

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: **THE SPECIFICS OF RENDERING IN UKRAINIAN THE UNITS OF THE LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD "CRIME" IN THE BRITISH DISCOURSE OF THE DETECTIVE GENRE (based on Agata Christie's novel «Nemesis»)**

Group PA 20-19  
School of translation studies  
Educational Programme:  
**Theory and Practice of Translation  
from English**  
Majoring 035 Philology  
**Bohdan O. Samar**

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

**КУРСОВА РОБОТА**

З ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

**ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ВІДТВОРЕННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОЮ МОВОЮ ОДИНИЦЬ  
ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧНОГО ПОЛЯ «CRIME» У БРИТАНСЬКОМУ  
ДИСКУРСІ ДЕТЕКТИВНОГО ЖАНРУ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ РОМАНУ  
АГАТИ КРІСТІ NEMESIS ‘НЕМЕЗІДА’)**

Самар Богдан  
Студент групи ПА 20-19

Керівник курсової роботи \_\_\_\_\_  
(підпис)  
Викладач  
Шкута Олена Георгіївна

Київ – 2023

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1	
THEORETICAL BASIS OF STUDYING THE SPECIFICITY OF REPRODUCING UNITS OF THE LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD «CRIME» IN TRANSLATION ....	4
1.1 The problem of lexical-semantic fields in modern linguistics.....	4
1.2 Classifications of translation transformations relevant to the tasks of literary translation.....	9
1.3 The problem of studying detective discourse in linguistic studios.....	14
CHAPTER 2	
SPECIFICS OF RENDERING IN THE UKRAINIAN TRANSLATION OF THE LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD «CRIME» BASED ON AGATHA CHRISTIE'S DETECTIVE NOVEL «NEMESIS».....	19
2.1. Lexical transformations in reproducing the units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the Ukrainian translation of the British detective discourse.....	19
2.2. Grammatical transformations in rendering the units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the Ukrainian translation of the British detective discourse.....	26
2.3. Combination of lexical and grammatical transformations in reproducing the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the Ukrainian translation of the British detective discourse.....	36
CONCLUSIONS.....	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	44
LIST OF REFERENCE SOURCES.....	47
LIST OF DATA SOURCES.....	47
ANNEX.....	48
PE3IOME.....	56

## INTRODUCTION

The analysis of the lexical-semantic field as structured knowledge about the corresponding fragment of reality acquires special importance, including in the aspect of studying modern detective discourse since such a field reflects a unique author's microcosm, an individual author's picture of the world. In addition, the relevance of the given topic is determined by its correspondence with the general direction of lexical studies on the in-depth study of the systematic organization of vocabulary in the language.

Lexical-semantic means in the discourse of the detective genre were studied by such Ukrainian and foreign scientists as J. Barzun, T.O. Bekhta, L.V. Duchenko, N. Maiboroda, O.O. Ponomarova, L.V. Tsapenko, who focused on the problems of genre-linguistic, structural-compositional, communicative-pragmatic, linguistic-cognitive and linguistic-synergistic features of this type of literary discourse. The lexical-semantic field of CRIME in the functional-semantic aspect of its manifestation was studied in the article by S. Sheludchenko and T. Kalynyushko [27] based on Agatha Christie's novels. At the same time, the problem of researching the lexical-semantic field in the aspect of reproduction of its components in translations remains a lacunar area of modern translation studies, which determines the scientific relevance and novelty of our research.

**The aim** of the research is to identify and analyze the main options of reproduction in the Ukrainian translation of units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the British discourse of the detective genre based on Agatha Christie's novel «Nemesis».

The main **objectives** of the research are:

- to highlight the problem of lexical-semantic fields in modern linguistics, proposing a definition of a field as an operational unit of analysis;
- to classify translation transformations that correspond to the tasks of literary translation with a distinction between methods and techniques of translation;
- to identify the specifics of detective discourse;

- to single out the core, central and peripheral components, constituting the lexical-semantic field «Crime» based on Agatha Christie's detective novel «Nemesis»;
- to identify and analyze formal lexical and lexical-semantic transformations in the translation of the components of lexical-semantic field «Crime»;
- to specify the grammatical transformations used in the reproduction of units of the lexical-semantic field "Crime";
- to clarify the combination of lexical and grammatical transformations to render the components of the lexical-semantic field «Crime».

**The object** of the research is the units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in Agatha Christie's detective novel «Nemesis».

**The subject** of the research is translational transformations in the reproduction of the components of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the text under consideration.

**The data sources** involve the Agatha Christie's detective novel «Nemesis».

The aim, tasks and data sources determine **the methods** of the study, which involve the text-interpretive analysis to identify and classify units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime», the method of descriptive analysis – for the description and classification of translation transformations applied in the target text, the method of comparative translation analysis aimed at comparing the units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the source and target texts as well as the method of quantitative analysis to determine the main options of reproduction in the translation of the lexical-semantic field «Crime».

**The theoretical significance** of the study lies in the fact that it can contribute to the problem of theoretical understanding of the ways of ordering lexical-semantic units into a field structure, as well as to the translational problem of reproducing such a structure.

**The practical value** of the research is based on its practical contribution to ways of transferring the lexical-semantic field «Crime» from English to Ukrainian. The results of the research can be used as a practical material on seminars on the practical course of translation and elective courses on the problems of translation of literary texts [Введіть текст]

in the aspect of reproduction in the target text of their lexical-semantic and stylistic characteristics.

**The structure** of the research paper includes the Introduction, two Chapters, Conclusions, Bibliography, List of Reference Sources, List of Data Sources, Annex and a Summary in Ukrainian.

## CHAPTER 1

# THEORETICAL BASIS OF STUDYING THE SPECIFICITY OF REPRODUCING UNITS OF THE LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD «CRIME» IN TRANSLATION

### 1.1 The problem of lexical-semantic fields in modern linguistics

In modern linguistics, the study of language units, their semantics, structure and functions from the standpoint of a systemic approach is of considerable interest. Linguistic units are combined into certain systems, the main characteristics of which include integrity, hierarchy and structure.

Currently, various lexical combinations are being studied, including lexical-semantic fields, semantic fields, lexical-thematic groups, lexical-semantic groups, semantic-grammatical groups, synonymous and antonymous paradigms, paronyms, etc. [1; 4; 5; 10; 11; 15; 17; 19; 21; 24; 26; 27; 28; 29].

One of the priority directions of modern research is the study of vocabulary in the form of semantically integrated parts – lexical-semantic fields, despite the fact that such studies are within the framework of a system-centric scientific paradigm. The largest lexical unit – the lexical-semantic field – attracts the keen interest of researchers as it is a holistic fragment of the national linguistic worldview. The comprehensive study of the lexical-semantic field allows for important conclusions to be drawn about certain characteristics of the national mentality of the language speakers, their priorities, and systems of values, which are reflected in lexical units.

The theory of semantic fields assumes that the lexical items of language can be classified into sets, or fields, related semantically and dividing up the semantic space in various ways. According to P.R. Lutzeler, semantic fields are special types of paradigms being derived from verbal contexts [19: 2].

For example, the field of «Killing Human Beings» in English includes such lexemes as «kill, murder, assassinate, massacre, slaughter, butcher, execute», which differ from one another in respect of many components of meaning [21: 201-220].

Thus, the object of the analysis of semantic fields is to collect all the lexical items that belong to a particular field while decomposing their meanings and showing the relationships of each of them to each other and to the common integrative meaning [17: 16]. The field is often subsumed under a general term usually referred to as the «archilexeme», «headword» [17], «generic term» [23] and «superordinate lexeme» (or «superordinate») [20]. In this vein, the lexeme «Killing» is the archilexeme of the field, which includes the lexical units mentioned above.

To reveal the connection of the field components with each other and with the unifying archiseme, the linguists usually apply the component analysis, which aims to decompose the meanings of lexemes into minimal semantic features which are contrastive and significant [23].

The founder of the semantic field method is the German scientist J. Trier, who distinguished between «conceptual» and «verbal» fields. By the conceptual field this scientist understood a separate conceptual sphere, or a number of concepts present in linguistic consciousness, which does not have an external form of expression in language [28: 129]. The verbal field is formed from conceptually related words and is subordinated to a closed conceptual complex in different ways, the internal organization of which is represented in the structure of the verbal field. However, the boundary between the conceptual and verbal fields in Trier's concept is not clear.

In contrast to the paradigmatic fields of J. Trier, the semantic field of V. Porzig [25] is based on the valence properties of words and is a syntagmatic formation that reveals the most characteristic connections of the meanings of words in their word combinations and derivative relations.

For example, the adjective «convict», if to be based on Porzig's concept, will be associated with the word «criminal» or «offender»; the verb «commit» will form the syntagmatic relations with the word «crime». That is, the nuclear elements in the Porzig's field are verbs and adjectives as words capable of expressing attributive features and perform a predicative function, and other linguistic elements of the field are combined with nuclear elements.



In modern linguistics, the term «field» is defined in various ways. According to L. Weisgerber [32], a field is a set of linguistic units, primarily lexical ones, united by a common meaning (sometimes also by common formal features) that reflect conceptual, object-related, or functional similarities of denoted phenomena [32: 380-381]. The Ukrainian researcher I. A. Askerova defines the field as a particular type of system, grouping, and interaction of linguistic elements based on the analytical approaches to language facts [1: 22-24].

N. Kanonik and A. Shkarovetska [4] distinguish several main aspects of using the field as a semantic model, that is:

(1) the semasiological aspect, which includes paradigmatic and syntagmatic levels of analysis (words are grouped by semantic relatedness of their lexical meanings);

(2) the onomasiological aspect (words are grouped by their extralinguistic relatedness, i.e., by the relatedness of objects, phenomena, and concepts that are designated by the words);

(3) the functional (inter-level) aspect (units of the field are grouped by a common semantic function).

It should be noted that within the first two approaches, the units of the field are homogeneous elements, while from the functional approach, they are elements of different linguistic levels [4: 191].

Semasiological approach focuses on lexical-semantic fields, semantic classes, and semantic fields as the higher level of abstraction in lexical semantics, as well as on lexical-semantic groups, antonymic and synonymous groups (series) [29].

Onomasiological approach deals with thematic groups, conceptual and associative fields.

In modern linguistics the scientists differentiate between semantic, lexico-semantic, and conceptual fields [29].

A lexical field is considered to be a field that unites components of one part of speech based on several closely related meanings or one archiseme (for example, based

on the archiseme «crime»). A conceptual field relates to a systemic-structural grouping united by a common concept.

A semantic field is a set of contiguous meanings united by the semantics of the constituents of the lexical field (for example, a set of meanings in a glossary). According to N.Ya. Klyuchka [5], the semantic field is characterized by the following features: (1) the presence of semantic relations (correlations) between its component words; (2) the systemic nature of these relations; (3) interdependence of lexical units; (4) relative autonomy of the field; (5) the continuity of the designation of its semantic space; (6) the interconnection of semantic fields within the entire lexical system [5: 130]. Linguistic units that form fields reflect the objective connections of phenomena and objects of material reality, their substantive, conceptual or functional similarity.

