

Shurma, Svitlana; Lu, Wei-lun

A cognitive poetic analysis of LIFE and DEATH in English and Ukrainian: a multiple-parallel-text approach to Hamlet's soliloquy

Theatralia. 2016, vol. 19, iss. 2, pp. 9-28

ISSN 1803-845X (print); ISSN 2336-4548 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/TY2016-2-1>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/135852>

Access Date: 26. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

A Cognitive Poetic Analysis of LIFE and DEATH in English and Ukrainian: A Multiple-Parallel-Text Approach to Hamlet's Soliloquy¹

Svitlana Shurma, Wei-lun Lu

[yorick]

Introduction

Cognitive Theatre Studies is an attempt to apply cognitive linguistic research to the field of Theatre Studies (MCCONACHIE and HART 2006; COOK 2006). As a developing field, it has received considerable attention; for the area is essentially an intersection of linguistics, literature, and performance arts. However, despite the field's increasing popularity, we observe that cognitive approach to the translation of theatrical plays need more scholarly attention, which constitutes a scientific niche, and is what we will discuss in this article. We aim to discuss how the concepts of LIFE and DEATH are reflected in one of the most recognizable soliloquys in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and its three versions in Ukrainian.

In Theatre Studies, plays by Shakespeare have been a primary focus of scholarly attention. Shakespeare is renowned as a literary genius and has been considered so since his own lifetime (HONAN 2003; POTTER 2012). Shakespeare is seen as difficult for a modern reader (CRYSTAL 2003). As one of the founders of English literary language, he is known for coining a vast volume of lexis (BUSSE 2002: 66). What is more, Morozov (1954) points out that Shakespeare employed a strategy of meaning widening, using words belonging to all stylistic layers of the vocabulary of his époque, such as neologisms, borrowings, synonymy and polysemy, metaphors and other figures of speech. All of these factors make Shakespeare difficult not only to read but also to translate. That is why the translators are often advised to use 'Shakespearean grammars' and 'Shakespearean dictionaries' (see GARAMJAN 2011) when approaching his works. Yet, the language of the original is often much more

1 The completion of this article was partially supported by a research project granted by Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for Scholarly Exchange, entitled 'The Language of Death in Contemporary Taiwan: Evidence from Condolatory Idioms, Presidential Eulogies and the Self-Introductions of Undertakers' (RG002-N-15).

than a mere reference to the denotate; it is often a whole web of implicatures, images and senses. In a way, the ambiguity of Shakespeare's works induced a host of literary, philosophical and many other approaches as to how the plays can be read. Yet, the translator's task is to make the translation similar to the original in terms of the audience's perception. However, readings and interpretations, including those of the translators, have a degree of subjectivity; that is why the level of similarity/difference in the translation is bound by the interpretative patterns chosen by the translators. What is more, unlike the original author, the translator faces a number of constraints which influence the overall translation: syntactic, semantic, phonological, and cultural. So, what does it leave the translator with? In this article we show that conceptual domain should also be taken into account while choosing an approach to reading Shakespeare. In a way, the aim of the cognitive linguistic approach is to constrain the multitude of interpretations.

Among other plays, Shakespeare's tragedy *Hamlet* is popular for translations. According to British Council trivia, it has been translated into 75 languages and is rivalled only by *Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *The Merchant of Venice* (ESTILL and JOHNSON 2015). From early on, it was 'recognized as one of the greatest works of the English stage, and it has remained the most widely produced of Shakespeare's plays' (BOYCE 1990: 240). A variety of issues are discussed and raised in the play, but it is the beauty and intensity of language that make the play 'a textual minefield' as Callaghan (2013: 213) calls it, or 'nearly a chaos' as Honan (2003: 280) puts it. Callaghan (2013 : 208) writes: 'In *Hamlet*, Shakespeare foregrounds the cultural work of tragedy by making death the fulcrum of the play. *Hamlet*, in other words, is *about* death.' According to Callaghan (2013: 208), in *Hamlet*, Shakespeare chose to make death his central, driving theme. We subscribe to this view, and in this article will show how life and death are presented from the perspective of cognitive linguistics.

The themes of life and death in Shakespeare have remained in the focus of Shakespearean studies (see, for example, CALDERWOOD 1987; COURTNEY 1995; BERRY 1999), but as Callaghan (2013: 208) points out, *Hamlet* is different in the way the death theme is revealed. *Hamlet* explores the human soul – which is neither totally good nor fully evil – and how it strives for life and death simultaneously. Hamlet's most famous soliloquy 'To be or not to be', discussed in our article, reveals the torments and paradoxes that Shakespeare's main hero goes through, and 'most readers and critics think that Hamlet is here contemplating suicide' (BLOOM 2008: 27). We aim to digress from the hermeneutic and general literary approach to Hamlet's monologue and look into the conceptual representations of life and death that underlie the use of language. With the advance of the cognitive approach, Shakespearean works have been viewed from this peculiar angle (see, for instance, FREEMAN 1995; COOK 2006, 2011); yet, the famous soliloquy remains to be investigated.

Material and Methods

The Ukrainian history of Shakespeare's translations is more than 150 years old, and *Hamlet* is naturally there among the most popular plays for translation. In our article, we discuss the discrepancy between the verbalization of concepts LIFE and DEATH in Hamlet's soliloquy 'To be or not to be' and its three Ukrainian versions from different periods of time: that of Grebinka (1939) / Tupajlo (1984–1986)², Kočur (1964) and Andruhovyč (2000). The first two translations are considered canonical and are used in school textbooks, while the latter is famous for its free translation approach (see KYSELIOVA 2014; KOLOMIJETS 2005; SOKOLJANS'KYJ 2008).

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (LAKOFF and JOHNSON 1980; KÖVESCES 2000) is applied to the analysis of the original and translation fragments representing the two concepts in question. In terms of data collection, we use a Multiple-Parallel-Text (Multi-ParT) Approach to cultural linguistic analysis (LU and VERHAGEN 2016; LU, SU and VERHAGEN 2016; LU, SHURMA, KEMMER and RAMBOUSEK, in preparation). Parallel texts are translations put alongside with the originals. The benefit of using parallel texts in linguistic research is that it allows researchers to efficiently investigate how similar conceptual contents (in the case of theatre and literature, theatrical or literary scenes) are rendered in the respective languages involved, with almost all sorts of context carefully controlled.

Cultural Conceptualization of Life and Death

The issue of being and death is central to human life. Everyone dies, so sooner or later one will have to face it. One loses their close relatives, which makes it inevitable for them to have to think about life and death and to try to accommodate the unfortunate change. However, a cross-cultural study of how people in certain cultures collectively conceptualize (SHARIFIAN 2011) life and death will have to start with comparing samples from individual languages (e.g. CAPONE 2010; LU, Submitted a, Submitted b). In the present study, we use samples from the English language and from the Ukrainian language. The English sample is the renowned theatrical world masterpiece *Hamlet*, and we use the Ukrainian translations to capture how the same theatrical scene is rendered in the two languages/cultures under investigation. Below, we first briefly introduce the Ukrainian cultural conceptualization of life and death.

