

Lexical and Semantic Field of Forms of Address and Greetings in 17TH-19TH c. French Fiction and the Ways of its Rendering into Ukrainian

LYUDMILA DIACHUK, *Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics*
brousls@ukr.net

Received: June 24, 2018.

Accepted: December 10, 2018.

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the discussion of lexical and semantic field of greeting and forms of address in French based on the literary works examples of the 17th – 19th c. and ways of their rendering into Ukrainian. This article provides a comparative analysis of lexical and semantic characteristics of French linguistic clichés used in greetings in the 17th – 19th c. and highlights lexical and grammatical specificities of their translation into Ukrainian. The study is based on the following methods: translation analysis, comparative linguistic analysis, descriptive and comparative method, continuous sampling, and generalization. The article singles out the translation techniques used by the translator in order to achieve adequate reproduction of the lexical and semantic field of forms greetings and address in the translated works of French writers. According to the study results, the most common methods of rendering lexical units of the field of forms of address and greetings are direct correspondences, descriptive translation, and the use of various translation transformations, caused by differences in linguistic clichés, in order to achieve translation adequacy.

Keywords: lexical and semantic field of greetings, forms of address, linguistic clichés, source text, target text, literary translation.

Introduction

The modern world could not be imagined without communication. This communication reveals both individual personality traits, and common, collective features that are manifested in the use of stereotyped formulas of language etiquette. For any nation, language etiquette acts as an integral part of its culture, as it carries the imprint of national cultural and historical traditions. Language etiquette serves as a linguistic tool of various kinds of relationships that prevail in society (Чередниченко, 1996: 3).

In spite of some general features of any language etiquette that reflect the categories of politeness, respect to an interlocutor, openness to communication, it is always marked by the specificity of the national character, which causes disparities between etiquette formulas in different languages. This could be illustrated by the example of sneezing: both in Ukrainian and in French, there is a polite form of reaction to this phenomenon. In Ukrainian mentality, this form of politeness is manifested in wishing a person to be healthy. The interlocutor says, “**Будьте зорові, На здоров’я**” (“**Be strong, healthy**”) or “**На правду**” (“**True**” as a confirmation). However, the French etiquette concerning this phenomenon presupposes wishing love “**À vos amours! À vos souhaits!**”. The adequacy of translation is achieved through the use of translation transformations caused by the difference in speech clichés.

Most translators and linguists recognize that language is not only a way of communication, but also a significant element of international relations at the level of culture and mentality (Чередниченко, 2001). The task of the translator is to overcome both linguistic and cultural barriers, the latter also being able to interrupt the effective exchange

of information. Translator's professional competence influences on successful relations between communicators (Муратов, 2004).

Literature review

Theoretical explanations to principles of organization of lexemes into lexical and semantic fields were provided by such well-known linguists as J. Trier (1931), G. Stern (1964), G. Matoré (1951), J. Lyons (1977), S. Ullmann (1972), E. Traugott and R. Dasher (2002), O. Potebnya (Потебня, 1993), F. Nikitina (Нікітіна, 1981), Yu. Karaulov (Караулов, 1972), V. Gak (Гак, 1977), G. Schur (Шур, 1974), A. Ufimtseva (Уфимцева, 1986), Yu. Sorokin (Сорокин, 1978). The development of transformational grammar, general and contrastive linguistics, semantics, communication theory, anthropology, semiotics, psychology and discourse analysis has influenced on translation theory. It expanded the research methods and gave new insights into the transition between linguistic and cultural systems for the theory and practice of translation. Thus, in our opinion, semantics plays a very important role in translation, since it develops approaches and methods for understanding the meaning and helps to solve the problem of translatability in fiction.

Thus, it is quite obvious that in translation of fiction, one must adhere to the requirements of the equivalence between the source and target texts. The American translator and translation theorist E. Nida identified two types of translation equivalence: formal and dynamic. According to his definition, formal equivalence is oriented to the original and aims to provide an opportunity for direct comparison of multilingual texts. Dynamic equivalence is the adaptation of vocabulary and grammar so that the translation sounds, as if the author wrote it in the target language (Найда, 1978). It is believed that in the hierarchy of translation quality parameters, dynamic equivalence should be placed at a higher level than the formal one. The founder of the semantic translation model J. C. Catford in his book "A Linguistic Theory of Translation" proposed a component analysis of the meanings of words and grammatical units. The scholar proved that the basis of such substitution is only a partial coincidence of the same composition of correlated phrases in the original and its translation (Кэтфорд, 1978: 91-114). P. Newmark distinguished and systematized two basic methods of translation: communicative and semantic. In his paper "Approaches to translation" P. Newmark noted that translation is primarily the transfer of the content of the text via the target language in accordance with the author's intentions (Newmark, 1981). Therefore, the criteria arising from the semiotic approach to translation are the correspondence of the source texts and the translation in their content and the similarity of their style and form.

