адресата, вуалирует дидактичность и морализацию со стороны сказителя, который пытается быть неназойливым оптимистом и большим другом читателя.

Антропоцентричность сказки детерминирована гуманистическим патернализмом, который проявляется в прагматических интенцияхарратора, реализуемых как имплицитным, так и эксплицитным способами. На материале сказки автор развлекает адресата, сопереживает с ним, дарит ему радость, релаксацию и минуты отдыха, подсказывает читателю пути решения житейских проблем, указывает на средства достижения целей, создает модель «образцового» человека, рассуждает о нравственных ценностях, выступает доброжелательным наставником отдаленного временем и местом коммуниканта.

Антропоцентричность сказки отличается дихотомическим принципом, который действует во всех композиционных блоках текста. Исследование глубинной структуры категории антропоцентричности в условиях сказки показывает, что автор относится к читателю с глубоким уважением, на правах наставника, советчика и воспитателя. Рамочная структура текста сказки отмечена дуализмом автора и читателя, посредником которых повсеместно выступают герои сказки.

SUMMARY

The article in question deals with anthropocentrism as the concept of human attitude towards the world. The author focuses on realization of anthropocentric principle in folklore discourse. Fairy-tales of distant nations are compared; universal trends and national peculiarities of their anthropocentric model are analyzed.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Грінченко Б. Д. Словник української мови. – К.: Видавництво Академії наук Української РСР, 1959. - Т. IV.– 563 с.
2. Грінченко Б. Д. Словник української мови. – К.: Видавництво Академії наук Української РСР, 1959. - Т. III.– 506 с.
3. Елеонский С. Ф. Литература и народное творчество. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1956. – 239 с.
4. Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. – М.: Наука,1981. – 138 с.
5. Пропп В. Я. Русская сказка. – Л.: Изд-во Ленинград, ун-та, 1984. – 335 с.
6. Simpson J. Scandinavian Folktales. – London: Penguin Books, 1988. – 243р.
7. Народные русские сказки А.Н.Афанасьева в 3-х томах. - Наука, 1984.
8. Folk-Tales of the British Isles.-Moskow: Raduga Publishers, 1987.-368 p.
9. Thompson S. The Folktale. – New York, 1951. – P.455-456.
10. Кухаренко В. А. Интерпретация текста. – М.: Просвещение, 1988. – 192 с.

NONSENSE AND WORDPLAY IN L. CARROL'S LITERARY WORKS

O. Medvid',
M. Bondarenko

The article touches upon the problems concerning with some stylistic difficulties (nonsense and wordplay) in translation of L.Carroll's works:mostly they are of extralinguistic character.Translator shoud be aware of not only language peculiarities of L.Carroll's fairy tales but of some national,ethimological and socio-psychological factors that influence greatly on the comprehention and translation of the texts.

Text comprehension is an inseparable part of speech activity. It reflects not only the language competence of a person but also the psychological peculiarities alongside with the individual specifics of the intellectual activity. Comprehension is associated with the reconstruction of the author's conception and building of the individual model of the text contents [2,21]. Such an approach is referred, first of all, to the text comprehension and interpretation**.** The level of the adequate or inadequate comprehension may be diagnosed

with the help of various methods. One of them is to reveal the lacunas caused by the differences in the cultural background of the readers and by the background at which the author's intention was directed.

Comprehension requires a much higher level of the intellectual activity and presupposes the estimate of the information percepted [3,34]. So, perception is predetermined by the individual peculiarities and personal experience. Perceptiveness is not an absolute feature but a matter of interpretation in the given conceptual system reflecting an individual cognitive experience and covering a piece of specific information [1,13]. Every message has a presumption of perceptiveness. Nonsense and absurd texts are not an ordinary case. However, nonsense is different form absurd.

Nonsense consists in the operations with the language: modeling different from the standard language quasi-language units, words, first of all, where the relations between the units as in the standard language are preserved (laws of their building and combinability), i.e. *twas brillig, and the slithy toves did gyre and gimble in the wabe* [10,51].

Absurd consists in the operations with the reference of the language units: modeling reference situations different from those possible in the standard language. Nonsense distorts the language operating with the language picture of the world. Absurd turns over the reality stereotypes (on the level of the common sense), operating with the naïve picture of the world. In nonsense the number of the lexical meanings is reduced to minimum, in absurd – the number of the common sense clichés.

