

PALACKÝ UNIVERSITY OLMOUC

Faculty of Arts

Department of English and American Studies

**Context and Translation: Two English
Translations of the Play "The Cherry
Orchard" by Anton Chekhov**

Diploma thesis

Author: András Zubaskov

Thesis supervisor: Mgr. Josefína Zubáková, Ph.D.

Olomouc 2020

I declare that I have elaborated this thesis myself and listed all the sources used.

In Olomouc, 28th April 2020

.....

(signature)

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to Mgr. Josefina Zubáková, Ph. D. for her professional supervision and valuable advice during the development of this diploma thesis.

Annotation

The diploma thesis deals with the notion of context as an indispensable part of drama creation and translation. The material of the thesis is based on the play "The Cherry Orchard" by Anton Chekhov and on two translations of this work into English. In the thesis, translations by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel are presented. The aim of the thesis is to analyse the two English versions from the perspective of cultural context and to compare the approaches used by the translators.

Key words: drama translation, context, culture, cultural realia, extralinguistic situation.

Anotace

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá pojmem kontextu jako nezbytnou součástí vzniku a překladu dramatu. Práce je založena na divadelní hře „Višňový sad“ Antona Čechova a na dvou překladech tohoto díla do angličtiny. V práci jsou představeny překlady Marie Amadei Ashotové a Libby Appelové. Cílem diplomové práce je analyzovat tyto dvě anglické verze z hlediska kulturního kontextu a porovnat postupy překladatelek.

Klíčová slova: překlad dramatu, kontext, kultura, kulturní realie, extralingvistická situace.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	6
CHAPTER 1. DRAMA TRANSLATION	9
1.1 Specific Features of Drama Affecting the Translation Process.....	9
1.2 Translation for Printed Editions and for Acting	11
CHAPTER 2. THE NOTION OF CONTEXT.....	13
2.1 Types of Context.....	13
2.2 Contextual Correspondence	15
CHAPTER 3. CONTEXT IN DRAMA TRANSLATION.....	22
3.1 Artistic Detail.....	23
3.2 Extralinguistic Situation	25
CHAPTER 4. CONTEXTUAL ELEMENTS OF DRAMA IN TRANSLATION.....	28
4.1 Translation of Forms of Addressing	28
4.2 Translation of Cultural Realia	28
4.3 Translation of Phraseological Units.....	29
CHAPTER 5. ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF WORKS BY ANTON CHEKHOV	32
CHAPTER 6. CONTEXT IN WORKS BY ANTON CHEKHOV	35
CHAPTER 7. ANALYSIS OF THE TWO ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF "THE CHERRY ORCHARD"	37
7.1 Forms of Addressing	38
7.2 Cultural Realia	44
7.3 Phraseological Units	46
CONCLUSION.....	50
RESUMÉ.....	52
LIST OF SOURCES	55

INTRODUCTION

Mykola Zerov claims that decent translations of works of foreign literatures have belonged to the basis of the national heritage of each European nation since ancient Romans (Zerov 1990, 51). Zerov considers translation to be a stimulus for a language to mobilise all its lexical and stylistic means (Zerov 1990, 53).

It is a common fact that drama is a highly specific part of literature that differs greatly from other genres. There are many factors that influence the perception of a dramatic text: culture, subtext, national peculiarities, way of life, etc. It is crucial for the translator to correctly adapt the text to all these conditions.

Therefore, it is necessary to take into account the context in which the units of the original work are used. Most linguistic units are ambiguous, but in a specific context they usually appear in one of their potential meanings. Comparison of potential meanings of linguistic units enables the translator to determine the meaning in which they are used in the text. Clarification of the meaning of a word in the context makes it possible to find a correspondence or a series of variant correspondences in the target language.

The history of Chekhov's translations into English is of particular interest. This is a tradition that dates back to the life of the writer. I. Bunin mentions that one of the most prosperous prose writers of the 1930s, Somerset Maugham, notes that admiring Chekhov in England was a sign of good taste (Bunin 1953, 155). Bunin also analyses the point of view of the Nobel Prize winner in literature, John Galsworthy, who argues that there is nothing in Chekhov's stories that does not exist and that the power of his talent lies precisely in the fact that he never invents anything (Bunin 1953, 156).

The *topic* of the thesis covers the notion of cultural context and its components, namely artistic details and extralinguistic situation as an indispensable part of drama creation and translation. The *material* of the study is based on the play "The Cherry Orchard" by Anton Chekhov and its English translations by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel. The translation of "The Cherry Orchard" by Maria Amadei Ashot was published in 2000. A more recent translation is authored by Libby Appel. It was published in 2015.

The *object* of the thesis lies in the notion of cultural context as one of the mechanisms of drama creation, while the *subject* of the research constitutes translation strategies applied by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel to interpret the original cultural context in their English translations of the play "The Cherry Orchard".

The *main objectives* of the thesis are as follows:

- (1) To outline main peculiarities of drama as a part of literature and theatre and their effect on the translation process;
- (2) To analyse the notion of cultural context as a crucial constituent of dramatic works;
- (3) To analyse artistic details and extralinguistic situation and the way they are employed in "The Cherry Orchard";
- (4) To analyse the two English translations from the perspective of context that is inextricably linked to the notion of an artistic detail and extralinguistic situation and to compare the approaches used by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel.

As far as the methodology of this diploma thesis is concerned, the classification of contextual elements of dramatic works by Roksolana Zorivchak (Zorivchak 2012, 9) will serve as the basis of the analysis of the two English translations of the play "The Cherry Orchard". This classification includes notions that reflect the cultural context of drama (Zorivchak 2012, 15). Moreover, contrastive analysis will be employed due to the fact that two languages (Russian and English) and two cultures are analysed.

Theoretical sources used for this thesis are Russian and English. The reason for such a choice of sources is to analyse views of the scholars from the perspective of the Russian and English translation tradition. This is due to the fact that the drama to be discussed belongs to Russian culture, whereas its translations became a part of Anglophone culture. Moreover, sources used for the thesis were published in the 20th and 21st centuries. The aim of such a selection is to demonstrate the development of views on translation problems related to context of dramatic works. Most of the theoretical sources were written by Russian translation scholars. These sources are used in order to analyse developed Russian tradition in translation studies. More specifically, works on the theory of drama translation (Vilen Komissarov (1973), Leonid Barkhudarov (1975), Peter Newmark (1988)), the theory of cultural context (Viktor Koptilov (1973), Roksolana Zorivchak (2012)) as well as on translations of Chekhov's works (Zinoviy Papernyi (1997), Viktoriya Ryapolova (2012)) are used in this diploma thesis. In addition, works of prominent Czech translation scholars (Jiří Levý (1963), Karel Horálek (1966), Zlata Kufnerová (2003), Zdena Skoumalová (2003), etc.) are cited in the thesis as well.

The diploma thesis consists of seven chapters. In Chapter 1, drama translation is analysed from the perspective of specific features of drama that affect the process of translation. Chapter 2 discusses the notion of context and its types. Moreover, this chapter describes

contextual correspondence that is an indispensable part of the analysis of cultural context. Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 analyse the notion of context in drama translation as well as components of the context. Chapter 5 describes the history of translation of works by Anton Chekhov into English. In Chapter 6, context in Chekhov's works is discussed from the perspective of culture. Finally, Chapter 7 analyses in detail the two English translations of the play "The Cherry Orchard".

CHAPTER 1. DRAMA TRANSLATION

In order to analyse drama translation, it is of the utmost importance to understand whether it has some peculiar features which make it different from other literary genres or not. The biggest difference is that a dramatic text is written to be performed on stage. As a matter of fact, drama possesses a special status, namely it is situated on the verge of literature and theatre. According to Ilya Galperin, the peculiarity of a drama text is also connected with the fact that the author's speech is limited and that it can be found only in the playwright's remarks and stage directions (Galperin 1981, 289).

1.1 Specific Features of Drama Affecting the Translation Process

The structure of drama is usually based on direct speech. It means that a dramatic work reproduces authentic conversation. However, this is not a direct representation of people's interaction. According to Ilya Galperin, the language of dramatic works is stylised due to the fact that the author uses the norms of the literary language of the given period to realise the aesthetic function (Galperin 1981, 289).

In addition, the language must be natural, i.e. it should be used the way people usually speak. As a result, words should be easy to pronounce. The author and the translator should adhere to the simplification of the language which is widely used in daily communication. This can be proved by the words of Luigi Pirandello, an Italian dramatist, novelist, poet and short story writer, who wrote the following about the playwright:

But in order for the characters to jump alive and moving off the written pages, the playwright must find that word that is spoken action, the living word that moves, the immediate expression, natural to the action, the unique expression that cannot be but that one, that is proper to that given character in that given situation; words, expressions that cannot be invented, that arise when the author has truly identified with his creature to the point that he feels it like the creature feels, until he himself wants it like the creature itself wants itself. (Pirandello 1939, 235)

Mona Baker distinguishes three features of a dramatic work, namely a) dialects, b) style, and c) register (Baker 2001, 71).

A. *Dialect*. Undoubtedly, the translator must have an insight into the way of speech used in a dramatic work. This is usually reflected in dialects. It is extremely complicated to substitute a

dialect of one language for a dialect of another one due to cultural differences. A dialect can be rendered by means of another dialect, occasionalisms, slang or literary language. The scholar G. Anderman shares her reflection on the matter: “If, for instance, a play was originally written in dialect, the translator will have to make a decision as to whether there is a suitable dialect in the TL into which it may be translated. Whereas some source language dialects may be successfully rendered in dialect in the TL, some may not without unwittingly evoking an inappropriate set of social associations” (Baker 2001, 71).

B. *Style*. The translator should also keep in mind that each author has his/her own peculiar way of thinking and individual style that affects greatly the plot of a work, its atmosphere, setting and readers’ perception of characters. At this point, the author and the translator are extremely connected. The latter should trace the author’s identity and idiostyle while rendering each significant part of the original. To substantiate our point, it is possible to quote the statement by T.H. Savory:

Style is the essential characteristic of every piece of writing, the outcome of the writer’s personality and his emotions at the moment, and no single paragraph can be put together without revealing in some degree the nature of its author. But what is true of the author is true also of the translator. The author’s style, natural or adopted, determines his choice of a word, and, as has been seen, the translator is often compelled to make a choice between alternatives. The choice he makes cannot be reflect, though dimly, his own style. What does the reader expect; what does the critic demand? One of the reasons for a preference for a literal translation is that it is likely to come nearer to the style of the original. It ought to be more accurate; and any copy, whether of a picture or a poem, is likely to be judged by its accuracy. Yet it is a fact in making the attempt to reproduce the effect of the original, too literal a rendering is a mistake, and it may be necessary to alter even the construction of the author’s sentences in order to transfer their effects to another tongue. (Savory 1957, 54)

C. *Register*. The writer uses the language for certain purposes of communication. Therefore, he/she will use the language variety determined by the subject matter. The translator has to realise the communication purpose to reproduce it duly. According to Tatyana Kazakova, this influences greatly the perception of the original work (Kazakova 1998, 71). Every speech act

in drama pertains to a certain register, and translator has to be quite sensitive to render the tone and the force of such act.

The notions mentioned above demonstrate the need for adjustments to be made before a play can be successfully performed in translation. Customs and attitudes differ markedly from one culture to another. The use of irony, to take another example, although commonly found in parts of the English-speaking world, is nevertheless not a universal phenomenon.

The rendering of the original is inextricably linked with its profound understanding. Without knowledge of life, the social environment, the historical era, etc. it is impossible to create a proper translation. For instance, national peculiarities are preserved by means of exact reproduction of the whole set of household features, way of life, working conditions, customs and the reconstruction of the landscape of a given country or region. For the translator, the aim is to reflect the author's thoughts.

