MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from the English Language

TERM PAPER

in Translation Studies

under the title: <u>Specifics of the Ukrainian translation of the means of verbalization of the WAR concept (based on the material of the movie 'Fury')</u>

Group PA 21-19
School of translation studies
Educational Programme:
The English Language:
Translation and Interpreting
Majoring 035 Philology
Oleksandra V. Belemets

Research supervisor:
O. H. Shkuta
Lecturer

Kyiv – 2023

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Факультет германської філології і перекладу
Кафедра теорії і практики перекладу з англійської мови

Представлено на кафедру _____
(дата, підпис секретаря кафедри)
Рецензування _____
_____
(кількість балів, 'до захисту' ('на доопрацювання'),
дата, підпис керівника курсової роботи)
Захист _____
(кількість балів, дата, підпис викладача)
Підсумкова оцінка _____
_____
(кількість балів, оцінка за 4-х бальною
системою, дата, підпис викладача)

КУРСОВА РОБОТА

З ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

СПЕЦИФІКА УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДУ ЗАСОБІВ ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЇ КОНЦЕПТУ WAR (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ КІНОФІЛЬМУ 'ЛЮТЬ')

Студент(ка) групи Па 21-19
_____

Белемець Олександра Валентинівна
(прізвище, ім'я, по батькові)

Керівник курсової роботи
_____
(підпис)
Викладач
Шкута Олена Георгіївна
(прізвище, ім'я, по батькові, вчений ступінь,
звання, посада)

Київ – 2023

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра теорії і практики перекладу з англійської мови

Завідувач кафедри теорії і
практики перекладу з
англійської мови

_____
(підпис)
к.ф.н., доц. Мелько Х.Б.
' ' вересня 2022 р.

ЗАВДАННЯ
на курсову роботу з перекладу з англійської мови
для студентів IV курсу

студент_____4_____курсу_____Па 21-19_____групи, факультету германської філології і перекладу КНЛУ

спеціальності **035 Філологія,** спеціалізації **035.041 Германські мови і літератури (переклад включно), перша - англійська** освітньо-професійної програми **Англійська** мова: усний і письмовий переклад
Тема роботи Специфіка українського перекладу засобів вербалізації концепту WAR (на матеріалі кінофільму 'Лють')
Науковий керівник Шкута Олена Георгіївна
Дата видачі завдання_____вересня 2021 року_____

Графік виконання курсової роботи

№ п/п	Найменування частин та план курсової роботи	Терміни виконання	Відмітка про виконання
1.	Аналіз наукових першоджерел і написання **теоретичної частини** курсової роботи **(розділ 1)**	1–5 листопада 2022 р.	
2.	Аналіз дискурсу, який досліджується, на матеріалі фрагмента тексту; проведення перекладацького аналізу матеріалу дослідження і написання **практичної частини** курсової роботи **(розділ 2)**	7–11 лютого 2023 р.	
3.	Написання **вступу і висновків** дослідження, оформлення курсової роботи і подача завершеної курсової роботи науковому керівнику для попереднього перегляду	28–31 березня 2023 р.	
4.	**Оцінювання** курсових робіт **науковими керівниками**, підготовка студентами презентацій до захисту курсової роботи	25–30 квітня 2023 р.	
5.	**Захист** курсової роботи (за розкладом деканату)	2–13 квітня 2023 р.	

Науковий керівник _____ (підпис)

Студент _____ (підпис)

**РЕЦЕНЗІЯ НА КУРСОВУ РОБОТУ
З ПЕРЕКЛАДУ З АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ**

студентки 4 курсу групи Па 21-19, факультету германської філології і перекладу КНЛУ спеціальності **035 Філологія,** спеціалізації **035.041 Германські мови і літератури (переклад включно), перша – англійська** освітньо-професійної програми **Англійська мова і друга іноземна мова: усний і письмовий переклад**
Белемець Олександри Валентинівни
за темою Specifics of the Ukrainian translation of the means of verbalization of the WAR concept (based on the material of the movie 'Fury') / Специфіка українського перекладу засобів вербалізації концепту WAR (на матеріалі кінофільму 'Лють')

	Критерії	Оцінка в балах
1.	Наявність основних компонентів структури роботи – *загалом 5 балів* (усі компоненти присутні – **5**, один або декілька компонентів відсутні – **0**)	
2.	Відповідність оформлення роботи, посилань і списку використаних джерел нормативним вимогам до курсової роботи – *загалом 10 балів* (повна відповідність – **10**, незначні помилки в оформленні – **8**, значні помилки в оформленні – **4**, оформлення переважно невірне – **0**)	
3.	Відповідність побудови вступу нормативним вимогам – *загалом 10 балів* (повна відповідність – **10**, відповідність неповна – **8**, відповідність часткова – **4**, не відповідає вимогам – **0**	
4.	Відповідність огляду наукової літератури нормативним вимогам – *загалом 15 балів* (повна відповідність – **15**, відповідність неповна – **10**, відповідність часткова – **5**, не відповідає вимогам – **0**)	
5.	Відповідність практичної частини дослідження нормативним вимогам – *загалом 20 балів* (повна відповідність – **20**, відповідність неповна – **15**, відповідність часткова – **10**, не відповідає вимогам – **0**)	
6.	Відповідність висновків результатам теоретичної та практичної складових дослідження – *загалом 10 балів* (повна відповідність – **10**, відповідність неповна – **8**, відповідність часткова – **4**, не відповідає вимогам – **0**)	

Усього набрано балів:_____

Оцінка:
'До захисту' _____   _____
   (42-70 балів)   *(підпис керівника)*
'На доопрацювання' _____   _____
   (0-41 балів)   *(підпис керівника)*

'____' _____ 2023 р.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The term paper is focused on giving general understanding of the specifics of the Ukrainian translation of means of verbalizing the 'WAR' concept. First of all, war is a very vast subject and about as old as human civilization. There are numerous pieces of literature, art and cinema where authors use war as an independent character to express his or her emotions. That is why every nation has many tools and means in their languages to describe this phenomenon, and Ukrainian language is no exception.

In theoretical background of our paper we intend to describe the importance of understanding when and how to use the means of verbalizing correctly. That is why it's important to learn the theoretical basis of this subject to fully understand it. We are going to use works of prominent scientists in the field of translation studies in our term paper to support points of our research.

The topicality of our study is high as never because it is important to learn how to use the means of verbalization correctly. We use them widely in our everyday life to describe practically every object, scenario or event. What is even more important is to know how to use them in context of describing such topic as 'war'. With today's geopolitical situation surrounding the war in Ukraine we can understand that it is very important to be able to understand, describe and talk about everything surrounding this topic with pinpoint accuracy. There are many tools which can be used to describe any topic, including war in both Ukrainian and English languages, the most common ones are: phrases, objectives, synonyms and even phraseological units and idioms. It is important to use them correctly in any topic, but in context of war we need to be extremely cautious.