Most of the nonsense texts are devoid of the lexical meanings, though the grammatical meanings are present in them and sound symbolism is of great importance. The structure of the text is preserved, too. Grammatical constructions reflect the structure of the situation described in the nonsense text: a character, means, locative, etc [8,11]:

> *"Twas brillig, and the slithy toves*
> *Did gyre and gimble in the wabe;*
> *All mimsy were the borogoves,*
> *And the mome raths outgrabe."*

In the passage from Jabberwocky given above it is clearly seen that the subject is *toves*. They *did gyre and gimble*. Where? *In the wabe,* etc. Although, the meanings of the "notional words" used in the passage are unknown for us and they are not registered in dictionaries, we can freely reproduce the structure of the situation but not what it consists in. This is a task for the reader but the translator's is much more difficult, it's a real challenge, whereas he should somehow reflect not only the structure of a certain situation but first of all create something of this kind with the help of the target language means.

For the standard interpretation of nonsense such features are typical: a rather high level of the abstract lexica, a wide variety of lexical units, a great number of the pronouns. It means that a standard picture of the sense of nonsense is rather vague and abstract. The ideas about the sense of nonsense are, first of all, predetermined by the grammatical relations between the text units. The phonetic resemblance of the nonsense quasi-words with the standard language lexical units plays an important role in the interpretation of the quasi-lexical meanings of the nonsense elements [7,19].

Interpreting nonsense the translator looks for the nominations among the units of a certain grammatical class basing themselves upon the resemblance in the sound structure between the quasi-word and the standard language word. In the process of nonsense interpretation the inner lexicon of the native speaker works the same way as in the process of the normal text comprehension and interpretation.

L.Carroll's dramatic composition largely rests on the play of words. In his books one can hardly find the cases of humour in situation itself: the play of words is based on the humour of words and the notions connected with humour. For Lewis Carroll the play of words was very important because in his books and in the fairy tales, particularly, it defines the characters' behavior, their actions and the development of the plot. This is the main distinction of his books from the works of other writers using the same principles. The most insightful dimension of the book as a whole consists in that language only means something

in relation to the language "game" of which it is a part, and it is important to know what "language or logic game" one is playing [11,40]. The play of words is another challenge for the translator. The humor of the characters, of the situations is comparatively not very difficult to translate but the play of words practically can't be translated adequately. In most cases it is up to the translator to choose between what is being said and how it is being said. It means that the translator has to choose between the contents and the humorous effect.

In the garden of talking flowers we have our first introduction to the punning, wordplay and general concern with language (and identity), which runs throughout the novel:

In Chapter 2 of *"Trough the Looking-Glass"* Alice asks the Rose whether it is afraid to be alone in the garden:

"Aren't you sometimes frightened at being planted out here, with nobody to take care of you?"

"There's the tree in the middle," said the Rose: "what else is it good for?"

"But what could it do, if any danger came?" Alice asked.

*"It says "**Bough-wough**"!" cried a Daisy: "that's why its branches are called boughs!"* [9,132]

The play of words here is based on the homonymy of the word *"bough"* denoting the part of the tree and of the sound-imitation *"bough-wough"*. According to the context, the tree, which has boughs, can bark and that's why it can serve as the defender of the flowers.

The Russian equivalent of the word *"bough"* is *"ветка"*, and *"bough-wough"* stands for the Russian *"гав-гав"*. The word *"ветка"* and the sound-imitation *"гав-гав"* have nothing to do with each other as to their meanings. N.M.Demurova refused word for word translation but decided to work with the breeds of the trees while in the original simply the word *"tree"* is used. She fixed her choice upon the oak, which stands for the Russian word *"дуб"*:

«- А вам никогда не бывает страшно? Вы здесь совсем одни и никто вас не охраняет…

*- Как это «одни»? – сказала Роза. – А **дуб** на что?*

- Но разве он может что-нибудь сделать? - удивилась Алиса.

*- Он хоть кого может **отдубасить**, - сказала Роза. – Что-что, а **дубасить** он умеет!*

*- Поэтому-то он и называется **дуб**, вскричала Маргаритка»* [5,133].

As we can see from the example above the translator managed to preserve the play of words. Moreover, all the components are present in the translation so, the meaning of the conversation between Alice and the Rose in the Russian variant is practically the same: from the translation it follows that the oak is a defender of the flowers as well as in the original. But in the Russian translation the tree is given somewhat different descriptions: it doesn't bark but it can belabour anybody.

In some cases the translator has to extent the structural components of the pun in order to preserve the play of words in the translation. In Chapter3 in *"Alice's Adventures in Wonderland"* Alice asks the Mouse to tell her the story of its life:

*"Mine is a long and a sad **tale**!»said the Mouse, turning to Alice, and sighing".*

*"It IS a long **tail**, certainly," said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse's **tail**; "but why do you call it sad?" And she kept on puzzling about it while the Mouse was speaking, so that her idea of the **tale** was something like this…"* [9,27].