If we differentiate between the concepts of lexical, semantic, and lexical-semantic field, then a semantic field can be defined as the related lexical units, each of which is characterized by a common concept; a lexical field – as a structure that unites words on an object-conceptual basis, the invariant of which is a non-linguistic phenomenon (denotata or a set of denotates, signified or a plurality of signifieds) and whose data are organized according to the principle of center and periphery. Finally, a lexical-semantic field is constructed by a combination of words that have paradigmatic and syntagmatic characteristics.

The lexico-semantic field is a paradigmatic grouping of lexical units based on a shared integral component of meaning. According to O.O. Selivanova, the structure of the field has a center, which includes the most commonly used words with the integral meaning, and a periphery, which is characterized by a much lower frequency of use and a stylistic coloring of meaning [33: 282-283]. The periphery of the field contains units that are furthest in meaning from the core. Peripheral words specify and detail the main meaning of the field. Usually, peripheral elements are related to other semantic fields, forming a lexical-semantic integrity of the language system.

In addition to the center and periphery, the field has a core represented by a generic semantic component around which the field unfolds. The core is characterized by neutrality, and high frequency of use. As the core is a lexical expression of meanings [Введите текст]

or semantic features, it can replace any member of the paradigm, serving, according to N Klyuchka [5] as a representative of the entire paradigm [5: 130]. The distinction between core and peripheral elements depends on the ability of one or another lexeme to express the main meaning, the frequency of its use, the genre-stylistic differentiation of meanings, valence, etc.

There are different points of view about which units are grouped into the lexico-semantic field. L. Weisgerber admits that lexico-semantic field is formed from words of different parts of speech, connected to each other by both semantic and word-forming relations [32]. A similar point of view regarding the fact that the lexical-semantic field combines lexical units with the corresponding semantics that may belong to different parts of speech is held by J. Trier [28]. N. Kanonik and A. Shkarovetska consider that the types of fields differ in the degree of their abstraction. In particular, the lexico-semantic field can be understood as (1) grammatically homogeneous part-of-speech formation, whose constituents belong to a specific part of speech and are grouped based on the similarity of their part-of-speech semantics; (2) grammatically heterogeneous part-of-speech fields, whose constituents belong to different parts of speech and are similar in their lexical meanings [4: 192-193].

The lexico-semantic field has a multi-level structure consisting of smaller structural units – lexical-semantic groups (LSG). In particular, Zh.P. Sokolovska defines a lexico-semantic group as «a grouping of word meanings that contain specific concepts that differ in the degree of manifestation of quality, feature, action, and opposing qualities of feature, action, object, phenomenon» [10: 54].

In this vein, the concepts of «field» and «lexical-semantic groups» can be related in genus-species relationships, where «field» is a general term, and «lexical-semantic groups» is its specific case.

The first and to this day the most significant study in the sphere of lexical-semantic groups is the work of F.P. Filin «On lexical-semantic groups of words» [11]. The main linguistic criterion for the selection of lexical-semantic groups is, as noted by F.P. Filin, the presence of semantic connections between words according to their lexical meanings. The categorical similarity of lexical-semantic groups is also taken [Введите текст]

into account as it ensures strong inter-lexical semantic connections that are manifested both at the level of lexical meanings of words and at the level of their word-formation constituents, thus ensuring the integrity of both the content and form of the LSG.

In summarizing approaches to defining a lexical-semantic field we define such a phenomenon as a structural-semantic unit of language characterized by the semantic connection between words and their meanings, designated by the notion of «archisema», hierarchical core-peripheral organization, not obligatory categorical similarity of lexical units, relative autonomy of units, continuity of semantic space and genus-species relationships between field and its constituting lexical-semantic groups.

## **1.2 Classifications of translation transformations relevant to the tasks of literary translation**

Translating the units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» is a complex translation problem, as the translator may face difficulties in choosing appropriate words and conveying the necessary meanings and nuances in the translation under the influence of various factors. Specifically, we believe that the semantic nuances of the nominative units related to the field of «Crime» will affect the adequacy of the translation. In Ukrainian, there are various terms that belong to the lexical-semantic field of «Crime», and each of them has its own nuances and significance. For example, «злочин» [34: 605] may include aspects such as violence, theft, fraud, whereas «правопорушення» [35: 508] may be a less serious violation of the law. The translator should consider these nuances and choose the most appropriate term for translation. In addition to this, cultural and historical differences can also affect the understanding and use of the crime-associated words in the source and target languages. Some words, including legal terms within the field, may not have an exact equivalent in the target language. Finally, differences in legal systems can also complicate the translator's task. The legal systems of Ukraine and Great Britain have differences in terminology and the definition of crimes. For example, in Ukraine, there is a concept of «розбій», which may be absent or have different definitions in English legal language. Conversely, a

number of English terms such as a «probation officer», «jury of jurors» may not have equivalents in the Ukrainian language.

While rendering the units of lexical-semantic field of Crime the translator is based on the componential approach conducting a componential analysis of the semantic field to which the lexemes in the original text belong. This analysis may be partial at the outset and can gradually be expanded according to the needs of the translation process. By undertaking such an analysis, the translator does not need to include all the descriptive components of a semantic feature but to include the components that fit the context in the translated text.

Newmark [22] mentions the difference between translation methods and translation procedures. He writes that, «while translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language» [22: 81]. The scientist goes on to refer to the following methods of translation:

- (a) Word-for-word translation: in which the source language word order is preserved, and the words are translated based on their most common meanings, out of context.
- (b) Literal translation, in which the source language constructions are converted to their nearest target language equivalents, while the lexemes are translated singly, out of context.
- (c) Faithful translation when the translator aims to render the contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the target language grammatical structures.
- (d) Semantic translation that differs from 'faithful translation' in that it considers the aesthetic meanings of the source language text.
- (e) Adaptation, in which the source language culture is converted to the target language culture with rewriting the input text.
- (f) Free translation by which the target language is reproduced without the style, form, or content of the original.

(g) Idiomatic translation, which reproduces the idea of the original text while distorting nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms not existing in the original.

In domestic and foreign translation studies (American and Western European translation studies) [6; 8; 16; 18; 22] there are some differences in the classification of interlingual transformations, which can be denoted by different terms (translation procedures, translation transformations, translation shifts or translation techniques). All these notions refer to the linguistic and textual changes that occur when a text is translated from one language to another. These shifts can include changes in word order, grammar, vocabulary, tone, and style, as well as the addition or deletion of information to ensure that the meaning of the source text is accurately conveyed in the target language.

The following are the different translation procedures that Newmark [22: 82-114] proposes:

- *Transference*, which includes transliteration and transcription.
- *Naturalization*, which adapts the source language word «first to the normal pronunciation, then to the normal morphology of the target language».
- *Cultural equivalent* – with replacing a cultural word in the source language with a target language lexical unit.
- *Functional equivalent* – with the use of a culture-neutral word.
- *Descriptive equivalent* when the meaning of a target language nomination is explained in several words.
- *Componential analysis*: it means «comparing an SL word with a TL word which has a similar meaning but is not an obvious one-to-one equivalent, by demonstrating first their common and then their differing meaning components of the source and target languages» [22: 114].
- *Synonymy* – with choosing a «near target language equivalent. » [22: 84].
- *Through-translation* – calque or loan translation. [22: 84].

- *Shifts or transpositions*, which involves a change in the grammar, i.e, (a) from singular to plural, (b) of a specific source language structure, which does not exist in the target language, (c) of a source language part of speech [22: 86].
- *Modulation* – when the translator reproduces the message of the original text in the target language in conformity with its normative requirements [22: 88].
- *Recognized translation* – when the translator «normally uses the official or the generally accepted translation of any institutional term. » [22: 89].
- *Compensation* – when loss of meaning in one part of a sentence is compensated in another part. [22: 90].
- *Paraphrase*, by which the meaning of the lexical unit from the output text is explained. [22: 91].
- *Couplets* – when the translator combines different transformations-procedures. [22: 91].
- *Notes* – by adding information in a translation. [22: 91].

In our research, we are guided by S. Y. Maksimov's classification of translation transformations, who combines several classifications and categorizes transformations into grammatical and lexical-semantic [8: 112–117].

Among grammatical transformations the scientist identifies:

- (i) Rearrangement (e.g., *He was the criminal* – Злочинець – він (N: 33) (hereinafter, the serial number in brackets means the number of the English fragment and its translation into Ukrainian in the Appendices).
- (ii) Substitution of parts of speech or syntactic substitution (e.g., *A murderer as yet unsuspected.* – Убивцею, якого досі ніхто не підозрює (N: 39).
- (iii) Addition (e.g., *but afterwards, perhaps, he wondered about the psychology of these things* – але згодом, можливо, він зацікавився психологічним підґрунтям тих подій (N: 15).
- (iv) Omission (e.g., *She had been considering a possible murderer... hat about a prospective victim?* – Досі вона шукала подумки можливого вбивцю, а як щодо жертви? (N: 28).

Lexical-semantic transformations:

[Введіть текст]

- (i) Differentiation (e.g., Was it in some way connected with someone who had been out there, who had taken part or been an *onlooker* there – Може, вона була пов'язана з кимсь із людей, що були там, що брали участь у тих подіях чи були їхніми *свідками* (N: 21).
- (ii) Specification (e.g., Either as a source of information or *someone* concerned with *the law* or a law case, or it might even be a murderer – Або як джерело інформації, або як *людина*, що має стосунок до *органів правосуддя* чи якоїсь кримінальної справи, або навіть убивця (N: 22).
- (iii) Generalization (e.g., my ethical *conduct* as a lawyer. – від етичних *принципів* порядного адвоката (N: 11).
- (iv) Modulation (e.g., Mr Rafiel had implicit trust in my discretion and in my ethical conduct as a lawyer. – Містер Рейфаєл цілком довіряв моєму вмінню зберігати таємницю й не відступати від етичних принципів порядного адвоката (N: 11).
- (v) Antonymous translation (such a transformation is not identified in the analyzed detective novel).
- (vi) Complete / holistic transformation of the sentence (e.g., A crime where? – Отже, він думав про злочин, але який саме і де його скоєно? (N: 44).
- (vii) Compensation (e.g., I have never been *a probation officer* or indeed *sat as a magistrate on a Bench* – Я ніколи не служила ані в *поліції*, ані в *органах судочинства* (N: 4).

In addition to the types of transformations mentioned, when translating components of the lexical-semantic field «Crime», especially its terminological nominations, the translator may use such transformational techniques as Transcoding subdivided into Transliteration reproducing the graphic form of the word in the source language by means of the alphabet of the target language [6: 1] and Transcription as the reproducing the sound form of the word of the source language using phonemes of the target language [6: 1]: (e.g. Nemesis – Немезида) (N: 7).



The material of the subsection made it possible to reveal the differences between translation methods and translation procedures, also referred to in translation studies as translation transformations, translation shifts or translation techniques.

The course work integrates domestic and foreign taxonomies of transformations and uses a classification that distinguishes between lexical, grammatical, and lexical-semantic transformations.