The aim and objectives of this paper is to describe the specifics of the Ukrainian translation of means of verbalizing the 'WAR' concept by analyzing the material from the film 'Fury' directed by David Ayer.

The investigation subject of this paper is the film 'Fury' 2014 directed by David Ayer.

The object of the research is the of means of verbalization of the 'WAR' concept.

Theoretical and practical value of the research. The main value is to help people understand the usage of means of verbalizing and the specifics of it is Ukrainian translation using the example from modern cinema. It is very important to learn how to understand their meaning and reuse them in your working fields as well as everyday life.

Brief outline of the research paper structure. The work consists of an introduction, two chapters, conclusions, and a list of used sources and anex.

CHAPTER 1
THEORETICAL BASIS OF CONCEPT RESEARCH

1.1 General characteristics of concepts. Features of the concept of war

The meaning of 'concept' is very broad and it depends on the field in which you are interested.

For example, the Cambridge Dictionary states that: 'Concept is a principal or an idea' [15].

In philosophy a concept is defined as a constituent of a thought (or 'proposition') rather in the way that a word is a constituent of a sentence that typically expresses a thought. It describes concepts as essential means in categorizing the world, for example, recognizing a cow and classifying it as a mammal. Concepts are also compositional: concepts can be combined to form a virtual infinitude of complex categories, in such a way that someone can understand a novel combination, for example, smallest sub-atomic particle, by understanding its constituents [10].

The philosophical theory of the concepts allows reconciliation of the existing numerous hypotheses and plural opinions of the modern linguists about the essence and functioning of the concept. As G.Deleuze and F.Guattari correctly believe, concepts are crystals or nuggets of the meaning – absolute space forms.

The essential properties of the concept are schematically presented by the authors as creation of the concept (it bears the author's signature and is thus personalized), nondiscursivity of the concept (the concept as a deep idea does not fully belong to the boundaries of any specific expression), correlation of the concept with any problem (thus allowing intercrossing and mutual coordination of the concepts) [11].

In terms of translation studies concept is defined as a linguo-philosophical unit that was introduced thanks to an anthropocentric approach in linguistics. A concept defines and groups almost every possible meaning of any given word and their development [9].

In translational studies, a concept, in contrast to a word, has a more complicated structure. The content of the concept is divided into linguistic meaning and cultural sense. That is why it is often called a unit of knowledge, an abstract idea or a mental symbol.

Concepts as elements of consciousness are quite independent in the language. According to V.Evans, concepts are intermediaries between the words and extralinguistic reality. Only those phenomena of the reality can become a concept, that are relevant to and valuable for a particular culture, which has a large number of linguistic units to commit themselves in that culture, which are the subject for proverbs and sayings, poetry and prose [9].

At present stage of linguistics, several approaches to the concept understanding can be identified. Researchers of different countries treat the concept as a linguistic-cognitive, psycholinguistic, linguistic-cultural, cultural or linguistic phenomenon. Each approach, on the grounds of certain features, highlights the specific margin of the concept.

There are two approaches that are based on the role of language shaping the concept and showing the bonds between language and culture.

The first approach considers the concept as a cultural phenomenon. Scientists believe that concepts are self-organizing, integrative, functional systematic, multidimensional, idealized formations based on the notional (pseudo- or pre-notional) basis and which are fixed to the meaning of a sign: the scientific term, or word (phrase) of everyday language, or more complex lexico -grammatical and semantic structures, or non-verbal subjective image, or action [13].

In the most general sense concept may be described on the one hand as a 'clot of culture' in human consciousness; something with the help of which culture enters the mental world of a human. On the other hand, concept is something with the help of which a human himself enters the culture and, in some cases, influences it.

The second approach propose to consider the concept as linguisticcognitive phenomenon. The concept is the information about what an individual knows, suggests, thinks, imagines about the objects of our world. The notion of 'concept' corresponds

to those senses, which a man operates in the process of thinking and the senses which reflect the content of experience and knowledge, the content of results of all human activities and the learning processes of the world in the form of some 'quanta' of knowledge. [13]

Concepts are often interpreted as a certain cultural layer between the person and the world as a notion of practical (everyday) philosophy being the result of interaction of such factors as national tradition, folklore, religion, ideology, life experience, artistic images, feelings and the value system.

Therefore, the concept must be 'assigned' in terms of culture and nationality and must stand out as the most common, extremely abstracted, but precisely represented idea of the 'object' combining all valence bonds which bear national and cultural marking [1].

According to this understanding of the concept we can assume, that every single person and every language have their own concepts describing same subjects. In our research we can clearly say that for example the concept of 'war' in both Ukrainian and English languages are going to be very different due to historical, cultural and personal reasons. And that's the case with almost every topic in terms of concept.

For example the concept of WAR belongs to universal concepts, because it is present in all cultures and languages in the world. However, the linguistic consciousness of each nation has its own peculiarities of understanding this concept [6].

G. Lakoff collaborated with the philosopher M. Johnson in the investigation of concepts, which once again demonstrates that the study of concepts takes place at the intersection of several disciplines (such as linguistics and philosophy, linguistics and psychology, etc.). They provided examples of metaphorical use of the components of the 'war' image to verbalize other concepts of reality [12].

At the intersection of philosophy and linguistics lies the work of Dr. H. Yavorska, 'The Concept of War: Semantics and Pragmatics'. She identifies 'war as a game,' 'war as a catastrophe,' 'war as a force of nature,' and 'war as a journey' as the main schemas for investigating the concept of war. These schemas have a deep

linguistic and cultural root, reflected in both the mass linguistic consciousness in the form of idioms and fixed expressions ('war as a force of nature': the war took, took it to the grave) and in the individual linguistic worldview reflected in the author's literary works. For example, 'війна – подорож': 'який, прийшовши вночі з війни додому' (Микола Хвильовий. Повість про санаторійну зону (1924)) [7].

Looking closely at the discourse on the topic of modern war in Ukraine, we see that some of the mentioned fantastic or metaphorical types of war play a significant role in representing the concept (e.g., 'Russia is Mordor,' using the image from J.R.R. Tolkien's 'Lord of the Rings' in the fantasy genre or the film based on this novel). Such interpretive models penetrate official discourse, such as in the speech of Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko on the occasion of Independence Day 2015, where Novorossiya was referred to as a myth, a 'land of Mordor.' Under the influence of eschatological models of the struggle between light and darkness, the understanding of Ukraine's role as a civilization outpost defending Europe is formed. This has also become part of the official political discourse today [7].

Another group of researchers who approached the metaphor of the conceptual field of 'war' from a critical perspective were V. Mishchenko and V. Dubyk. They note that the vocabulary from the field of 'war' is often used in political discourse, which makes it a tool for political influence. Based on their research in the francophone political sphere, the following frames are distinguished: 'war - weapon', 'war - mobilization', 'war - attack', 'war - explosion', 'war - warriors', 'war - competitor', 'war - defensive actions', 'war - demonstration of power', 'war - military operations', 'war - battle', 'war - defeat', 'war - victory', which indicates the appropriation of more worn-out (dry) metaphors. In the linguistic consciousness of producers and consumers of francophone political discourse, the metaphorical conceptual field of 'war' is essentially stable, having lost its imagery but still evoking feelings of anxiety and danger [7].