1.2 Translation for Printed Editions and for Acting

Zlata Kufnerová and Zdena Skoumalová mention two kinds of a dramatic translation:

1. A dramatic text is translated as a literary one to be published for readers.
2. The director asks the translator to render a particular play for performing on stage (Kufnerová et al. 1994, 140).

It means that not all translations are done for both purposes. It is necessary to distinguish translation for printed editions and translation for acting. This was outlined by Raymond van den Broeck: “Unlike the translation of the novel, or a poem, the duality inherent in the art of the theatre requires language to combine with spectacle, manifested through visual as well as acoustic images. The translator is therefore faced with the choice of either viewing drama as literature or as an integral part of a theatrical production” (van den Broeck 1985, 55-56).

It is noteworthy that S. Bassnett makes a step further and develops five major strategies of drama translation:

1. The dramatic text (play) should be regarded as a ‘literary work’;
2. The source language’s cultural context should be viewed as a ‘frame text’;
3. The translator is to translate ‘performability’;
4. The source language verse drama should be created in alternative forms;
5. Co-operative translation (Bassnett 1984, 90-91).

What is more, it is necessary to emphasise that the translator also has to attribute great attention to the issue of rendering the source text cultural elements in the target text of the drama. The recreation of linguistic, social and historical characteristics of the original is of the utmost importance in the dramatic translation as the translator cannot introduce the explanations in the comments to the source language units because every translated word is used in the actors' speeches on the stage. So, the immediacy factor in the perception of the translated dramatic work on the part of the spectator plays an immense role.

Thus, due to the fact that drama stands on the verge of literature and theatre and contains some characteristics that have to be clear to the target reader or spectator at a glance, the translator is faced with much more complicated task when translating dramatic works.

CHAPTER 2. THE NOTION OF CONTEXT

Anyone involved in translation understands that the difficulty in the work of the translator is the choice of a suitable word, i.e. the equivalent. The translator continuously estimates various lexical possibilities and selects a word (rarely, two or three words) which can fully reproduce the sense of the original. At the same time, a variety of considerations pass through the mind of the translator. This is why contextual orientation is to be considered. Each word in any literary work is associated with the work as a whole, with its features, with the history of its creation, often with the personality of the author, etc.

The translator can adhere to a certain extent to the method that K. S. Stanislavski recommended to actors. According to Stanislavski, the actor must see what happens with the play: before the beginning and partly after the end of it. If necessary, the translator must feel what happens outside the text, must be able to see the subtext and the background of the work. It is crucial to translate in such a way that the author's intention is preserved. According to Sergey Tolstoy, the translator has to preserve the emotional subtext, which is hidden behind the features of the author's style (Tolstoy 2008, 63).

It is an undeniable fact that context is defined in many ways. For this reason, the chapter will introduce context according to definitions of several scholars.

2.1 Types of Context

According to Lomtyev, there are two types of context – linguistic and situational (extralinguistic) (Lomtyev 1976, 29).

1. Linguistic context. This is the linguistic environment of the use of language components. As far as the notion of linguistic context is concerned, Lomtyev distinguishes narrow context (or "microcontext") and broad context (or "macrocontext") (Lomtyev 1976, 45). Narrow context is the context of a sentence, that is, the linguistic units that create the environment of the unit within the sentence. Broad context refers to the linguistic environment of a given unit that goes beyond the scope of a sentence. The exact scope of broad context cannot be specified. According to Lomtyev, it can be the context of a group of sentences, paragraph, chapter or even the whole work (Lomtyev 1976, 125).

Moreover, Lomtyev states that narrow context, in turn, can be divided into syntactic and lexical context (Lomtyev 1976, 131). Syntactic context is a syntactic construction in which a given word, phrase or (subordinate) sentence is used. Lexical context is a set of specific lexical units, words and stable phrases in the environment of which the unit occurs.

2. Situational (extralinguistic) context. This is a situation, time and place to which the statement refers. This includes any facts of reality, the knowledge of which helps the reader and translator to correctly interpret the meanings of linguistic units in the utterance.

According to Amosova, context is a minimal syntactic construction, the element of which is a given semantically feasible word (Amosova 1998, 36). The scholar claims that the minimal syntactic construction is determined by a reference minimum, that is, a word or words that help determine the meaning of the word searched (Amosova 1998, 39). Translation practice demonstrates that reference minimum may be absent not only in the sentence under consideration, but also in the entire text. In such cases, the meaning of a word is determined by a non-linguistic context or setting.

Context is a language environment in which a linguistic unit is used. The context of a word is a combination of words, grammatical forms and constructions in the environment of which a given word occurs. As it has been already mentioned, a word is not the only unit of language; other linguistic (and speech) units, such as phonemes, morphemes, phrases and sentences, are also found not in isolated usage, but in a certain language environment, so there is every reason to talk about phoneme context, morpheme context, phrase context and sentence context.

Context plays the significant role in resolving the ambiguity of linguistic units. Therefore, context makes it possible to choose one of several potentially existing equivalents of a unit in the target language. It is an undeniable fact that the role of context is not limited to resolving the ambiguity of words and other linguistic units. However, this is the main function of context.

In the translation process, sometimes it is enough to take into account the syntactic context of a particular unit in order to resolve the ambiguity and determine the choice of an equivalent. More often, however, the choice of an equivalent is determined only by considering the lexical context of a given unit, the unambiguity of which is established within a certain lexical environment. According to Leonid Barkhudarov, there are cases when in order to determine the meaning of the original word and choose an unambiguous translation equivalent, considering the narrow context is insufficient and the translator has to analyse the broad context (Barkhudarov 1975, 171).

2.2 Contextual Correspondence

Contextual meanings arise in the process of using words in speech, depending on the environment, and are realised under the influence of a narrow, broad and extralinguistic context.

The word, especially a polysemantic one, is a complex semantic structure. It has the nominative meaning, which is directly aimed at objects and phenomena of reality. This meaning, according to V.V. Vinogradov, is the basis of all other meanings and applications of the word (Vinogradov 1978, 156). A whole series of studies is devoted to the problem of the hierarchy of meanings of a polysemantic word. Among these studies there are works by R. O. Jakobson on primary and specific meanings and works by E. Kurilovich on primary and secondary semantic functions. The difference between the main linguistic meaning and subordinate specific meanings is that the main meaning is not determined by the context, while the subordinate meanings add contextual elements to the semantic elements of the main meaning. Enrichment of the context leads to the emergence of further specific meanings.

According to the degree of frequency, there are repetitive and occasional (individual) contextual meanings. Repetitive meanings, with the accumulation of observations, become a part of the category of variant correspondences. Occasional meanings can appear and disappear as a manifestation of the subjective use of words by authors and are mostly used in fiction. This is mainly a sudden association of ideas, emotional excitement, willingness to achieve a comic effect or simply to draw the attention of the listener or reader. This is occasional and unusual use of a word. Contextual meanings are an implementation of the potential meanings of words. The basis of these meanings is the semantic structure of a word.

According to A. L. Novikov, the definition of the lexical meaning of a word through the disclosure of its semantic structure as a system of bilateral minimal lexical units (lexical-semantic variants of the word) enables the translator to take into account the factors that determine the lexical meaning (Novikov 2004, 25). Novikov distinguishes the following factors: 1) settled (systemic) contexts of use of words; 2) the belonging of a given word to a certain semantic or lexical-grammatical category of words; 3) specific lexical relations with other words, due to the models of semantic compatibility of verbal signs inherent in a given language; 4) the semantic correlation of words with synonyms and other words that are close in meaning in the system of the language as a whole (Novikov 2004, 27).

As mentioned above, a polysemantic word is a complex semantic structure. Its main meaning is the nominative meaning. According to A. L. Novikov, the primary function coincides with

the main meaning, whereas secondary functions are identical with specific meanings (Novikov 2004, 38). Novikov also claims that the use of the notions "proper (literal) meaning" and "figurative meaning" suggests a certain hierarchy between them (Novikov 2004, 39).

The main meaning and specific meanings directly given in regularly realised positions are linguistic proper. A. L. Novikov states that beyond regularity there are chains of further shades of specific meanings and the meanings that are already extralinguistic in nature (Novikov 2004, 41). These are contextual senses of a word, i.e. special applications of a word in a context that go beyond the limits of usual linguistic meanings, although they are indirectly motivated by linguistic meanings through the system of implications. Such contextual senses are not listed in explanatory dictionaries due to the fact that they go beyond the regular application. Novikov emphasises that the sense, in contrast to the usual linguistic meaning, is the actualisation of parties that are associated with a given situation and the affective attitude of the subject (Novikov 2004, 43).

These facts create the prerequisite for distinguishing between the linguistic and extralinguistic content of the word. Such an opposition is based on the opposition of regular and irregular relations of meanings of words or meanings with explicit and implicit internal forms. The meaning of the word as a non-linguistic use of the sign is based on modification, contextual expansion of the original internal form and its actual specification. The contextual internal form is determined not only by the specifics of a given linguistic text, but also by a system of extralinguistic knowledge, relevant cognitive orientation of human speech and cognitive activity. The sign and its meaning, thanks to such a mobile internal form, which occupies an intermediate position between language and reality (including poetically modelled), receive a specific reference in the text.

As far as semiotics is concerned, the opposition of the meaning of the word and the sense of the word is justified in the distinction proposed by Yuriy Vannikov. The scholar considers the connection between the sign and the meaning (Vannikov 1970, 205). The concept of meaning is thus inextricably linked with epistemological semantics that goes beyond the limits of linguistic proper. The opposition of the meaning of the word and the sense of the word is not rigid since it presupposes transitional cases. The sense itself is connected with the meaning through the system of motivations and implications supported by extralinguistic data.

A person expressing thoughts by means of a language does not create, with very rare exceptions, new words, but uses words already existing in the language that belong to its

vocabulary. If speakers or writers create a new word, they do this, as a rule, either on the basis of elements of existing words or by analogy with existing words. Translators do the same, choosing from the vocabulary of the language into which they translate the words that correspond to the words of the original, in accordance with the meaning of a whole sentence and wider context. In some rare cases when, for example, translators create a new word to convey a term or occasionalism, they do this with the help of existing lexical and morphological elements.

The vocabulary capabilities of translators, depending on the vocabulary of the language into which they translate, are quite wide. Moreover, even if in a given language there is no word that exactly corresponds to the word of another language since in the material environment of the life of a given nation there is no such object designated by a word, the possibility of descriptive expression of the concept depends on the richness of the vocabulary of a language. With the economic and cultural development of nations, the emergence and enrichment of their written language and literature and the possibilities of translation into their languages become easier.

According to Aleksey Novikov, narrow context (i.e. one specific sentence) and broad context (i.e. the nearest sentences, a whole paragraph, chapter, etc.) play a decisive role in conveying the meaning of foreign words, i.e. when choosing appropriate words in the target language (Novikov 2004, 55). However, the translator should bear in mind that the vocabulary of the language is not just a collection of words, but a system that allows infinitely diverse, but not any combinations of words in any context. Individual elements of the dictionary are connected with each other by certain semantic and stylistic relations.

Novikov states that when conveying the meaning of a word, the translator has to make a choice between several possible translation possibilities (Novikov 2004, 106). There are three typical cases that reflect the problem of the choice:

- 1) in the target language, there is no dictionary correspondence to a word of the original;
- 2) the correspondence is incomplete, i.e. only partially covers the meaning of a source language word;
- 3) different meanings of the polysemantic word of the original correspond to different words in the target language (Novikov 2004, 109).

The case when a completely unambiguous word of the original has an unambiguous (in different contexts) correspondence is relatively rare. Such unambiguity of correspondence is

possible in certain layers of vocabulary. These are terms, calendar concepts (names of months, days of the week), some names of kinship, animals, common objects and personal pronouns.