Research methods

The purpose of the article is to outline the lexical and semantic characteristics of the meaning of speech clichés of greeting in 17th-19th c. French literature and their lexical and grammatical features of translation into Ukrainian.

In order to achieve the goal, the following *tasks* were set: to analyze lexical and semantic units of the field of greetings in French fiction; to outline lexical and grammatical features of their translation into Ukrainian; to illustrate, by examples, the general trends in reproduction

of the lexical and semantic field of forms of greetings and address of French originals into Ukrainian; to establish formal equivalence and functional adequacy between lexical and semantic units of the field of forms of greetings and of address in source and target texts.

This research also uses general scientific methods such as: translational and comparative linguistic analysis of source and target texts; comparative and descriptive analysis of speech clichés in the original and translated texts. The method of continuous sampling was used in selection of the factual material and while studying scientific works on the topic of our research. These methods allow us to obtain reliable data.

Scientific novelty, relevance, and research materials

The relevance of this paper lies, firstly, in the extension and deepening of attention of the modern translation studies toward its traditional object, first of all, the inclusion of various aspects of human communicative behavior into the communication process; secondly, the importance of the social function executed by language stereotypes in society; and thirdly, the need for a comprehensive analysis of the issues and features of reproduction of various speech clichés, in general, and forms of address and greetings, in particular, in the Ukrainian translation studies.

The object of the study is lexical units of greetings and forms of address, selected by the sampling method from French novels and corresponding Ukrainian translations.

The material for our study is the works of 17th-19th c. French literature and their Ukrainian translations: Molière's "Tartuffe" translated by V. Samiilenko (1981), Pierre-Augustin Caron Beaumarchais' "Le Mariage de Figaro ou La Folle Journée" translated by S. Tobilevich (1951); Diderot's "La Religieuse" translated by I. Kovtunov (1963), Voltaire's "Candide ou l'Optimisme" translated by V. Pidmohylnyi (1955), Guy de Maupassant's "Bel Ami" translated by V. Pidmohylnyi (1990); Anatole France's "Monsieur Pigeonneau" translated by M. Venhrenivska (1977) and V. Pidmohylnyi (1932); Prosper Mérimée's "Carmen" translated by M. Rudnytskyi (1926) and B. Tkachenko (1930).

The novelty of the article is represented by the first attempt at investigating into the reproduction of lexical and semantic field of forms of address and greetings used in the abovementioned French originals in translation into Ukrainian. It testifies to the fact that the reproduction of the lexical units of the original text is related to the establishment of formal equivalence and functional adequacy in translation.

Research process and discussion of results

In our opinion, greetings (just as forms of address) should be analyzed from **verbal** (lexical and semantic) and **non-verbal** (paralinguistic) points of view.

From **lexical and semantic** point of view, greetings, as a rule, belong to a group of lexical indicators of the beginning of dialogic speech. It is in this type of speech that greetings play the main role as expressions that indicate the recipient of communication.

In comparison the original of the comedy "Tartuffe" by Molière and its translation by V. Samiilenko, the discrepancy between the translated and original forms of pronouns used in greetings becomes particularly evident:

Madame Pernelle: Vous êtes, mamie, une fille suivante. Un peu trop forte en gueule, et fort impertinente: Vous vous mêlez sur tout de dire votre avis (Molière, 1992: 25).

Голубочко! Ти дуже язиката. Свалолі й смілости в тобі якраз до ката. Ти думаєси, що всім язык потрібен твій (Мольєр, 1981: 51).

In contrast to the English translators who often complain about the absence of clear, unequivocal distinction in English between polite and unceremonious forms of pronouns used in greetings, French translators are more fortunate, since a clear distinction exists both in French and in Ukrainian. But the pragmatic substitution by V. Samiilenko of the original second-person plural form of address with the second-person singular form in translation can be explained, in our opinion, only by the translator's desire to bring the French comedy closer to Ukrainian reality. It is extremely unusual for a mother-in-law to address her daughter-in-law using the second-person plural form of address in Ukrainian fiction.