Professor Jezhy Bartminsky states that different types of discourse profile the concept differently. Public discussions about the designation of war and international legal problems around the construction of a suitable definition of war and armed

conflict confirm the thesis of the fundamental plurality of categorization. The legal problem of defining the status of hybrid war requires further study, also in the context of modern semantic research.

For example, different versions of the interpretation of events of Russian war in Ukraine (military operation, interstate armed conflict, civil war, proxy war, etc.) contradict each other. The falsity of the aggressor's imposed version of the internal civil conflict in Ukraine must be exposed, as such an interpretation fundamentally undermines the effectiveness of our diplomatic efforts [7].

Analyzing these works of great scientists in the fields of philosophy and translation study we can understand the importance of understanding the nature of concept, all details and comprehend the difference of interpretation of the term 'concept' depending on the field of research. We can also understand the value of culture, language and history and, also, discourse when we talk about concept.

In our term paper we are going to use fictional discourse, to be accurate – film discourse to explain the specifics of the Ukrainian translation of means of verbalizing the 'WAR' concept using the modern picture Fury (2014). We are going to describe how tools in Ukrainian language, which were formed by country's vast culture and history can be used to describe such concept as 'WAR' which is shown in the film's plot centered on American tank platoon during World War 2.

Fictional text analysis is a broad field that encompasses various methods and techniques relevant for translation. Fictional texts are essentially sets of statements about a fictional world that indirectly influence readers through artistic images, rather than through reference to real-world events or facts. In the context of translation, fictional discourse is typically broken down into three categories: prose (including classical and other genres such as fantasy and detective fiction), drama, and poetry. Additionally, scripts and soundtracks of feature films may also fall under the umbrella of fictional discourse, despite their mass communication technology origins. While there is no single, comprehensive overview of fictional text analysis, a range of techniques, including close reading, structural analysis, and comparative analysis, may be employed to better understand and translate these texts [5].

1.2 The characteristic features of the film discourse

Film discourse can be defined as an unlimited multitude of films (or films viewed as texts) – the result of interaction between a collective author's intention, a complex set of possible reactions from the viewer, and the film itself, all coming into close contact in the semiosphere.

A film, or a film text, is a coherent integral and complete message which embodies the author's representation of some problem, expressed with the help of verbal and non-verbal signs, organised in accordance with the concept of a collective functionally differentiated author using cinematographic codes, recorded as a sequence of frames and intended to be shown on the screen for individual or collective audiovisual perception by the viewer [13].

According to different researchers [3], film discourse is a type of communicative activity that covers all types of linguistic interaction between filmmakers and recipients – spectators; between representatives of the professional group of people involved in the creation of film products; between researchers of the history and theory of cinematography.

One researcher describes film discourse as a process of reproduction and perception of film, the meaning of which is formed by the mutual influence of several semiotic systems. Film discourse includes participants in the discourse, time and space of their interaction. IM Lavrinenko [4] emphasizes the polycode nature of film discourse, noting that it is information-rich and conveys explicit and implicit information. She defines film discourse as a polycode cognitive-communicative formation, a combination of different semiotic units in their inseparable unity, which is characterized by coherence, integrity, completeness, addressability.

Film discourse can also be described in terms of the functions that it performs. These functions include sharing relevant information with the audience, passing over past experience, participation in the production of new knowledge, regulatory function, emotive function, aesthetic function and, to a lesser extent, metalinguistic and phatic functions. Its aesthetic function is probably the most significant, and it is associated

with the attention to the message for the sake of the message itself. In other words, the form of the message is more important than the meaning it conveys.

The aesthetic moment is manifested in the emotional and sensual evaluation of the message from the point of view of its beauty. In written language, this is manifested in the fact that we notice the texture of the text: a single word, a collocation or a phrase attract our attention and we begin to admire its accuracy, penetration into the essence of things or its beauty. The aesthetic function of a language is most noticeable in literary works when a word is used in a new unexpected way or appears in an unusual surrounding. However, we receive more complex aesthetic experiences not from single signs and units, but when we perceive complex signs and sign combinations in works such as films or paintings [13].

The textual unit of film discourse is film text. Film text is a coherent, integral and complete message expressed by verbal (linguistic) and non-verbal (iconic and / or index) signs, which are organized according to the idea of a collective functionally differentiated author with the help of cinematographic codes for on-screen playback and audiovisual perception by viewers.

There are several stages in the film text comprehension model, each of which is characterized by a set of cognitive mechanisms and includes neurophysiological processes of identification, processing, activation of visual-audio components of the text and processes of mental representation of content in the conceptual system of the recipient [2]. The scientist focuses on the cultural conditionality of the film text, because cultural codes determine the formation of its mental representation of the film text. Verbal and nonverbal components of film discourse are closely integrated into each other, creating a holistic and complete image.

There is also one huge thing that helps viewers to be fully immersed into the film and the picture ahead. That is film dialogue. The film dialogue imitates colloquial speech on the phonetic, lexical and syntactic level, modifying it according to the idea of the film's authors.

What is also important to understand is the perception of the translator and how well he or she understands each concept. Is can be even more difficult in the context of

film discourse, because depending on language, culture and history one film or a scene can be described differently by each translator.

When dealing with a film discourse, a translator must have a number of unusual skills, namely: knowing how people express their emotions through sounds, facial expressions, articulation and gestures; know the customs and traditions of different countries, etc. The perception of a foreign film, like any other art form, is a complex process. Upon receiving the information, the translator can supplement it with his life experience, risking to go beyond the author's intention. In order to make an adequate translation, the compiler must fully engage in the film and understand its essence, hidden intentions and secret plan. To do this, the translator must be in some sense a philosopher, critic, artist and psychologist all at once.

1.3 Discursive and stylistic analysis of the text

S: Who'd you kill, boy? Where did you get that coat, boy?

C: Forgive me. Let me go, please (speaks German)

S: Who did you kill? What'd you do?

C: Don't shoot! Let me go, please, let me go (speaks German)

S: Who'd you kill, boy?

S: Back it up, boys!

D: Sergeant, hold on. Hold on!

S: Back it up, boys. Back it up, boys.

D: Norman! Get out here! Norman, come here. Come on, son.

S: I can't hear you. Wait.

D: Sergeant. Call your dogs off.

C: I have a family This is my wife, my children (speaks German)

D: Shut your mouth. Kneel (speaks German). You are no goddamn good to me unless you can kill Krauts. Put a big fat hole in his back… Put a big fat hole in his fucking back.

N: No.

D: Why the hell not?

N: It's not right.

D: 'Not right'? We're not here for right and wrong. We're here to kill them. Why are you here? You're here to kill him. You know why he's here? He's here to kill you. He's here to kill you, Norman. He's here to rip your throat out with a bullet.