The meaning of a word is not autonomous, it depends on the context both in the original work and in the translation and is clarified in the context (sometimes quite broad). This is taken into account by any experienced and attentive translator. There are frequent cases when one word of the original is conveyed in another language by a combination of two or more words, or when a combination of two or more words is conveyed by one word, or when the original word (even a term) is omitted in the translation, being clear from the previous text, or conveyed by a pronoun, or, finally, when a pronoun is conveyed by a noun.

The very concept of a "translation unit" is somewhat arbitrary, and scholars disagree as far as both the term itself and the nature of the concept are concerned. Developments in this area are presented in works by L. S. Barkhudarov who claims that a unit of translation is such a unit in the source text for which a correspondence can be found in the text of the translation, but whose components individually do not have correspondences in the text of the translation (Barkhudarov 1975, 175).

The basis of a translation unit can be not only a word, but any language unit: from a phoneme to a super-phrasal unity. The main condition for correct determination of the source translation unit is the identification of the text function of a particular source unit. The inadequacy of word-for-word translation is caused by incorrect assessment of the text functions of language units: getting into a particular speech (written or oral) situation, the word as a unit of the language is connected with other words of the given text or statement, that is, the word gets into situational dependence or a number of dependencies from text conditions. According to T. Kazakova, these dependencies are systemic in nature and constitute a hierarchy of contexts, from minimal to maximal (Kazakova 1998, 28).

However, a sentence, which is a much larger and formally completed segment of the text, cannot be recognised as a permanent independent translation unit. The meaning of the sentence is far from completely autonomous and often depends on the content of surrounding sentences, the whole paragraph, etc. There are frequent cases when a single sentence is divided into several smaller ones, or, vice versa, when several sentences of the original text merge into a larger one in the translation.

Strictly speaking, not only a word, not only a sentence, but sometimes a larger segment of a text (a chain of sentences or even a paragraph) cannot be considered a constant unit of translation because semantic relations between all these segments of the text are too variable (and not only in literary works). Sometimes words repeated in the original at a considerable distance from each other in different contexts have to be conveyed by the same word that can be inappropriate in a given context. And this, in turn, may make it necessary for the translator to search for the word that is equally suitable for different contexts.

The choice of a particular correspondence in translation is largely determined by the context in which a particular language unit is used. Translation does not imply mechanical application of a correspondence instead of the translated unit of the original. Contexts define:

- the choice of a correspondence;
- rejection of known correspondences;
- the need to search for other methods of translation.

Contextual replacement is a rare way of translating the original work. In some cases, the conditions for using a language unit in a context force the translator to abandon the use of a regular correspondence. The translator has to find a translation option that most accurately conveys the meaning of a unit of the source text in the given context.

Thus, every word and every sentence, both in the original and in the translation, is associated with other elements of the text. For this reason, even when translating a single word, the translator has to take into account the role of the context.

Hryhoriy Kochur proves the thesis of plurality of translation interpretations based on several objective (complicacy of the object and the historical and cultural context of translation) and subjective factors (interpretative position and the individual style of the translator) (Kochur 1968, 413). The scholar compares artistic translation to performing a musical work (Kochur 1968, 414). The latter is unique, but performed differently by each musician. Kochur introduces a method of comparative analysis of translations, notes the importance of preserving national peculiarities in drama translation and follows the principle of source oriented translation presupposing accurate preservation of original features (Kochur 1968, 415). This principle includes domestication as a form of assimilation of the original and allows moderate foreignisation putting emphasis on the foreign origin of a work (Kochur 1968, 416).

There were two opposite points of view as far as rendering national peculiarities is concerned. The first one is related to the theory of untranslatability. According to this theory, as P. Kopanyev notes, a full-fledged translation from one language into another is generally impossible due to a significant difference in the expressive means of different languages (Kopanyev 1972, 124). Thus, the translation is only a weak and imperfect reflection of the original.

However, most researchers adhere to a different point of view, which formed the basis of the activities of many professional translators. It lies in the fact that any developed national language is a sufficient means of communication for the full transfer of thoughts expressed in another language.

V. Koptilov considers untranslatability as a phenomenon and reveals the objective basis of translation. Perception of the translation is a subjective phenomenon, but each translation possesses a rather objective genesis and function. Thus, the scholar supposes that each translator must see a dramatic work as a creation of two epochs, two environments and two stylistic systems (Koptilov 1971, 51). V. Koptilov argues that translation of drama is a process in which the translated work preserves ideological and imaginative structure of the original and serves as its semantic and stylistic parallel (Koptilov 1972, 184).

Karel Horálek considers the problem of translatability to be the main one in translation theory (Horálek 1966, 55). When analysing untranslatable elements, linguists refer to linguistic symbolism, word play, etc. According to Horálek, the notion of translatability is not that much connected with reflecting the author's thoughts in another language, but it relates to the task to make these thoughts understandable to the target audience (Horálek 1966, 117). Moreover, Horálek is convinced that all expressions can be translated (Horálek 1966, 119). If each language as a universal sign communication system expresses any reality, it means that all texts having intellectual content can be translated into all languages. A language that is not prepared for expressing more complicated meanings becomes enriched in the process of translating necessary expressive means.

In translation theory, opinions about each work being translatable collide with thoughts that the translation always deprives the original of its specific features. Z. Kufnerová argues that it is almost impossible to classify the level of untranslatability of elements between different languages (Kufnerová et al. 2003, 160). This level is not stable, depends on the degree of linguistic creativity of each literary text and on relatively occasional coincidences or differences of both languages and cultural contexts.

According to Ye. Malanyuk, the main principle is that the translation must be equivalent to the original (Malanyuk 1987, 240). Text equivalence is a complex notion since it includes both problematics of re-expressing artistic structure and problems of functioning in a certain polysystem. The latter influences the choice of re-expressing means. An equivalent translation has the same effect on the target reader as the original on the reader belonging to the original linguistic and cultural environment. The translation can evoke the same feelings only in a certain group of people distinguished by education, social ranking, age, region, etc. The translator should aim at making the work as close to the target reader as possible. However, he/she cannot eliminate all specific elements from the work. Otherwise, the translation would be deprived of the creativity and expressiveness of the original.

The author of the original creates a text which affects the reader from the same environment, who is familiar with all its aspects. The reader of the translation understands that it is a variant of the foreign original that is dealt with. The literary theorist Milan Hrdlička claims that the process of translation and reception of the translated work is a contact of different literatures, cultures and a certain confrontation of both communicative contexts (Hrdlička 1997, 105). If a level and communicative context of the original and translated creation is relatively the same, the role of a translator is considerably simplified since it is not needed to avoid or explain various differences to the reader.

CHAPTER 3. CONTEXT IN DRAMA TRANSLATION

M. Rylskiy aphoristically defines drama translation as cooperation between the translator and the author (Rylskiy 1987, 16). In 1950s, numerous scholars discussed linguistic and literary approaches to translation. This differentiation is linked with the fact that the first approach considers translation through the deviation of two language systems and different artistic means, whereas the second one is based on the comparison of texts created by certain literary traditions and norms. The development of linguo-stylistics and discourse studies partially eliminated this differentiation connected with recreating functions of certain artistic means.

P. Zaytsev notes that the theory of drama translation defines principles of translation quality and adequacy (Zaytsev 1986, 342). The principles relate to detailed rendering of the original and its context (Zaytsev 1986, 345). The researcher distinguishes three fundamental principles of drama translation: 1) corresponding choice of words and avoidance of words belonging to a different stylistic register; 2) preservation of tropes and figures of the original; 3) preservation of textual characteristics (Zaytsev 1986, 347).

M. Zerov disagrees with discussions about absolute accuracy of drama translations not from the perspective of theoretical correctness, but from the perspective of theoretical ideality that is impossible to reach in the translator's daily work (Zerov 1990, 38). Relating to views of I. Annenskiy on the fact that the process of translation starts with understanding of the complexity of a dramatic work, M. Zerov argues that the interpretation of context of the original is subjective (Zerov 1990, 40). Having accepted text understanding as a main condition of drama translation, Zerov draws the translator's attention to three requirements: 1) lexical choice sounds as a warning to differentiate between high and low styles and incorrect use of lexicon; 2) paying attention to tropes and figures and their rendering; the translator has to be careful not to overwhelm the reader's perception with unusual images; 3) beauty of a native language (Zerov 1990, 42).

Context of a dramatic work contains a wide range of phenomena. According to Zerov, the most distinguishable ones are the preservation of the original artistic details in a translation and the interpretation of extralinguistic situation. The interpretation of context can have various directions, from preserving all peculiarities of the original work to radical re-orientation of the context of the translation that loses almost all characteristics it could have in common with the context of the original.

3.1 Artistic Detail

In literary criticism and stylistics, the opinion that the widespread use of an artistic detail can serve as an important indicator of individual style and characterises, for example, various authors such as Chekhov, Hemingway, Mansfield, etc. has been firmly established. Therefore, the popularity of the artistic detail among authors stems from its potential strength capable of enhancing the readers' perception, encouraging them to co-create, and exposing their associative imagination. According to Kopanyev, the detail actualises primarily the pragmatic orientation of the text and its modality (Kopanyev 1972, 98).

The detail, as a rule, expresses an insignificant, purely external sign of a multilateral and complex phenomenon, for the most part it acts as a material representative of facts and processes that are not limited to the mentioned surface sign. The very existence of the phenomenon of the artistic detail is connected with the impossibility to capture the phenomenon in its entirety and the consequent need to convey the perceived part to the addressee, so that the latter receives an idea of the phenomenon as a whole. The individuality of the external manifestations of feelings and the individuality of the author's selective approach to the observed external manifestations gives rise to an infinite variety of details representing human experiences.

The detail affects the reader in the most effective way because it saves visual means and creates an image of the whole. Moreover, it makes the reader engage in co-creation with the author, complementing the picture which the latter did not complete. The detail is a powerful signal of imagery evoking in readers not only empathy with the author, but also their own creative aspirations.

In addition to the creative impulse, the detail makes readers feel independent as far as their imagination is concerned. Not taking into account the fact that the whole was created on the basis of the detail deliberately selected by the author, readers are confident in their independence from the author's opinion. This apparent independence of the development of reading thought and imagination gives the narrative a tone of disinterested objectivity. For all these reasons, the detail is an essential component of literary texts. The functional load of the detail is diverse. According to Kopanyev, depending on the functions performed, the following classification of types of artistic details can be proposed: graphic, specifying, characterological and implicating (Kopanyev 1972, 154).

1. *The graphic detail* is designed to create a visual image of the described. Most often, it is included as an integral element in the image of nature and the image of appearance. The landscape and portrait greatly benefit from the use of the detail. The latter adds individuality and preciseness to the picture of nature or the appearance of the character. The author's point of view is clearly manifested in the choice of the graphic detail. In connection with the local-temporal nature of many graphic details, it is possible to dwell upon the periodic updating of the local-temporal continuum through the graphic detail.

2. The main function of *the specifying detail* is to fix the reliability of the insignificant details of a fact or phenomenon. The character also needs the features of authenticity. Moreover, since details characterise a person, the specifying detail is essential for creating an image of the character. Therefore, without directly mentioning the person, the specifying detail is involved in creating the anthropocentric orientation of the work.

3. *The characterological detail* fulfils its function not indirectly, as graphic and specifying, but directly, fixing certain features of the character. This type of the artistic detail is dispersed throughout the text. The author does not provide the reader with a detailed characterisation of the character, but places details in the text. The entire composition of characterological details scattered over the text can be directed either to the comprehensive characterisation of the object or to the emphasis on its main feature. In the first case, each detail marks a different side of the character, whereas in the second one the details are subordinate to the demonstration of the main passion of the character and its gradual disclosure. The characterological detail gives the impression of eliminating the author's point of view and therefore is especially often used in this particular function.