By contrast with French, Ukrainian has also a vocative case that sounds natural in emotional expressions, where the form of address is emphasized and highlighted, especially in discussions of a difficult relationship between a mother-in-law and a daughter-in-law. Therefore, a vocative case with a transliterated realia sounds natural in Ukrainian equivalents of French forms of address, as in the examples given below:

Allons, Flipote, allons, que d'eux je me délivre (Molière, 1992: 25).

Ходім, Фліпото; йди ж! Не хочу тут баритись (Мольєр, 1981: 51).

In the Ukrainian translation a spoken form of address in the vocative case is perceived as completely natural:

Voilà les contes bleus qu'il vous faut pour vous plaire. Ma bru, l'on est chez vous contrainte de se tair (Molière, 1992: 30).

Тобі, невісточко, така балаканина. Видимо до смаку, а я мовчать повинна ... (Мольєр, 1981: 56).

The text below demonstrates that in the original in his comedy "Tartuffe", Molière almost completely lowered the speech register by resorting to the use of colloquial vocabulary, so it provides the necessary conditions for the actualization of an adequate pragmatic effect:

(Donnant un soufflet à Flipote). Allons, vous! Vous rêvez, et bayez aux corneilles. Jour de Dieu! je saurai vous froter les oreilles. Marchons, gaupe, marchons" (Molière, 1992: 31).

(Ударивши по щоці Фліпоту). А ти загавилась і спиши уже, псяюхо! А, трясця!.. Як візьму оце тебе за вухо! Іди за мною! Ну!.. (Мольєр, 1981: 57).

It can be noted that Mme Pernel's form of address to her daughter-in-law Flipote becomes a culmination, it can be seen not only in the words that show her attitude to her daughter-in-law as a *gaupe* ("a woman of easy virtue"), but also in such non-verbal means as **donner un soufflet** ("a slap on the cheek"). In our opinion, V. Samiilenko succeed in conveying Mme. Pernel's negative attitude to Flipote, although in order to preserve the rhyme he had to use a domesticated abusive equivalent of the "псяюха" (brute) (Словник української мови, 1977: 378). Moreover, in order to increase tension, in our opinion, the translator used the

interjection *Hy!* (“Well!”).

“Le Mariage de Figaro ou La Folle Journée” by P. Beaumarchais would be the best introduction to an analysis of the 18th c. forms of address and greetings. In our opinion, it is no coincidence that linguists divide forms of address into different categories, among which, perhaps, the first place could be given to the differentiation of forms of address according to social and family characteristics. An excellent example of the abovementioned characteristics of forms of address is the relationship between Mme. Pernel and her daughter-in-law Flipote in “Tartuffe”. Those relations were very colorful in the dialogues between the characters in general, and in their forms of address for each other, in particular. The results of the analysis of “Le Mariage de Figaro ou La Folle Journée” serve a further confirmation and development of the abovementioned arguments. Beaumarchais provides his characters with quite different forms of address, in contrast to Mme. Pernel, and a reader of “Le Mariage de Figaro” instantly feels a different, positive atmosphere. The colloquial style is emphasized by both verbal and non-verbal means.

Therefore, concerning the first category, that is the verbal aspect of forms of address and greetings, than, the analysis of the example of forms of address and, accordingly, the relationship inside the pair Susanne – Figaro, immediately shows that they are more than friends. This is evidenced by their forms of address to each other:

Suzanne: Adieu, mon petit Fi, Fi, Figaro, rêve à notre affaire (Beaumarchais, 1984: 12).

Сюзанна. [...] До побачення, мій маленький Фі... Фі... Фігаро; думай про нашу справу (Бомарше, 1951: 12).

In this example, S. Tobilevich rendered *Fi, Fi, Figaro* by transliterating the proper name, but a form “Фігарочко” (“Little Figaro”) with a diminutive suffix can be used as an option.

Notably, Beaumarchais successfully used not only words, but also various gestures of his heroes for a more convincing expression of their mood, energy, passion, irony, etc. Beside verbal forms of address such as “*mon petit Chérubin, mon petit Fi, mon cher ami, ma petite Suzanne, Monseigneur*”, the characters also communicated and greeted each other by non-verbal means: curtsies, kisses, hugs, handshakes, etc.:

Suzanne, une révérence: Votre servante, Madame il y a toujours quelque chose d'amer dans vos propos. Marceline, une révérence: Bien la vôtre, Madame; où donc est l'amertume? (Beaumarchais, 1984: 20).