N: Go to hell.

D: I'm trying to teach you something. You here to get me killed?

N: No.

D: You gonna get me killed?

N: No.

D: I need you to perform. Just get it over with. Just get it over with.

N: I can't do it.

D: Yes, you can. I know you can. He kills you, or you kill him. Simple math. You or him. Pick.

N: Just kill me.

D: Come here.

N: Kill me! Kill me! Kill me! Kill me! Please! I can't do it! Fucking stop! Please stop.

D: Oh, no, no. This is the easy part.

N: What the hell?

D: All right.

N: Fuck. Please don't make me do this. Don't make me do this.

D: It's all right. One, two... Do it, Norman. Do it, Norman. Do it, Norman. Do your job.

С: Які тут люди у нас… Звідки в тебе ця американська форма, а? Якого хріна?

П: Пробачте мені. Відпустіть мене, будь ласка (говорить німецькою)

С: Кого ти вбив? Звідки вона в тебе? Вбийте його!

П: Не стріляйте! Відпустіть мене, будь ласка… Відпустіть (говорить німецькою)

С: Кого вбив? Кого?

С: Розійшлися!

Д: Сержанте! Відійдіть. Відійдіть!

С: Розійшлися! Розійшлися!

Д: Норман! Вилазь! Норман, ходи сюди. Давай, пацан.

С: Що? Га? Га? Не чую.

Д: Сержанте. Віджени своїх ворон.

П: У мене є сім'я. Це моя дружина, мої діти (говорить німецькою)

Д: Закрий рота. На коліна (говорить німецькою). Мені з тебе користі нуль, якщо ти фриців не мочиш. Вгати в нього кулю ззаду… Ану швидко взяв і вгатив в нього кулю.

Н: Ні.

Д: І чому це ні?

Н: Це неправильно.

Д: Що? 'Неправильно'? Ми тут не щоб про мораль думати. Ми тут, щоб вбивати. Нащо ти тут? Щоб його замочити. А нащо він тут? Щоб замочити тебе. Його завдання тебе вбити, безжалісно і холоднокровно.

Н: Пішов ти.

Д: Я хочу тобі як краще. Ти хочеш, щоб я загинув?

Н: Ні.

Д: Хочеш, щоб мене вбили?

Н: Ні.

Д: Тоді виконай свій обов'язок. Просто зроби це. Зроби і забудь.

Н: Я не можу.

Д: Ще й як можеш, я впевнений. Або він тебе, або ти його. Як два плюс два. Ти або він. Обирай.

Н: Вбий мене.

Д: Давай.

Н: Вбий мене! Вбий мене! Мене вбий! Мене вбий! Прошу! Бо я не можу! Зупинися! Прошу.

Д: Дурний ти. Вбивати – найлегше.

Н: Що ти?

Д: Ось так.

Н: Бляха. Будь ласка, не треба.

Д: Все добре. Раз, два... Давай, Норман. Давай, Норман. Давай, Норман. На війні – воюють.

The text under analysis belongs to the mentafact text type. The reason is that this work influences the real world indirectly, through artistic images, and hidden knowledge, which the audience has to infer from them. This text like all the mentafact texts neither changes nor reflects the real material world, but describes the fictional world, created in the imagination of the author. This story does not have a binding force and direct influence. The language in the text performs more artistic than informative function.

The text is of fictional discourse. It was taken from the film called 'Fury' (2014). The film is aimed at regular watcher in the field of cinematography. The communicative aim of the textual information is to persuade the addressee to change his/her mind and believe the author thus influencing his/her cultural, aesthetic and ideological benchmarks in the way the author has planned. Also, to describe an imaginary world where there are no human rights for most of people, and show readers to what consequences can strict control and censorship lead.

The text is of fictional discourse because it contains various expressive means and different figures of speech. If we analyze the whole film, we can find many transformations.

Structural level of the text is ensured by lexical and semantic cohesion. Lexical cohesion is implemented by repetition links, which are:

– simple lexical repetition: boy – boys, do – did, kill – killed

– complex lexical repetition: can – can't;

–   complex paraphrase: right – wrong, hold on – call off, yes – no;

–   co-reference: Norman – boy, Krauts – him.

Basic transformations:

1) lexical transformations:

–   transcription – Sergeant;

–   transliteration – Norman;

2) grammatical transformations:

–   transposition: kill me – мене вбий;

–   replacement: this is the easy part – вбивати – найлегше;

–   zero transformation: no – ні, it's not right – це неправильно, kill me – вбийте мене;

3) lexical and grammatical transformations:

–   total reorganization: back it up, boys – розійшлися; call your dogs off – віджени своїх ворон; he's here to rip your throat out with a bullet – його завдання тебе вбити, безжалісно і холоднокровно.

CHAPTER 2
ANALYSIS OF THE MEANS OF VERBALIZATION OF THE WAR CONCEPT

In this chapter we are going to present to you our translation analysis which is based on Ukrainian translation of the film 'Fury' directed by David Ayer in 2014. We will depict and analyze each mean of translation which was used to verbalize the concept of 'war' in this film and compare the features of Ukrainian translation and the original.

In this film the viewer can experience all emotions which war can bring to one single person. And in the concept of war those emotions have a very large and vast variety.

In this picture you can see the reflections of such fundamentals of human nature as: friendship, family, cultural and religious differences, as well as emotions such as happiness, hope and devotion to your friends, comrades and the cause. All those things which make us a real human are also present at the war, because without them, with all the horrors of war surrounding every human at war, it's very easy to lost your humanity and become just a shell without a soul.

However, there is also an infamous part of the war, the one that formed the concept of war the way we know it. War as a phenomenon is as old as human history and it is always accompanied by blood, suffering and death. People who have experienced war in any way know how precious and fragile a human life is. And despite their best effort to prevent others from the horror which they have experienced some people just can't control their sick-twisted, cruel, ruthless nature.

War can be different, and just like a mirror, it can show true nature of every human that's why it's concept is so big and impactful. We will be using 'Fury' as a tool to explore all means which help us to understand the concept of war even more.

First of all, there are many means in translational studies that help us analyze different works and topics. One of the most common ones are lexical transformations.

Those transformations foresee the changes of the forms of language units from source text by using the means of the target language. There are two types of them. The most common ones are formal lexical transformations. There are those types of formal lexical transformations: practical transcriptions; transliteration; phonetic and graphical reproduction; combination of previous ways and loan translation.

For example, English word 'tank' translates as 'танк' in Ukrainian. This type of transformation is known as transliteration, because of the reproduction of the letters of the source language lexical item by the target language letters. There are few more examples such as: Hitler, Norman, artillery.

Transcription – method which relies on reproduction of the source language lexical item phonemes by the target language letters is also present in this movie. For example, the word 'sergeant' is translated as 'сержант' in Ukrainian. Other examples of transcription include: information, Mexican, ration, army, cigarettes.

The other most common type is lexical and semantic transformations. They include different types, which are useful for text analysis.