4. *The implicating detail* marks the external characteristic of the phenomenon, by which its deep meaning is guessed. The main purpose of this detail is the creation of subtext. The main object of the image is the internal state of the character. The implicating detail is always anthropocentric.

In a certain sense, all of the listed types of details are involved in creating the subtext because each involves a wider and deeper coverage of a fact or event. However, each type has its own functional and distributive specificity, which, in fact, makes it possible to consider them separately. The graphic detail creates an image of nature or an image of appearance and is used mainly one time. The specifying detail creates an image of things or an image of the situation and is distributed in a descriptive passage. The characterological detail forms the character's image and is dispersed throughout the text. The implicating detail creates an

image of the relationship between the characters or between the character and reality. In the process of translation, the translator should realise how significant the details of the original work are. In order to understand the meaning of each detail in each particular case, it is necessary to conform to its verbal environment, i.e. context.

Translation of drama is a complex problem. Imagery is created by writers with a variety of linguistic means, and for this purpose they use the richness of the language. Therefore, the translator must carefully estimate all the details that create the artistic impression, so that the translation does not deprive the work of its brightness, brilliance and individual characteristics of the author's style. However, at the same time, the translator should not blindly copy every detail if it goes against the stylistic norms of the target language. If necessary, the translator has the right to replace one technique with another that produces an equal effect.

3.2 Extralinguistic Situation

There are cases when even the broadest context does not contain any indications as to in which meaning a polysemantic unit is used and, therefore, what equivalent should be chosen. According to Leonid Barkhudarov, in these cases, in order to obtain the required information, it is necessary to go beyond the language context and consider the extralinguistic situation (Barkhudarov 1975, 172). The latter is, firstly, the situation of communication, i.e. the situation in which a communicative act is performed; secondly, the subject of the message, that is, the situation (a set of facts) described in the text; thirdly, the participants of communication, i.e. the speaker (writer) and the listener (reader). The consideration of these factors in many cases is a prerequisite for the correct choice of a correspondence to a particular unit of the source language in the process of translation.

Therefore, in the translation process, the "removal" of the polysemy of linguistic units and the determination of the choice of a translation equivalent is influenced by a number of factors, such as narrow context, broad context and an extralinguistic situation. Without taking into account these factors in their interaction, understanding of a work and its translation is impossible. For this reason, the linguistic basis of the theory of translation is the linguistics of the text and the macrolinguistic description of the language.

If the two language systems – English and Russian – are compared, it is possible to notice some similarities between them, such as the subdivision of the languages into standard and dialectal ones. Nevertheless, these languages vary greatly due to the fact that they belong to different language types. English is considered to be an analytical one, i.e. a language that

conveys grammatical relationships without using inflectional morphemes. Russian belongs to synthetic languages that are languages with a high morpheme-per-word ratio.

A considerable difference between the use of English and Russian language variations is that Russian allows a wide range of changes on the phonemic and morphemic level, whereas syntax provides only few possibilities. English variations are prevalingly connected with changing syntactic structures.

As a result, all the points mentioned above affect significantly the process of translation, especially when considering drama. The latter is linked with the language common to the majority of native speakers and its naturalness, with emotions and feelings expressed verbally. For this reason, the translator must take all the peculiarities into consideration in order to reproduce the effect of the original.

The process of translation includes not only text rendering. It also presupposes maintaining a contact between two different cultural environments. Z. Kufnerová argues that a translator should bear in mind different emphases on the same historical events, a different system of chronology, different reminiscences and associations, a different system of estimating events and personalities, different responsibilities in family relations, a different system of government, political or cultural institutions (Kufnerová 2003, 57).

Therefore, translation is not only the interaction of languages, but also the interaction of cultures. Vilen Komissarov states that it is hardly possible to adequately describe the translation process, not taking into account the fact that it is carried out not by an idealised construct, but by a person whose value and psychological orientation inevitably affects the final result (Komissarov 1973, 215).

National variants of translations are specific due to distinct typological differences between the languages involved, cultural remoteness and different perception of local peculiarities. Pragmatic aspect is reflected in the way of presenting local customs and historical allusions related to this locality. Local peculiarities are mostly represented by so called untranslatable words reflecting a certain culture, its qualities and civilizational phenomena. As far as the preservation of these elements is concerned, scholars distinguish exoticised translation with the wide use of this type of words and naturalised translation attempting to omit them.

The resolution of such problems is achieved through the communicative activities of the translator, existing grammar guides, bilingual dictionaries, manuals on the culture of different nations and the personal cultural experience of the translator. The accuracy of translation

depends on how correctly the translator chooses the translation method, applies the appropriate strategy and determines the units of translation.

Speaking practically, the translator faces two mutually exclusive requirements:

1. The translated text should be as close as possible to the original.
2. The perception of the translation by a person of a different culture should be as close as possible to the perception of the original text by a person belonging to the original culture.

Between the two extremes, a whole range of translations is possible, differing in the degree of authenticity of the text and the adequacy of the context.

In order to match the style of the original, the translator has to overcome cultural differences. Not only is it crucial to preserve the style of the work, but also those peculiar features of the language of characters which essentially define and make them distinct and which evoke certain emotions and opinions in the mind of readers or the audience.

CHAPTER 4. CONTEXTUAL ELEMENTS OF DRAMA IN TRANSLATION

Roksolana Zorivchak outlines three main types of elements of dramatic works that reflect their context. These are forms of addressing, cultural realia and phraseological units (Zorivchak 2012, 26).

4.1 Translation of Forms of Addressing

As it has been already mentioned, drama is based on direct speech. Zorivchak states that direct speech is inextricably linked with the notion of communicative equivalence (Zorivchak 2012, 56). Hryhoriy Kochur claims that communicative equivalence is the relation between texts which coincide in their communicative value (Kochur 1968, 413). It means that original communicative value is preserved in the process of translation. Communicative value is defined by Kochur as a text characteristic that makes the text create a certain communicative effect (Kochur 1968, 147). The latter is the process of activating a certain condition of the recipient's consciousness which the author was willing to share.

Forms of addressing are inextricably linked with communicative value due to the fact that they reflect the relationships between characters and their social status. Moreover, the way how characters address each other demonstrates their emotional state.

The use of forms of addressing depends on social and linguistic factors. Forms of addressing have been changing since they have been created on the basis of national traditions of a particular epoch. For this reason, it is necessary to take cultural peculiarities into consideration. In addition, the linguistic approach has to be applied when analysing forms of addressing in different languages.

4.2 Translation of Cultural Realia

It is a common fact that languages differ both in grammar and in the number of words, not to mention the difference in cultures, which can also affect the process of translation. Moreover, despite the fact that comparative grammar and bilingual dictionaries exist in sufficiently detailed versions, there are practically no comparative reference books on cultures of certain nations. According to M. Morozov, the solution to the problem of combining the accuracy of translation and creative freedom largely depends on the correct approach to the problem of transferring national peculiarities (Morozov 1956, 18).

The question of national and historical specificity is inextricably linked with the process of translation since it is needed to express the content and form of the original in another

language material. The language itself is a distinguishing feature of a certain nation. Translation process results in losing this specificity. Thus, it is possible to leave a lexical unit in its original sounding when it is a bearer of a meaning typical for the historical environment of the original. These units can later enrich the target language with a new meaning for which it does not have a separate definition.

Means that have no equivalent in the target language and do not evoke the illusion of the original environment can be substituted by a domestic analogy. In such a way, it is possible to avoid contradictions with the original. Another hardship is time and place differences which can cause incomprehensibility of the text or misunderstanding. Such cases require the use of explanations or hints. An explanation serves for introducing an element which was included in the original. A hint is applied when an artistic means is a language material which cannot be preserved in the translation.

4.3 Translation of Phraseological Units

According Z. Kufnerová, when rendering phraseologisms, translators have to substitute what is said in a situation given (Kufnerová et al. 2003, 84). The scholar also notes that phraseologisms cannot be translated paying attention to components, but globally, i.e. each phraseological whole must be substituted by another one (situational equivalent) which is situationally adequate and relevant (Kufnerová et al. 2003, 85). Kufnerová argues that linguists claiming that the translation cannot be full and absolute equivalent of the original do not collide with supporters of translatability (Kufnerová et al. 2003, 87). The translation of stable phrases proves that any of them can actually be translated into another language in a certain way (especially when speaking about European languages). Nonetheless, it is hard to require full semantic or formal equivalence from the translation of fixed phrases and idioms.

The ability to analyse speech functions is one of the conditions for adequate translation of phraseological units into foreign languages. Authors may use phraseological units in several meanings at once to create figurative or emotional associations or a humorous effect. There are cases when the translator has to restore phraseologisms that underwent author's transformation and to convey their effect. Therefore, when translating phraseological units, the translator has to take the context into consideration.

Another inevitable difficulty is national and cultural differences between phraseological units in different languages. According to Zorivchak, often, coinciding in meaning, phraseologisms have a different emotive function or stylistic colouring (Zorivchak 2012, 154).

Similar problems can arise even when translating expressions that have the same source, for example, biblical, antique or mythological. Such phraseological expressions are considered international. These include phraseological units that were borrowed from one language to another or that originated among different nations independently of each other due to the commonality of human thinking or the proximity of certain aspects of social life, work, production, the development of science and arts.

According to M. Morozov, phraseological equivalents may be full or partial (Morozov 1956, 142). Full phraseological equivalents are those that coincide in meaning, lexical composition, imagery, stylistic colouring and grammatical structure. A translation based on partial phraseological equivalents does not at all mean that the meaning and figurativeness of phraseological units are not fully conveyed in the translation; by this term it should be borne in mind that in the equivalent proposed in English, some discrepancies with Russian are possible. In other words, for the translator it is important, first of all, to convey the image of a phraseologism, and not its linguistic structure. M. Morozov states that partial phraseological equivalents can be divided into three groups (Morozov 1956, 143):

1. The first group includes phraseological units that coincide in meaning, stylistic colouring and are close in figurativeness, but diverging in lexical composition.
2. The second group includes phraseological units that coincide in meaning, imagery, lexical composition and stylistic colouring, but differing in such formal signs as the number and order of words.
3. The third group includes phraseological units that coincide in all respects, with the exception of imagery.

As a distinctive feature of phraseological units, the frequency of using a particular idiomatic expression can give the speaker's speech unusual or even old-fashioned character.

Jiří Levý describes the importance of sense-for-sense translation by dwelling upon stable phrases that are a type of artistic details (Levý 1963, 126). He is convinced that if a word does not have a meaning itself, but it is a component of a whole, the whole should be translated not paying attention to the meanings of separate words (Levý 1963, 127). Stable phrases, idioms and most sayings and proverbs are translated as one lexical unit. As far as figurative expressions are concerned, implications of separate words, their relation to semantic reality and the connection between a thought and its artistic expression are crucial. For this reason, each detail must be duly analysed, especially when it is a part of a higher complex, e.g. the

author's style and intention. In some situations, it is impossible to preserve all qualities of a work. Thus, the translator must decide which qualities of the work are the most important and which of them could be omitted.

As it has been already mentioned, in almost any language several levels of phraseological expressions are noted, and not all of them are well-known, widely used and fixed in dictionaries. Some of them are used only by certain groups of native speakers. For this reason, the primary task of the translator is to be able to recognise them in the text and to distinguish a stable combination from a variable one.