Сюзанна (робить реверанс). Прошу вибачення. Але пані мені завжди прикрі речі говорить! Марселіна (робить реверанс). Слуга покірна! Де ж тут прикрість (Бомарше, 1951: 19).

As it can be seen, the translator did not try to convey the French word “*une révérence*” (*a curtsy*) by a proper Ukrainian lexeme but transliterated the French one – “*реверанс*”, thus foreignizing the text of translation, although the word “присідає” (proper Ukrainian for “curtsy”) could be used in this case. For instance:

Marceline, les bras ouverts: Embrasse ta mère, ma jolie Suzannette. Le méchant qui te tourmente est mon fils (Beaumarchais, 1984: 113).

Марселіна (простягає руки). Обійми мене, моя люба Сюзанночко! Цей недобрій

хлопець, що тебе мучить, – це мій син! (Бомарше, 1951: 107).

In this case, in our opinion, the translator did not provide an adequate translation, because the French “*les bras ouverts*” would better correspond to the Ukrainian expression “відкриває обійми” (“opens her arms”). At the same time, S. Tobilevich successfully conveyed the diminutive value of addressing to Suzanne “*ma jolie Suzannette*”, suggesting a phrase “*моя люба Сюзанночко*” (“*my dear Suzannette*”).

As it can be seen, these examples provide evidence of the richness of the verbal flow in the forms of address between people, when they want to express their sincere feelings.

The lines spoken by the characters in translation deserve a separate mention, since the comparison of the original and S. Tobilevich’s translation shows that there are some discrepancies in the translation of forms of address and greetings. This is evident in the following examples:

Figaro s’interrompt: ... Héééé, voilà le gros docteur, la fête sera complète. Hé, bonjour, cher docteur de mon coeur. Est-ce ma noce avec Suzon qui vous attire au château. Bartholo, avec dédain: Ah! mon cher Monsieur, point du tout (Beaumarchais, 1984: 15).

Фігаро (перебиває себе)... А-а! Ось і славетний доктор. Свято буде чудове! Доброго здоров’ячка, мій любий докторе! Скажіть, будь ласка, чи це моє весілля з Сюзанною приваблює вас до замку? Бартоло (презирливо). О мій ласкавий; зовсім ні! (Бомарше, 1951: 14).

They prove that the author of the original tries, by lexical means, to convey the attitude of one interlocutor to the other.

Figaro: Pourquoi cela, Monseigneur? Mon cher ami! Papa! Petit papa! (Beaumarchais, 1984: 98).

Фігаро. Навіщо це, ясновельможний пане. Мій коханий друже! Таточку! (Бомарше, 1951: 102).

In this episode, the translator used decompression in rendering the word *Monseigneur* (Mister) not merely as a *пан* (“sir”), but as “*ясновельможний пане*” (“Your grace”), which is an adequate translation decision, because this form of address was used towards the royalty and higher church ranks at that time.

In our opinion, certain differences in this translation do not affect the consistency in the transfer of the atmosphere, feelings, and experiences that prevail in the original “Le Mariage de Figaro” for the target readers of S. Tobilevich’s translation.

Moreover, in our opinion, Beaumarchais in “Le Mariage de Figaro” and S. Tobilevich in her translation, successfully reproduced richness of verbal and non-verbal means of greetings and forms of address, used in society at that time. The accuracy of translation is proved by the use of non-verbal means of communication – curtsies, as mentioned by Diderot in “La Religieuse”:

Quelques jours se passèrent, sans que j’entendisse parler de rien ; mais un matin, sur les neuf heures, ma porte s’ouvrit brusquement ; c’était M. Simonin. Je me levai, je lui fis la révérence (Diderot, 1980: 64).

Минуло кілька днів, нічого не чути було; аж ось уранці, години о дев’ятій, двері мої

раптом розчинилися — ввійшов пан Сімонен. Я підвелася, зробила йому реверанс (Дідро, 1963: 58-59).

I. Kovtunov used a borrowed phrase “*зробити реверанс*” (to curtsy). Moreover, if we analyze the grammatical constructions used in the original and in the translation of this expression, then the absolute adequacy of the constructions is clearly seen.

S'il survient un étranger mes bras vont se croiser sur ma poitrine, et au lieu de faire la révérence, je m'incline (Diderot, 1980: 280).

Зайде хтось чужий — я руки складаю на грудях і, замість привітатись, укланяюся (Дідро, 1963: 211).