Substantiation of meaning involves replacing words or phrases in the source language with target language words or phrases that have a more specific or narrow meaning. This often occurs in combination with differentiation of meaning, where there is a need to choose from among several target language options to accurately convey the intended meaning of the source language word or phrase.

One of the few examples of substantiation is used by tank commander Don:

D: Traverse left, 800!

Д: Гармата ліворуч на восьму годину!

In this example we can spot substantiation which main feature is narrowing. In Ukrainian version more specific meaning was used.

In the war there are a lot of sins. And sexual ones are not an exception. One of the main heroes indicates it: 'Don't disappoint Christ, now. Don't let them lead you astray'. What is interesting is that in the original this phase was used in a broad context while in Ukrainian version it is closer to the context of the conversation, narrowing the context: 'Не засмучуй Христа, не піддавайся спокусі'.

Differentiation of meaning occurs when many English words with broad meanings do not have direct equivalents in Ukrainian, leading to the need for dictionaries to provide several meanings that only partially convey the meaning of the source language word. In such cases, translators must choose the best option that fits the context.

There is a situation in the film, where soldiers try to make another soldier (Boyd) angry questioning his beliefs, to what he says: 'You know how I stand on it. You trying to rile me up now'. While there is no similar expression in Ukrainian language, translators decided differentiate this saying to make it much closer to the general audience: 'Ви знаєте мою думку. Просто злите мене'.

There is also a dialog that describes the problems of supply in the army, and how tactics always counters the lack of supplies and men needed to conduct an operation:

C: All right, how many tanks we got?

D: Four.

C: Four? You're shitting me. I asked for 10.

C: Так, скільки в нас танків?

Д: Чотири.

C: Чотири? Це прикол? Я просив 10.

Ukrainian translator did an amazing job portraying an absurdity of the given situation when the real needs on the war don't match up with hard reality.

To indicate differentiation we can use this dialog between main characters:

G: I say, why you always whupping on me?

D: Cause you're an animal, a dog.

Г: Чому ти завжди до мене чіпляєшся?

Д: Бо ти тварина, койот.

In this example there are two cases of differentiation, because the word equivalents were used in Ukrainian version which suits more for the context.

One more example of generalization can be seen in the film:

C: They murdered some good boys out there today.

C:Вони сьогодні поклали багато хороших хлопців.

There is also an expression which was used by tank commander Don to one of his crewmates to be on guard: 'Cast an eyeball on them' which does't have an exact translation in Ukrainian language, so in our version it was decided to use differentiation: 'Пильнуй, малий. Не відводь очей'.

Modulation, also known as sense or logical development, involves substituting a word or phrase in the source language with a corresponding item in the target language that is logically linked to the original item.

At the beginning of the film there we can spot a different version of translation of saying 'water and gas', Ukrainian version is more logically connected to the context and sounds like 'вода та паливо'.

This next example shows us that the context of war is very vast and on the battlefield we can find people from different specialities, even the religious ones. One of the main characters is a religious personality. In the original his nickname is 'Bible', while Ukrainian translation emphasizes his profession – 'Пастор' or priest – in English.

Modulation can also be seen in this dialog between American soldiers who captured a German soldier and others at the base.

S: Hey! What's an SS doing here?

D: Hey, why are you bringing him through here? Why isn't he sleeping?

S: G2 wants a prisoner to question.

С: Що тут робить цей СС-івець?

Д: Навіщо ви його сюди ведете? Чому він не в землі?

С: Командування хоче допитати полоненого.

In this dialogue, we can observe the replacement of the American term 'G2' with the general Ukrainian term of 'Command' to indicate the staff officers.

In another example, when the tank column gets to the place they were heading they are greeted by another soldier who says: 'Park it over there. Old Man's waiting.' in this scene there is no context whether the soldier is talking about the age of the person or something else, however thanks to Ukrainian version we can understand that he is probably referring to the rank of the person: 'Ставайте отам, капітан чекає'.

Generalisation of meaning refers to the act of replacing words or phrases in the source language that have a narrow meaning with words or phrases in the target language that have a broader or more general meaning.

In the scene that we have discussed before during the dialog between American soldiers who captured a German soldier and others at the base.

D: Hey, why are you bringing him through here? Why isn't he sleeping?

Д: Навіщо ви його сюди ведете? Чому він не в землі?

People at war tend to use different terms to indicate death or the process of killing in general. In our case, in the original, soldiers use more soft term 'Why isn't he sleeping?' While in Ukrainian version more straightforward phrase was used: 'Чому він не в землі?'.

Now let's analyze grammatical translating transformations which are present in the movie. They are most common type of transformation which I have encountered in this picture.

Let's start with omission, which main feature is to avoid redundant information.

There is an expression in the original script which is an omission. It indicates the ruthless nature of the war: 'Anything that makes a move, you cut them right in half', in Ukrainian version it was decided to use more short phrase, to cut someone in half means to kill somebody, which is exactly how that scene sounds in Ukrainian version: 'Як хтось ворухнеться, стріляй'.

The opposite transformation to omission is addition, researching this type of transformation I can state that it's inherent to the Ukrainian translation and can be seen a lot and this film is not an exception.

The next type is zero transformation, which represents word for word reproduction of syntactic structure. These are examples of zero transformation:

D: How many troops did he see?

C: I don't know.

D: What kind of troops? They have tanks, horses, artillery?

Д: Скільки цього ворога?

С: Не знаю.

Д: З чим маємо справу? В них танки, коні, артилерія?

There are a lot of cases of zero transformation in this film, so I have decided to look into another types of transformations instead of focusing on only this one.

The next type of grammatical translation transformation is replacement. It is main distinction from other types is substitution of a word belonging to one part of speech by a word belonging to another part of speech.

Good example can be seen in the scene before the assault and rescue mission tank commanders are consulting about the mission plan, an interesting dialog is taking place:

D: Why are you such an asshole?

Д: А чому ти триндиш багато?

In this interaction we can spot the usage of replacement in translation from source to Ukrainian language. in English, a noun is used for description, as in Ukrainian, emotions are accurately conveyed using a verb. In addition, in original the emphasis is been made on the fact that experienced crew should risk their lives for freshman who are stuck under enemy fire, however in Ukrainian version translators decided to underline the heroic nature of such decision, even if it is a risky virtue.

In one scene which portrays an intense battle, the newbie soldier is tasked with an objective to shoot dead enemy soldiers, to make sure they won't shoot allies in the back.

For a regular human, taking a life leaves a huge mental impact for the rest of your life, but to shoot an already dead human is even more challenging for your mental health. In the dialog between main characters we can see the devastation of Norman, new crewmate of main tank team:

N: I can't fucking be here any-fucking-more!

D: Turn your goddamn intercom off if you're gonna bawl like that.

Н: Я тут, бляха ні секунди більше не витримаю!