Nevertheless, dramatic texts based primarily on general cultural values, or at least on comparable values, are quite successfully translated if translators focus on the transfer of general and universal concepts and do not exaggerate the untranslatability of stylistic, emotional and evaluative components of the source information, which are problematic to preserve as they have different manifestations in different national and cultural traditions. These problems range in a rather wide scale - from individual non-translatable elements to the entire source text. If the original is more remote as far as locality, society, age, civilisation or culture are concerned, it causes more considerable problems in the process of translation. Similarly to the original, the translation exists in a certain literary and cultural context. Specific relations and links change in the process of translation. The link to the source culture is lost, whereas a new relation to the target culture appears. Translation is realised in the field of a certain historical tradition when its aim is to converge two different developing cultures and literary traditions (poetics, expressive means, topics).

CHAPTER 5. ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF WORKS BY ANTON CHEKHOV

Anton Chekhov (1860-1904) is one of the most popular classics of Russian literature known to the world, first of all, as a playwright and master of prose, whose works have been translated into more than one hundred languages. Chekhov gained a reputation as a classic both in his homeland and abroad.

A. Mirzabayeva emphasises that initially appearing on the pages of the English edition of "The Athenaeum" in 1889, Chekhov was presented as an author of small psychological studies and an unsuccessful playwright, in whose play "Ivanov" there is no action, and the main characters are a mixture of conflicting qualities (Mirzabayeva 2015, 26).

Due to the fact that for a long time English publishers rejected translations done by O.R. Vasilyeva, V.D. Childs, etc., by the beginning of the twentieth century in England, only a few stories by Anton Chekhov were published: "Overdoing It", "Typhus" and "Misery". Nevertheless, the growing interest in the writer's works both in his homeland and abroad obviously made the English-speaking readers turn their attention to the classics of Russian literature. In 1903 and 1908 the English journalist Robert Edward Crozier Long, who visited Russia for several times, translated and compiled the first collections of short stories by Chekhov. In addition, the translator independently compiled and published the article "Anton Chekhov" containing some facts from the life of the writer. According to Z. Papernyi, this was the only biographical sketch about A.P. Chekhov in English for a long time (Papernyi et al. 1997, 114).

At the beginning of the 20th century, translations of Chekhov's works began to appear more often in English publications and were also published in America and Canada. During this period, Anton Chekhov's plays "Uncle Vanya", "Ivanov", "The Seagull" and "Swan Song" translated by Marian Fell were published too. According to Papernyi, Fell made two considerable mistakes: firstly, she did not familiarise herself with the culture of the original text, and secondly, she sought to literally translate the works, as a result of which her translation options contained a number of geographical, historical, and other errors (Papernyi et al. 1997, 171). Therefore, as Papernyi states, the English-speaking reader did not have the opportunity to recognise the unique creative manner of the Russian classic (Papernyi et al. 1997, 178).

Translations of Chekhov's works were also done by S.S. Kotelyansky. Since the mother tongue of the translator was Russian, the first collection "The Bet and Other Stories" (1915)

was co-authored with the British translator J. M. Murry. According to Z. Papernyi, unlike his colleagues, S. S. Kotelyansky chose the syntactic replacement of Russian names with similar pan-European names as his translation strategy (Papernyi et al. 1997, 199). This brought the work of the Russian classic closer to the English-speaking reader. The second collection, "The House with the Mezzanine and Other Stories" (1917), was translated by means of the same translation strategy.

As Z. Papernyi notes, in 1910 the famous translator from Russian literature Constance Garnett started translating works by Anton Chekhov (Papernyi et al. 1997, 202). Her collection of translated stories included 201 works, some of which were published for the first time. It is believed that the publication initiated admiration for Chekhov's work among English readers. For half a century, it was thanks to Constance Garnett's translations that English-speaking readers became acquainted with the artistic heritage of Anton Chekhov. Moreover, at this time biographical essays about the writer, translations of his letters, various notes and articles on literature, theatre, etc. were published as well.

However, the need to review existing translations and create new ones did not disappear, and by the 1960s, eight more collections were published in England and the USA, which included "The House with the Mezzanine", "The Lady with the Dog", etc. The next attempt to translate works by Anton Chekhov was the translation by Ronald Hingley and the publication of the nine-volume Oxford collection of Chekhov's works titled "The Oxford Chekhov". Each volume of this publication contains not only works of the Russian classic, but also a preface, biographical essays, notes and comments independently compiled by the translator.

R. Hingley's innovation lies in the fact that he conveys proper names, realia, features of narrative techniques and the uniqueness of the style of the Russian classic. "The Oxford Chekhov" was positively estimated by both readers and literary critics. According to Z. Papernyi, not a single Russian author had been presented to English readers as fully as Chekhov in this publication (Papernyi et al. 1997, 215).

In 1982, a new collection of early stories by Anton Chekhov was compiled by Patrick Miles and Harvey Pitcher. The works that made up the collection were already translated by many translators. However, the purpose of this publication was stated differently: to demonstrate the new Chekhov to English-speaking readers, using all kinds of functional replacements and focusing on the preservation of the author's speech and style features. The innovation of Patrick Miles and Harvey Pitcher lies in the fact that the translators made an attempt to

convey the surnames of the characters in a completely different way, i.e. to use English words as roots of the surnames, so that the latter have some implications.

David Alan Mamet, a contemporary American playwright, has translated "The Cherry Orchard" (1994), "Uncle Vanya" (1994) and "The Three Sisters" (2010). The translator has worked from literal translations of the plays.

Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, literary translators of classic Russian literature, have translated plays by Anton Chekhov as well. They were published in a collection called "Selected Stories of Anton Chekhov" (2000). In 2020, the translators published a new collection of Chekhov's works named "Anton Chekhov: Fifty-Two Stories".

This diploma thesis will focus on two contemporary translations of "The Cherry Orchard" by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel that were published in 2000 and 2015 respectively. It has to be noted that both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel have translated other plays by Anton Chekhov. Maria Amadei Ashot has translated "Uncle Vanya" (1997) and "Three Sisters" (1998). Libby Appel has translated "Ivanov", "Seagull", "Uncle Vanya" and "Three Sisters". These plays were published in 2015.

Despite the large number of translations from Russian, works by Anton Chekhov remain one of the most difficult to interpret in other languages. Several centuries have changed, new names have appeared in world literature, however, translators of the 21st century continue to translate and interpret the literary heritage of the writer, thereby proving that the history of translations of works by Anton Chekhov has not been finished yet.

CHAPTER 6. CONTEXT IN WORKS BY ANTON CHEKHOV

In order to interpret Chekhov's plays, it is of the utmost importance to understand the era which the author describes in his works. For instance, the play "The Cherry Orchard" is a story about the passing noble era. All events revolve around the cherry orchard, which embodies this era.

As far as context in Chekhov's plays is concerned, it is problematic to define the genre nature of his plays. For example, the genre nature of "The Cherry Orchard" is controversial. There are features of tragedy (all characters in the play are lonely and unhappy) as well as drama (subjective dissatisfaction with human life) in it, there are no clearly negative or positive characters, and the conflict itself remains unclear. The speech of the characters is ridiculous and pompous, pathetic monologues flow into farce, and behind the lightweight sadness there is usual tearfulness for weak and nervous people. These features allow the reader to consider this work as a comedy.

The next aspect is the language of Chekhov's plays. According to Ryapolova, it has features that can become a problem when translating them into English (Ryapolova 2012, 83). The scholar defines the following features: grammatical construction of sentences, syntactic features of the Russian language, the melody of speech, author's words and phrases, and language units existing only in Russian culture (Ryapolova 2012, 84).

In addition, the main difficulty in translating Chekhov's stories may be the translation of surnames the roots of which are usual Russian words: Ochumelov, Khryukin, etc. These surnames reflect the personality of the characters and may be impossible to convey into English. This fact, unfortunately, deprives a work of deep meaning and vivid images. Undoubtedly, stereotypes about another nation also influence the process of translation.

It is known that, in contrast to English people using simple constructions, Russian speech is emotional and full of various complex configurations. Therefore, as V. Ryapolova notes, the speech of Chekhov's characters reflects the specifics of a certain epoch, characterises a certain type of people and has an unusual style (Ryapolova 2012, 41). In order to interpret Chekhov's works as close as possible to the original, it is necessary to take into account all the features of Russian culture, speech, lifestyle, time and place of the events described.

Each word of Chekhov's characters reveals their nature. For example, the contradictory essence of Ranevskaya in the play "The Cherry Orchard" - her sincerity, mannerism and excessive sensitivity – is reflected in her habit to use diminutive suffixes and lyrical epithets.

One of the main unique features of the play is that despite the fact that such a work can be considered artistic, the characters in it speak using mostly colloquial and common vocabulary. Plays by Anton Chekhov contain a large number of phraseologisms. According to T. Kazakova, the latter are a special type of combinations, the main feature of which is partial or complete discrepancy between the content plan and the expression plan that determines the specifics of the idiom (Kazakova 1998, 127).

CHAPTER 7. ANALYSIS OF THE TWO ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF "THE CHERRY ORCHARD"

The structure of "The Cherry Orchard" corresponds to the compositional rules of dramatic texts. The play consists of four acts.

In the first act of the play, the cherry orchard is to be auctioned. In connection with this event, the whole family comes to the old estate. In the second act, all family members want to keep the estate, but at the same time they refuse any decisive action. The bright representative of the new time - Lopakhin - proposes to cut down the cherry orchard and build cottages in its place. The third act begins with a ball - a striking event in the life of an almost bygone era, and ends with Lopakhin buying an estate at the auction. In the final act, all the characters say goodbye to each other and the estate.

"The Cherry Orchard" is satirical. This is caused by the abundance of farcical situations and good humour. The play lacks conflicts, confrontations, clashes of ideas, opinions, or characters. This makes the work as close as possible to everyday life.

Two translations into English by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel will be analysed in the following part of this chapter. Both translations were done for printed editions. These translations were chosen due to the fact that these are one of the latest translations of "The Cherry Orchard". This is a fact that makes it possible to compare the views of the two translators of the 21st century on realia that are reflected in the play written on the verge of the 19th and 20th centuries.

The main aim is to analyse approaches of the translators to creating translations for publication. In the analysis, extracts from all four acts of the play will be used in order to be able to analyse the translators' solutions throughout the whole text. Extracts that will be used in this chapter were chosen on the basis of cultural context that is reflected in the play "The Cherry Orchard". Adhering to this approach, 23 extracts were selected for the detailed analysis. The analysis of the play "The Cherry Orchard" is divided according to the classification of contextual elements of dramatic works introduced by Roksolana Zorivchak (Zorivchak 2012, 9). As it has been mentioned in Chapter 4, Zorivchak outlines three types of the contextual elements, namely forms of addressing, cultural realia and phraseologisms (Zorivchak 2012, 10).

7.1 Forms of Addressing

Table 1.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
<p>Аня. Я спать пойду. Спокойной ночи, мама. (Целует мать.) (Act 1, 10)</p>	<p>Anya. I will go to sleep. Good night, mom. (Kisses the mother.)</p>	<p>AN: I'm going to sleep. Good night, Mama. (Kisses her mother.) (Act 1, 13)</p>	<p>ANYA I'm going to sleep. Bonne nuit, maman. (<i>Kisses her mother.</i>) (Act 1, 9)</p>

In the original work, the author uses the typical way of saying "Good night" in Russian, while Libby Appel uses the expression in French – "Bonne nuit". The reason for this choice can be the attempt of the translator to reflect the life of the society. Using French expressions was widespread in upper classes of the Russian society. This was the way people demonstrated their intelligence. Moreover, speaking French was common in Russian families of upper classes. For this reason, Anya calls her mother "maman". The translation of the original sentence by Libby Appel proves the fact that the translator pays particular attention to the extralinguistic reality that is reflected in relationships between people. It has to be noted that Libby Appel uses French expressions only in greetings and farewells. The total number of French phrases used by the translator is 34.