Therefore, in his translation of the word “*la révérence*”, I. Kovtunov completely reproduces the whole French expression “*faire la révérence*” (to curtsy) with the Ukrainian “*привітатись*” (to greet), resorting to compression in translation and thus reducing the number of linguistic signs in translation.

Curtsies, bows, and kissing of hands and lips, together with verbal greetings and forms of address are also present in Diderot’s work: *Sœur Sainte-Suzanne – Сестро Сюзанно* (Sister Susanne); *Et vous, chère mère? – панімамка, панімамонько* (My dear mother); *Mon enfant – дитино моя, дитинко моя* (my child, my little one).

In our opinion, the picture presented in the analysis of greetings and forms of address in the chronological order would be incomplete without the famous writer of that time, Voltaire and his work “*Candide ou l’Optimisme*”. It is Voltaire’s “*Candide*” that confirms of the existence of court etiquette in the 18th c., which, at the time, was going through a period of extensive development. Naturally, Voltaire would not avoid writing about the events of that time. Moreover, he himself would tell about etiquette: how to behave, how to address which gestures to use. The Ukrainian translation of this work by V. Podmogylny in 1927, edited by M. Tereshchenko, was published by a Kyiv publishing house in 1955.

Cacambo demanda à un grand officier comment il fallait s’y prendre pour saluer Sa Majesté; si on se jetait à genoux ou ventre à terre; si on mettait les mains sur la tête ou sur le derrière; si on léchait la poussière de la salle; en un mot, quelle était la cérémonie. L’usage, dit le grand officier, est d’embrasser le roi et de le baiser des deux côtés. Candide et Cacambo sautèrent au cou de Sa Majesté, qui les reçut avec toute la grâce imaginable et qui les pria poliment à souper (Voltaire, 1932: 66).

Какамбо спитав у старшин, як треба вітати його величність: падати навколішки чи на живіт? класти руки на голову чи на спину? і чи треба лизати пил на підлозі? — одно слово, яка церемонія? — У нас звичай, — сказав старшина, — обіймати короля і цілувати його в обидві щокки. Кандід і Какамбо кинулись королю на шию, а той привітав їх так ласкаво, як тільки можна уявити, і ввічливо запросив їх повечеряти (Вольтер, 1955: 44).

From a chronological point of view, this is the first instance of a greeting in the form of kisses on both cheeks, which nowadays is becoming more widespread in our country too. However, this episode shows that old-time etiquette had its own clear rules of attitude towards persons of high social status.

The analysis of the 19th c. should begin with the observation that the greeting formulas,

found in the works by 17th-18th c. French authors, also can be found in 19th c. French literature. There were a lot of non-verbal means of greetings, too, in works by French writers: “Bel ami” by Guy de Maupassant is a striking example of this trend.

It is worth mentioning that, in French literature, both of 19th c. and of the previous centuries, the strict selection of linguistic etiquette formulas in each link of verbal contact (its start, observance, and end) creates a certain tone of communication, that is, such social quality of communication that could be defined as a measure of adherence to ethical norms of communicative interactions, and also as an indicator of a cultural level and intelligence of interlocutors. The novel “Bel ami” shows that the forms of address of the main characters perfectly characterize their relationship, social status and behavior, characteristic of the representatives of a certain social class of that time.

Therefore, in the case of a meeting of familiar people, the author used appropriate formulas that point to their long-standing and obviously friendly relations:

Qu'est-ce que vous me voulez, monsieur? Duroy se mit à rire: “Tu ne me reconnais pas? – Non. – Georges Duroy du 6-e hussards”. Forestier tendit les deux mains: “Ah! mon vieux! comment vas-tu? – Très bien et toi?” (Maupassant, 1983: 20).

Чого вам треба, пане? Дюруа засміявся: — Не впізнаєш мене? — Ні. — Жорж Дюруа з 6-го гусарського. Форестєр простяг обидві руки: — А, друже! Як ведеться? — Чудово! А як ти? (Мопассан, 1990: 213).

The first phrase indicates that, by addressing another person as “**You/Sir**”, Charles Forestier demonstrates that he is not familiar with that man. However, after both hussars recognized each other, their way of speaking changed immediately to the informal second-person singular form “you”: “Ah! **mon vieux! comment vas-tu?**” and a more familiar form of address “**mon vieux!**” (old friend). V. Podmoglyny’s translation is oriented towards the original in the reproduction of politeness formulas.