Д: Вимикай рацію, коли хочеш бути нюнею

We can see the same situation here – changing the verb to a noun. It is interesting to observe, that in Ukrainian version of this piece we can observe that Norman is literally on edge of his mental health after receiving such vicious task.

The next one is transposition. It is main particularity is a change in order of words in phrases and sentences, which is often caused by the structural differences. You can spot it in the following example:

N: Kill me! Kill me! Kill me! Kill me!

Н: Вбий мене! Вбий мене! Мене вбий! Мене Вбий!

Now let's analyze lexical and grammatical transformations.

The first type of lexical and grammatical transformations is antonymic translation which is known for it is substitution of the source language notion by it is opposite in translation with the relevant restructuring like in the following example:

Boyd says: 'You mind if I continue invading Germany?' which is interesting in the cultural and historic aspects. In original Americans soldiers understand that they are foreign soldiers on foreign land, and a lot of them consider themselves invaders, even if they are fighting for the 'greater good'.

In Ukrainian version we hear 'Можна мені продовжувати звільняти Німеччину?'. In this context we persuade those soldiers differently, as liberators who came to another country with the idea of freeing German from Hitler's regime. This kind of narrative is still present in a lot of historic works from soviet times.

The next type I want to analyze is total reorganisation. It's main feature is rearrangement of the inner form of any segment of the text. It can be spotted in the following example:

Sgt.B: Why are we rescuing kittens, instead of just driving down into Berlin? (Якого ми тут граємось в героїв, коли можна піти на Берлін?).

There is also another piece of interaction between Don and the captain which indicates that people often use all means to humiliate an enemy, most frequently – using words and harsh language:

C: You just paste them hard for me.

C: Змели тих ковбасників на фарш.

We can see that in Ukrainian language old stereotype was used (about German's love for sausages) to show that hate among troubled American regiment towards nazis.

Same thing is with the phrase which was used by tank commander Don: 'All right, knock it off. Knock off the horseplay' to stop childish behavior of his crew on an important mission. Ukrainian language doesn't have a direct counterpart to that interesting idiom, that's why it was decided to use the direct approach here: 'Досить. Годі дуріти, хлопці'.

In one of the most brutal scenes of the movie we can hear this line from Don: 'Next German you see with a weapon, you rake the dog shit out of him.' which indicates the nature of war, where moral side of the soldiers is questioned. In Ukrainian language translators used: 'Наступного разу побачиш німця – стріляй як ненормальний.' that also makes the scene heavier when you understand that those soldiers were literal kids.

Next example is brought by this one-liner that is delivered by Don while his tank platoon is moving to the destination, however in that short scene we can spot the change of the tone for a brief moment:

D: There you go, boys. Keep pounding them.

Д: Гарно малюють, бомбіть гадів.

In this scene we can observe an air battle between an allied air forces and german planes. It would be pretty generic scene, however thanks to Ukrainian translation we can understand that every person see an object differently, even in the context of war.

First of all, in Ukrainian translation Don comments on the beauty of the shapes of plane's traces which are formed behind them. And just after that the movie gets us back into the harsh reality of war by showing Dom rooting for their side of the air-fight.

Phraseological units are fixed expressions that consist of two or more words that function together as a single semantic unit, conveying a specific meaning that is often non-compositional or idiomatic. These expressions can include idioms, collocations, proverbs, and other types of fixed phrases commonly used in a language.

The example of the phraseological units can be spotted right from the start of the movie we can listen to an audio que which appears to be radio-communication between soldiers on the mission and their staff. From it we can learn that the name of the headquarters is 'Culture', and in Ukrainian it was translated as 'Чистюля'. In context of war that makes sense, because soldiers and officers who were in the field were more likely to get their hands dirty, especially in terms of killing, while people in the rear were more 'чисті' or 'cultural'.

We can spot other numerous phraseological units throughout the movie. One of the most memorable is used when the crewmembers of the tank were arguing at the start of the movie and one of them says: 'Who put the fucking nickel in you, top?' and in Ukrainian the translators picked an idiom 'Яка муха тебе вкусила?', which is used in both languages to indicate an ongoing conflict.

Ukrainian translators used the word 'сила' to bring the best meaning possible for the viewer translating an English idiom:

D: All you understand is the fist and boot.

Д: Ти тільки силу розумієш.

Another example which was used in the movie to describe cunning German soldiers who could be hiding among civilians is 'wolf in the sheep', Ukrainian languages has a perfect counterpart which was used in the movie – 'вовк в овечій шкурі'

There is also an idiom which was masterfully used to portray the difference between the people in the rear and those who are deep in the frontline. Once the captain of the brigade requested help and was left with a denial he comments about in this way: 'Pencil-pushing motherfucker', referring to the commanding staff. Ukrainian version of this scene also translated that irritation very well using the expression: 'Тиловий щур', to indicate that most people of the rear don't understand the problems on the front and very often are scared of it.

There is also a scene where crewmates describe to Norman – new team member their commander – Don using an interesting phraseological unit.

G: <u>Don might be crazier than a shithouse rat, but he's solid.</u> We've been together since before Africa. I won't fight with anybody else.

B: Me, neither. (Це точно)

Г: <u>Дон може з головою і не дружить, але він як та гора.</u> Ми були разом ще навіть до Африки. І він найкращий командир.

From this little conversation we can learn a lot about relationship between soldiers on war. The main things which matter there are loyalty and respect. Crewmates of Don's tank emphasize that without Don's craziness, loyalty and respect for his crew they probably wouldn't be alive by now. What is also interesting, apart from pointing out the crazy park of Don's character in both original and Ukrainian translation, in our version also his mates also commend his leading skills, hinting that that's exactly the reason why they are all still alive.

To summarize everything, I have gathered several scenes from the movie where we can see different types of transformation all at once.

For example, this interaction between Don and Norman is taking place after the battle and tank commander (Don) wants to teach a freshman (Norman) to take a human life in order to protect the rest of the crew using a german soldier captured after the battle, however Norman refuses an order:

N: It's not right (Це неправильно) – word for word translation

D: 'Not right'? (Неправильно?) – word for word translation

D: We're not here for right and wrong. (Ми тут не щоб про мораль думати) – total reorganization

D: We're here to kill them. (Ми тут щоб вбивати) – an omission.

In this part human limits are tested once again and in the original to emphasize it the idiom was used, while the Ukrainian translation also does so by generalizing it to one word – 'мораль'.

In the scene where Don's crew rides through downtown and they spot hanged bodies with signs you can understand that the cruelty of some people has no limits, and crewmembers mention exactly that:

B: What do them signs say? (В них таблички на шиях, що там написано?) – an addition.

D: I'm a coward and refused to fight for the German people. (Я боягуз і відмовляюся битися за німецький народ) – word for word translation.

G: The SS does that. (Це СС-івці.) – word for word translation.

G: Let them rip themselves to pieces, huh? (Нехай вирізають одне-одного, га?) – word for word translation.

G: Fuck them. (Падлюки) – replacement

They can't comprehend how fellow countryman can do those kinds of evil deeds to each-other.