Traditionally, the concepts of life and death in Ukrainian culture are closely linked to Christian beliefs (mainly Orthodox), but also carry traces of pagan belief. Pagan

² Kolomijec' (2006: 31) points out that Grebinka's translation of 1939 was significantly modified by M. Tupajlo, the editor of Shakespeare's collected works in six volumes. The original translation by Grebinka was published only in 2003; yet, we would use the 1980s edition since it had been the one translation recognized by Ukrainian readers for two decades. Even though Kolomijec' states that Grebinka's original language and interpretation 'was damaged... by artificial spelling changes and bans' (KOLOMIJETS 2006: 31), the translation represents the époque in which it was published.

Ukrainians believed that death is a transfer from one world to another (BORYSENKO 2000: 172). Omel'janenko's (2005) analysis of the Ukrainian phraseological units revealed that the reference to the 'other' world is still fixed in the language; what is more, it is often associated with the existence in the new world (Ukr. *svit*) and is metaphorized as kingdom (Ukr. *carstvo*). Ukrainians believe that after death, the souls of unworthy people are sent to hell (Ukr. *peklo*) while good souls go to heaven (Ukr. *raj*); in Orthodox belief, which predominates around Ukraine, the idea of Purgatory is not supported. From Omel'janenko's analysis, we can reconstruct some conceptual metaphors associated with death, namely: DEATH IS A JOURNEY (e.g.: *vidišla v inšyj svit* – lit. went to another world), DEATH IS A FAREWELL (e.g.: *zi svitom proščatysia* – lit. to say goodbye to the world) (OMEL'JANENKO 2005: 31–2) which run contrary to DEATH IS THE END OF A JOURNEY projection pointed by Kövecses (2002: 44, 282).³ God also plays an important role in the beliefs of Ukrainians, and in the language this is reflected as a row of phraseological units, such as *viddav Bogovi dušu* (lit. gave one's life to God = died) (OMEL'JANENKO 2005: 33). Christian beliefs are reflected as reference to the soul as a 'symbol of immortality' (OMEL'JANENKO 2005: 33) in such units as *duša proščajet'sja z tilom* (lit. the soul says farewell to the body, used to describe the final moments of a dying person). Suicide is frowned upon by the church and Ukrainians, and those who die in this way are referred to as *založni merci*⁴. The notion comes from the way these people were buried: the body was not put in a grave, but was left on the ground and covered with branches in the Slavonic period, and later was not allowed to be buried in a cemetery (PONIKAROVSKA 2012: 83–4). The souls of the people who died an untimely death – through suicide, as a result of a curse or even lightning strike – became misshapen and tormented the living.

Taking the general Ukrainian cultural conceptualizations of life and death, which are reflected in the language, our hypothesis is that some traces of those will be noted in the Ukrainian versions of *Hamlet* due to the use of ethno-specific units, which results in a cross-linguistic difference in the construal of that particular theatrical scene (i.e. the soliloquy about LIFE and DEATH).

Selected Views on Hamlet's Soliloquy 'To Be or Not to Be'

The most well-known Hamlet's soliloquy, often called '[t]he most famous pentameter in the English language' (PREMINGER and BROGAN 1993: 305), appears in Act III Scene 1 of the play. There, though Hamlet speaks to himself, the audience is aware that Ophelia, Claudius and Polonius are hiding within earshot. Hamlet has already learned that his father was killed by King Claudius, who inherited the throne and married Hamlet's mother, Queen Gertrude. Hamlet is tortured by the need to avenge his father's death, and becomes rather melancholic, while other characters in the play

3 For a similar discussion, see LU (Submitted b).

4 Some Ukrainian expressions simply do not have an English equivalent. For such cases, we provide a detailed semantic description in the main text.

see him as almost mad. For that reason, the King and Queen send Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to watch the prince, but they fail to find the reason for Hamlet's madness, which they report to Claudius and Gertrude. At this point Claudius and Polonius decide to spy on Hamlet and Ophelia, while the audience hears some of the most prominent lines in theatrical history.

Much is written on what 'To be or not to be' is about. However, in this article we focus on some views on the interpretation of the monologue. The ambiguity comes from the first two lines, which, through the use of the antithesis 'be – not be', leaves the audience to wonder about the intentions of the prince. To a high degree, the multitude of readings emerges due to the polysemantic nature of the verb itself. *Online Etymology Dictionary* traces the word to Proto-Indo-European root **bheue-* 'to be, exist, grow, come into being', Sanskrit *bhavah* 'becoming' and Old English *beon, beom, bion* 'be, exist, come to be, become, happen'. Originally, the word referred not only to physical existence, but also to eventfulness. However, one of the most comprehensive web-resources on Shakespeare, *shakespeareswords.com*, featuring David and Ben Crystal's books and supplementary material dedicated to this topic, interpret the meaning of the verb *to be* in Shakespeare's lines as 'be alive, live'.

Below, we offer several selected views on the interpretation of the monologue within the fields of literary and theatre studies. Our aim here is to give the reader an idea that conceptual metaphor analysis applied to the original and translations offers theatre studies a way to examine the text from a different perspective. We take Freeman and Takeda's (2006) view that 'a cognitive analysis enables the translator to make an informed choice: to select a reading that is closest or most "prototypical" to the poem's inner coherence, or to choose a reading that is less prototypical. The translator must not only be aware of the cognitive effects of the language being translated but also consider the cognitive effects of the target language' (FREEMAN and TAKEDA 2006: 111).

The most popular view among readers and scholars is that the monologue is about Hamlet's attempt at making a decision whether or not to commit suicide. For instance, Hirsh (2010) shows that throughout the play, Hamlet makes references to suicide intentionally, to deceive his enemies and Ophelia – and 'he launches into a feigned soliloquy to convey (ultimately) to his enemy that his mental state has rendered him incapable of taking any action' (HIRSH 2010: 37). What Hirsh tries to say, is that Hamlet imposes a role upon himself, which he masterfully carries out to trick his enemies into the game he is playing. Interestingly, in most popular cinematic interpretations of Hamlet, the actors are seen talking to themselves while pronouncing the words. For instance, in the 1948 film adaptation, Hamlet (Laurence Olivier) is meditating on a rock overlooking the sea. In 1996, Hamlet (Kenneth Branagh) faces himself in the mirror, and in 1990, Hamlet (Mel Gibson) enters a sepulchre. Hirsh allows the actors playing the role of Hamlet to acknowledge the presence of other characters, especially Ophelia, on stage (HIRSH 2010: 36–7, 39).

Boyce (1990: 237–9) also points to the dominance of death and suicide themes in the play and the soliloquy in question in particular. However, the author highlights the 'effect, that we have no choice but to accept our destiny and live' (BOYCE 1990: 238),

as a conclusion, which Hamlet comes to by the end of his meditations. Thus, in this interpretation, Hamlet's monologue is a meditation on the 'value of life' as well as 'acceptance of life and its evils' (BOYCE 1990: 234, 238).