Other examples of forms of address between these two people also point to their friendly relationship, but not to a close friendship, which could testify to a certain inequality, either social or financial, at the time of the meeting of former fellow soldiers. In their dialogues, both hussars use a whole range of forms of address. Thus, in addition to the already mentioned ones, new forms such as *cher maître*, *mon cher* appear:

Forestier lui dit: “Adieu, cher maître”. L’autre lui serra la main: “Au revoir, mon cher”, et il descendit l’escalier en sifflotant, la canne sous le bras (Maupassant, 1983: 23).

Форестєр сказав йому: Прощавайте, любий метре! Той потиснув йому руку: — До побачення, любий мій, — і пішов сходами вниз, посвистуючи, з паличкою під пахвою” (Мопассан, 1990: 216).

In this episode, in our opinion, the form of address *cher maître* (my dear master!) is rather interesting. The analysis of this form of address shows that K. Ganshina’s French-Russian dictionary really gives one of the meanings of the word *maître* as a “**master**” when used towards a lawyer or notary (Ганшина, 1979: 548). But we know that Georges Duroy, whom Charles Forestier addresses, is neither a lawyer nor a notary. He is a son of a rural innkeeper and a former non-commissioned officer of the colonial troops in Algeria. Therefore, it can be concluded that Charles Forestier uses this form of address in a figurative sense with obvious respect to his fellow soldier. Probably, in response to such a respectful

attitude to his interlocutor, Georges Duroy resorted to non-verbal means, “shaking hands” with his fellow soldier.

As it has already been noticed, Guy de Maupassant’s novel “Bel Ami” describes a lot of non-verbal forms of address and greetings, including handshakes, kisses, bows, etc.:

1. *La première personne qu’il rencontra fut Saint-Potin qui, lui serrant la main avec une énergie de complice (Maupassant, 1983: 74) – Першим, кого він зустрів, був Сен-Потен, що міцно, наче спільникові, потиснув йому руку (Мопассан, 1990: 258).*

2. *Elle lui tendit la main, sans bouger, tournant seulement la tête, et elle dit: “Bonjour, Bel-Ami (Maupassant, 1983: 115) – Вона подала йому руку, не ворухнувшись, і, обернувши тільки голову, мовила: “Добрий день, Любий друже (Мопассан, 1990: 294).*

3. *Elle vint à lui: “Bonjour, mon chat. Tu vas bien? Très bien, et toi? – Moi, pas mal (Maupassant, 1983: 75) – Вона підступилася до нього. - Добрий день, котику. Як ся маєш? - Якнайкраще, а ти? - Непогано (Мопассан, 1990: 259).*

This novel contains a large amount of interwoven verbal and paralinguistic forms of address and greetings. The main “object” of these forms of address, of course, is George Duroy. It is no accident that Guy de Maupassant used one of the forms of address towards his main character as the title of his novel, “Bel Ami”, which became his nickname. It should be noted that forms of address and greetings are those elements of linguistic etiquette, which, above all, indicate social relations, established within the communicative act. Therefore, the main factor influencing the choice of a certain form of address is a social status of communicants, their communicative situation.

In terms of the specificities of transferring French forms of address and greetings into Ukrainian, in our opinion, nothing can demonstrate these features better than the comparative analysis of several variants of translation of the same work of fiction.

This purpose required comparison of A. France’s “Monsieur Pigeonneau” and its translations by M. Vengrenivska and V. Pidmohylnyi. There is a noticeable difference between the two translations of its title. The word *Monsieur*, as part of the title, was translated by M. Vengrenivska as “пан” (“Mr.”), and by V. Pidmohylnyi as “добродій” (“kind sir, good man”). Further analysis of these translations demonstrates that this synonymous pair “пан-добродій” is almost constantly present in the forms of address used in translations by M. Vengrenivska and V. Pidmohylnyi respectively:

1. *Je savais bien que vous viendriez, monsieur Pigeonneau. Je balbutiai un compliment (France, 1898: 58-59);*

Я була певна, що ви прийдете, пане Піжано (Франс, 1977: 27);

Я добре знала, що ви прийдете, добродію Піжано. Я пробурмотів комплімент (Франс, 1932: 88).

2. *La lettre de miss Morgan ne m’instruisit pas beaucoup à cet égard. Elle était ainsi conçue: Cher monsieur, Je vous envoie un petit chat que le docteur Daoud a rapporté d’Egypte et que j’aime beaucoup (France, 1898: 64-65);*

З листа міс Морган я теж небагато довідався. Ось той лист: Вельмишановний пане Піжано! Надсилаю вам кошечку: доктор Дауд привіз його з Єгипту, і я його дуже люблю (Франс, 1977: 29-30);

Лист міс Морган багато з’ясував мені з цього приводу. Там було написано: Любий добродію! Посилаю вам кішечку, яку доктор Дауд привіз із Єгипту і яку я дуже люблю (Франс, 1932: 92).