As far as the translation by Maria Amadei Ashot is concerned, the translator adheres to the original sentence and does not use any specific features of speech of the upper classes in this extract.

Table 2.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
<p>Любовь Андреевна. Ненаглядная дитюся моя. (Целует ей руки.)</p>	<p>Lyubov Andreyevna. Beloved child my (Kisses her hands.)</p>	<p>RA: My adorable baby angel. (Kisses her hands.)</p>	<p>LYUBOV ANDREYEVNA My beloved baby. (<i>She kisses her</i></p>

(Act 1, 10)		(Act 1, 13)	<i>hands.</i>) (Act 1, 9)
-------------	--	-------------	----------------------------

This example represents the method of compensation. In the original sentence, Lyubov Andreyevna addresses her daughter with the word "дитюся", which is a diminutive form of "дитя" ("child"). The latter is a word that is used only rarely and has the same meaning as the word "ребёнок" ("child"). Diminutive forms of nouns are widespread in Russian and are one of the main ways of expressing people's emotions. This is the point in which Russian and English differ from each other considerably. Due to the fact that English is an analytic language, diminutives are not widespread in it. For this reason, in order to translate Russian diminutives, translators should use other ways of reflecting people's emotions.

Maria Amadei Ashot adds the word "angel". The latter demonstrates how important Anna is in the life of Lyubov Andreyevna and the fact that parents idealise their children. Libby Appel uses the expression "my beloved baby", i.e. the translator adds an extra word ("beloved") to convey the diminutive "дитюся".

As it has been already mentioned, in order to match the style of the original, the translator has to overcome cultural differences. It is crucial to preserve those peculiar features of the language of characters which essentially define and make them distinct and which evoke certain emotions and opinions in the mind of readers or the audience.

Table 3.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Любовь Андреевна. Спасибо, родной . Я привыкла к кофе. Пью его и днем и ночью. Спасибо, мой старичок . (Целует Фирса.) (Act 1, 11)	Lyubov Andreyevna. Thank you, dear . I am used to coffee. I drink it day and night. Thank you, my old man (Kisses Firs.)	RA: Thank you, my good man . I have a coffee habit. I drink it day and night. Thank you, my old friend . (She kisses Fierce.) (Act 1, 14)	LYUBOV ANDREYEVNA Thank you, my dear . I've become quite addicted to coffee. I drink it day and night. Thank you, my dear old man . (<i>She kisses Firs.</i>) (Act 1, 10)

In this extract, Lyubov Andreyevna addresses Firs in a kind way using the diminutive "старичок" which literally means "a small old man". As it has been already mentioned, diminutives are one of the most widespread difficulties in the process of translation from the Russian language. The translator should find a way to convey the emotions of characters expressed by means of diminutives. Maria Amadei Ashot uses the phrases "my good man" and "my old friend". Similarly to Libby Appel, Ashot does not preserve the meaning of "small". Nevertheless, she introduces the word "friend" that is not used in the original, but contributes to the understanding of the relationship between Lyubov Andreyevna and Firs. Libby Appel uses the expression "my dear old man" which does not completely reflect the meaning of the original phrase since there is no attempt to preserve the meaning of "small". Moreover, in this extract Lyubov Andreyevna uses two expressions to address Firs. These are "родной" and "мой старичок". The expressions are different, but Libby Appel uses the word "dear" in both corresponding expressions.

Table 4.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Аня. Милая, добрая, хорошая моя мама, моя прекрасная, я люблю тебя... (Act 3, 44)	Аня. Sweet, kind, good my mother, my beautiful, I love you...	AN: My sweet, good, beautiful mama, I love you... (Act 3, 48)	ANYA My sweet, kind, good mama, my beautiful, I love you... (Act 3, 42)

This is an extract that contains several epithets used by Anya to address her mother. Both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel preserve the kindness of Anya's words since the translators adhere to the original epithets.

Table 5.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Фирс: ... Готов кофий? (Строго, Дуняше.) Ты! А	Firs: ... Is coffee ready? (Strictly, to Dunyasha.) You! And	Fierce: Is coffee ready? (Sternly to Dunyasha) You there,	Firs: Is coffee ready? (Sternly to Dunyasha) Girl!

сливки?	cream?	where's the cream?	Where's the cream?
Дуняша: Ах, боже мой... (Быстро уходит)	Dunyasha: Oh, my god... (Leaves quickly)	Dunyasha: Dear me! (She goes out hastily)	Dunyasha: Ah, mercy on us! (She goes out quickly)
Фирс: Эх ты, недотепа... (Act 1, 10)	Firs: Eh you, klutz...	Fierce: Why , bungler! (Act 1, 13)	Firs: Ech! you good for nothing! (Act 1, 9)

As far as the translation by Libby Appel is concerned, the combination of the purely Russian sound of interjection "Ech" and the deviation from the author's also purely Russian intonation changes the perception: instead of "Ech, you good for nothing" the expression "Ech! you good for nothing!" is used. With such punctuation, the translation emphasises the motive of negligence of the maid and the reproachful tone of the old man. Moreover, Libby Appel softens Firs's appeal to Dunyasha ("Ты! А сливки?" – "You! And cream?"). Instead of the rude "You!" Firs says: "Girl! Where's the cream?" As far as the translation by Maria Amadei Ashot is concerned, she uses the expression "You there", which is closer to the original one.

Table 6.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
"Не плачь, говорит, мужичок, до свадьбы заживет..." (Act 1, 5)	"Don't cry, she says, little man , it will heal before the wedding..."	"Don't cry, little peasant ," she said, "it will heal in time for your wedding" (Act 1, 8)	"Don't cry, little peasant ," says she, "it will be well in time for your wedding day" (Act 1, 5)

In the above extract, Ranyevskaya uses the word "мужичок" ("little man") in order to address Lopakhin. This is a diminutive form of the word "мужик" ("man"). As it has been already mentioned, the use of diminutive suffixes in the Russian language is widespread. Both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel use the expression "little peasant" despite the fact that in the original work, a word that would mean "peasant" is not used.

Table 7.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Гаев. Когда-то мы с тобой, сестра , спали вот в этой самой комнате, а теперь мне уже пятьдесят один год, как это ни странно... (Act 1, 5)	Gayev. Some time ago, you and I, sister , slept in this very room, but now I'm fifty-one years old, how it is strange...	GH: Once upon a time, Sis , you and I slept in this very room, and here I am now, 51 years old, strange though it may seem... (Act 1, 8)	GAYEV. At one time, sweet sister , we slept in this very room, and now I am fifty one years old. Isn't it strange... (Act 1, 5)

The detail that has to be analysed in the above extract is the way the translators convey the word "сестра" ("sister") used by Gayev to address his sister. In the original version, the word "sister" is used, but Libby Appel adds the epithet "sweet" to reflect the relationships of the siblings. Maria Amadei Ashot chooses another way of conveying the word "сестра" and uses the word "Sis" which is a colloquial version of "sister".

Moreover, the author uses the expression "как это ни странно" which means "although it is strange". Libby Appel uses a reversed word order to convey this phrase. Therefore, the sentence looks like an unfinished question: "Isn't it strange..." This contributes to the emotional state of Gayev who is thinking about his life. Maria Amadei Ashot uses the expression "strange though it may seem" which is much closer to the original one.

The original sentence has no special stylistic devices, whereas the translation by Libby Appel is stylistically marked in order to preserve the general spirit of the original and to compensate for some other expressions in which the translator does not manage to keep original stylistic devices.

Table 8.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Любовь Андреевна. Как это? Дай-ка	Lyubov Andreyevna. How is this? Let	RA: How does it go	LYUBOV ANDREYEVNA

вспомнить... (Act 1, 10)	recall...	again?... (Act 1, 13)	How does it go? Let me remember... (Act 1, 9)
--------------------------	-----------	-----------------------	--

In this extract, Lyubov Andreyevna uses the word "дай-ка" ("let") that is the colloquial form of the word "дай". Maria Amadei Ashot omits this sentence. Libby Appel uses the word "let" which is literary, i.e. she does not use an English word that is colloquial. In the Russian language, there is a considerable number of words that have colloquial forms. The latter reflect the relationships between people and the conversational situation.

Table 9.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Лопухин. Да, время идет. Гаев. Кого?	Lopakhin. Yes, time is going . Gaev. Whom?	LOPAHIN Yes. Time flies . GAYEV Whazzat?	LOPAKHIN Yes, time flies . GAYEV What? LOPAKHIN I said, time flies . (Act 1, 9)
Лопухин. Время, говорю, идет. (Act 1, 10)	Lopakhin. Time, I say, is going .	LOPAHIN Time. I said, it flies . (Act 1, 13)	

This extract is the dialogue between Lopakhin and Gayev. In the original, Lopakhin says "Да, время идёт" which literally means "Yes, the time goes". However, both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel use the phrase "Yes, the time flies" which sounds natural in English and emphasises Lopakhin's idea that the life is short.

In addition, Gayev does not understand Lopakhin's idea immediately and asks him "Koro?" which literally means "Whom?" This is the colloquial way of asking "What have you said?" Libby Appel uses the literary word "What?", but Maria Amadei Ashot uses the colloquial "Whazzat?" which reflects the way of using "Koro?" in the original.

7.2 Cultural Realia

Table 10.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Фирс. А воля вышла , я уже старшим камердинером был. (Act 2, 27)	Firs. And the liberty came out , I was already a senior valet.	FI: And when they freed the serfs , I was already chief valet. (Act 2, 30)	FIRS I was the head footman before the emancipation came. (Act 2, 28)

Translating this phrase, the translators go beyond the linguistic context and turn to the extralinguistic situation. Libby Appel uses the word "emancipation". However, it can happen that the English-speaking reader does not know about the fact of the abolition of serfdom in the Russian Empire. Maria Amadei Ashot makes the sentence much longer: "And when they freed the serfs..." This sentence is more understandable, but the spirit of Firs's speech disappears in it.

Table 11.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Гаев. Я человек восьмидесятых годов . Не хвалят это время, но все же могу сказать, за убеждения мне доставалось немало в жизни. (Act 1, 19)	Gayev. I am a man of the eighties . They do not praise this time, but I can still say that for my beliefs I have got a lot in my life.	GH: I'm a man of 'eighties . People frown on the 'eighties, but I may say I've had to smart my convictions in my time. (Act 1, 22)	GAYEV I'm a man of the eighties . They run down that period, but still I can say I have had to suffer not a little for my convictions in my life. (Act 1, 18)

In this extract, the meaning of "a man of the eighties" is not fully understandable for English readers. Both translators use literal translation which may be insufficient to characterise Gayev, a man of the era when excellent-minded liberalism flourished, peacefully coexisting

with a fierce political reaction (a connotation well known to the Russian audience - a contemporary of Chekhov).

The point is that there are frequent cases when one word of the original is conveyed in another language by a combination of two or more words, or when a combination of two or more words is conveyed by one word, or when the original word (even a term) is omitted in the translation. As it has been noted, in order to match the context of the original, the translator has to overcome cultural differences. Not only is it crucial to preserve the style of the work, but also those peculiar features of the language of characters which evoke certain emotions and opinions.

The above extract is a bright example of a characterological detail. The latter fulfils its function directly, fixing certain features of the character. This type of the artistic detail is dispersed throughout the text. The author does not provide the reader with a detailed characterisation of the character, but places details in the text.

Table 12.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Аня. Сядем на вокзале обедать и она требует самое дорогое и на чай лакеям дает по рублю . (Act 1, 8)	Аня. We will sit at the station for lunch and she requires the most expensive and tips each lackey a ruble .	AN: When we had dinner at the stations she always ordered the most expensive things and tipped the waiters a ruble each. (Act 1, 11)	ANYA When we had dinner at the stations, she always ordered the most expensive things and gave the waiters a whole ruble . (Act 1, 7)

When translating the word "рубли", both translators use the transliteration "ruble". However, the English or American viewer or reader may not know what the real value of the Russian ruble is. Therefore, instead of indicating a specific amount (which in this case does not matter), it is also possible to emphasise generous nature of the tip that Ranevskaya gives and to use the generalisation technique, that is, replacing a word with a specific meaning with more general, but more understandable for a native speaker of a foreign language.