Crosman (2005) argues, that apart from the suicidal issue, the soliloquy also 'suggests a kind of ontological despair, a scepticism on Hamlet's part that he even *exists!*' (CROSMAN 2005: 134). The scholar draws attention to the similarity between Hamlet's feelings and the ones of adolescents striving to find their identity and place. In this approach, Hamlet is likened to the actor, 'looking for the right role, for the perfect script' (CROSMAN 2005: 149). The chapter of the book dedicated to Hamlet shows that the motive behind the ambiguities of the play is the prince's search for the right choices in life, while Shakespeare himself perpetuates the view that 'world's a stage'.

Ukrainian scholars of Shakespeare often quote the Russian literary critic Belinsky (1948), who sees Hamlet's role in the play as a fight with himself, an attempt to conquer the weakness of the will, a movement from the state of childish harmony to the harmony of adulthood through this fight. Another researcher, Gorohov (2005), continues Belinsky's thought and states that the soliloquy is about the fight against evil or the possibility of avoiding the fight. Its themes include the idea of being, an individual's position in it and the analysis of human thought (GOROHOV 2005: 12). The author also points to the fact that Hamlet chooses life over death.

As seen from the most popular views on the themes behind the soliloquy, the motifs of life and death, being and not being, are central ones and the ones the critics agree with. But will a conceptual metaphor analysis support these views?

Conceptual Analysis of LIFE and DEATH in the Different Ukrainian Translations of the Soliloquy

In this section, we look at six conceptual metaphors with the target domains of LIFE and DEATH in the soliloquy:

a) LIVING IS EXISTING, DYING IS NOT EXISTING

It has already been mentioned that Hamlet's soliloquy opens with the renowned 'to be or not to be' (Hamlet 3.1. 1749) through which the author creates the opposition for the entire monologue. Because the verb 'be' refers simultaneously to being, existence and, thus to life, when negated, it refers to non-existence and not-being, and therefore to death. Conceptual metaphors behind the line seem to be LIVING IS EXISTING; DYING IS NOT EXISTING. We see these metaphors as elaboration of the generic-level metaphor BEING ALIVE IS BEING HERE (LAKOFF 2003: 53). From the data, we notice that although the line became aphoristic and the three Ukrainian translators also tried to render the scene as faithfully as they could (see Appendix), some irreducible differences still remain.

For instance, Andruhovyč tries to follow the Shakespearean metaphorical mapping; yet, in Andruhovyč's translation the mapping is triggered twice in the text: in lines 1 (*buty čy ne buty*) and 14 (*Pobuty, vik dobuty svij* = to stay, one's time on earth to live

through to the end). The second time, the translator uses a verb formed of the Ukrainian root *buty* (to be) which through the prefixation, changes the meaning of the verb. The first verb *po-buty* is formed with the prefix expressing the duration, as in *poguliaty* (have a nice walk), while the second one, *do-buty*, with the prefix expressing the ending, as in *dorobyty* (to finish work). This line refers to the traditional conceptualization of death as the end of a journey, triggered by the change of the aspect of the verb. Therefore, as has been shown, although the general conceptual mapping remains similar in Andruhovyč's version, the translator uses a set of linguistic constructions that still, in a way, invoke a different construal.

b) DEATH IS SLEEP

The first line in Hamlet's soliloquy sets forth the further antitheses which comprise the verse: being and not being. The conceptual metaphor, the verbal manifestation of which explicitly appears in lines 1753–61, reflects the state of not being as DEATH IS SLEEP:

... To die – to sleep.
 No more; and by a sleep to say we end
 The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks
 That flesh is heir to. 'Tis a consummation
 Devoutly to be wish'd. To die – to sleep.
 To sleep – perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub!
 For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
 When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
 Must give us pause... (Hamlet 3.1. 1753–61)

In the extended metaphor that the author uses, we notice the following trends. Firstly, the metaphor of DEATH AS SLEEP, does not appear to be in a position linguistically common to metaphors – A is B. Shakespeare uses parallelism, and not only places the words 'to die – to sleep' in a position of homogeneous elements, but also repeats them in the end of lines 1753 and 1757, creating a golden means between the image of a hostile and painful life (*heartache and the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to*) and 'sleep of death'. This parallelism of DEATH and SLEEP makes our mind perceive them as interchangeable concepts and completes the projection of one onto another. However, what Shakespeare does through this syntactic device is change the tenor and vehicle relation of subordinated mapping, where the vehicle dominates the projection pattern to a position of equality: when we sleep we die or when we die we sleep. Ivan Ogijenko, an Orthodox metropolitan and historian of Ukrainian culture, writes that: for Ukrainians, sleep and death were almost equal, and death was viewed as a long sleep which may be stopped (ILARION 1994: 238–9). In this respect, the Shakespearean metaphor was not viewed by the translators as novel. Yet, in their translations, the Ukrainian masters chose to deal with rendering the lines in radically different ways.

<p>... Zasnuty, Pomerty – i ničogo, lyš zaznaty, Jak son pozbavyt' bolju, nerviv, tila, A z nymy i straždan'. Taka rozvjazka Cilkom godyt'sia. Tak, zasnuty, spaty – I ščo, i sny dyvytysia? Problema Odna: jaki nam sny nasnjat'sja, mertvym, Koly zemni marnoty vidšumliat'? (ŠEKSPIR 2008: 103–4)</p>	<p>... To fall asleep, To die – and nothing, only to experience How the dream will deprive of pain, nerves, body, And with them of sufferings. Such a denouement Is quite suitable. Yes, to fall asleep, to sleep – And what, and to see dreams? The problem Is single: what dreams we will see, the dead, When worldly troubles will have faded in sound?⁵</p>
--	--

Andruhovyč (see the Ukrainian text and literal translation above) shifts the original order of the parallel verbs: in his version, *zasnuty* (to fall asleep) appears before the verb *pomerty* (to die). DEATH and SLEEP parallelism in the translation reverses the Shakespearean tenor and vehicle relation, while giving additional prominence to the verb *zasnuty*. If we assume that 'conceptually more accessible entities' precede 'conceptually less accessible entities' (TANAKA, BRANIGAN, MCLEAN and PICKERING 2011: 319) in a sentence, then Andruhovyč places the verb *pomerty* into the position of the latter one, unlike Shakespeare. That means the structure of information (CHAMONIKOLASOVÁ 2007; FIRBAS 1992) in the versions are different.⁶ *Zasnuty* and *pomerty* are verbs of perfective aspect which entails the reference to the Ukrainian traditional belief that DEATH IS SLEEP; cf. euphemism popular in Ukraine *vičnyj son* (lit. eternal sleep = death). The translator also breaks the rhythm, dividing the homogeneous elements between the lines. This creates the pause which changes the perception of the verbs as interchangeable, but places the verb *zasnuty* (to sleep) in the position of a vehicle. What is more, the repetition of the same phrase is lost, substituted by perfective *zasnuty* (to fall asleep) and imperfective *spaty* (to sleep) verbs.