Ukrainian translation is following the source material by emphasizing what kind of human can do such thing 'падлюка'.

During one of the most intense battles which takes place in tight spaces on the streets of small town we can witness following radio-chat between tank chiefs:

D: Binkowski, see that Kraut stinger in the cellar on my left? Mind giving him what for? (Не розберешся з тим дятлом, що у підвалі ліворуч?) – an ommision

B: I'm gonna slap him around a little bit for you. (Я йому зараз дзьоб вирву) – total reorganisation

Here we can see the professionalism of the tank commanders, their ability to remain calm and reasonable even in the most trying times. That's how we understand the reason behind their huge fight experience.

What is also worth noting, is that in Ukrainian version we can see that the accent is made on the emotional side of the battle, where is the original it is has more cold-blooded and agitated feeling to it.

In this scene Don shows Norman a room full of dead nazi high-ranked officers to bring him even deeper into the reality of war.

D: They knew we were coming. (Вони знали, що ми близько) – replacement

D: So they got drunk as lords and they shot themselves at sunup. (Вони напилися до чортів і застрелилися зі сходом сонця) – modulation

N: Why are you showing me this? (Нащо ви мені це показуєте?) – word for word translation.

D: Ideals are peaceful, history is violent (Всі хочуть миру, та життя брутальне) – total reorganisation.

In this scene we can see the clash of two different outlooks.

I think that in this interaction we can see where one person who was just thrown at the gates of the war tries to save his humanity with all means necessary and the other person, whose big part of life was nothing but war.

Don sees his sole mission in saving his crew, and to do that he wants to get rid of all weaknesses, and the empathy of Norman is one of them, that's why he wants to make him as ruthless as he can be.

Ukrainian translation once again putting an emphasis on the emotional side to make this scene more impactful with the usage of idiom and phase 'життя брутальне'.

In the next scene we can see the difference between people who lived regular life and people who have been living the war life for years and being almost feral in some senses:

C-A: I'm gonna fix that for you. (Почекай, приправу забула) – total reorganisation.

C-A: Let me just fix this for you real quick. (Секунду, зараз зробимо) – an ommision

C-A: I didn't touch her. (Не торкався) – an ommision

G: Y'all were gonna eat like kings and queens over here. And we weren't invited. (Вони тут збиралися їсти, як королі й королеви, а нас не запросили) – word for word translation.

This particular dialog show how much harm war can do to a healthy personality.

The best example here is Cone-Ass. He, out of all crewmates breaks the most at the scene of the normal life and starts harassing civilian German girl Emma. In Ukrainian version of this scene he offers her a 'seasoning' to her meal, after that he drools over her scrambled egg. It seems that he only did this to bring his cruel world into the world of regular noncombatant people, who try to live a normal life.

One of the most intense scenes in this movie isn't action-packed. However, it's frightful because of it's nature and the way it's been discussed at the dining table:

English version:

G: Your eyes see it, but your head can't make no sense of it.

G: And we go in there.

G: And for three whole days, we shoot the wounded horses.

G: All day long.

G: Sunup to sundown, just shooting horses.

G: And they were some hot summer days.

B: I ain't never smelled nothing like that, top.

G: Do you know how you kill a horse?

G: You pet it on the...

G: Pet it on the forehead, no?

G: And it becomes your friend, it goes like this.

G: And then you shoot it right through the spine.

G: And the sound of it?

G: Those fucking screaming horses?

G: Do you remember that, Don?

G: All the black clouds of flies

G: just buzzing around.

G: It was like being in a giant beehive.

G: But you weren't there.

Ukrainian version:

Г: Очі бачать, але в голові це не вкладається.

Г: І ми починаємо ходити

Г: І цілих три дні ми добиваємо поранених коней

Г: Цілісінькі три дні.

Г: Від ранку до ночі, добиваємо коней.

Г: А дні були тоді спекотні

Б: А запах це щось із чимось, шеф

Г: Знаєш як вбивають коня?

Г: Ти гладиш його…

Г: Гладиш по чолі, так?

Г: І кінь думає, що ти його друг

Г: А потім ти стріляєш, просто в хребет

Г: А ці звуки…

Г: Крики коня в агонії

Г: Пам'ятаєш цей жах, Дон?

Г: І ці чорні хмари мух

Г: Їхнє гудіння

Г: Це все одно, що бути у великому вулику

Г: Тільки тебе там не було

In this scene we hear powerful monologue delivered by one of the crewmates – Gordo. In his speech he doesn't describe human suffering or some atrocious battle with high casualties or one of those horrible things.

Gordo describes something more impactful for the human soul – suffering of the animal. To be clear – horses.

It's a well-known fact that animals suffered a lot in both First and Second World Wars and mercy killing of the wounded horse was a common occasion, however many war survivors describe this task as one of the most terrifying experiences they have endured in the war due to the screams of the animal companion.

In Ukrainian version Gordo emphasizes that they have been doing this for three days straight, which is mentally unbearable even by thinking about that. That partially explains the behavior of the crew at dining table. And judging from their backstory that's just one of many horrendous things they have done on the war.

I have decided to choose this part because it did the best job in showing the real concept of war, true horror that destroys everything in the beautiful world we live in and also captures human souls into it's devastating limbo of mental suffering, leaving only the shells of those who were once normal human beings.

To conclude, in this chapter we have revised the script of the film Fury for numerous means of translation to identify which language tools were used by Ukrainian translators to adapt the concept of war as close to an ordinary viewer as possible.

If we analyse the data that we collected during our research we can get such interesting results of the most used means of translations:

Lexical transformations – 15%

Lexical and semantic transformations – 25%

Grammatical transformations – 30%

Lexical and grammatical transformations – 20%

Phraseological units – 10%

That means that during during the translation the most used tool to create and understanding of the concept of among general audience was grammatical transformation. However, other means also helped to reach the main goal of enriched the plot to such extent that the concept of war would be revealed for every viewer in their own personal way.

CONCLUSIONS

In our work we managed to describe and analyse the specifics of the Ukrainian translation of means of verbalizing the «WAR» concept using the material from the film Fury directed by David Ayer.

In the first chapter we described the theoretical basis that helped us to better understand the meaning and specifics of the term "concept" from the perspective of translation studies and philosophy, which aided us in further study of the "war" concept and how to research it properly.

We have also studied the field of fictional discourse, especially one of it's type - film discourse to better understand how to work more properly with the script of such impactful movie as Fury and to use all available tools, so we can provide the best analysis possible.

In the second chapter we do more practical research to understand what language units are used for and how they enrich our understanding about the concept of war.

To conclude, after the research it's clear that the means of translation play a huge part of our comprehension of the any concept, the concept of war is no different. What is even more fascinating is an impact of the language of translation, you could have seen numerous times on the example of the 'Fury', the difference between the original and Ukrainian versions, and sometimes the emotional impact of one scene can be completely different due to the cultural, historical and other reasons.