### **1.3 The problem of studying detective discourse in linguistic studios**

Works related to the study of the discursive space of detective stories touch upon a very wide range of problems related to the stylistic features of detective fiction, its linguo-cognitive characteristics, structural-compositional and communicative-pragmatic parameters [2; 3; 7; 13; 14].

When studying detective novels, scholars usually focus on their compositional, genre, and narrative features, and often do not address the issue of linguistic characteristics of these texts. This is probably because, according to researchers, the main features of the detective discourse are a tendency towards standardization, typification, recognizability of plots and characters, the presence of clichés, which results in a formal and content unity of the work. According to S.O. Filonenko, popular literature, especially detective fiction, tends to conform to a canon, which implies both thematic and structural determinacy, where each element of the form is associated with a particular meaning. [12: 106].

At the same time, it is important to note that in a literary text, especially in the detective genre, it is the «lexical units that serve as important textual and stylistic factors» [7: 57], which determine the «ability of the text to capture and hold attention, ensured by a vivid conflict, the presence of intrigue, and dynamic plot development» [12: 70].

Studying the functioning of lexical-semantic means in detective fiction texts in English, Ukrainian, and French languages [2; 3; 9; 13], scientists conclude that such means become concrete-historical expression of the depicted events, help to convey the cultural-historical background, create an appropriate emotional background,

[Введите текст]

providing logical orderliness, compositional coherence, and completeness to the author's narrative.

In domestic linguistics the analysis of the lexical-semantic field was carried out on the material of Agatha Christie's detective novels in the article «Lexico-Semantic Field CRIME: the Functional and Semantic Aspects (a Study of the Novels «The Secret of Chimneys», «The Seven Dials Mystery», «Towards Zero» by Agatha Christie)» [27], the aim of which was to determine and characterize the semantic and functional peculiarities of the concept of «Crime» and its lexical-semantic manifestations.

In particular, the authors of the article managed to identify four basic lexico-semantic groups within the «Crime» field, differentiated by the criterion of their part-of-speech membership. The most numerous is the nominal lexico-semantic group, the second in frequency is the verbal lexico-semantic group, the third is adjectival, and the least numerous is the adverbial lexico-semantic group. In turn, each of the groups is represented by corresponding subgroups.

Our research differs from the work of the mentioned authors on several criteria. Firstly, the material of our study is Agatha Christie's novel «Nemesis», which, as far as we know, has not been the subject of linguistic and translation studies in Ukrainian and foreign linguistics. Secondly, we have chosen different criteria for identifying components of the lexico-semantic field of «Crime», namely, the nucleus-periphery criterion based on the proximity or remoteness of the meaning structure of the LSGs components from the hypernym with archiseme «Crime». The lexico-semantic groups themselves are differentiated based on differential semantics, related to the manifestation of the hypernym. Thirdly, our research differs in the subject of study, which is translation transformations.

The analysis of Agatha Christie's detective novel «Nemesis» revealed core central and peripheral parts, which constitute the lexical-semantic field of «Crime».

The core of the field is formed by the lexeme «Crime» (N: 33; N: 35) (the ordinal number in brackets hereinafter correlates with the numbering of the example in the Appendices).

The center of the field is formed by seven lexical-semantic groups, subdivided into substantive and verbal groups.

The substantive group include units for denoting:

(a) the types of crimes: Murders - вбивства (N: 1; N: 27); swindle (of a criminal kind) – шахрайська афера з грішми (N: 18), насильство (N: 32) (is identified only in a target text) (N: 33), espionage – шпигунство (N: 33), fraud or robbery – шахрайство (N: 33);

(b) the object, weapon and results of the crime: victim – жертва (N: 28; N: 29; N: 38), a body – труп (N: 30; N: 40), a dead body – мертве тіло (N: 41);

(c) designations of criminals: a murderer – вбивця (N: 12; N: 22; N: 23; N: 26; N: 27; N: 37; N: 38), criminals (N: 31; N 33) (in N: 31 the Ukrainian translation, due to the transformation of modulation, the lexeme «criminal» is absent and is reproduced with a word combination «скоїти злочин»);

(d) the law enforcement bodies and officials: probation officer – поліція (N: 4), a magistrate on a Bench – органи судочинства (N: 4), a detective agency - агенція детективних розслідувань (N: 4) (examples are provided from the Appendices as they are used in the original and target texts – although the translation is often not literal, applying the various translation transformations analyzed in the next section); lawyer – адвокат (N: 6);

(e) instruments of enforcement of justice: Nemesis – Немезида (N: 7) (metaphonymic nomination of tools for the forced implementation of principles of justice, personification of Retribution, Revenge, Retribution, based on an allusion to the precedent name of the ancient Greek goddess of retribution Nemesis), the law - органи правосуддя (N: 22), the law – закон (N: 24), Justice – Правосуддя (N: 24),

The verbal group include units for denoting:

(f) the actions associated with Crime: to kill - забрати чиєсь життя (N: 23), preparing to kill – готується забрати (чиєсь життя) (N: 23), stabbed with a dagger – заколотого кинджалом (N: 40);

(g) the actions and items associated with investigation process: undertake an investigation – здійснити таке розслідування (N: 2); investigation of crime – розслідування злочинів (N: 3), get mixed up in any murders – втручатися в розслідування (N: 1), to serve the cause of justice - послужити справедливості й правосуддю (N: 9), to administer justice – здійснювати правосуддя (N: 16), criminal affair – кримінальна справа (N: 10; N: 22), onlooker – свідок (N: 21), to set right an injustice – виправити помилку правосуддя (N: 36), to avenge evil by bringing it to justice – знайти злочинця (N: 36); to have connection with crime – мати стосунок до злочинів (N: 3; N: 5), Not connected with crime - Непричетна до вбивства (N: 25), connected or concerned with a murder – причетний до вбивства (N: 37), unsuspected – ніхто не підозрює (N: 39);

The periphery of the field is formed by six lexical-semantic groups, namely substantive, verbal and attributive, which include units:

(a) to designate qualifications of law enforcement officers and officials: to be qualified (to undertake an investigation) – кваліфікованіші (для того, щоб здійснити розслідування) (N: 2), a sound and trustworthy lawyer – розумний і гідний довіри адвокат (N: 6), natural genius (for investigation) – природні здібності й природний потяг (до розслідування злочинів) (N: 8), discretion – вміння зберігати таємницю (N: 11); ethical conduct as a lawyer – етичні принципи порядного адвоката (N: 11), to have special skills – вміти розслідувати (N: 34), a flair for crime – схильність до розслідування злочинів (N: 35);

(b) to nominate realities associated with the peculiarities of the investigative process: source of information – джерело інформації (N: 13; N: 22), psychology (of these things) - психологічне підґрунтям (тих подій) (N: 15), the causes of crime – причини злочинів (N: 17), to have something to do with – бути причетним (N: 19), to put things together – стулити факти до купи (N: 20);

(c) to nominate the evaluative features peculiar to the criminal: a bad lot – найпаскудніший мерзотник (N: 12);

(d) to nominate crime science: criminology – кримінологія (N: 14);

(e) to designate the specifics peculiar to the crime: clever swindle – геніально прокручена шахрайська афера (N: 19); popular murder – популярне вбивство (N: 27);

(f) to designate features peculiar to the victim: prospective victim (N: 28), possible victim (N: 29) (the Ukrainian translation, due to the transformation of the omission, uses in both cases the lexeme «жертва»).

The material of the subsection allowed us to reach such main conclusions. Despite the fact that the detective discourse strives to conform to the canon and is characterized by a tendency towards standardization, typification, plot predictability and structural certainty, the lexical and semantic component of each individual detective story ensures its narrative amusing, keeping the reader's attention and, moreover, reproduces cultural, historical and emotional background necessary for a full-fledged literary text.

The analysis of Agatha Christie's detective novel «Nemesis» identified the core, central and peripheral parts, constituting the lexical-semantic field «Crime».

The core of the field is formed by the archiseme, determining the denotative meaning of the lexeme «Crime». The center of the field is formed by seven lexical-semantic groups, among which the highest frequency (65%) is characteristic for the substantive LSG, and the average frequency – for verbal LSGs (35 %). The periphery of the field is formed by six lexical-semantic groups, among which the highest frequency (55%) is characteristic for the attributive LSGs, the substantive LSG are in second place (35%), and verbal LSGs are in third place (10%).

**CHAPTER 2**

**SPECIFICS OF RENDERING IN THE UKRAINIAN TRANSLATION OF  
THE LEXIACL-SEMANTIC FIELD «CRIME» BASED ON AGATHA  
CHRISTIE’S DETECTIVE NOVEL «NEMESIS»**

A comparative translational analysis of Agatha Christie's detective novel 'Nemesis' and its Ukrainian translation allowed for identifying the most common types of translational transformations used to reproduce the specificity of lexical-semantic components of the 'Crime' field."

It has been identified that the most frequent type of translation transformations in the analyzed translations are lexical transformations, and, above all, lexical-semantic techniques of generalization, differentiation and modulation. With this in mind, the first subsection of the section focuses on identifying and analyzing this type of transformations.

**2.1. Lexical transformations in reproducing the units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the Ukrainian translation of the British detective discourse**

Comparative and translational analysis revealed the predominance of lexico-semantic transformations of generalization, specification, differentiation and modulation among all the identified lexical transformations. Formal lexical transformations are significantly inferior to them in their frequency.

The most common type of lexical-semantic transformation in the translation of the analyzed detective novel is **modulation** or logical development, that is, the substitution in the target text of the lexical equivalent of the source text with a contextual one that is lexically related to it [8: 114], for example:

(1) I think I am justified in asking if there has been recently in his life any criminal affair in which he might possibly have been interested, either in the course of his business or in his personal relations – а тому, думаю, з мого боку буде цілком виправдано запитати вас, чи не зіткнувся він незадовго до своєї смерті з якоюсь

кримінальною справою, що торкалася його інтересів або в галузі професійної діяльності, або в приватному житті (N: 10).

In the given example, several components of the source text are subjected to modulation (which are marked with underlines), which refers to replacing the consequence with a condition (a person has the right to perform certain actions, if such actions are justified; if a criminal case affects the interests of a certain subject, he becomes interested in solving such a case). It is important to note that modulation is applied simultaneously with a number of other transformations, such as antonymous translation: recently in *his life* – незадовго до своєї смерті; grammatical part-of-speech recategorization of the gerund into the verb: *in asking* – *занятимі*, differentiation of meanings of the verb (if there *has been* – чи не зіткнувся) and noun (*relations* – *житті*); omission of lexical units *might possibly* in translation; addition *з мого боку буде цілком*; grammatical substitution of the syntactic structure of the original text: I am justified – з мого боку буде цілком виправдано, if there has been recently in his life – чи не зіткнувся він, either in the course of his business – що торкалася його інтересів.