<p>... Zasnuty, vmerty – I vse. I znaty: vičnyj son vrjatu, Iz sercja vyjme bil', pozbavyt' ploti, A zarazom straždan'. Čy ne žadanyj Dlja nas takyj kinec'? Zasnuty, vmerty. I spaty. Može, j snyty? Os' v čim klopit; Jaki nam sny prysnjat'sja pislja smerti, Koly pozbudemos' zemnyh sujet? (ŠEKSPIR 1986: 54)</p>	<p>To fall asleep, to die – And that is all. And to know: eternal sleep will save, Will draw the pain from the heart, deprive of flesh, And sufferings altogether. Isn't desired Such end for us? To fall asleep, to die. And to sleep. Maybe, have dreams? This is what the trouble is; What dreams we will see after death, When we will get rid of earthly flusters?</p>
---	---

Grebinka/Tupajlo also change the order of the verbs in the translation, yet preserve their position in a line. This change also entails the alteration in the conception: as

5 We offer literal translations for the reader's convenience; however, it should be noted that such translations are simplified as the Ukrainian language used by the translators is polysemantic and symbolic.

6 The finding suggests that use of metaphor may be related to the information structure of the sentence. Goatly (2010) has a detailed discussion of that in Chapter 7 and 8.

sleep (*zasnuty*) comes before death (*vmerty*), the reader is more likely to perceive the events happening in the same order. This idea is also explicated by a coordinate nature of the sentence in the next lines (*I use* – and that is all; *I spaty* – and to sleep).

... Vmerty –	... To die –
Zasnut' ne bil'sh. I znaty, ščo skinčyt'sja	To fall asleep, no more. And to know, that will end
Serdečnyj bil' i tysjača turbot,	The pain in the heart and thousand of troubles,
Jaki sudyls' tilu. Cej kinec'	That were destined for the body. This end
Žadanyj buv by kožnomu. Pomerty –	May have been desired by everyone. To die –
Zasnuty. Može, j bačyty snovyddja?	To fall asleep. Maybe, to see dreams?
U c'omu j perepona. Ščo prysnytys'	This is where the hindrance is. What can come
Nam može u smertel'nim sni, koly	To us in deathly dream, when
Vantaž zemnoji sujety my skynem?	The burden of earthly fluster we will shake off?
(ŠEKSPIR 2004: 227–8)	

Yet another variation appears in Kočur's version of the soliloquy. The translator places a dash between the verbs *vmerty* (to die) and *zasnut'*⁷ (to fall asleep) and separates the two verbs keeping them in different lines, just as Andruhovyč does. The use of a punctuation mark indicates a longer pause while their order follows the Shakespearean pattern. In the Ukrainian language, the use of a dash in case of homogeneous elements suggests that the second word specifies the first one (GROMYK 2013: 132), which means that the translator metaphorically projects the domain of SLEEP onto DEATH, indicating and highlighting this projection with the help of the punctuation mark. In addition to this, the longer pause and the reversed order of the events shows that the speaker first perceives death as an event, and only later projects the concept of SLEEP onto it.

Cognitive linguistics highlights the embodied nature of our minds (GIBBS 2006; TURNER 2011), and Hamlet's speech supports the view. In lines 1753–61 the reference to body is associated with LIFE in flesh (line 1756) and SLEEP as a state we enter after death. The experience of sleep dominates the lines as the word itself is used 5 times and there is a reference to dreaming. The author speaks of life as a disease using bodily allusions to *heartache*, *natural shock*, *flesh*, and *mortal coil* that is shaken off. At the same time in the 'sleep of death' a human might even see dreams.

Andruhovyč's version preserves the bodily impulse, yet creates a different construal by making it even more prominent. Thus, he uses body vocabulary: *Jak son pozbavyt' bolju, nerviv, tila, A z nymy i stráždan'* (lit. As the sleep will deprive of pain, nerves, body, and with them, of sufferings). This enumeration places greater emphasis on bodily experiences than in Shakespeare's verse. Regarding the image of sleep, the Ukrainian language does not have separate root words for *sleep* and *dream*, as *son* (dream), *vičnyj son* (eternal sleep) and *spaty* (to sleep) are formed of the same root. In the Ukrainian

7 *Zasnut'* is a form of the verb *zasnuty*. In the Ukrainian language the Old Slavic verbal ending *-ty* is still found in infinitives, while *-t'* is the result of later changes in the language. Both endings (suffixes) today are used interchangeably (GORPYNYČ 2004: 162, 164).

translation the dreams are watched (*sny dyvytysja*) and dreamt (*sny nasnjat'sja*). Both verbs *dyvytysja* and *nasnytytsja* are formed with the help of the suffix *-sja* that in the given verbs is a marker of the reflexive voice in which the action is 'directed towards the subject (agent), comes from it and concentrates on it having no access to the object' (GORPYNYČ 2004: 188). The verb *dyvytysja* is a common-reflexive verb in which the action involves the agent, while the verb *nasnytytsja* refers to the action without involvement of the object and highlights the property or characteristic of the agent, in this case, that of dreams (GORPYNYČ 2004: 188). Therefore, we see that the Ukrainian linguistic tools have allowed the translator create a different understanding from Shakespeare's rendering of the same literary scene.

Grebinka/Tupajlo's version contains reference to the bodily nature of life; yet, body is presented in his lines as a CONTAINER: *Iz sercja vyjme bil', pozbavyt' ploti, A zarazom strazhdan'* (lit. Will draw the pain from the heart, deprive of flesh and suffering altogether). Preposition *z/iz* in the Ukrainian language is polysemantic. Gorpynyč (2004: 262) points to 68 meanings of the preposition. However, as it is used here with the verb *vyjme* (to take out, draw from), the primary meaning of the preposition is connected with *space* (GORPYNYČ 2004: 265). We say: *vyjmaty z šuhljady* (to take out of a drawer), *vyjmaty z kyšeni* (to take from a pocket). Also, *plot'* (flesh) is presented here as a CONTAINER that one can get rid of. That is a construal that is not present in Shakespeare's version either.

In addition, as we can see, both Grebinka/Tupajlo and Andruhovyč use the verb *pozbavljaty* (deprive of) which, when it appears in the collocation *pozbavljaty žyttja* means: 'to take life from somebody or oneself'. The choice of the verb might be indicative of the translator's reading of the lines as contemplation of suicide. The sleep/dream reference in the translation is rendered with the help of different derivatives: *snyty* (to have dreams); *sny prysnjat'sja* (dreams will be dreamt). The word combination *sny prysnjat'sja* is actually almost the same as Andruhovyč's *sny nasnjat'sja* with the difference in prefixal form of the verb rather than its meaning. In lines 5–12, Grebinka/Tupajlo are more direct in verbalization of death-as-sleep metaphorical projection. They use a word combination *vičnyj son* (eternal sleep) which is a common euphemistic expression in the Ukrainian language (see above), thus rendering the scene in a different way from Shakespeare's version.

