Quantitatively, this method is 10 percent of nationally colored words in translation of “Black Council”. As a rule, the descriptive paraphrase is given

by the writer in page links. For example, rus. *boklaga* – “flat barrels on bandages over the shoulder” (Book 6, 59); rus. *gospada* – “the house, in a sublime and polite tone” (Book 7, 21); rus. *chura* – “squire. Chury were the closest attorneys not only to ordinary Cossacks, but also to sergeants. To serve as a chura meant to learn not only a military skill, but also loyalty. The Cossacks did not hide anything from their chur ”(Book 6, 9); rus. *kireya* – “a kind of sleeveless armor” (Books 6, 71); rus. *kleinody* – “so called signs of power: bulava, bunchuk and timpani” (Book 6, 11); rus. *kelep* – “hammered. The Cossacks did not part with this weapon even on a home walk. The custom of carrying an ax on a stick has survived to our time. I saw myself old men with keleps ”(Book 7, 80); rus. *zholner* – “meant actually a soldier; but by the word soldiers we mean lower ranks, while here we are talking about chiefs ”(Book 6, 6); rus. *karmazyn* – “red cloth, valued in ancient times very expensive” (Book 6, 45). The lexemes *Komora* and *Khustka* are explained by P. Kulish twice in the same way, and in the text there are also tracing of these words. For example, rus. *komora* – “shop with goods” (Book 6, 16; Book 7, 94); rus. *shop* (Books 7, 79); rus. *khustka* – “handkerchief” (Books 6, 103; Books 7, 3); rus. *handkerchief* (Book 7, 1).

The text also contains words that the writer interprets when they are used a second time: rus. *pospolity* (Books 6, 30), rus. *pospolity* – “commoner” (Books 7, 11); rus. *salogub* (Books 6, 47), rus. *salogub* – “salogubs are mockingly called lard traders” (Book 7:22).

5. The method of tracing is a special type of borrowing, when the structural-semantic models of the source language are reproduced element by element by the material means of the receiver language<sup>22</sup>. Words with national and cultural specifics, translated by tracing, make up 15 percent of the total number of words. In the translation of the “Black Council” the following lexemes are used, reproduced in this way: ukr. *gai* – rus. *forest*: “Not reaching two or three miles to Kyiv, they took in the left hand, and climbed the gai, on a crooked path” (BC, 38); “Before reaching Kiev two or three miles, they turned left and drove through the woods on a winding road, barely broken between the stumps” (Book 6, 1); ukr. *pancakes* – rus. *bliny*: “I immediately put hot mlyntsi on the table, put a piece of lard on a mug and put a bowl of sour cream” (BC, 115–116); “In one minute hot bliny appeared and filled the whole house with pleasant steam” (Books 7, 36); ukr. *rushnytsia* – rus. *ruzhie*: “Some people in karmazyny and with swords, and the other are in blue kaptany and siriaky, without swords, only some of them hold rushnytsi and kosy on their shoulders” (BC, 133); “Some were in Karmazyn zhupany and sabers, and

---

<sup>22</sup> Zorivchak, R. P. (1989). Realiia i pereklad (na materialii anhlomovnykh perekladiv ukrainskoi prozy). Lviv : Vyd-vo pry Lvivsk. derzh. un-ti, 128.

others are in blue kaftans and sermiaga, without sabers, only some held ruzhie and clubs on their shoulders” (Book 7, 59).

6. The method of assimilation (substitution) is to reproduce the semantic and stylistic functions of the nationally marked vocabulary of the source language by a foreign analogue. Quantitatively, words translated in this way are 4 percent. For example, ukr. *shelyag* – rus. *kopeyka*: “It seems to them that there is nothing better for God than this miserable life; but whoever has sense at least for the shelyag, he will tell everyone that it is not worth any pity!” (BC, 114); “They think that this miserable life is no better! And whoever has sense at least for kopeyka, will say that a wise man should not live in the world at all ”(Book 7, 34); ukr. *voevoda* – rus. *boyarin*, *authorized*: “Peter had just risen to his feet, and then Somko received a rumor that the vovodas from the king will come quickly to Pereyaslav” (BC, 96); “Suddenly a runner appeared with the news that the king boyarins had already crossed the Ukrainian border”; “After the council for which the King’s authorized were expected to approve Somko as hetman, it was supposed to play a hetman’s wedding for the whole of Ukraine” (Books 7, 6), etc.

7. The method of situational equivalent involves the replacement of the word with national and cultural semantics most appropriate to the situation. Lexemes translated in this way make up 1 percent of the total number of nationally colored words. For example, ukr. *karmazyn* – rus. *pan*: “But how to endure when the Karmazyns overrids people on the roads?” (BC, 99); “... but how to endure when pans oppress people on the roads” (Book 7, 10); ukr. *nyzovyk* – rus. *klevret*: “It was then that the men began to turn to the lords, who knew that he was a good lord, again and to escort him to the lord from under Nizhen; and the lords began to calculate how not to let Ukraine down completely to the nyzovyks” (BC, 154); “It was then that the settlers realized what networks Bryukhovetsky had entangled them in, and began to gather around the pans, escorting them home and then guarding their farms and village yards; and the pans began to invent means to liberate Ukraine from Bryukhovetsky and his klevrets” (Book 7, 93).