Other examples of modulation:

(2) If you prefer to serve the cause of justice, I hope that *you may at least find it interesting*. – Але якщо ви все ж таки захочете послужити справедливості й правосуддю, то, можливо, *моя пропозиція зацікавить вас* (N: 9) (modulation occurs with a change of phrasal subject *you may* - *моя пропозиція*, which is the substitution of process for effect, with grammatical part-of-speech recategorization of the participle *interesting* into the verb *зацікавить*, transposition and omission: *you may at least find it interesting* – *моя пропозиція зацікавить вас* and logical development of the sentence meaning due to addition of the lexeme *правосуддю*).

(3) Mr Rafiel had implicit trust in my discretion and in my ethical conduct as a lawyer. – Містер Рейфаєл цілком довіряв моєму вмінню зберігати таємницю й не відступати від етичних принципів порядного адвоката (N: 11) (the meaning conveyed by a lexeme *discretion* is logically developed in translation into the phrase

вмінню зберігати таємницю, and the word-combination *ethical conduct* is logically developed into *не відступати від етичних принципів*).

(4) Unlikely to be criminals – Мало ймовірно, щоб вони могли скоїти злочин (N: 31).

(5) Point 2. What is involved in *my problem is justice*. – Пункт другий: *моя проблема пов'язана з відновленням справедливості* (N: 36).

Both in (N: 34) and (N: 36) examples of modulation refer to the replacement of the result by the process.

(6) Crime in the West Indies and crimes in her own neighbourhood at home. - Адже йому було відомо, що вона мала справу зі злочинами й у Вест-Індії, де вони відпочивали, і вдома, у своєму близькому оточенні (N; 43). Modulation with the replacement of consequences by processes is based in the given example on the addition of a whole structure that explains the motives of the actions of one of the characters and is also combined with the syntactic transformation of replacing a simple sentence with a complex adverbial.

Transformation of **differentiation** is used in cases when the lexical unit of the source text has a broad meaning and it is necessary to choose one of the translation options, or there is no direct equivalent in the target language.

(1). I think *is* only *fair* for me to do – *зобов'язана* це зробити (N: 5).

In the process of differentiation, the predicative adverb of state with a modal connotation of necessity in (N: 5) acquires the semantic component of «obligation». Therefore, there is a simultaneous lexical-semantic transformation of differentiation and a morphological transformation of part-of-speech re-categorization.

(2) You have a natural *genius* – ви маєте природні *здібності* (N: 8).

Due to the transformation of differentiation, the noun with a broad meaning *genius* in (N: 8) to designate an exceptional talent or skill is replaced with the noun to denote one of the manifestations of «*genius*».

The translational transformation modulation is also identified in the examples (N: 21), (N: 25), (N: 9) and (N: 31).



(3) Was it in some way connected with someone who had been out there, who had taken part or been an *onlooker* there – Може, вона була пов'язана з кимсь із людей, що були там, що брали участь у тих подіях чи були їхніми *свідками* (N: 21).

(4) Not connected with crime. Too *social* and selfcentred – Непричетна до вбивства. Занадто *балакуча* й занадто любить себе (N: 25).

(5) *Unlikely to be criminals* – Мало ймовірно, щоб вони могли *скоїти* злочин (N: 31).

(6) If you *prefer* to serve the cause of justice – Але якщо ви все ж таки *захочете* послужити справедливості й правосуддю (N: 9).

In isolated cases, it has been identified that the differentiation of meanings can lead to a distortion in the translation of the meaning of units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime». In particular, in the example given below (N: 37), the translator's attempt to avoid the synonymy of units *connected or concerned* denoting involvement in a crime. It results in the replacement of the lexeme *concerned* with the lexeme *постраждає*, which does not correspond to the content of the original text.

(7). Somebody among our group is *connected or concerned with a murder*. – Хтось із нашої групи *причетний до вбивства або постраждає від убивства* (N: 37).

Transformation of **specification** results in the replacement of the word or term of wide semantics in the original text with the lexeme of narrow semantics. Our research has identified subtypes of this translation transformation, including:

- Specification of pronouns as in examples (N: 21) and (N: 22):

(1) Was it in some way connected with *someone* who had been out there, who had taken part or been an onlooker there - Може, вона була пов'язана з *кимсь із людей*, що були там, що брали участь у тих подіях чи були їхніми *свідками* (N: 21).

(2) Either as a source of information or *someone* concerned with *the law* or a law case, or it might even be a murderer – Або як джерело інформації, або як *людина*,

що має стосунок до *органів правосуддя* чи якоїсь кримінальної справи, або навіть убивця (N: 22).

- Specification of nouns / noun idioms as in (N: 15), (N: 20), (N: 12), (N: 34) and (N: 50).

(3) he wondered about the psychology of these *things* – він зацікавився психологічним підґрунтям тих *подій* (N: 15).

(4) I think he expected me to put *things* together but what *things*? – Гадаю, він сподівався, я зможу стулити *факти* докупи — але які *факти*? (N: 20).

(5) The kind that would so easily marry *a bad lot* - Вона належить до жінок того типу, які легко можуть вийти заміж за *найпаскуднішого мерзотника* (N: 12).

(6) So crime is involved, and it is presumably not espionage or fraud or robbery, because such *things* have never come my way and I have no connection with such things, or knowledge of *them*, or special skills – Отже, злочин мав місце і не йшлося ані про шпигунство, ані про шахрайство чи пограбування, бо з такими *злочинами* я ніколи не зустрічалася, не мала до них жодного стосунку, я нічого про них не знаю і не вмію їх розслідувати (N: 34).

(7) They found him guilty. It may have been Bostol or Broadsand - one of those *places* beginning with 'B' as they sent him to". Його назвали винним і посадили чи то до Бостола чи до Бродсенда, до *в'язниці*, назва якої починається на "Б" (N: 50).

In the last of the above examples, in addition to the specification, the translator uses the morphological translation transformation of the change of number in the target text compared to the original: *places* is replaced with *в'язниця*.

- The specification of adjectives:

(8) He is a *sound* lawyer – Він *дуже розумний* адвокат (N: 6).

In contrast to specification, translation transformation of **generalization** consists in the replacement of the word or term of narrower semantics in the output text with the lexical units of the wider semantics in the input text. Compared to other types of lexical semantic transformations, generalization is identified in isolated cases as in (N: 11).

(1) my ethical *conduct* as a lawyer – від етичних *принципів* порядного адвоката (N: 11).

[Введіть текст]

In terms of its semantics, the word «principles» is broader than the word «behavior / *conduct*», since it includes in its semantic scope such a component of meaning as «behavior» (cf. a moral rule or standard of good behavior (CD)).

- (1) Strangled and her head *beaten to pulp* її знайшли задушеною, зі *спотвореним* обличчям (N: 48).

In the given example, there is a translational transformation of generalization, since the adverb «*спотворений*» (in relation to the face), without specifying the type of distortion, has more general semantics than an idiom *beaten to pulp*.

Compared to lexical-semantic transformations, formal lexical transformations are much less represented in the analyzed text of the Ukrainian translation, and include transcription, transliteration, and loan translation.

**Loan** or root-for-root or word-for-word **translation** is represented by (N: 27), (N: 13), (N: 47), (N: 41) and (N: 37).

- (1) it would be a very popular murder – це було б дуже популярне вбивство (N: 27);  
 (2) source of information - джерело інформації (N: 13);  
 (3) a sinister atmosphere – зловісну атмосферу (N: 47);  
 (4) dead body – мертве тіло (N: 41);  
 (5) concerned with a murder – причетний до вбивства (N: 37).

**Transliteration** as the mechanical transmission of individual words, which are recorded by graphic system of the source language, by means of graphic system of the target language, is identified in (N: 50), (N: 41), and (N: 26).

- (1) Bostol, Broadsand (prison names) – Бостол, Бродсенд (N: 50);  
 (2) Miss Marple – міс Марпл (N: 41; N: 26).

**Transcription** as the reproduction of the sound form (phonemic composition) of the word of the source language using phonemes of the target language is revealed in (N: 5), (N: 10), (N: 11), and (N: 14).

- (1) Mr *Broadribb* (the lawyer's name) – містере *Бродриб* (N: 5)  
 (2) Mr *Rafiel* (initiator of the murder investigation) – містер *Рейфаєл* (N: 5; N: 10; N: 11; N: 14).

**Adaptive/practical transcoding**, in which the word of the source language adapts to the structural features of the target language, is identified as the most frequent subtype of formal lexical transformations in the analyzed text. It is represented in the Appendices by examples (N: 4), (N: 7), (N: 10), (N: 14) and (N: 22).

- (1) detective - детективний (N: 4),
- (2) agency – агенція (N: 4),
- (3) Nemesis – Немезида (N: 7)
- (4) criminal – кримінальний (N: 10)
- (5) criminology – кримінологія (N: 14)
- (6) (a source of) *information* – (джерело) *інформації* (N: 22).

38 analyzed units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» have been rendered into Ukrainian by means of lexical transformations. The main types of transformations and the percentage of their use in the process of translation are displayed by the Table 1.

*Table 2.1*

Lexical transformations in their percentage to total number of examples

<b>Types of transformations</b>	<b>percentage of the total number of examples in Annexes (50)</b>
<b>Lexical-semantic transformations</b>	<b>46 %</b>
Modulation: 6 examples	12 %
Differentiation: 7 examples	14 %
Specification: 8 examples	16 %
Generalization: 2 examples	4 %
<b>Formal lexical transformations</b>	<b>30 %</b>
Loan translation: 5 examples	10 %
Transliteration: 2 examples	4 %
Transcription: 2 examples	4 %
Adaptive/practical transcoding: 6 examples	12 %

On the basis of the Table 1, the lexical-semantic transformations are considered to be the most productive way of all lexical transformations since 46 % of units of the [Введіть текст]

lexical-semantic field «Crime» were rendered into Ukrainian by means of modulation, differentiation, specification and generalization. In turn, the most frequent among lexical-semantic transformations are the transformations of specification that take the first place on the scale of frequency with the corresponding 16 % of the total number of selected examples. The second place in terms of frequency of use is held by transformations of differentiation with 14 %. The third place is occupied by transformations of modulation (12 %). The least productive are generalization transformations (4 %).

Adaptive/practical transcoding with 12 % predominate quantitatively among formal lexical transformations. The loan translations with 10 % are slightly inferior to them in percentage terms. The least represented are transliteration and transcription transformations with the same percentage of 4%.

## **2.2 Grammatical transformations in rendering the components of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the Ukrainian translation of the British detective discourse**

The frequency of grammatical transformations identified in the Ukrainian target text compared to the original, can be explained by differences in the grammatical structures of English and Ukrainian, which belong to different grammatical groups according to typological classification, namely analytic and synthetic languages, respectively. This is reflected in significant differences between grammatical features, such as the presence of articles, gerunds, centralized structure of simple sentences in English, and adverbial participles in Ukrainian, as well as fixed word order in English and free word order in Ukrainian, etc.

In the Ukrainian translation of a detective novel, various types of grammatical transformations have been identified, including transposition, syntactic replacement, addition and omission, which result in the substitution of grammatical units of any level, such as parts of speech, sentence members, and so on.