Kočur's translation is the closest to Shakespeare, but the construal presented therein is still far from identical to that in Shakespeare's version. For instance, he renders lines 1754–6 almost identically: *skinčyt'sja Serdečnyj bil' i tysjača turbot, Jaki sudylys' tilu* (lit. will end the pain in the heart and thousands of troubles that were destined for the body). There is a slight difference in how the concept BODY is projected in the translation. In Shakespeare's lines, the body, or more specifically *flesh*, is personified as an heir (*That flesh is heir to*), while in the translation the metonymic relation BODY FOR PERSON is highlighted (*Jaki sudylys' tilu* – that were destined for the body). What is more, like Grebinka/Tupajlo, Kočur enhances the connection between death and sleep through the use of the combination *u smertel'nim sni* (in a deadly dream).

c) LIFE IS A BURDEN

A conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A BURDEN appears in lines 1760 (*When we have shuffled off this mortal coil*), 1761 (*who would bear*), 1769–70 (*Who would these fardels bear, To grunt and sweat under a weary life*). Hamlet, who needs to make a choice whether to be or not to be, to live on or die, to avenge or to forget about everything and others, sees life as a burden that would end only in death. In fact, the conceptual metaphor in *Hamlet* is an elaboration of another one, namely DIFFICULTIES ARE BURDENS (see Metaphor and Metonymy Index in KÖVESCES 2000). The construal gives the reader a pessimistic impression of Hamlet's view of life, seeing it as 'natural shocks' or difficulties as 'mortal coils' or 'rubs'. He focuses mainly on moral incongruities and injustices and seeks 'consummation devoutly to be wished'.

Andruhovyč's version invokes a different construal of the same scene – there is an image substitution in line 12: *Koly zemni marnoty vidšumliat'* (lit. When worldly troubles will have faded in sound). The primary meaning of the verb *vidšumity* is to fade in sound or pass away (about a sound or noise). In addition, the word *vidšumity* is used metaphorically in everyday language to speak about negative events such as war or revolution. There is also a substitution of line 15 image in line 16 of the translation: *To hto iz nas terpiv by ci znuščannja* (lit. So who of us will endure these tortures), repeated once again in line 21 – *Hto stav by ce terpity* (Who would endure this). The verb *terpity* means to withstand physical or moral pain, etc., and in the Ukrainian language the connection with BURDEN is not activated. Instead, the concept of PAIN is invoked, which results in a different construal. Yet, the translator tries to compensate the conceptual gap with the help of a more detailed image: *I hto tiagnuv by dali Šleiu žyttievu i stikav by potom* (lit. And who will pull further breaching of life and will flow out with sweat). In Ukrainian, talking about difficulties in life involves the concept of YOKE, as in the set expression: *nesty jarmo* (lit. to bear yoke – to subdue to life's difficulties). Therefore, in Andruhovyč's translation we get to see how the Ukrainian language talks about LIFE using a concept that is different from the convention of the English language.

Grebinka/Tupajlo's translation gets closer to Shakespeare's image than Andruhovyč's. The LIFE IS A BURDEN conceptual metaphor is traced in the lines *Koly pozbudemos' zemnyh sujet* (lit. When we will get rid of earthly vanities) and *Hto stognav by Pid tjararem žyttja i pit svoj lyv* (lit. Who would moan under the burden of life and shed his sweat). Like Shakespeare, Grebinka/Tupajlo manage to offer direct access to metaphoric mapping LIFE IS A BURDEN rather than to a questioned or extended metaphor. At the same time, the translator elaborates the metaphoric mapping including the concept of TIME into the domain of LIFE: *Bo hto b terpiv byči j narugy času* (lit. So who would endure these whips and unbearable abuses of time). Using the verb *terpity*, discussed above, the translator allows the verbal metaphor to continue.

Kočur's rendering of the literary scene is also different from Shakespeare's, in the sense that the image in Kočur's version is more detailed. For instance, in the phrase *koly Vantaž zemnoji sujety my skynem* (lit. When the burden of worldly vanity will we shake off): Grebinka/Tupajlo's *tjarar* and Kočur's *vantaž* are the two words which may be translated into English as *burden*; still their connotations are quite different. *Tjarar*

refers to something that is physically heavy, and the noun can appear in figurative meaning as ‘life misfortunes’. At the same time, the noun *vantaž* is used to describe baggage, cargo, or something that burdens with its presence. In Kočur’s translation, the word *tjagar* appears later in the verse: *Hto b ce stav potity, Vgynajučys’ pid tjagarem žytt’ovym* (lit. Who would sweat bending under the burden of life). To render the meaning of the verb ‘bear’, the translator uses two synonyms: *znosyty* (line 14) and *sterpity* (line 16), a derivative of *terpity* (see above). Interestingly, *znosyty* is formed of the verb *nesty*, *nosyty* – to carry; therefore, the choice of the verb supplements the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A BURDEN.

d) DEATH IS A COUNTRY and DEATH IS A JOURNEY

Lines 1771–3 are created through a combination of two conceptual metaphors: DEATH IS A COUNTRY and DEATH IS A JOURNEY, which is evidenced by the following lines:

But that the dread of something after death –
The undiscover’d country, from whose bourn
No traveller returns – (Hamlet 3.1. 1771–3)

In this passage, death is presented as a place from which there is no coming back (a one-way journey), and the deceased becomes a traveller, going to it. In cognitive linguistics literature, life has mainly been analysed as a journey, with death as the end of it (LIFE IS A JOURNEY and DEATH IS THE END OF A JOURNEY in KÖVESCES 2000: 282–3); yet, the Shakespearean metaphor presents an interesting deviation from the generalization, pointing to a Christian belief that there is a new life after death.⁸

The Ukrainian versions each differ from the English version in their own way, in terms of the construal that is invoked in the text. Andruhovyč’s image is different in the following aspects: *Jakby ne strah – a ščo tam pišla smerti, U tij kraïni z inšyh geografij Ščo z neï ne pryjduť mandrivnyky* (lit. If not for the fear – what is there after death, in that country from other geographies from which no traveller comes). The translator chose the verb *pryjty* (come) rather than *povernutysja* (return), with the use of a deictic verb creating a difference in viewpoint (cf. LU and VERHAGEN 2016: 183–5). We see that the other substitution that catches the eye is the change in the image of ‘undiscovered country’. The translator chose a more mystical, and yet more ambiguous and less specific *inšyh geografij* (other geographies) which the reader is left to wonder about.

Grebinka/Tupajlo rendered the lines differently: *Koly b ne strah popasty pišlja smerti V toj kraj neznanij, zvidky šče nihto Ne povertavsja* (lit. If not for the fear of getting after death to that land unknown, from which no one has ever returned). Earlier in the article we mentioned that in the Ukrainian belief structure, the place where souls go after death is often metaphorically compared to a kingdom. Yet, the translator chose a direct rather than traditional equivalent to the original ‘undiscovered country’ – *kraj neznanij*. We also see that the role of the traveller is absent from the translated text and

8 Not only Christians see death as a journey; Buddhists too. For details, see LU (Submitted b)

thus left out of the conceptual profile, which results in a more generic viewpoint than that in the original.