Thus, from the material analyzed above we can conclude that, although P. Kulish, translating the historical novel in the mid-nineteenth century, was far from the problems, methods and ways of translational renaming of nationally marked vocabulary, he himself with his literary flair he found such methods of translation, which are recognized by modern translation science.

## CONCLUSIONS

In 1846, P. Kulish wrote a Ukrainian-language novel-chronicle “Black Council”, as well as translated into Russian. During 1845–1846 the writer managed to publish part of the Russian edition of the novel in the

“Sovremennik” and “Moskvitianin”. P. Kulish was allowed to publish both versions of the novel in full only ten years later.

P. Kulish did not consider the Russian version of the novel as translation, but spoke of it as a separate fiction, because of this there are significant differences between two versions of the same novel: each section of the Russian edition is preceded by an epigraph, numerous page notes explain to the Russian reader the realities of Ukrainian material and spiritual culture, Cossack expressions, etc., give a brief description of the geography of Ukraine; author's stories and descriptions of the culture of Ukrainian life in the Russian translation of the “Black Council” are broader than in the Ukrainian version, etc.

The words that are non-equivalent to the Russian language used by P. Kulish in the translation of the “Black Council” are the greatest difficulties for Russian readers of historical literary texts. Thus, P. Kulish was one of the first to pay attention to the problems of translation studies, the main of which is the problem of transmission the national identity of the original in the language of translation.

Since translation is an act and the result not only of interlingual communication, interlingual nomination, but also of intercultural communication, the most interesting group of words for translation studies are non-equivalent units and background names for a certain language. Such lexical units are closely connected with the national coloring, way of life, history of the ethnos, with the subtext of the work.

When translating non-equivalent vocabulary, there is a problem of transmission such words by means of another language, because in the language of translation there is no full or partial equivalent, or the referent, concept or phenomenon associated with them, and there is a need at the same time with the denotative meaning of the nationally marked word to convey the coloring and connotations of national and historical color.

P. Kulish mastered two languages perfectly, carefully studied historical sources and documents, and personally got acquainted with the heritage of the Ukrainian word in its folk basis. The main tendency of the writer was to preserve and emphasize the national specificity of his own work.

To analyze the translation of vocabulary with national and cultural semantics, we used the classification of R. Zorivchak. The author has identified nine ways of translationally renaming words with national semantics. P. Kulish used seven methods in the translation of “Black Council”: 1) transcription (transliteration): ukr. *kobenyak* – rus. *kobenyak*, ukr. *cozzack* – rus. *cozzack*, ukr. *kolyska* – rus. *kolyska*, ukr. *perchakivka* – rus. *perchakivka*; 2) hyperonymic renaming: ukr. *baidak* – a kind of boat, ukr. *mazha* – a kind of cart; 3) descriptive periphrasis: ukr. *varenyukha* – rus. *boiled vodka*, ukr. *serdyuk* – rus. *bodyguard*; 4) combined renomination: rus.



*kireya* – a genus of sleeveless opancha, rus. *klynody* – so called signs of power: bulava, bunchuk and timpani; 5) tracing: ukr. *gai* – rus. *forest*, ukr. *mlyntsi* – rus. *bliny*; 6) method of assimilation (substitution): ukr. *shelyag* – rus. *kopeyka*, ukr. *voevoda* – rus. *boyarin, authorized*; 7) finding a situational equivalent (contextual translation): ukr. *karmazin* – rus. *pan*, ukr. *nyzovyk* – rus. *klevret*.

So, having made his own translation of the historical novel “Black Council” in Russian, Panteleimon Kulish once found translation methods that are recognized by modern science. This gives grounds to claim that he laid the foundations of domestic translation studies.

## SUMMARY

The given section of the monograph considers the national and cultural component in the language of P. Kulish’s historical novel “Black Council”, reveals the concepts of background and non-equivalent vocabulary, the semantic features of the nationally marked vocabulary of the work. The history of writing the Russian and Ukrainian versions of the historical novel “Black Council” is presented, the difference between them is clarified.

P. Kulish’s contribution to the formation of Ukrainian translation studies is revealed. Particular attention is paid to the analysis of the methods of translational renaming, which showed that the most productive way of translating vocabulary with national and cultural semantics is transcription, or transliteration, – 56 percent. 15 percent of nationally marked words were translated by tracing, 10 – by combined renomination, 9 – by hyperonymic renaming, 5 – by descriptive periphrasis, 4 – by the method of assimilation (substitution), and 1 percent of nationally colored words –by finding a situational equivalent (contextual translation).