These forms of address need a deeper, culture-specific explanation: in Soviet times, in Ukraine such form of address as “**пан, пані, панове**” (Mr., Mrs., ladies and gentlemen) were considered unacceptable. The Soviet era tried to root out such forms of address by all means, replacing them with “comrades” and “citizens”. At the same time, it is hard to imagine how the translations, or, in general, original Ukrainian works (at least those not related to Soviet times), would sound, if they used “citizen” or “comrade” as forms of address.

Nowadays, semantically neutral “**пан, пані, панове**” (Mr., Mrs., ladies and gentlemen) are a manifestation of polite attitude of a speaker to his/her interlocutor. The Proto-Slavic form of address “**добродій**” (*dobrodiy*, literally “benefactor”, a charitable person) has a concept of benevolence, a benevolent attitude to the interlocutor at its core.

In our opinion, the synonymous pair “**пан-добродій**” presupposes that the forms “пан”, “пані”, as the equivalents for the French forms of address “*monsieur*” and “*madame*”, seem more domesticated and more commonly used in everyday speech. “Добродій” (*dobrodiy*) gives us a reason to believe that this form of address was withdrawn from the use in Soviet times, but nowadays it has returned to Ukrainian etiquette. Consequently, it should be noted that M. Vengrenivska and V. Pidmohylnyi in their respective translations reproduced the specifics of the original “*Monsieur Pigeonneau*” by Anatole France, by means of two different forms of address, both historically and culturally marked in their semantics. It is possible that the time when the translations were carried out played a great role. Moreover, M. Vengrenivska and V. Pidmohylnyi used “пан-добродій” as forms of address in their translations. But there is a certain discrepancy in the frequency of their use.

A similar picture can be seen in translations of Prosper Mérimée’s “*Carmen*” by M. Rudnitsky and B. Tkachenko:

Mon cigare allumé, je choisis le meilleur de ceux qui me restaient, et je lui demandai s'il fumait. "Oui, monsieur", répondit-il (Merimée, 1977: 447);

*Запаливши цигару, я вибрав між рештою одну з найкращих і спитав його, чи він курить. – Так, **пане** – відповів (Меріме, 1930: 3);*

*Запаливши свою цигару, я вибрав ліпшу з тих, що лишилися, і спитався його, чи він часом не курить. – А так, **добродію**, – відказав він (Меріме, 1930: 8-9).*

M. Rudnitskyi and B. Tkachenko rely on rich resources of traditional Ukrainian expressions in linguistic etiquette using both “пан” and “добродій” in translation.

Conclusions

It can be concluded that the analysis of 17th-19th c. fiction indicates certain features in the works of French authors of each century concerning forms of address and greetings. This could be related to both verbal constructions and paralinguistic means of communication, which, as a rule, characterized social relations, level of education of people, or the level of scientific and technological development of society at the time. It is impossible to adequately reproduce a work of fiction without knowing social and historical patterns of linguistic behavior and the extralinguistic environment where communication occurs. It must be emphasized that, when readdressing the work of art to a foreign reader, the translator has to take into account his/her background knowledge and associations, historical, social, cultural,

psychological and other differences in perception of the text by readers in different countries. Forms of address and greetings express not only personal but also social relations, determined by the speaker's place in public life. Authors use this to characterize their characters, their inner spiritual world, feelings and mood.

The results of the study suggest that the possibility of an adequate translation of forms of address and greetings resides in the similarity of their stylistic functions in both languages. A form of address may express kindness, reproach, contempt; create shades of a certain celebration, lyricism, intimacy, and caress. The stylistic range of greetings is much smaller and limited mainly to the shades of officiality, unofficiality, and intimacy. The findings also indicate that there are no universal ways of rendering lexical units that belong to the field of forms of address and greetings. According to our research, this could be a direct equivalent or descriptive translation, if the semantics of a lexeme in the original text does not have a direct equivalent in translation; also, various translation transformations could be used to achieve adequacy in reproducing the semantic and stylistic meaning of lexical units.