Finally, Kočur offers yet another different construal of the scene: *Jakby ne strah pered neznanyj čy mos' U tij nezvidanij krajini, zvidky Šče ne vertavsja žoden podorožnij* (lit. If not for the fear of something unknown in that undiscovered country from which no traveler ever returned). In the translation, direct reference to death is substituted by a word combination *neznanyj čy mos'* (something unknown). Andruhovyč and Kočur use two synonyms to render the idea of a traveller: *mandrivnyk* and *podorožnij*. The former is associated with the verb *mandruvaty*, to roam without a plan or itinerary, while the latter – with the verb *podorožuvaty*, to have a more or less planned trip. Though the words are often used interchangeably, the shades of meanings do colour the image in the translation. The same concerns Grebinka/Tupajlo's *neznanyj* and Kočur's *nezvidanyj*. The first adjective is formed from the verb *znaty* (to know) with a negative prefix added to it and refers to something that is not known; yet, the second one is coined from the verb *vidaty* (to have an idea, knowledge). The adjective *nezvidanyj* acquired the meaning of 'undiscovered, unknown'.

Conclusions

With a detailed presentation of our findings, we have shown that the hypothesis is supported by various pieces of evidence that the MultiParT approach has helped identify – most importantly, no Ukrainian version renders the theatrical scene in *exactly* the same way the English version does, although the general conceptual mapping is largely retained across all the versions. That means each Ukrainian version is different from the English version in its own way, in terms of how the scene is verbalized and construed. In addition, although the overall conceptual correspondence is retained across the versions, the actual linguistic manifestations are very different, which shows a certain extent of inter-linguistic and intra-linguistic variations. In general, there are differences at all levels of verbalization and conceptualization, in terms of lexical choice, viewpoint, conceptual profiling, and the conceptual granularity of the scene presented. With the above analysis, we have shown that MultiParT can indeed be adopted as an effective methodology that is capable of helping identify lack of textual and conceptual correspondence between verbalizations of the same conceptual content (in the same language or in different languages), to provide a methodological opportunity for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural cognitive theatrical studies. Finally, we believe that the study also has important implications for the study of the language of death – although death is a universal source of human pain and suffering that invariably afflicts human beings across all societies, which is exactly what makes the monologue in *Hamlet* a classic in literature. The way in which people verbalize and conceptualize *the same* event of death is irreducibly language- and culture-specific.

Bibliography

- Akademičnyj Tlumačnyj Slovník* (1970–1980) [Academic Ukrainian Dictionary] [online]. [accessed on 16 June 2016]. Available online at <http://sum.in.ua>.
- BELINSKY, Vissarion. 1948. Gamlet, drama Šekspira. Močalov v roli Gamleta [*Hamlet*, Shakespeare's Drama. Mochalov Starring as Hamlet] [online]. In *Sobranije Sočinenij v treh tomah* [Collected Works in Three Volumes]. Vol. 1. Moscow: OGIZ, GIHL, 1948. [accessed on 13 January 2016]. Available online at http://az.lib.ru/b/belinskij_w_g/text_1180.shtml.
- BERRY, Philippa. 1999. *Shakespeare's Feminine Endings: Disfiguring Death in the Tragedies*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- BLOOM, Harold (ed.). 2008. *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Hamlet*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008.
- BORYSENKO, Valentyna. 2000. *Tradycii i žytt'edijal'nist' etnosu: Na materialah sviatkovo-obriadovoji kul'tury urkañciv* [Traditions and Life of an Ethnos: Based on Festive and Ceremonial Culture of the Ukrainians]. Kyiv: Uniserv, 2000.
- BOYCE, Charles. 1990. *Shakespeare A to Z: The Essential Reference to His Plays, His Poems, His Life and Times, and More*. New York: Laurel, 1990.
- BUSSE, Ulrich. 2002. *Linguistic Variation in the Shakespeare Corpus: Morpho-syntactic Variability of Second Person Pronouns*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002.
- CALDERWOOD, James L. 1987. *Shakespeare and the Denial of Death*. Amherst: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- CALLAGHAN, Dymrna. 2013. *Who was William Shakespeare? An Introduction to the Life and Works*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2013.
- CAPONE, Alessandro. 2010. On pragmemes again. Dealing with death. *La linguistique* 46 (2010): 2: 3–21.
- CHAMONIKOLASOVÁ, Jana. 2007. *Intonation in English and Czech Dialogues*. Brno: Masaryk University Press, 2007.
- COOK, Amy. 2006. Staging Nothing: Hamlet and Cognitive Science. *SubStance* 35 (2006): 2: 83–99.
- COOK, Amy. 2011. Cognitive Interplay: How Blending Theory and Cognitive Science Reread Shakespeare. In Jonathan Culpeper and Mireille Ravassat (eds.). *Language and Stylistics in Shakespeare*. New York: Continuum, 2011: 246–72.
- COURTNEY, Richard. 1995. *Shakespeare's World of Death: The Early Tragedies*. Toronto: Dundurn, 1995.
- CROSMAN, Robert. 2005. *The World's a Stage: Shakespeare and the Dramatic View of Life*. Bethesda: Academia Press, 2005.
- CRYSTAL, David. 2003. The language of Shakespeare. In Stanley Wells and Lena Orlin (eds.). *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003: 67–78.
- DICKSON, Andrew. 2014. Why Shakespeare is the world's favourite writer [online]. BBC.com. [accessed on 22 February 2016]. Available online at <http://www.bbc.com/culture/story/20140422-shakespeare-the-worlds-writer>.
- ESTILL, Laura and Eric JOHNSON. 2015. Fun international facts about Shakespeare [online]. British Council. Published 19 March 2015. [accessed on 19 February 2016]. Available online at <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/fun-international-facts-about-shakespeare>.

- FIRBAS, Jan. 1992. *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- FREEMAN, Donald C. 1995. 'Catch[ing] the nearest way': Macbeth and cognitive metaphor. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24 (1995): 6: 689–708. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00015-K](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00015-K).
- FREEMAN, Margaret H. and Masako TAKEDA. 2006. Art, Science, and Ste. Emilie's Sunsets: a Háj-inspired Cognitive Approach to Translating an Emily Dickinson Poem into Japanese. *Style* 40 (2006): 1–2: 109–27. [accessed on 21 July 2016]. Available online at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1427815>.
- GARAMJAN, Arusjak. 2011. Perevod komedij Šekspira kak osnova professional'noj kompetencii specialista (perevodčika) [Translation of Shakespeare's Comedies as the ground for professional (translator's) competence] [online]. *Universitetskije čtenija* [University Discussions] (2011). [accessed on 20 January 2016]. Available online at http://pglu.ru/editions/un_reading/detail.php?SECTION_ID=2865&ELEMENT_ID=10024.
- GIBBS, Raymond W., Jr. 2006. *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- GOATLY, Andrew. 2011. *The Language of Metaphors (2nd Edition)*. London/New York: Routledge, 2011.
- GROHOV, P. A. 2005. Nash sovremennik princ datskiy (filosofskaja problematika tragedii 'Gamlet' [Our Contemporary Danish Prince (Philosophical Issues in *Hamlet*)]. *Vestnik Orenburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Orenburg State University Herald] (2005): 7: 8–14.
- GOPYNYČ, Volodymyr O. 2004. *Morfologija ukraïns'koho movy* [Ukrainian Morphology]. Kyiv: Akademia, 2004.
- GROMYK, Yuriy. 2013. *Ukraïns'kyj pravopys* [Ukrainian Language Rules]. Kyiv: Centr učbovoji literatury, 2013.
- HIRSH, James. 2010. 'The 'To be, or not to be' Speech: Evidence, Conventional Wisdom, and the Editing of *Hamlet*. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 23 (2010): 34–62.
- HONAN, Park. 2003. *Shakespeare: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- ILARION, the metropolitan. 1994. *Dohrystyjans'ki viruvannja ukraïns'koho narodu* [Pre-Christian Beliefs of the Ukrainian People]. Kyiv: Oberegy, 1994.
- KOLOMIJEC', Lada. 2006. Dva Leonidy Grebinky: Do pytannja pro avtentyčnyj pereklad i redaktors'ku pravku (na materiali perekladu 'Gamleta' V. Šekspira) [Two Grebinkas: On Authentic Translation and Editor's Changes (Based on W. Shakespeare's *Hamlet*)]. *Inozemna filologija* [Foreign Philology] (2006): 40: 31–5.
- KOLOMIJEC', Lada. 2005. Novyj ukraïns'kyj 'Gamlet': perekladac'ka strategija Jurija Andruhovyča [New Ukrainian *Hamlet*: Yuriy Andruhovyč's Translation Strategy] [online]. *Mova i Kul'tura* [Language and Culture] 3 (2005): 8: 349–56. [accessed on 4 August 2015]. Available online at <http://shakespeare.zp.ua/texts.item.64/>.
- KÖVESCES, Zoltán. 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- KYSELIOVA, Kateryna. 2014. 'Ty bidnyj pryvid, čy proklyatyj goblin?' – Gamlet u perekładi Andruhovyča ['Are you a poor ghost or a cursed goblin?' – Hamlet in Andruhovyč's Translation] [online]. *Gazeta.ua*. 2014. [accessed on 4 August 2015]. Available online at http://gazeta.ua/articles/culture/_ti-bidnij-pryvid-chi-proklyatij-goblin-gamlet-u-perekładi-andruhovicha/561373?mobile=true.