This abstract is followed by the famous verse reminding the mouse tale. Here, as it is typical for L.Carroll, the form and the contents are skillfully combined together to produce the play of words based on the homonymy of the words *tale* and *tail*.

In the translation by P.S.Solovyova this abstract is rendered like follows:

*«- Моя история – печальная история, - произнесла Мышь вздыхая, - но она полна самых интересных приключений, в которых я проявила много чувства и большое самопожертвование. Узнав её, вы не назовёте меня **хвастуньей**, - прибавила она, обращаясь к Алисе.*

*- Я уверена, что ваша история очень интересна, - сказала Алиса, невольно глядя на **хвост** Мыши, - но название **Хвостуньи** всё-таки очень к вам подходит, и я не понимаю, почему вы не хотите, чтобы я вас так называла.*

*Она продолжала смотреть на **хвост** Мыши в то время, как та начала говорить, так что рассказ ей представился в следующем виде...»* [4,31].

P.S.Solovyova worked into the text a remark about courage and selflessness of the Mouse so that it enabled the translator to make a "funny" verbal range in the Russian language: *хвастунья – хвостунья – хвост*.

N.M.Demurova went another way also using the derivative of the word *хвост*:

«- Это очень длинная и грустная история, - начала мышь со вздохом.

Помолчав, она вдруг взвизгнула:

*- **Прохвост**!*

*- **Про хвост**? – повторила Алиса с недоумением и взглянула на её хвост. – Грустная история **про хвост**?*

*И, пока Мышь говорила, Алиса всё никак не могла понять, какое это имеет отношение к мышиному **хвосту**»* [5,29].

From the abstract above it is clearly seen that N.M.Demurova played on the common component *хвост* having used it in the word "*прохвост*" which is to some degree negatively charged and having used it as the notional word itself but in different cases.

Boris Zakhoder went another way. All his wordplays are directed at the child's comprehension and perception. First of all attraction of a young reader is drawn by the diminutiveness of the whole phrase.

*«Внемли, о дитя! Этой трагической саге, этой страшной **истории с хвостиком** тысяча лет! - сказала она. **Истории с хвостиком?** - удивленно переспросила Алиса, с интересом доглядев на мышкин **хвостик**. - А что с ним случилось страшного? По-моему, он совершенно цел - вон он какой длинный!»* [6,30].

Still Lewis Carroll's works have many points to be discussed and explained, many riddles to be answered to. The task of the translator in this case is not only to translate Lewis Carroll's wordplay adequately but also to bring the understanding of what this extraordinary writer wanted to say by this or that word. The translator has to choose between the context of the utterance and the humorous device. When the context was only the reason for the wordplay, the translators applied the humorous device.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Дана стаття звертає увагу на деякі труднощі перекладу казок Л. Керролла, зокрема випадків абсурду та каламбуру, що потребують здебільшого знань екстралінгвістичного характеру – національно-етимологічних та соціо-психологічних нюансів, що впливають на особливості перекладу текстів.

СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Брудный А.А. Подтекст и элементы внетекстовых знаковых структур. – Москва, 1976. – 250с.
2. Дейк ван Т.А. Язык, познание, коммуникация. – Москва, 1989. – 224с.
3. Демурова Н. М. Льюис Кэрролл: Очерк жизни и творчества. – М., 1979. –192с.
4. Кэрролл Л. Приключения Алисы в стране чудес / Перевод Allegro (П.С. Соловьёвой); Репринт. Воспроизведение. – С.-Пб., 1991. – 166с.
5. Кэрролл Л. Алиса в Стране чудес. Алиса в Зазеркалье. / Перевод Н.М.Демуровой; Иллюстрации Дж.Тенниела. – М.: Наука, 1991. – 360с.
6. Кэрролл Л. Алиса в стране чудес / Перевод Б.В.Заходера; Иллюстрации С.Чижикова // Журнал «Пионер», 1972. - №№2, 3.
7. Милова Т. Другие берега Страны Чудес // «Русская мысль», 1993. – С. 13.
8. Пропп В.Я. Трансформация волшебных сказок. – Сб. «Фольклор и действительность». – М., 1976. – С.120
9. L.Carroll. Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass // Ed. by R.L.Green. – L., 1976. – 256p.
10. Holmes Roger W. The Philosopher's Alice in Wonderland. – N.Y., 1990. – 200p.
11. Shane Leslie. Lewis Carroll and the Oxford Movement. – "The London Mercury", 1973. – 240p.