**Transposition.** Transformations of transposition as the rearrangement of words in the target language in comparison with their arrangement in the source language is [Введіть текст]

extensively involved in the translation of the field «Crime» components into Ukrainian. Changing the word order in a sentence is caused by structural differences in expressing the topic / theme and rheme in the output and input languages.

The following types of transposition have been singled out during the comparative translation analysis: 1) transposition of words; 2) transposition of word combinations; 3) transposition of the abbreviation. The transposition of parts of a complex sentence has not been identified.

#### Transposition of words:

- (1) There are other people surely much better qualified to undertake *an investigation* of this nature?" Адже існують інші люди, які, безперечно, значно кваліфікованіші для того, щоб здійснити таке *розслідування* (N: 2).
- (2) *He* was the criminal – Злочинець – *він* (N: 33).
- (3) They found *him* guilty. – Його назвали винним (N: 50)
- (4) *Strangled* and her head beaten to pulp – її знайшли *задушеною*, зі спотвореним обличчям (N: 48).
- (5) Who was a possible *victim*? No one very likely. – На *жертву* ніхто з них не схожий (N: 29).

Along with transposition, (N: 29) represents a total reorganization of the sentence with the addition of a whole phrase as a result of the sense modulation.

#### Transposition of word combinations:

- (6) A *dead body* on their library floor *one morning*. – *Одного ранку* вона знайшла на підлозі своєї бібліотеки *мертве тіло* (N: 41).

The example (N: 41) is a double transposition of the word combinations *a dead body* / *мертве тіло* and *one morning* / *одного ранку* of the beginning and end of the phrase. Transposition is used in the target text in combination with the transformation of addition *вона знайшла*.

#### Transposition of the abbreviation:

- (7) It may have been Bostol or Broadsand - one of those places beginning with 'B' as they sent him to." – посадили чи то до Бостола чи до Бродсенда, до в'язниці, назва якої починається на "Б" (N: 50).

[Введіть текст]

The last example (N: 50), in addition to transposition, contains a complex of transformations, including addition, omission, concretization (places – в'язниці), differentiation of meanings (have been – посадили), including the implementation of the domestication strategy (may – чи то) as well as total reorganization of the sentence.

**Replacement.** Transformations of transposition as the grammatical substitution of a syntactic construction in the original text that is absent or atypical in the target language have been identified in such varieties.

Replacing an infinitive construction with a subordinate object clause:

(1) There are other people surely much better qualified to undertake an investigation of this nature?" – Адже існують інші люди, які, безперечно, значно кваліфікованіші для того, щоб здійснити таке розслідування (N; 2).

(2) Unlikely to be criminals. – Малоімовірно, щоб вони могли скоїти злочин (N: 31).

(Replacement of the past participle by a two-part subordinate clause:

(3) A murderer as yet unsuspected. – Убивцею, якого досі ніхто не підозрює" (N: 39).

Replacing the subordinate conditional sentence with a subordinate attributive clause:

(4). Forgive me if this is idle curiosity but have you had - oh, how shall I put it? - any connection with crime or the investigation of crime?" – Пробачте за моє запитання, яке може вам здатися виявом пустої цікавості, але чи мали ви — як би ліпше мені висловити свою думку? — бодай якийсь стосунок до злочинів або до розслідування злочинів? (N; 3).

Replacement of the participial with a subordinate attributive clause:

(5) A young man it was, stabbed with a dagger, *lying on the hearthrug*. Труп молодого хлопця, заколотого кинджалом, який лежав на килимку (N: 40).

(...) one of those places *beginning with 'B'* as they sent him to – до в'язниці, назва якої починається на "Б" (N: 50).

Replacing an impersonal sentence with two-member sentences:

(6) I am justified in asking if *there has been recently in his life any criminal affair in which he might possibly have been interested*, – з мого боку буде цілком виправдано [Введіть текст]

запитати вас, чи не зіткнувся він незадовго до своєї смерті з якоюсь кримінальною справою, що торкалася його інтересів (N: 10).

Replacing a complex object with a complex sentence.

(7) I think *he expected me to put things together* but what things? Гадаю, він сподівався, я зможу стулити факти докупи — але які факти? (N: 20).

In the given example, the translator uses the specified grammatical transformation simultaneously with the omission of the conjunctions of the complex subordinating relations.

Replacement of an adjective by a subordinate attributive construction:

(8) Either as a source of information or *someone concerned with* the law or a law case  
Або як джерело інформації, або як людина, що має стосунок до органів правосуддя чи якоїсь кримінальної справи (N: 22).

Replacing a subordinate clause with a verbal word-combination.

(9) A murderer who might have already killed *or one who might be preparing to kill*. – Убивця, який уже забрав чиєсь життя *або готується забрати* (N: 22).

Replacing a compound sentence with a complex one:

(10) He said I had a flair for justice *and that necessarily included a flair for crime* Він написав, що я маю природжену схильність до справедливості, яка неминуче включає в себе природжену схильність до розслідування злочинів (N: 35).

Replacing an elliptical sentence with a two-member one.

(11) Either to set right an injustice or to avenge evil by bringing it to justice. Я повинна або виправити помилку правосуддя, або знайти злочинця, якому пощастило від нього сховатися (N: 36).

Sentence partitioning (fragmentation):

(1) To explain to you, Mr Broadribb, which I think is only fair for me to do and which I think Mr Rafiel ought to have done, to explain it in any way all I can say is that during our stay in the West Indies, we both, Mr Rafiel and myself, had a certain connection with a crime that took place there. – Я можу дати вам лише одне пояснення, містере Бродриб, і, гадаю, зобов'язана це зробити, якщо Mr Rafiel містер Рейфаєл вам нічого не пояснив. Під час нашого перебування у Вест-Індії ми обоє, містер [Введіть текст]



Рейфаєл і я, мали певний стосунок до розслідування вбивства, яке там сталося. Досить неймовірного й ретельно підготованого вбивства (N: 5).

One complex sentence of the original text is fragmented into three sentences in the target text – two complex sentences and one simple sentence, which is a logical modulation of the meaning of the previous statements.

### Sentence joining.

(1) And Mr Jameson, being an architect, would know just where the priest's hole was. He might aid her to discover it, or she might aid him to discover it and then they would find a body. – І містер Джеймсон, будучи архітектором, точно знатиме, де розташована ця ніша, і він допоможе їй її знайти або вона допоможе йому її знайти, і вдвох вони знайдуть там труп (N: 30).

(2) They found him guilty. It may have been Bostol or Broadsand - one of those places beginning with 'B' as they sent him to. – Його назвали винним і посадили чи то до Бостола чи до Бродсенда, до в'язниці, назва якої починається на «Б» (N: 5).

(3) I presume that Mr Rafiel was of sound mind and disposition when he died? I think I am justified in asking if there has been recently in his life any criminal affair in which he might possibly have been interested, either in the course of his business or in his personal relations. – Я виходитиму з припущення, що містер Рейфаєл був при здоровому глузді, коли помер, а тому, думаю, з мого боку буде цілком виправдано запитати вас, чи не зіткнувся він незадовго до своєї смерті з якоюсь кримінальною справою, що торкалася його інтересів або в галузі професійної діяльності, або в приватному житті (N: 10).

**Addition** is used to compensate for semantic or grammatical losses in the process of translation and often accompanies rearrangement and syntactic substitution. This transformation involves introducing words or phrases into the translation that are absent in the original in order to adequately convey meaning and adhere to linguistic norms. We have identified such options for implementing the addition transformation, as addition of a word, addition of a word combination, as well as addition of a part of a sentence or a sentence:

### Addition of a word:

[Введіть текст]

- (1) You have a natural genius, I should say, for investigation - Адже ви маєте природні здібності й природний потяг до *розслідування злочинів* (N: 8).
- (2) If you prefer to serve the cause of *justice*, I hope that you may at least find it interesting. – Але якщо ви все ж таки захочете послужити справедливості й правосуддю, то, можливо, моя пропозиція зацікавить вас (N: 9).
- (3) but afterwards, perhaps, he wondered about the *psychology* of these things – але згодом, можливо, він зацікавився *психологічним підґрунтям* тих подій (N: 15).
- (4) He is a sound and trustworthy lawyer. – Він дуже розумний і гідний довіри адвокат (N: 6).
- (5) my ethical conduct as a lawyer – не відступати від етичних принципів *порядного адвоката* (N: 11).
- (6) A young man it was, stabbed with a dagger, lying on the hearthrug. – *Труп* молодого хлопця, заколотого кинджалом, який лежав на килимку (N: 40).

Addition of a word combination:

- (7) A really *clever swindle of a criminal kind* might have interested him, nothing else – *Яка-небудь геніально прокручена шахрайська афера з грішми* могла його зацікавити, але нічого більше... (N: 18).

Addition of a part of a sentence or a sentence:

- (8) we both, Mr Rafiel and myself, had a certain connection with a crime that took place there – ми обоє, містер Рейфаєл і я, мали певний стосунок до розслідування вбивства, яке там сталося. Досить неймовірного й ретельно підготованого вбивства (N: 5).
- (9) Well, she hadn't wished to get mixed up in any murders, but it just happened. – Вона б і не хотіла *більше* втручатися в *розслідування хай там* якого вбивства, але це сталося якось само собою (N: 1).
- (10) Forgive me if this is idle curiosity but have you had - oh, how shall I put it? - any connection with crime or the investigation of crime?" – Пробачте за *моє запитання*, яке може вам здатися виявом пустої цікавості, але чи мали ви — *як би ліпше мені висловити свою думку?* — бодай якийсь стосунок до злочинів або до розслідування злочинів? (N: 3).

[Введіть текст]

In the given examples, the transformation of addition contributes to the clarification and specification of components of the «Crime» field. Specifically, the object of investigation is specified (*розслідування злочинів* instead of *investigation*), and the characteristics of representatives of the judiciary institution are detailed (*дуже розумний адвокат* instead of *a sound and trustworthy lawyer*; *природні здібності й природний потяг до розслідування злочинів* instead of *natural genius for investigation*; a lawyer – *порядного адвоката*). In order to eliminate the polysemy of the lexeme «justice», a coordinated element (*справедливості й правосуддю* instead of *justice*) is added in the Ukrainian translation. To specify the features of the crime, the transformation of adding a whole phrase is used: *Досить неймовірного й ретельно підготованого вбивства*.

### **Omission.**

The omission performs a function opposite to addition and helps to prevent information overload. Omission occurs at the level of words, phrases, and parts of a complex sentence.

#### Omission of the word:

- (1) If you prefer to serve *the cause of justice* – Але якщо ви все ж таки захочете послужити *справедливості* (N: 9).
- (2) I presume that Mr Rafiel was *of sound mind and disposition* when he died - Я виходитиму з припущення, що містер Рейфаєл був *при здоровому глузді*, коли помер (N: 10).
- (3) She had been considering a possible murderer... hat about *a prospective victim?* – Досі вона шукала подумки можливого вбивцю, а як щодо *жертви?* (N: 28).

The last fragment is also marked by the lack of reproduction of the stylistic device of aposiopesis, instead of which a semantic gap is filled in the Ukrainian translation with function words *а як щодо*.