REFERENCES

- Beaumarchais, J.-P. de (1984). *La Folle Journée ou Le mariage de Figaro*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Diderot, D. (1980). *La Religieuse. Le Neveu de Rameau*. Moscou: Edition du progrès.
- France, A. (1898). *Balthazar (Monsieur Pigeonneau)*. Paris: Calmann Lévy, 43–70.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Matore, G. (1951). *Le Vocabulaire et la société sous Louis-Philippe*. Geneva: Librairie Droz.
- Maupassant, G. de. (1983). *Bel-Ami*. Paris: Librairie générale française.
- Mérimée, P. de. (1977). *Nouvelles*. Moscou: Edition du progrès.
- Molière, J. B. (1992). *Le Tartuffe ou l'Imposteur*. Paris: Hachette Livre.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Prentice Hall.
- Stern, G. (1964). *Meaning and Change of Meaning, with Special Reference to the English Language*. Bloomington-London: Indiana University Press.
- Traugott, E., Dasher, R. (2002). *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trier, J. (1931). *Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. Die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Ullmann, S. (1972). Semantics. In: T.A. Sebok (Ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics*. Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V., Vol. 9.
- Voltaire. (1932). *Candide ou l'Optimisme*. Paris: Librairie Nilsson.
- Бомарше, П. О. (1951). *Безумний день або весілля Фігаро* [пер. з франц. С. Тобілевич]. Київ: Мистецтво.
- Вольтер. (1955). *Повісті. (Кандід або Оптимізм)* [пер. з франц. В. Підмогильний]. Київ: Державне видавництво Художньої літератури.
- Гак, В. (1977). *Сопоставительная лексикология (на материале французского и русского языков)*. Москва: Междунар. отношения.
- Ганшина, К. (1979). *Французско-русский словарь*. 8-е изд., стереотип. Москва: Русский язык.

- Дідро, Д. (1963). *Вибрані твори (Черниця, Небіж Рамо)* [пер. з франц. І. Ковтунова]. Київ: Державне видавництво Художньої літератури.
- Караулов, Ю. (1972). Структура лексико-семантичного поля В: *Филологические науки*. Москва: Наука, № 1, 57-68.
- Кэтфорд, Дж. (1978). Лингвистическая теория перевода. В: В. Н. Комисаров (ред.) *Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике: сб. статей*. Москва: Междунар. отношения, 91-114.
- Меріме, П. (1926). *Кармен і інші оповідання* [пер. з франц. М. Рудницький]. Стрий: Горихвіт.
- Меріме, П. (1930). *Кармен* [пер. з франц. Б.Ткаченко]. Харків: Державне видавництво України.
- Мольєр, Ж. (1981). *Комедії* [пер. з франц. В. Самійленко]. Київ: Дніпро.
- Мопассан, Гі де. (1990). *Любий друг* [пер. з франц. В. Підмогильний]. Київ: Дніпро, Том 1., 209-492.
- Муратов, Д. (2004). Соціокультурна інформація та її врахування у перекладі і підготовці перекладачів. В: *Вісник КНУ. Іноземна філологія*, 103-105.
- Найда, Ю. (1978). К науке переводить. В: В. Н. Комисаров (ред.) *Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике: сб. статей*. Москва: Междунар. отношения, 114-136.
- Нікітіна, Ф. (1981). Виділення і визначення лексико-семантичних полів. *Мовознавство*, 1, 11-15.
- Потебня, А. (1993). *Мысль и язык*. Киев: Синто.
- Словник української мови (СУМ)* [Електронний ресурс]. Retrieved from: <http://sum.in.ua>
- Сорокин, Ю. (1978). Книга как семантический объект. В: *Психолингвистические проблемы общения и обучения языку* (с. 140-146). Москва: АН, Ин-р языкознания.
- Уфимцева, А. (1986). *Лексическое значение. Принцип семиотического описания лексики*. Москва: Наука.
- Франс, А. (1932). *Твори* [пер. з франц. В. Підмогильний]. Харків. Київ: Література і мистецтво.
- Франс, А. (1977). *Твори в п'яти томах (Пан Піжонно)* [пер. з франц. М. Венгрєнівська]. Київ: Дніпро, Том 3.
- Чередниченко, О., Мельник, В., Соколова, Г. (1996). *Мовленнєвий етикет: Українсько-французький довідник*. Київ: ТОВ НО Центр "АЕЛС".
- Чередниченко, О. (2001). Міжкультурні аспекти перекладу. В: *Мови, культури та переклад у контексті європейського співробітництва: Зб. наук. праць. Спец. випуск КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка*, 485-489.
- Щур, Г. (1974). *Теория поля в лингвистике*. Москва: Наука.