- LAKOFF, George and Mark JOHNSON. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- LAKOFF, George. 2003. Metaphor and semantics. In *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics: AAVE-Esperanto*. Vol. 1. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2003: 53–4.
- LU, Wei-lun. Submitted a. Socio-cultural factors in analyzing the pragmeme of accommodation: A case study of the official online eulogy request system in Taiwan. Submitted to: *The Pragmeme of Accommodation and Intercultural Pragmatics: The Case of Interaction around the Event of Death*. Vahid Parvaresh and Alessandro Capone (eds.). New York: Springer.
- LU, Wei-lun. Submitted b. Cultural conceptualizations of death by Taiwanese Buddhists and Christians: Categories and schemas in Mandarin eulogistic idioms. Submitted to: *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*. Farzad Sharifian (ed.). New York: Springer.
- LU, Wei-lun, Arie VERHAGEN and I-wen SU. In press. A Multiple-Parallel-Text approach for viewpoint research across languages: The case of demonstratives in English and Chinese. In Szilvia Csábi (ed.). *Expressive Minds and Artistic Creations: Studies in Cognitive Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LU, Wei-lun and Arie VERHAGEN. 2016. Shifting viewpoints: How does that actually work across languages? An exercise in parallel text analysis. In Barbara Dancygier, Wei-lun Lu and Arie Verhagen (eds.). *Viewpoint and the Fabric of Meaning: Form and use of viewpoint tools across languages and modalities*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016: 169–90.
- MCCONACHIE, Bruce and F. Elizabeth HART. 2006. *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.
- MOROZOV, Mihail. 1954. Jazyk i stil' Šekspira [Shakespeare's Language and Style]. In Mihail Morozov. *Izbrannyje stat'i i perevody* [Collected Articles and Translations]. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1954: 93–148.
- OMELJANENKO, O. V. 2014. Verbalizacija ujavlen' pro smert' kriz' pryizmu Ukraïns'kyh frazeologizmiv iz nazvamy ponjat' irreal'nogo svitu [Language manifestation of cognizing death reflected in Ukrainian phraseological units naming the notions of the unreal world]. *Lingvistychni Doslidzhennia* [Linguistic Research] (2014): 38: 29–35.
- Online Etymology Dictionary* [online]. [accessed on 3 April 2016]. Available online at www.etymonline.com.
- PONIKAROVSKA, N. A. 2012. Strah jak zmistoutvorjujučyj factor obrjadovyh dij, povjazanyh iz založnymy pokijnykamy v obrjadovosti davnih slovjan [Fear as a sense-forming factor of rituals connected with založny dead in rituals of Old Slavs]. *Kul'tura Ukra ny* [Culture of Ukraine] (2012): 39: 82–9.
- POTTER, Lois. 2012. *The Life of William Shakespeare: A Critical Biography*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2012.
- PREMINGER, Alex and T. V. F. BROGAN (eds.). 1993. *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- ŠEKSPIR, Viljam. Gamlet, prync dans'kyj [Hamlet, the Danish Prince]. Tr. by G. Kočur. In U. Šekspir. *Tragediji* [Tragedies]. Harkiv: Folio, 2004: 165–310.
- ŠEKSPIR, Viljam. 1986. Gamlet, prync dats'kyi [Hamlet, the Danish Prince]. Tr. by L. Grebinka. In id. *Tvory v shesty tomah* [Collected Works in Six Volumes]. Vol. 5. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1986: 5–118.

- ŠEKSPIR, Viljam. 2008. *Gamlet, princ dans'kyj* [Hamlet, the Danish Prince]. Tr. by Yu. Andruhovych. Kyiv: A-BA-BA-GA-LA-MA-GA, 2008.
- SHAKESPEARE, William. Act III. Scene I. *Hamlet* [online]. [accessed on 28 June 2016]. Available online at <http://www.shakespeareswords.com/Plays.aspx?Ac=3&SC=1&IdPlay=2#117126>.
- SHARIFIAN, Farzad. 2011. *Cultural Conceptualizations and Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011.
- SOKOLJANS'KYJ, Mark. 2008. U poloni groteskovoji strategiji [online]. 2008. [accessed on 4 August 2015]. Available online at <http://litakcent.com/2008/12/12/u-poloni-hroteskovoji-stratehiji/>.
- TANAKA, Mikihiro N., Holly P. BRANIGAN, Janet F. MCLEAN and Martin J. PICKERING. 2011. Conceptual influences on word order and voice in sentence production: Evidence from Japanese [online]. *Journal of Memory and Language* 65 (2011): 3: 318–30. [accessed on 29 June 2016]. Available online at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/241097087_Conceptual_influences_on_word_order_and_voice_in_sentence_production_Evidence_from_Japanese.
- TURNER, Mark. 2011. The Embodied Mind and the Origins of Human Culture. In Ana Margarida Abrantes and Peter Hanenberg (eds.). *Cognition and Culture: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*. Frankfurt & Berlin: Peter Lang, 2011: 13–27.