#### Omission of phrases, and parts of a complex sentence.

- (4) Our code word, *my dear lady*, is Nemesis. – Нашим паролем буде слово "Немезида" (7). The omission of the expanded address occurs here simultaneously with the addition of the lexeme «слово».

[Введіть текст]

(5) You have a natural genius, *I should say*, for investigation - Адже ви маєте природні здібності й природний потяг до розслідування злочинів (N: 8).

(6) *Do you think* - I have often wondered - *do you think* that Mr Rafiel had any particular interest in criminology, the study of it, I mean? - *А вам не здавалося*, — я часто ставила собі таке запитання, — що містер Рейфаєл мав особливий інтерес до кримінології, до її вивчення, так би мовити (N: 14).

(7) A murderer who *might* have already killed or *one who might* be preparing to kill – Убивця, який уже забрав чиєсь життя або готується забрати (N: 23).

(8) *Who was a possible victim?* No one very likely – На жертву ніхто з них не схожий (N: 29).

In addition to the transformation of omission, the translation in (29) involves the syntactic-grammatical transformation of the rearrangement of two independent sentences into one simple sentence.

In some cases, the transformation of the omission leads to semantic losses in the target text. Specifically, the following snippet of input text does not render such a component of a field «Crime» as «to have a link with the victim of a crime».

(9) Somebody has information or *a special link* with the victim of a crime, or someone *personally is himself or herself* a murderer. – Хтось володіє інформацією про жертву вбивства або хтось і є вбивцею (N: 38).

As the given examples demonstrate, the grammatical transformations did not significantly affect the interpretation of the components of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the target text, which are adequately reproduced in the Ukrainian translation.

### **Substitution.**

A common type of grammatical transformations is presented by substitutions that affect nearly all types of linguistic units. We have identified the substitution of word forms, parts of speech, sentence members, sentence types and types of syntactic relations.

#### Substitution of word forms:

(i) substitution of singular by plural and vice versa:

(1) but have you had - oh, how shall I put it? - any connection with *crime* or the investigation of *crime*?"але чи мали ви — як би ліпше мені висловити свою думку? — бодай якийсь стосунок до *злочинів* або до розслідування *злочинів*? (N: 3)

(2) who had taken part or been *an onlooker* there – що брали участь у тих подіях чи були їхніми *свідками* (N; 21)

(3) one of those *places* beginning with 'B' as they sent him to – до *в'язниці*, назва якої починається на "Б" (N: 50).

(4) I had a flair for justice and that necessarily included a flair for *crime* я маю природжену схильність до справедливості, яка неминуче включає в себе природжену схильність до розслідування *злочинів* (N: 35).

(ii) substitution of tense forms – past by present, etc.:

(5) Our code word, my dear lady, *is* Nemesis.Нашим паролем *буде* слово «Немезида» (N: 7).

(6) Or rather that even *if they possessed* it, they *did not know* it could possibly be useful to her or to Mr Rafiel or to the law or to Justice with a capital "J". – Або знають, що *володіють* нею, а проте *не знають*, що вона може бути корисною для неї, або для містера Рейфаєла, або для закону, або для Правосуддя з великої літери (N: 24).

(7) Was she going into danger in this business? Отже, їй загрожує небезпека, пов'язана з цією справою? (N: 42)

(8) possibly what she *was doing* might involve a certain amount of danger – цілком можливо, те, що вона *робитиме*, накличе на неї певну небезпеку (N: 45)

something she *knew* about – щось *знає* про це (N: 19)

(9) So *crime is* involved, and it *is* presumably not espionage or fraud or robbery Отже, злочин *мав* місце і не йшлося ані про шпигунство, ані про шахрайство чи пограбування (N: 34).

(iii) substitution of passive by active and vice versa:

(10) where they found a body – було знайдено труп (N: 40).

(11) Or he got interested in the cases where *justice had not been administered* properly or - oh, well... – бо його увагу могли привернути випадки, коли *правосуддя здійснювали* не так, як годилося б, або... (N: 16).

(v) Substitution of parts of speech:

(12) I hope that you may at least find it *interesting* – можливо, моя пропозиція *зацікавить* вас (N: 9)

(13) A murderer as yet *unsuspected*. – Убивцею, якого досі ніхто не підозрює (N: 39).

Students were very *violent*. – Студенти схильні до *насильства* (N: 32).

54 analyzed utterances representing the functioning of the units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» have been rendered into Ukrainian by means of lexical transformations. The main types of transformations and the percentage of their use in the process of translation are displayed by the Table 2.

Table 2.2

Grammatical transformations in their percentage to total number of examples

Types of transformations	percentage of the total number of examples in Annexes (50)
Transposition: 7 examples	14 %
Replacement: 11 examples	22 %
Addition: 10 examples	20 %
Omission: 9 examples	18 %
Substitution: 13 examples	26 %
Sentence joining: 3 examples	6 %
Sentence partitioning (fragmentation): 1 example	2 %

The Table 2 shows that the grammatical transformations are the most productive way of translation since they are identified in almost of all selected 50 examples, namely, they make up 94% of 100%, illustrating the functioning of the components of the

[Введіть текст]

«Crime» field. The most frequent among grammatical transformations are the transformations of substitution and replacement with 26 and 22 percent, respectively. The third place in terms of frequency of use is held by transformations of addition with 20 %. The fourth and fifth places are occupied by transformations of omission and transposition with 18 and 14 percent, respectively. The least productive are sentence joining (6 %) and sentence partitioning (2 %).

### **2.3 Combination of lexical and grammatical transformations in reproducing the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the Ukrainian translation of the British detective discourse**

#### **Total reorganization.**

During the translation of components of the lexical-semantic field «Crime», the transformations of total reorganization (holistic transformation) have been identified, which involve the restructuring of the internal form of elements of the original text, for example:

(1) I thought *this might have been something to do with her or something she knew about*. – Я думала, вона до цього якось причетна або щось знає про це (N: 19).

(2) *Was it in some way connected with someone* who had been out there, who had taken part or been an onlooker there – *Можже, вона була пов'язана з кимсь із людей, що були там, що брали участь у тих подіях чи були їхніми свідками* (N: 21).

(3) Point 2. *What is involved in my problem is justice. Either to set right an injustice or to avenge evil by bringing it to justice*. – Пункт другий: *моя проблема пов'язана з відновленням справедливості, Я повинна або виправити помилку правосуддя, або знайти злочинця, якому пощастило від нього сховатися* (N: 36).

(4) *Was she going into danger in this business?* – *Отже, їй загрожує небезпека, пов'язана з цією справою?* (N: 42).

In (42) the total reorganization involves grammatical recategorization of time from the past continuous to the present, in conjunction with the syntactic transformation of a simple sentence into a sentence complicated by participial construction).

[Введіть текст]

(5) A crime where? – Отже, він думав про злочин, але який саме і де його скоєно? (N: 44).

Holistic transformation involves here the transformation of modulation with the logical-semantic development of the sentence in the target text by supplementing it with components of spatial and temporal deixis.

### **Compensation.**

In addition to the total reorganization of the utterances of the target text compared to the original, we have also identified cases of compensation as a method of translation that is used when some semantic elements of the output text and its stylistic features cannot be transmitted literally:

(1) I have never been *a probation officer* or indeed *sat as a magistrate on a Bench*. – Я ніколи не служила ані в поліції, ані в органах судочинства (N: 3).

The absence of the concept of «probation officer» (who carries out socio-psychological work with the convicted) in the Ukrainian legal discourse, as well as the impossibility of translating the phrase «sat as a magistrate on a Bench» without loss of meaning, cause the use of translation compensation.

(2) Either to set right an injustice or *to avenge evil by bringing it to justice*. – Я повинна або виправити помилку правосуддя, або знайти злочинця, якому пощастило від нього сховатися (N: 36).

(3) *a flair for crime* – природжену схильність до розслідування злочинів (N: 35).

In the last two examples, the translator applies compensation, trying to convey as accurately as possible the connotations associated with the phrase *to avenge evil* and the word *a flair*.

In the text under consideration the compensation is sometimes associated with the implementation of the strategy of domestication of the output text in order to adapt it to the cultural specifics of the target text. The strategies of foreignization/alienation and domestication were first described in the treatise by F. Schleiermacher «On Different Methods of Translation» in 1813, and later formulated by the American translator L. Venuti [30; 31]. Domestication implies a certain replacement of the culture of the source language with the culture of the target language, and foreignization [Введіть текст]



contributes to the preservation of the cultural component of the original in the target text.

We have identified one examples of the «domesticated» compensation, related to the characteristics of the criminal:

(4) The kind that would so easily marry *a bad lot*. – Вона належить до жінок того типу, які легко можуть вийти заміж за *найпаскуднішого мерзотника* (N: 12).

At the same time, the domestication strategy is often used in the translation of the analyzed text not in direct connection with the components of the «Crime» field, but in the context of their actualization:

(1) Well, she hadn't wished to get mixed up in any murders, but it just happened. – Вона б і не хотіла більше втручатися в розслідування *хай там* якого вбивства, але це сталося *якось* само собою (N: 1).

(2) but have you had (...) any connection with crime or the investigation of crime? - але чи мали ви (...) *бодай* якийсь стосунок до злочинів або до розслідування злочинів? (N: 3).

(3) Or he got interested in the cases where justice had not been administered properly or - oh, well... – бо його увагу могли привернути випадки, коли правосуддя здійснювали не так, *як годилося б*, або...(N: 16).

I just wondered if he had any theories, you know... about the causes of crime?" і я подумала, чи він, *бува*, не мав певних теорій про... причини злочинів? (N: 17).

### **Translation of English idioms.**

The translation of English idioms in the target text is also partly related to the strategy of domestication. In the collected material, we managed to find only a few idiomatic English expressions. However, they are not directly related to the lexical-semantic field «Crime» but constitute the immediate contextual environment of the nominative units associated with the field and, thus, affect the stylistic and connotative aspects of their meaning. At the same time, it is important to note that in the Ukrainian translation the connection with the lexical-semantic field under consideration is intensified due to the ways of translating the idioms of the target text.

(1) have something to do with: I thought this might have been something to do with her. – Я думала, вона до цього якось причетна (N: 19).

In the given example, due to the transformation of specification with replacing the idiom with the adjective «причетна» (the literal translation would be «пов’язана») actualizes the seme «involvement in the crime». In addition, the morphological-grammatical transformation of the case change and the syntactic-grammatical transformation of transposition with shift of the pronoun «her» in the nominative case «вона» in the position of the phrasal subject reinforces the seme.

(2) put something together: I think he expected me to put things together Гадаю, він сподівався, я зможу стулити факти до купи (N: 20).

In the above example (N: 20) the transformation of specification with the replacement of *things* with the Ukrainian noun *факти* results in using a word in the Ukrainian translation that is more related to the field of investigation than in the original version.

(3) come one’s way: it is presumably not espionage or fraud or robbery, because such things have never come my way – не йшлося ані про шпигунство, ані про шахрайство чи пограбування, бо з такими злочинами я ніколи не зустрічалася, (N: 34).