Table 13.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Лопакхин И квасу мне принеси. (Act 3, 38)	Lopakhin And bring me kvass .	LO: And bring me some kvass . (Act 3, 42)	LOPAKHIN And bring me some kvass . (Act 3, 36)

In this example, translation transcription of the name of the Russian drink kvass is used. The latter is unknown to English-speaking culture. However, judging from the extralinguistic situation it is understandable that kvass is used as a soft drink.

7.3 Phraseological Units

The play "The Cherry Orchard" contains numerous phraseological units. Due to its semantic richness, imagery, laconicism and brightness, phraseology plays an important role in language. It gives speech expressiveness and originality. When translating phraseological units, the translator must convey its meaning and reflect its imagery, finding a similar expression and not losing the stylistic function of phraseological units.

A larger number of examples are presented in the construction "verb + noun". This is due to the fact that in the Russian language the main semantic structure is the one that contains information about the subject and its action, or about the action performed on the subject. In addition, as far as the translation of phraseological units is concerned, it must be said that Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel use either absolute or relative equivalents as well as descriptive translation.

Table 14.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Лопакхин: Экая прорва! (Act 3, 38)	Lopakhin: What a load!	Lopahin: What a gobbler! (Act 3, 42)	Lopakhin: What a glutton! (Act 3, 36)

The phrase "What a gobbler" used by Maria Amadei Ashot does not reveal the essence of the phraseologism since "gobbler" is a pompous person. This image does not correlate with the context of the work. When translating the phraseological phrase "Экая прорва!", Libby Appel uses full correspondence: "What a glutton!"

Table 15.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Трофимов: Должно быть, я буду вечным студентом. (Act 1, 16)	Trofimov: Most probably, I will be an eternal student.	Trofimov: Yes, I seem likely to be a perpetual student. (Act 1, 19)	Trofimov: I shall probably be an eternal student. (Act 1, 15)

Full correspondence is used by both translators when translating the phraseologism "вечный студент" ("eternal student"): Maria Amadei Ashot uses the expression "perpetual student", whereas Libby Appel uses the phrase "eternal student". This phraseological unit is an implicating detail. The main point of it is to demonstrate that Trofimov does not do anything and cannot even finish the institute.

Table 16.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Любовь Андреевна: Если бы снять с груди и с плеч моих тяжёлый камень... (Act 4, 47)	Lyubov Andreevna: If I could remove a heavy stone from my chest and shoulders...	Ranevskaya: If only I could shake off the heavy stone that weighs on my heart! (Act 4, 51)	Lyubov Andreyevna: If I could cast off the burden that weighs on my heart... (Act 4, 45)

Maria Amadei Ashot uses a calque when conveying the expression "тяжёлый камень". The contextual meaning of this phrase is "a heavy burden". The word "burden", which emphasises the difficult life situation of Lyubov Andreyevna, is used by Libby Appel.

Table 17.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Пищик. Не надо принимать медикаменты, милейшая... от них ни вреда, ни	Pishchik. No need to take medicine, my dear... there is no harm or benefit	Pishtchik: You oughtn't to take medicine, dear lady. It does you neither harm nor good. (Act	Pishtchik: You shouldn't take the medicines, my dear madam... they do no harm no good. (Act

пользы... (Act 4, 49)	from them...	4, 53)	4, 47)
-----------------------	--------------	--------	--------

When translating the phraseologism "ни вреда ни пользы", Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel use the full correspondence "neither harm nor good" and "no harm no good". In this case, the translation does not depend on the context because it has an identical phraseological unit in the English language.

Table 18.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Варя. Двадцать два несчастья. (Act 2, 22)	Varya. Twenty-two misfortunes.	Varya: Two and twenty troubles. (Act 2, 25)	Varya: Twenty-two misfortunes. (Act 2, 21)

Both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel use expressions that are literal translations of the original phrase "Двадцать два несчастья".

Table 19.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Любовь Андреевна: О, мои грехи... Я всегда сорила деньгами без удержу как сумасшедшая. (Act 2, 25)	Lyubov Andreyevna: Oh, my sins ... I always threw money without restraint like crazy.	Ranevskaya: Oh, the sins that I have committed! I've always squandered money recklessly, like a crazy woman. (Act 2, 28)	Lyubov Andreyevna: Oh, my sins! I've always thrown my money away recklessly like a lunatic. (Act 2, 24)
Любовь Андреевна: Она привыкла рано ставать и работать, и теперь без труда она как рыба без воды.	Lyubov Andreyevna: She was used to getting up early and working, and now without work she is like a fish without	Ranevskaya: She's used to getting up early and working, and now that she has no work to do, she's like a fish out of	Lyubov Andreyevna: She is used to getting up early and working, and now with no work to do, she's like a fish out

(Act 4, 51)	water.	water. (Act 4, 55)	of water. (Act 4, 49)
-------------	---------------	---------------------------	------------------------------

In these examples, both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel use mostly literal translation. The Russian phraseologism "как рыба без воды" has the analogical English equivalent that is used by both translators. However, in some cases the translators deviate from the original expressions. The phrase "сорила деньгами" is not translated literally. Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel use the verbs "throw" and "squander" that sound natural in this expression.

Table 20.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Варя (Лопухину и Пищичку). Что ж, господа? Третий час, пора и честь знать. (Act 1, 11)	Varya (to Lopakhin and Pishchik). Well, gentlemen? It is three o'clock, it is time to know honour.	VA: Well, gentlemen? It's almost three in the morning. Time for guests to let the hosts rest. (Act 1, 14)	VARYA Well then, gentlemen, it is three o'clock in the morning, time to go. (Act 1, 10)

In the original sentence, the author uses the expression "Пора и честь знать", which is an indirect and polite way of saying "it is time to go". The Russian expression literally means "It is time to know the honour". This sentence reflects the speech of the upper classes that use literary language and expressions of politeness.

As far as the translations are concerned, Libby Appel uses a simple expression "Time to go", whereas Maria Amadei Ashot uses a longer sentence ("Time for guests to let the hosts rest."), which is the descriptive way of conveying the original expression.

Table 21.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Гаев. Дам я ему, держи карман шире. (Act 3, 38)	Gayev. I'll give him, hold the pocket wider.	Gayev: Let him have it. He'll have a long wait! (Act 3, 42)	Gayev: Me give to him. Hold out your pocket! (Act 3, 36)

As far as the translation of the expression "держи карман шире" is concerned, Libby Appel uses literal translation that may be difficult to understand. Maria Amadei Ashot uses the direct way of expressing Gayev's thoughts, i.e. with no phraseologisms. This approach makes the expression understandable, but the imagery of the original phrase disappears.

Table 22.

Anton Chekhov	Literal translation	Maria Amadei Ashot	Libby Appel
Любовь Андреевна. Ведь все уже кончено там, имение продано или торги не состоялись, зачем же так долго держат в неведении! (Act 3, 35)	Lyubov Andreevna. After all, everything is already over there, the estate was sold or the auction did not take place, so why keep in the dark for so long!	RA: It must be all over by now; the property's sold; or the auction never came off; why does he keep me in suspense so long? (Act 3, 39)	LYUBOV ANDREYEVNA Why, everything must be over by now. The estate is sold, or the sale has not taken place. Why keep us so long in suspense? (Act 3, 33)

The expression "to keep in suspense" is used by both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel. It is a full correspondence to the Russian phraseological unit.

CONCLUSION

The analysis demonstrates that context is a key component of the process of drama translation. Context is a complex notion that can be understood in different ways. The diploma thesis proves that artistic details and extralinguistic situation that were chosen for the analysis as crucial parts of the notion of cultural context are inextricably linked with the correct understanding of dramatic works. The latter are a specific part of literature because

they reproduce authentic conversation, i.e. fully reflect the relationships between characters and their way of life. Moreover, dramatic works reflect cultural peculiarities that have a considerable effect on the way that characters communicate, behave and react to various life situations. All the aspects that are reflected in dramatic works are related to context that can be considered as a way of reproducing a different epoch.

As far as the notion of cultural context is concerned, it can be divided into linguistic and cultural constituents, which are intertwined. Artistic details are a bright example of the linguistic side of the notion of context. On the one hand, artistic details can be understood in a text since they are used in conversations between characters. On the other hand, without having sufficient knowledge of the culture, it is likely that readers will not fully understand the way characters communicate and behave. Cultural peculiarities are reflected in communication.

The analysis of English translations of the play "The Cherry Orchard" by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel reflected the problems of the interaction of two cultures. The analysis proved the complicacy of context and demonstrated the approaches of the translators to making the original context understandable for the target audience. Moreover, the difference of cultures is not the only problem in the process of translating "The Cherry Orchard". One more difficulty is the differences between the source and the target language that belong to different language types.

As far as the translation of forms of addressing the characters is concerned, both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel use several approaches to convey Russian diminutives. The translators also preserve epithets that are used by the characters of the play to address others. It has to be noted that Libby Appel uses French phrases in her translation despite the fact that the correspondent phrases in the original are in Russian. This is done to demonstrate the fact that it was typical for the upper classes of the Russian society at the end of the 19th century to speak French.

The approaches of the translators to conveying colloquial expressions are different. Whereas Maria Amadei Ashot attempts to find English colloquial words that correspond to the Russian ones used in the "Cherry Orchard", Libby Appel mostly uses neutral expressions in English.

When conveying cultural realia, both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel mostly use literal translation or transliteration with no explanations of the Russian realia.

On the basis of the analysis of phraseologisms it is possible to state that the translators use English equivalents of the Russian phraseological units where it is possible. In other cases, Maria Amadei Ashot uses expressions that are similar to the meaning of the Russian phraseologisms, whereas Libby Appel uses simple and even colloquial English phrases.

Translations by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel preserve the original context. The translators use various translation techniques to make the expressions, behaviour and reactions of the characters understandable to target readers. In some cases, both Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel adhere to original elements since in order to clarify them, an explanation would be needed that cannot be used in the very text of a dramatic work. However, both translators compensate for such elements and enable the target audience to understand the culture of the Russian society at the end of the 19th century.

The prospects of this topic for further research can be narrowed to the following:

- (1) Extension of the scope of the illustrative material to cover all acts of the drama in the English translations;
- (2) Analysis of the reception of translations by Maria Amadei Ashot and Libby Appel in English culture by reviewing journal publications and other translators' feedbacks;
- (3) Elaboration of a broader, interdisciplinary theoretical framework of context through the lens of translation studies and drama translation in particular.

RESUMÉ

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá kontextem dramatických děl a jeho součástmi, konkrétně uměleckými detaily a extralingvistickou situací, které jsou nezbytné při psaní a překladu dramatu. Pro analýzu bylo zvoleno drama Antona Čechova "Višňový sad" a jeho dva anglické překlady od Marie Amadei Ashotové a Libby Appelové.

Drama je specifickou součástí literatury. Vzhledem k tomu, že je na pomezí literatury a divadla a obsahuje některé vlastnosti, které musí být cílovému čtenáři na první pohled jasné, stojí před překladatelem při překládání dramatických děl mnohem komplikovanější úkol.

Proces překladu předpokládá hluboké porozumění původního textu. Bez znalosti života, sociálního prostředí, historické éry atd. není možné vytvořit správný překlad. Například národní specifika zahrnují rysy domácnosti, způsobu života, pracovních podmínek a zvyků dané země nebo regionu. Překladatel musí věnovat pozornost převedení kulturních prvků zdrojového textu. Při překladu dramatických děl je důležité převedení jazykových, sociálních a historických charakteristik originálu.