## REFERENCES

1. Aizenshtok, I. (1930). Lysty P. Kulisha do Izm. Sreznevskoho. [Letters of P. Kulish to Izm. Srezhnevsky] *Literaturnyi arkhiv*, 1–2, 197–224.
2. Barhudarov, L. S. (1975). Jazyk i perevod (Voprosy obshhej i chastnoj teorii perevoda). [Language and translation (Questions of general and specific theory of translation)] Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija.
3. Diachenko, L. M. (1997). Funktsionalno-semantychna kharakterystyka bezekvivalentnoi ta fonovoi leksyky suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy: [Functional-semantic characterization of non-equivalent and background vocabulary of the Ukrainian literary language:] *Candidate’s thesis (Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01)*. Kyiv, Kyivskiy derzh. lnhvistychnyi un-t.

4. Fedorov, A. V. (1983). *Osnovy obshej teorii perevoda: Lingvistich. probl.* [Foundations of the general theory of translation: Linguistic. probl.] Moskva: Vysshaja shkola.

5. Gdovska, B. (1993). *Leksika stranovedcheskih realij v hudozhestvennom tekste.* [Vocabulary of regional geographic realities in the literary text] Candidate's thesis (Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01). Kiev : Ukrainskij pedagogicheskij un-t im. M.P. Dragomanova.

6. Kulish, P. O. (1990). *Chorna rada : Khronika 1663 roku. Opovidannia.* [Black Council: Chronicle of 1663. Story] Kharkiv: Osnova.

7. Levchenko, O. P. (1995). *Bezekvivalentna rosiiska i ukrainska frazeolohiia:* [Non-equivalent Russian and Ukrainian phraseology:] Candidate's thesis (Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01, 10.02.02). Kyiv, NAN Ukrainy, In-it movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni.

8. Lysty P. Kulisha do M. Pohodina (1929). In: Kulish P. O. *Materialy i rozvidky.* [Materials and intelligence] Lviv: Nakladom Nauk. t-va im. Shevchenka. T. 22, Ch. 1.

9. Melnyk, L. V. (2001). *Kulturno-natsionalna konotatsiia ukrainskykh frazeolohizmiv:* [Cultural and national connotation of Ukrainian phraseology:] Candidate's thesis (Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01). Luhansk, Luhanskyi nats. ped. universytet im. Tarasa Shevchenka.

10. Palamarchuk, O. L. (1997). *Vidtvorennia bezekvivalentnoi leksyky yak problema perekladoznavstva. Problemy zistavnoi semantyky,* 416–417. (In Ukrainian)

11. Rodiuk, N. (2020). *Semantyko-teoretychnyi analiz natsionalno markovanoi leksyky istorychnoho tvoruu.* [Semantic-theoretical analysis of the nationally marked vocabulary of a historical work.] *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnogo universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Serii: Filolohiia (movoznavstvo): zbirnyk naukovykh prats,* Vyp. 31, 71–77.

12. Sapogova, L. I. (1978). *Realii: Sushhnost' i funkci.* [Realities: Essence and function.] *Voprosy lingvisticheskoi semantiki: Sb. nauch. tr.* Vyp. 2, 73–79.

13. Shevchuk, V. N. (1981). *Otnositel'no kal'kirovanija sovetskih voennyh realij na anglijskom jazyke.* [On the tracing of Soviet military realities in English] *Lingvisticheskie problemy perevoda (ss. 60–74).* Moskva : Izd-vo Mosk. gos. un-ta.

14. Shvejcer, A. D. (1970). *K probleme lingvisticheskogo izuchenija processa perevoda.* [On the problem of linguistic study of the translation process] *Voprosy jazykoznanija,* № 4, 31–43.

15. Vezhbickaja, A. (1996). *Language, culture, knowledge* [Jazyk, kul'tura, poznanie.] Moskva : Russkie slovari.

16. Vinogradov, V. S. (1978). Lexical issues of translation of fiction [Leksicheskie voprosy perevoda hudozhestvennoj prozy.] Moskva : Izd-vo Mosk. gos. un-ta.

17. Zorivchak, R. P. (1989). Reality and translation (based on English translations of Ukrainian prose [Realiia i pereklad (na materialii anhlomovnykh perekladiv ukrainskoi prozy)]) Lviv : Vyd-vo pry Lvivsk. derzh. un-ti.

#### LIST OF CONDITIONAL ABBREVIATIONS

Book 6 – Kulish, P. A. (1857). Chernaja rada, hronika 1663 goda. *Russkaja beseda*, Kn. 6, 1–108. (In Russian)

Book 7 – Kulish, P. A. (1857). Chernaja rada, hronika 1663 goda. *Russkaja beseda*, Kn. 7, 1–122. (In Russian)

BC – Kulish, P. O. (1998). Chorna rada. Khronika 1663 roku. In: Kulish P. O. *Tvory* (T. 1, ss. 38–173). Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (In Ukrainian)

#### Information about authors:

##### **Melnyk Larysa Volodymyrivna,**

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor at the Department of Philology  
Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University  
1, Gogol Sq., Starobilsk, Luhansk region, Ukraine, 92703  
[orcid.org/0000-0002-5999-4156](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5999-4156)

##### **Rodiuk Nataliia Yuriivna,**

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Head of the Department of Philology,  
Head of the Department of Ukrainian Language  
Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University  
32, Ostrozkogo St., Vinnytsia, Ukraine, 21000  
[orcid.org/0000-0003-1002-9731](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1002-9731)