In the same vein, the transformation of specification with the replacement of *things* with the Ukrainian noun *злочинами* associates the Ukrainian translation with one of the center units of lexical-semantic field «Crime».

We also identified an example in which the unit of the central part of the field *killed*, which is not idiomatic, is translated into Ukrainian as an idiom – *забрав чиєсь життя*.

(4) A murderer who might have already killed. – Убивця, який уже забрав чиєсь життя (N: 23).

13 analyzed utterances representing the functioning of the units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» have been rendered into Ukrainian by means of lexical and grammatical transformations. The main types of transformations and the percentage of their use in the process of translation are displayed by the Table 3.

[Введіть текст]

Table 2.3

Lexical and grammatical transformations in their percentage to total number of examples

<b>Types of transformations</b>	<b>percentage of the total number of examples in Annexes (50)</b>
Total reorganization: 5 examples	10 %
Compensation: 4 examples	8 %
Translation of English idioms: 3 examples	6 %

The Table 3 shows that total reorganization is the most productive of lexical-grammatical transformations making up 10 % of the total number of examples. The second place in terms of frequency of use (8 %) is occupied by compensation often associated with the strategy of domestication. The less productive is transformations used by translation of English idioms, with 6 %.

The material of the Chapter allowed us to come to such basic conclusions.

The most productive way of translation is the grammatical transformations, which makes up 94% of 100% of the total number of examples. Among these transformations, we identified substitutions, replacement, addition, omission and transposition, sentence joining and sentence partitioning, distributed in various ways according to the frequency scale of their use. The most frequent are the transformations of substitution and replacement, The least productive are sentence joining and sentence partitioning. A significant percentage of grammatical transformations can be explained by differences in the grammatical structures of the English and Ukrainian languages, which belong to the analytical and synthetic typological subtypes of languages with free and fixed word order, respectively.

Among lexical transformations, lexical-semantic transformations predominate, with the highest frequency of specification, which makes up 16 % of the total number of selected examples. Differentiation is slightly inferior to specification in percentage terms (14 %), and modulation makes up 2 percent in the total number of examples. The

[Введите текст]

most unproductive among lexical-semantic transformations is generalization transformations, which testifies, in our opinion, to the desire of the translator to explicate and concretize the meanings of the original text for the target Ukrainian audience in as much detail as possible.

Among the formal lexical transformations, which are inferior in quantitative terms to lexical-semantic transformations, the most frequently used are adaptive/practical transcoding and loan translations, which make up 12 % and 10 %, respectively, of the total amount of examples. The most unproductive are transliteration and transcription transformations.

The least representative when reproducing units of the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in Ukrainian translation are lexical-grammatical transformations, among which the most frequent is total reorganization (10%), compensation, which is 8% and implements the translation strategy of domestication. The least frequent are transformations used in the reproduction of English idioms – 6%. The way of their rendering contributes to the intensification of semes associated with the lexical-semantic field «Crime» in the target text.

## CONCLUSIONS

In the process of our research, we have analyzed the main option of translating the lexical-semantic field «Crime» based on Agatha Christie's detective novel «Nemesis» and its Ukrainian translation.

In the theoretical part we studied the problem of lexical-semantic fields in modern linguistics, which is defined in the work as a structural-semantic unity, characterized by a semantic connection between words and their meanings based on the integrative component of meaning – «archisemes». The field is a multi-level structure, which consists of smaller structural units – lexico-semantic groups, has a core represented by a generic semantic component around which the field unfolds, a center that includes the most commonly used words with an integral meaning, and a periphery that clarifies and details the meaning of the field by components characterized by a significantly lower frequency of use and stylistic coloring of the meaning.

While studying the existing classifications of translation transformations, we differentiated between the translation methods as relating to whole texts, and translation transformations as procedures used for utterances and the fragments of texts as well as clarified the types of transformations relevant to the tasks of literary translation.

The study of the characteristics of the detective discourse made it possible to identify such its features as conformity to the canon, a tendency towards standardization, typification, plot predictability and structural integrity, as well as to determine the function of lexical and semantic means in providing narrative entertainment, engaging the reader, and reproducing the cultural, historical, and emotional background. We also identified the components of the core, central and peripheral parts that make up the lexical-semantic field «Crime», in which we specified 7 lexical-semantic groups of the central part with a quantitative distribution of

substantive (65%) and verbal (25%) groups, and 6 LSNs of the periphery – attributive (55%), substantive MSU (35%) and verbal (10%).

Among the identified translation transformations, grammatical transformations have been identified as the most productive, represented in 94% of 100% of the total number of examples. We revealed such transformations as substitutions, which are the most productive (26 %), replacement (22 %), addition (20 %), omission (14 %) and transposition (14 %) as well as the unproductive sentence joining (6 %) and sentence partitioning (2 %).

Of the lexical transformations, the most productive are the lexical-semantic transformations (46 %), which involve specification, which are the most frequent type (16%), differentiation (14 %), modulation (12 %) and generalization as the least used translation technique (4%) in the target text under consideration. This percentage is explained, in our opinion, by the desire of the translator to explicate and concretize the meanings of the original text for the target Ukrainian audience in as much detail as possible. Formal lexical transformations are less represented in the input text (30% of the total number of lexical transformations) and include adaptive-practical transcoding (12%), loan translation (12%), as well as transliteration and transcription (4% each) as the most unproductive ways of translation in the target text.

Lexical-grammatical transformations are few compared to the other two types considered and are represented by total reorganization (10%), compensation (8%) and transformations used in the reproduction of English idioms (6%), which are the least numerous in the corpus of material. While rendering the idioms the translator applies the transformation of specification, which intensify the «Crime» hyperseme, bringing the translation units closer to the lexical-semantic field of the same name.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Аскерова І. А. Семантичне поле назв емоційно-афективних станів у польській мові : дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04: 10.02.03. Київ, 2006. 206 с.
2. Бехта, Т. О. (2009). Лінгвокогнітивне моделювання англomовного детективного дискурсу: дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Чернівці, 2009. 174 с.
3. Дученко Л. В. (2004). Жанрово-лінгвістичні особливості темпорально-оповідальної структури художнього тексту (на матеріалі англomовної детективної прози 20 ст.: дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук : . 10.02.04. Одеса, 2004. 195 с.
4. Канонік Н., Шкаровецька А., 2015. Наукові підходи до вивчення лексико-семантичних полів у лексико-семантичній системі сучасної англійської мови. *Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки*, 2015. №. 4. С. 189-195.
5. Ключка Н. Я. (2012). Лексико-семантичне поле як системно-структурне утворення. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»*. Сер.: Філологічна, 2012. № 24. С. 129-131.
6. Кучман І. Переклад англійських термінів у галузі комп'ютерних технологій. *Вісник Житомир. держ. ун-ту імені Івана Франка*, 2005. № 23. С. 164–166.
7. Майборода Н. Лексико-семантичні особливості детективних романів Андрія Кокотюхи. *Філологічний часопис*. 2021. № 2. С. 56–63.
8. Максимов С. Є. Практичний курс перекладу (англійська та українська мови). Теорія та практика перекладацького аналізу тексту для студентів факультету перекладачів та факультету заочного та вечірнього навчання: Навчальний посібник. Київ: Ленвіт, 2006. 157 с.
9. Пономарьова О. О. Структурно-композиційні та комунікативно-прагматичні особливості французького детективного гумористичного

- роману: дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук: 10.02.05. Київ, 2008. 165 с.
10. Соколовкая Ж. П. Проблемы системного описания лексической семантики. Київ: Наукова думка, 1990. 183 с.
  11. Филин Ф. П. О лексико-семантических группах слов. Езиковедски изследования в чест на академик Стефан Младенов. София: Българска академия на науките, 1957. С. 523–538.
  12. Філоненко С.О. 2011. Масова література в Україні: дискурс / гендер / жанр : монографія. Донецьк: ЛАНДОН–XXI, 2011. 432 с.
  13. Цапенко Л. В. (2019). Англomовна детективна розповідь: прагматичний та лінгвосинергетичний аспекти: дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Запоріжжя, 2019. 266 с.
  14. Barzun J. Detective Fiction. *A Collection of Critical Essays*. R. I. Winks (Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, 1980. P. 144-153.
  15. Belica C., Keibel H., Kupietz M. & Perkuhn R. An empiricist's view of the ontology of lexical-semantic relations. *Lexical-semantic relations: Theoretical and practical perspectives*. In P. Storjohann (Ed.). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010. P. 115-144.
  16. Bell R. T. Translation and translating: Theory and practice. London, UK: Longman, 1991. 298 p.
  17. Lehrer A. Semantic Fields and Lexical Structures. Amsterdam and London, North Holland, 1994. 225 p.
  18. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk B. Semantics and translation. In H. Kittel et al. (Ed.), *Übersetzung - translation – traduction: An international encyclopedia of translation studies*, 2004. № 1. P. 301-312.
  19. Lutzeler P.R. The Notion of Lexical Field and its Application to English Nouns of Financial Income. *Lingua*, 1982. № 56. P. 1-42.
  20. Lyons J. Semantics. Vols. 1 and 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.



21. Mansouri A. N. Semantic fields in English and Arabic: Problems in translation. *Building bridges: Integrating language, linguistics, literature, and translation in English studies*. In N. Al Zidjaly (Ed.). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012. P. 201-220.
22. Newmark, P. *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall, 1988. 311 p.
23. Nida E.A. *Componential Analysis of Meaning*. The Hague: Mouton, 1995. 269 p.
24. Ohman S. Theories of the Linguistic Field. *Word*, 1953. No. 9. P. 123–134.
25. Porzig W. Wesentliche Bedeutungsbeziehungen. Wortfeldforschung: zur Geschichte und Theorie des sprachlichen Feldes. *Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft*, 1973. № XVIII. S. 78-103
26. Saeed J. I. *Semantics* (4th ed.). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2016. 496 p.
27. Sheludchenko S., Kalyniushko T. Lexico-Semantic Field CRIME: the Functional and Semantic Aspects (a Study of the Novels «The Secret of Chimneys», «The Seven Dials Mystery», «Towards Zero» by Agatha Christie). *Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки*, 2016. № 5. С. 174-179.
28. Trier J. Das Sprachliche Feld - Eine Auseinandersetzung. *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung*, 1934. № 10. P. 428–439.
29. Tschirch F. *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*. 3. Aufl. Berlin: Erich Schmid Verl., 1989. 304 S.
30. Venuti L. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge, 1999. 210 p.
31. Venuti L. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge, 1995. 353 p.
32. Weisgerber L. *Grundzüge der inhaltbezogenen Grammatik*. 4 Auflage. Dusseldorf: Verlag, Schwann, 1962. 431 s.