Using all those means we can see how vast this concept is. In the plot of the movie we can see numerous times both humane, beautiful moments that give us hope for the future of mankind and at the same time gruesome and ruthless side of it, where death and destruction are the main characters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Васянович Євгенія. Структурно-семантичне наповнення концепту «війна» у лінгвістичних дослідженнях: Гуманітарна освіта в технічних вищих навчальних закладах. № 38, Київ, 2018. Ст. 5-10.

2. Винникова Т. А. Моделювання механізмів розуміння кінотекстів: Автореферат. Дис. Барнаул, 2010. – 23 с.

3. Ісаєнко О. В. Текст і медіатекст як категорії кінодискурсу/Лінгвістичні дослідження: Зб. наук, праць ХНПУ ім. Г. С. Сковороди. 2015. – с. 93-96.

4. Лавриненко І. Н. Стратегії і тактики комунікативних ролей в сучасному англомовному кінодискурсі. Дисс. Харків, 2011. – 260 с.

5. Максімов С. Є. Практичний курс перекладу (англійська та українська мови): Навчальний посібник 2-ге видання, «Ленвіт», м. Київ, 2012. Ст. 204.

6. Стаднік І. О. Поняттєвий компонент концепту WAR/війна як об'єкт перекладу: Херсонський державний університет, 2016. Ст. 313-316. URL: https://eprints.oa.edu.ua/5069/1/114.pdf.

7. Яворська Г. М. Концепт «війна»: семантика і прагматика. Стратегічні пріоритети, № 1 (38), 2016 р. Ст. 14-23. URL: https://www.rastko.rs/cms/files/books/577a757fb1999.pdf.

8. Concept as the Main Research Object of Cognitive Linguistics: International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 2016, VOL. 11, NO. 10. P. 3167-3178. URL: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1114655.pdf.

9. Evans V. How Words Mean. New York. 2009.

10. Georges Rey. Concepts: Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 1998. P. 3. URL: https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/concepts/v-1.

11. Guattari Deleuze. Concepts: Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 1998. P. 7.

12. Lakoff G. and Johnsen M. Metaphors we live by. London: The university of Chicago press, 2003. P. 193.

13. Zaichenko S. Film discourse as a powerful form of media and its multisemiotic features. Future Academy, 2019 – pp. 629-635.

14. Živil Nemickien. "Concept" in Modern Linguistics: the Component of the Concept "Good": Kaunas College. P. 1-11. URL: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/62656539.pdf.

LIST OF REFERENCE SOURCES

15. Cambridge Dictionary. URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/.

ANNEX

1. Tank – танк

2. Hitler – Гітлер

3. Norman – Норман

4. Artillery – артилерія

5. Sergeant – сержант

6. Mexican – мексиканець

7. Ration – раціон

8. Army – армія

9. Cigarettes – сигарети

10. Traverse left, 800! – Гармата ліворуч на восьму годину!

11. Don't disappoint Christ, now. Don't let them lead you astray – Не засмучуй Христа, не піддавайся спокусі.

12. You know how I stand on it. You trying to rile me up now – Ви знаєте мою думку. Просто злите мене.

13. All right, how many tanks we got? – Так, скільки в нас танків?

14. I say, why you always whupping on me? – Чому ти завжди до мене чіпляєшся?

15. They murdered some good boys out there today. – Вони сьогодні поклали багато хороших хлопців.

16. Cast an eyeball on them – Пильнуй, малий. Не відводь очей.

17. Water and gas – вода та паливо.

18. Bible – пастор

19. G2 wants a prisoner to question – Командування хоче допитати полоненого.

20. Why isn't he sleeping? – Чому він не в землі?

21. Park it over there. Old Man's waiting – Ставайте отам, капітан чекає.

22.   Anything that makes a move, you cut them right in half – Як хтось ворухнеться, стріляй.

23.   What kind of troops? They have tanks, horses, artillery? – З чим маємо справу? В них танки, коні, артилерія?

24.   Why are you such an asshole? – А чому ти триндиш багато?

25.   Turn your goddamn intercom off if you're gonna bawl like that. – Я тут, бляха ні секунди більше не витримаю!

26.   Kill me! Kill me! Kill me! Kill me! – Вбий мене! Вбий мене! Мене вбий! Мене Вбий!

27.   You mind if I continue invading Germany? – Можна мені продовжувати звільняти Німеччину?

28.   Why are we rescuing kittens, instead of just driving down into Berlin? – Якого ми тут граємось в героїв, коли можна піти на Берлін?

29.   You just paste them hard for me. – Змели тих ковбасників на фарш.

30.   All right, knock it off. Knock off the horseplay – Досить. Годі дуріти, хлопці.

31.   Next German you see with a weapon, you rake the dog shit out of him – Наступного разу побачиш німця – стріляй як ненормальний.

32.   There you go, boys. Keep pounding them – Гарно малюють, бомбіть гадів.

33.   Culture – Чистюля

34.   Who put the fucking nickel in you, top? – Яка муха тебе вкусила?

35.   All you understand is the fist and boot. – Ти тільки силу розумієш

36.   Wolf in the sheep – вовк в овечій шкурі;

37.   Pencil-pushing motherfucker – Тиловий щур;

38.   Don might be crazier than a shithouse rat, but he's solid – Дон може з головою і не дружить, але він як та гора.

39.   : We're not here for right and wrong. – Ми тут не щоб про мораль думати

40.   What do them signs say? – В них таблички на шиях, що там написано?

41.   Let them rip themselves to pieces, huh? – Нехай вирізають одне-одного, га?

42.   Binkowski, see that Kraut stinger in the cellar on my left? Mind giving him what for? – Не розберешся з тим дятлом, що у підвалі ліворуч?

43.   So they got drunk as lords and they shot themselves at sunup. – Вони напилися до чортів і застрелилися зі сходом сонця.

44.   Ideals are peaceful, history is violent – Всі хочуть миру, та життя брутальне.

45.   Y'all were gonna eat like kings and queens over here. And we weren't invited – Вони тут збиралися їсти, як королі й королеви, а нас не запросили.

46.   Your eyes see it, but your head can't make no sense of it – Очі бачать, але в голові це не вкладається.

47.   And for three whole days, we shoot the wounded horses – І цілих три дні ми добиваємо поранених коней;

48.   And then you shoot it right through the spine – А потім ти стріляєш, просто в хребет;

49.   Those fucking screaming horses? – Крики коня в агонії

50.   It was like being in a giant beehive – Це все одно, що бути у великому вулику.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Курсову роботу присвячено особливостям українського перекладу засобів вербалізації концепту WAR. У ході роботи висвітлено основні наукові думки в галузі перекладознавства, описано поняття концепту та основні трансформації у процесі перекладу. Крім того, у курсовій роботі наведено фактичний матеріал дослідження – 50 англійських речень із досліджуваним явищем за проблематикою курсової роботи та їх переклад українською мовою.

Ключові слова: концепт, кінодискурс, дискурсивний і стилістичний аналіз, засоби вербалізації.