Proto je nutné vzít v úvahu kontext, který je jazykovým prostředím, ve kterém se používá určitá jazyková jednotka. Ve specifickém kontextu se jazykové jednotky objevují v jednom ze svých potenciálních významů. Porovnání potenciálních významů lingvistických jednotek umožňuje překladateli určit přesný význam.

Diplomová práce ukazuje, že kontext je klíčovou součástí procesu překladu dramatických děl. Kontext je komplexním pojmem, který lze chápat různými způsoby. Tato práce také dokazuje, že umělecké detaily a extralingvistická situace, které byly pro analýzu vybrány jako klíčové součásti pojmu kontextu, jsou neoddělitelně spjaty se správným chápáním dramatických děl. Dramatická díla zahrnují právě dialogy, tj. plně odrážejí vztahy mezi postavami a jejich životní styl. Dramatická díla navíc zahrnují kulturní specifika, která mají značný vliv na to, jak postavy komunikují, chovají se a reagují na různé životní situace. Všechny aspekty, které se odrážejí v dramatických dílech, souvisí s kontextem, jež lze považovat za způsob odrážení jiné epochy.

Kontext lze rozdělit na jazykové a kulturní složky, které jsou propojeny. Umělecké detaily jsou příkladem jazykové stránky kontextu. Na jednu stranu mohou být umělecké detaily v textu chápány, protože se používají v dialozích mezi postavami. Na druhou stranu je pravděpodobné, že čtenáři nebudou plně rozumět tomu, jak postavy komunikují a jak se chovají, pokud nemají dostatečné znalosti o původní kultuře. Kulturní specifika se tedy projevují v komunikaci. Existují totiž případy, kdy ani nejširší kontext neobsahuje žádné náznaky, ve kterém smyslu je jednotka použita. V těchto případech je za účelem získání požadovaných informací nutné překročit jazykový kontext a vzít v úvahu extralingvistickou situaci. Význam slova není autonomní. Závisí na kontextu jak v původním díle, tak i v překladu a v kontextu je objasněn.

Dramatická díla založena především na obecných kulturních hodnotách nebo přinejmenším na srovnatelných hodnotách se překládají úspěšně, pokud se překladatelé zaměřují na přenos obecných a univerzálních konceptů. Stylistické a emocionální prvky je složité převést, protože mají odlišné významy v různých národních a kulturních tradicích. Tyto problémy se pohybují v poměrně širokém měřítku - od jednotlivých prvků po celý zdrojový text. Originál a překlad existují v určitém literárním a kulturním kontextu. Specifické vztahy a spojitosti se v procesu překladu mění. Kultura originálu se ztrácí a zároveň se objevuje nový vztah k cílovému jazyku. Překlad je realizován v rámci určité historické tradice, pokud je jeho cílem sblížit dvě různé rozvíjející se kultury a literární tradice (poetiku, výrazové prostředky, témata).

Otázka národní a historické specifičnosti je neodmyslitelnou částí procesu překladu, protože je potřeba vyjádřit obsah a formu originálu v jiném jazyce, který je charakteristickým rysem určitého národa. Výsledkem procesu překladu je ztráta této specifičnosti. Je tedy možné ponechat lexikální jednotku v původním znění, když je nositelem významu typického pro historické prostředí originálu. Tyto jednotky mohou cílový jazyk obohatit o nový význam, pro který nemá samostatnou definici.

Mezi angličtinou a ruštinou existují některé podobnosti. Nicméně se značně liší, jelikož patří do různých typů jazyků. Angličtina je považována za analytickou, tj. jazyk, který zprostředkovává gramatické vztahy bez použití inflexních morfémů. Ruština patří k syntetickým jazykům, což jsou jazyky s vysokým poměrem morfémů vzhledem k počtu slov.

Je nepopiratelnou skutečností, že je komplikované překládat klasická ruská díla do angličtiny, protože představují životní styl a filozofii ruského národa, což se často odráží ve slovech, jejichž ekvivalenty je obtížné najít v cizím jazyce. Příkladem takových děl jsou dramata Antona Čechova.

Mezi objektivní potíže patří značné rozdíly mezi ruskými a anglickými reáliemi. Některé reálie lze pochopit pouze v kontextu ruského života. Aby bylo možné interpretovat dramata Antona Čechova, je důležité pochopit, jakou epochu popisuje autor ve svých dílech.

Co se týká kontextu v dramatech Antona Čechova, je problematické definovat žánrovou povahu jeho děl. Například žánrová povaha dramatu "Višňový sad" je kontroverzní. Jsou v něm rysy tragédie (všechny postavy jsou osamělé a nešťastné) a také dramatu (subjektivní nespokojenost s lidským životem), neexistují žádné pouze negativní nebo pozitivní postavy a samotný konflikt zůstává nejasný.

Dalším aspektem je jazyk dramat Antona Čechova. Má funkce, které se mohou stát problémem při jejich překladu do angličtiny. Jedná se o gramatickou konstrukci vět, syntaktické charakteristiky ruského jazyka, melodii řeči, autorova slova a jazykové jednotky existující pouze v ruské kultuře.

Kromě toho může být hlavním problémem při překladu dramat Antona Čechova překlad příjmení, jejichž kořeny jsou obvyklá ruská slova. Tato příjmení odrážejí osobnost postav a je komplikované tyto jednotky přeložit do angličtiny. Tato skutečnost bohužel připravuje dílo o hluboký význam a živé obrazy. Proces překladu nepochybně ovlivňují také stereotypy o jiném národě.

Překladatel musí překonat kulturní rozdíly. Je nezbytné zachovat specifické rysy řeči postav, které je odhalují a odlišují a které vyvolávají určité emoce ve čtenářích či divácích. Řeč Čechovových postav je účinná. Každé slovo navíc odhaluje povahu postavy. Například upřímnost a citlivost Raněvské v dramatu "Višňový sad" se odráží v jejím zvyku používat zdvořilost a epitety. Jednou z hlavních jedinečných vlastností zmíněného dramatu je, že bez ohledu na to, že takové dílo lze považovat za umělecké, postavy v něm mluví většinou hovorově.

Analýza anglických překladů dramatu "Višňový sad" od Marie Amadei Ashotové a Libby Appelové ukazuje problémy interakce dvou kultur. Analýza prokazuje komplikovanost kontextu a popisuje přístupy překladatelek k tomu, aby byl původní kontext srozumitelný pro cílové publikum.

LIST OF SOURCES

Primary sources

Appel, Libby. 2015. *Five Chekhov Plays*. Electronic source.

Ashot, Maria Amadei. 2000. *The Cherry Orchard*. Electronic source.

Chekhov, Anton. 2015. *Vishnyovyy sad* [Cherry orchard]. Moscow: Azbuka.

Secondary sources

Amosova, Nataliya. 1998. *O sintakticheskom kontekste. Leksikograficheskiy sbornik* [About syntactic context. Lexicographical collection]. Moscow: Nauka.

Baker, Mona. 2001. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Barkhudarov, Leonid. 1975. *Jazyk i perevod. Voprosy obshchey i chastnoy teorii perevoda* [Language and translation. Questions of general and specific translation theory]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.

Bunin, Ivan. 1953. *O Chekhove. Nezakonchennaya rukopis* [About Chekhov. Unfinished manuscript]. New York: The Chekhov Publishing House.

Galperin, Ilya. 1981. *Stilistika* [Stylistics]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.

Horálek, Karel. 1966. *Příspěvky k teorii překladu*. Prague: SPN.

Hrdlička, Milan. 1997. *Literární překlad a komunikace*. Prague: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.

Humboldt, Wilhelm. 1985. *Jazyk i filosofiya kultury* [Language and philosophy of culture]. Moscow: Progress.

Kazakova, Tamara. 1998. *Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskiye aspekty)* [Translation theory (linguistic aspects)]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.

Kochur, Hryhoriy. 1996. *Masterstvo perevoda* [Mastery of translation]. Moskva: Prosveshcheniye.

Komissarov, Vilen. 1973. *Slovo o perevode* [A word about translation]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.

Kopanyev, Pavel. 1972. *Voprosy istorii i teorii chudozhestvennogo perevoda* [Questions of history and theory of artistic translation]. Minsk: BGU.

Koptilov, Viktor. 1973. *Stylizatsiya u perekladi* [Stylisation in translation]. Kyiv: Svitanok.

Kufnerová, Zlata, Zdena Skoumalová, and Vlasta Straková. 2003. *Překládání a čeština*. Prague: Nakladatelství H&H.

Kukhareenko, Valeriya. 2000. *Interpretatsiya teksta* [Text interpretation]. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.

- Levý, Jiří. 1963. *Umění překladu*. Prague: Československý spisovatel.
- Lomtyev, Timofey. 1976. *Obshcheye i russkoye yazykoznaníe* [General and Russian linguistics]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Lvov, Mikhail. 2002. *Osnovy teorii rechi* [Basics of speech theory]. Moscow: Akademiya.
- Malanyuk, Yevhen. 1987. *Shevchenko y Rossiya* (do problemy perekladu) [Shevchenko and Russia (to the problem of translation)]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Mirzabayeva, Aygul. 2015. *Perevody proizvedeniy Chekhova na inostrannyye yazyki* [Translations of works by Chekhov into foreign languages]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Morozov, Mikhail. 1956. *Posobiye po perevodu russkoy chudozhestvennoy prozy na angliyskiy yazyk* [Book on translation of Russian artistic prose into English]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Novikov, Aleksey. 2004. *O kontekstualnom smysle slova* [About contextual sense of a word]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Papernyi, Zinovi, and Emma Polotskaya. 1997. *Chekhov i mirovaya literatura* [Chekhov and world literature]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Popovič, Anton. 1988. *Problemy chudozhestvennogo perevoda* [Problems of artistic translation]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Ryapolova, Viktoriya. 2012. *Angliyskiye perevody pyes A. P. Chekhova* [English translations of plays by Anton Chekhov]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Ryl'skiy, Maksym. 1987. *Zbirnyk tvoriv* [Collection of works]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Tolstoy, Sergey. 2008. *Osnovy perevoda s angliyskoho yazyka na russkiy* [Basics of translation from English into Russian]. Moscow: IMO.
- Vannikov, Yuriy. 1970. *O yedinom komplekse perevodcheskikh disciplin. Voprosy teorii i tehniki perevoda* [About the unified complex of translation disciplines. Questions of translation theory and practice]. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Vinogradov, Viktor. 1978. *Leksicheskiye voprosy perevoda chudozhestvennoy prozy* [Lexical problems of translation of artistic prose]. Moscow: Moscow University Publishing House.

Zaytsev, Pavlo. 1986. *Pro polski pereklady z Shevchenka* [About Polish translations of Shevchenko]. Lviv: Vezha.

Zerov, Mykola. 1990. *Do storichcha vid dnya narodzhennya* [To the 100th anniversary from the birth]. Kyiv: Znannya.

Zorivchak, Roksolana. 2012. *Osoblyvosti kontekstu dramy v procesi perekladu* [Specificities of drama context in translation process]. Lviv: Vezha.

Name and surname	András Zubaskov
University and faculty	Palacký University Olomouc, Faculty of Arts
Title of the diploma thesis	Context and Translation: Two English Translations of the Play "The Cherry Orchard" by Anton Chekhov

Title of the diploma thesis in Czech	Kontext a překlad: dva anglické překlady divadelní hry "Višňový sad" Antona Čechova
Thesis supervisor	Mgr. Josefina Zubáková, Ph.D.
Number of pages	59
Number of signs	116 088
Number of primary sources used	3
Number of secondary sources used	33