## ANNEX

1	Well, she hadn't wished to get mixed up in any murders, but it just happened.	Вона б і не хотіла більше втручатися в розслідування хай там якого вбивства, але це сталося якось само собою.
2	There are other people surely much better qualified to undertake an investigation of this nature?"	Адже існують інші люди, які, безперечно, значно кваліфікованіші для того, щоб здійснити таке розслідування.
3	Forgive me if this is idle curiosity but have you had - oh, how shall I put it? - any connection with crime or the investigation of crime?"	Пробачте за моє запитання, яке може вам здатися виявом пустої цікавості, але чи мали ви — як би ліпше мені висловити свою думку? — бодай якийсь стосунок до злочинів або до розслідування злочинів?
4	I have never been a probation officer or indeed sat as a magistrate on a Bench or been connected in any way with a detective agency.	Я ніколи не служила ані в поліції, ані в органах судочинства, не була пов'язана з жодною агенцією детективних розслідувань.
5	To explain to you, Mr Broadribb, which I think is only fair for me to do and which I think Mr Rafiel ought to have done, to explain it in any way all I can say is that during our stay in the West Indies, we both, Mr Rafiel and myself, had a certain	Я можу дати вам лише одне пояснення, містере Бродриб, і, гадаю, зобов'язана це зробити, якщо Mr Rafiel містер Рейфаєл вам нічого не пояснив. Під час нашого перебування у Вест-Індії ми обоє, містер Рейфаєл і я, мали певний стосунок до розслідування вбивства, яке там сталося. Досить неймовірного й ретельно підготованого вбивства.

	connection with a crime that took place there.	
6	He is a sound and trustworthy lawyer	Він дуже розумний і гідний довіри адвокат.
7	Our code word, my dear lady, is Nemesis.	Нашим паролем буде слово «Немезида»
8	You have a natural genius, I should say, for investigation	Адже ви маєте природні здібності й природний потяг до розслідування злочинів.
9	If you prefer to serve the cause of justice, I hope that you may at least find it interesting.	Але якщо ви все ж таки захочете послужити справедливості й правосуддю, то, можливо, моя пропозиція зацікавить вас.
10	I presume that Mr Rafiel was of sound mind and disposition when he died? I think I am justified in asking if there has been recently in his life any criminal affair in which he might possibly have been interested, either in the course of his business or in his personal relations.	Я виходитиму з припущення, що містер Рейфаєл був при здоровому глузді, коли помер, а тому, думаю, з мого боку буде цілком виправдано запитати вас, чи не зіткнувся він незадовго до своєї смерті з якоюсь кримінальною справою, що торкалася його інтересів або в галузі професійної діяльності, або в приватному житті.
11	Mr Rafiel had implicit trust in my discretion and in my ethical conduct as a lawyer.	Містер Рейфаєл цілком довіряв моєму вмінню зберігати таємницю й не відступати від етичних принципів порядного адвоката.
12	The kind that would so easily marry a bad lot. In fact, the	Вона належить до жінок того типу, які легко можуть вийти заміж за

	sort of woman that would marry a murderer if she were ever given half a chance.	найпаскуднішого мерзотника. І навіть одружитися з убивцею, якщо випаде така нагода.
13	Which makes it more difficult to use her as a source of information	І тим важче мені буде використати її як джерело інформації.
14	"Do you think - I have often wondered - do you think that Mr Rafiel had any particular interest in criminology, the study of it, I mean?"	А вам не здавалося, — я часто ставила собі таке запитання, — що містер Рейфаєл мав особливий інтерес до кримінології, до її вивчення, так би мовити
15	"Well, no, not because of that, but afterwards, perhaps, he wondered about the psychology of these things.	Ні, не зовсім те, але згодом, можливо, він зацікавився психологічним підґрунтям тих подій.
16	Or he got interested in the cases where justice had not been administered properly or - oh, well...	бо його увагу могли привернути випадки, коли правосуддя здійснювали не так, як годилося б, або...
17	Queer turns of phrase, sometimes, and I just wondered if he had any theories, you know... about the causes of crime?"	Дуже дивні фрази вихоплювалися в нього іноді, і я подумала, чи він, бува, не мав певних теорій про... причини злочинів?
18	"A really clever swindle of a criminal kind might have interested him, nothing else."	Яка-небудь геніально прокручена шахрайська афера з грішми могла його зацікавити, але нічого більше...
19	"I thought this might have been something to do with her	Я думала, вона до цього якось причетна або щось знає про це

	or something she knew about,"	
20	I think he expected me to put things together but what things?	Гадаю, він сподівався, я зможу стулити факти до купи — але які факти?
21	Was it in some way connected with someone who had been out there, who had taken part or been an onlooker there	Може, вона була пов'язана з кимсь із людей, що були там, що брали участь у тих подіях чи були їхніми свідками
22	Either as a source of information or someone concerned with the law or a law case, or it might even be a murderer	Або як джерело інформації, або як людина, що має стосунок до органів правосуддя чи якоїсь кримінальної справи, або навіть убивця.
23	A murderer who might have already killed or one who might be preparing to kill	Убивця, який уже забрав чиєсь життя або готується забрати. евфемизм
24	Or rather that even if they possessed it, they did not know it could possibly be useful to her or to Mr Rafiel or to the law or to Justice with a capital "J"	Або знають, що володіють нею, а проте не знають, що вона може бути корисною для неї, або для містера Рейфаела, або для закону, або для Правосуддя з великої літери.
25	Not connected with crime. Too social and selfcentred.	Непричетна до вбивства. Занадто балакуча й занадто любить себе.
26	She did not remind Miss Marple of any murderer she'd ever known.	Вона не нагадувала міс Марпл жодного вбивцю з тих, яких вона будь-коли знала.

27	If she had committed a murder, it would be a very popular murder.	Якби вона вчинила вбивство, то це було б дуже популярне вбивство
28	She had been considering a possible murderer... hat about a prospective victim?	Досі вона шукала подумки можливого вбивцю, а як щодо жертви?
29	Who was a possible victim? No one very likely.	На жертву ніхто з них не схожий.
30	And Mr Jameson, being an architect, would know just where the priest's hole was. He might aid her to discover it, or she might aid him to discover it and then they would find a body.	І містер Джеймсон, будучи архітектором, точно знатиме, де розташована ця ніша, і він допоможе їй її знайти або вона допоможе йому її знайти, і вдвох вони знайдуть там труп
31	Unlikely to be criminals	Малоймовірно, щоб вони могли скоїти злочин,
32	Students were very violent	Студенти схильні до насильства.
33	He was the criminal.	Злочинець — він.
34	So crime is involved, and it is presumably not espionage or fraud or robbery, because such things have never come my way and I have no connection with such things, or knowledge of them, or special skills	Отже, злочин мав місце і не йшлося ані про шпигунство, ані про шахрайство чи пограбування, бо з такими злочинами я ніколи не зустрічалася, не мала до них жодного стосунку, я нічого про них не знаю і не вмію їх розслідувати.

35	He said I had a flair for justice and that necessarily included a flair for crime	Він написав, що я маю природжену схильність до справедливості, яка неминуче включає в себе природжену схильність до розслідування злочинів.
36	Point 2. What is involved in my problem is justice. Either to set right an injustice or to avenge evil by bringing it to justice.	Пункт другий: моя проблема пов'язана з відновленням справедливості. Я повинна або виправити помилку правосуддя, або знайти злочинця, якому пощастило від нього сховатися.
37	Somebody among our group is connected or concerned with a murder.	Хтось із нашої групи причетний до вбивства або постраждає від убивства.
38	Somebody has information or a special link with the victim of a crime, or someone personally is himself or herself a murderer.	Хтось володіє інформацією про жертву вбивства або хтось і є вбивцею
39	A murderer as yet unsuspected."	Убивцею, якого досі ніхто не підозрює".
40	"In this room, ladies and gentlemen, the White Parlour, folks call it, is where they found a body. A young man it was, stabbed with a dagger, lying on the hearthrug.	У цій кімнаті, леді та джентльмени, яку зазвичай називають Білою Вітальнею, було знайдено труп. Труп молодого хлопця, заколотого кинджалом, який лежав на килимку.
41	A friend of mine," said Miss Marple to Miss Cooke and Miss Barrow who were next to her, "had a most nerve-	«Одна з моїх подруг, — сказала міс Марпл, звертаючись до міс Кук та міс Бароу, які ішли поруч із нею, — пережила велике потрясіння кілька років тому».



	racking experience only a few years ago. A dead body on their library floor one morning."	Одного ранку вона знайшла на підлозі своєї бібліотеки мертве тіло.
42	Was she going into danger in this business?	Отже, їй загрожує небезпека, пов'язана з цією справою?
43	But he might think of her in connection with crime. Crime in the West Indies and crimes in her own neighbourhood at home	Але він міг подумати про неї у зв'язку з якоюсь кримінальною історією. Адже йому було відомо, що вона мала справу зі злочинами й у Вест-Індії, де вони відпочивали, і вдома, у своєму близькому оточенні.
44	A crime where?	Отже, він думав про злочин, але який саме і де його скоєно?
45	possibly what she was doing might involve a certain amount of danger	цілком можливо, те, що вона робитиме, накличе на неї певну небезпеку.
46	They must be concerned, implicated in whatever this was	Певно, вони втягнуті в цю справу, якимсь чином причетні до неї, хоч би про що йшлося.
47	Why did anything thought of in threes somehow seem to suggest a sinister atmosphere?	Чому сама думка про те, що їх троє, уже створює якусь зловісну атмосферу?
48	Strangled and her head beaten to pulp	її знайшли задушеною, зі спотвореним обличчям
49	A wicked devil he was. a bad lot from the day he was born or so it seems	О, то був справді мерзенний поганець — кажуть, він уже й народився негідником.

50	They found him guilty. It may have been Bostol or Broadsand – one of those places beginning with 'B' as they sent him to.	Його назвали винним і посадили чи то до Бостола чи до Бродсенда, до в'язниці, назва якої починається на "Б".
----	---	--

## РЕЗЮМЕ

Курсову роботу присвячено дослідженню способів перекладу одиниць лексико-семантичного поля «Crime / Злочин» у детективному романі Агати Крісті «Немезида». У теоретичній частині досліджувалась проблема лексико-семантичних полів у сучасній лінгвістиці, існуючі класифікації перекладацьких трансформацій із розмежуванням способів і технік перекладу, а також особливості детективного дискурсу і функцію у ньому лексико-семантичних засобів – із виокремленням компонентів ядра, центральної та периферійної частин, що складають лексико-семантичне поле «Злочин» у романі Агати Крісті. Серед виявлених перекладацьких трансформацій найпродуктивнішими визначено граматичні трансформації субституції, додавання, опущення і транспозиції, фрагментації і об'єднання речень. Серед лексичних трансформацій поширеними є лексико-семантичні трансформації конкретизації, диференціації, модуляції та, непродуктивними – генералізації. Формальні лексичні трансформації адаптивно-практичного транскодування, калькування, транслітерації та транскрипції не є репрезентативними у тексті перекладу. Лексико-граматичні трансформації є нечисленними порівняно з іншими типами трансформацій і представлені тотальною реорганізацією, компенсацією та трансформаціями, які використовуються при відтворенні англійських ідіом, які є малопродуктивними в корпусі матеріалу.