Summary

A Cognitive Poetic Analysis of LIFE and DEATH in English and Ukrainian: A Multiple-Parallel-Text Approach to Hamlet's Soliloquy

The article zeroes in on the discrepancy between the verbalization of LIFE and DEATH in Hamlet's soliloquy 'To be or not to be' in the English version and three Ukrainian ones. The Multiple-Parallel-Text-based analysis shows that the conceptual metaphors LIVING IS EXISTING, DYING IS NOT EXISTING, DEATH IS SLEEP, DEATH IS A COUNTRY, DEATH IS A JOURNEY and LIFE IS A BURDEN reconstructed from the original have been largely left intact in the translations. However, we find that the actual verbalization and conceptualization in the two languages are highly culture-specific and that the versions exhibit great inter- and intra-language variations.

Keywords

cognitive poetics, conceptual metaphor, contrastive linguistics, life and death, MultiParT, parallel texts, soliloquy, translation

DOI: 10.5817/TY2016-2-1

Svitlana Shurma, Ph.D.

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University, Ukraine

E-mail: lanashurma@gmail.com

Svitlana Shurma is currently an Associate Professor of English Philology and Translation Department at Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University and a Visegrad visiting scholar at Masaryk University. She has published on translation, cognitive poetics, and foreign language teaching.

Wei-lun Lu, Ph.D.

Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

E-mail: weilunlu@gmail.com

Wei-lun Lu is currently Research Fellow and Language Program Coordinator at the Center for Chinese Studies, Masaryk University. His research expertise includes cognitive linguistics and cultural linguistics, using a strictly corpus-based methodology.

Appendix

To be, or not to be – that is the question:
 Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
 The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune
 Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
 And by opposing end them. To die – to sleep –
 No more; and by a sleep to say we end
 The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks
 That flesh is heir to. 'Tis a consummation
 Devoutly to be wish'd. To die – to sleep.
 To sleep- perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub!
 For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
 When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
 Must give us pause. There's the respect
 That makes calamity of so long life.
 For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
 Th' oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
 The pangs of despis'd love, the law's delay,
 The insolence of office, and the spurns
 That patient merit of th' unworthy takes,
 When he himself might his quietus make
 With a bare bodkin? Who would these fardels bear,
 To grunt and sweat under a weary life,
 But that the dread of something after death –
 The undiscover'd country, from whose bourn
 No traveller returns- puzzles the will,
 And makes us rather bear those ills we have
 Than fly to others that we know not of?
 Thus conscience does make cowards of us all,
 And thus the native hue of resolution
 Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
 And enterprises of great pith and moment
 With this regard their currents turn awry
 And lose the name of action. – Soft you now!
 The fair Ophelia! – Nymph, in thy orisons
 Be all my sins rememb' red.

(Hamlet 3.1. 1749–83)

1. I ot pytannia – buty čy ne buty.
2. U čomy bil'she gidnosti: skorytys'
3. Udaram doli i ljagty pid strily
4. Čy oporom zustrity čorni hvyli
5. Neščast' – i tym spynyty jih? Zasnuty,
6. Pomerty – i ničogo, lyš zaznaty,
7. Jak son pozbavyt' bolju, nerviv, tyla,
8. A z nymy i straždan'. Taka rozvjazka
9. Cilkom godyt'sja. Tak, zasnuty, spaty –
10. I ščo, i sny dyvytysia? Problema
11. Odna: jaki nam sny nasnat'sja, mertvym,
12. Koly zemni marnoty vidsumljat'?
13. I tut sydyt' vagannja: šče hoč trohy
14. Pobuty, vik dobuty svij, a zvidsy –
15. Prymnožennia neščast'. Jakby ne ce,
16. To hto iz nas terpiv by ci znuščannja:
17. Ci utysky verhiv, aplomb nikčem,
18. Znevažene kohannja, bezzakonnja,
19. Nahabstvo vłady, napady na čest',
20. Jakymy poslugovujet'sja pidlist',
21. Hto stav by ce terpity, adže možna
22. Zvyčajnym lezom zupynyty hid
23. Usih straždan'? I hto tjagnuv by dali
24. Šleju žyttievu i stikav by potom,
25. Jakby ne strah – a ščo tam pislja smerti,
26. U tij kraïni z inšyh geografij
27. Ščo z neï ne pryjduť mandrivnyky?
28. I strah nam kaže vyterpity muky
29. Tutešni, dobre znani, j ne šukaty
30. Neznanyh, potobjičnyh. Vynen rozum –
31. Ce vin blidymy robyt' nas i barvy
32. Poryviv našyh, a vidvažni plany
33. Po rozдумah volijemo vidklasty
34. I zovsim pohovaty. Htos' tut je?
35. Ofelija? Za mene pomolysia,
36. Prekrasna nimfo, grišņogo zgdaj.

Translated by Andruhovyč
 (ŠEKSPIR 2008: 103–4)

1. Čy buty, čy ne buty – os' pytannja.
2. Ščo blagorodniše? Korytys' doli
3. I bil' vid gostryh stril ũ terpity,
4. A čy, zitnuvšys' v gerci z morem lyha,
5. Poklasy kraj jomu? Zasnuty, vmerty –
6. I vse. I znaty: vičnyj son vrjatuje,
7. Iz sercja vyjme bil', pozbavyt' ploti,
8. A zarazom straždan'. Čy ne žadanyj
9. Dlja nas takyj kinec'? Zasnuty, vmerty.
10. I spaty. Može, j snyty? Os' v čim klopit;
11. Jaki nam sny prysnjat'sja pislja smerti,
12. Koly pozbudemos' zemnyh sujet?
13. Os' v čim vagan' pryčyna. Čerez ce
14. Žyvut' napasti naši stil'ky lit.
15. Bo hto b terpiv byči j narugy času,
16. Gnit možnovladdja, gordija znevagy,
17. Vidštovhnutu ljubov, nespravedlyvist',
18. Vlastej svavolju, tjažanyu sudu,
19. Z česnoty skromnoji bezčesnyj glum,
20. Koly b vin prostym lezom mig sobi
21. Zdobuty vičnyj spokij? Hto stognav by
22. Pid tjažarem žyttja i pit svij lyv,
23. Koly b ne strah popasty pislja smerti
24. V toj kraj neznanyj, zvidky šče nihto
25. Ne povertavsja? Strah cej nas bezvolyt',
26. I v zvyčnyh bidah my volijem žyty,
27. Niž lynuty do ne vidomyh nam.
28. Tak rozum polohlyvymy nas robyt',
29. Jaskravi barvy našoji vidvagy
30. Vid rozdumiv vtračajut' kolir svij,
31. A namiry vysoki, led' zrodyvšys',
32. Vmyrajut', šče ne vtilyvšys' u diju.
33. Ale tyhiš! Ofelija! Zgadaj
34. Moji grihy v svojij molytvi, nimfo.

Translated by Grebinka/Tupajlo
(ŠEKSPIR 1986: 54)

1. Tak. Buty čy ne buty – os' pytannja.
2. V čim bil'še gidnosti: terpity movčcky
3. Važki udary navisnoŭ doli,
4. Čy staty zbrojno proty morja muk
5. I kraj poklasy jim borneju? Vmerty –
6. Zasnut' ne bil'š. I znaty, ščo skinčyt'sja
7. Serdečnyj bil' i tysjača turbot,
8. Jaki sudylys' tilu. Cej kinec'
9. Žadanyj buv by kožnomu. Pomerty –
10. Zasnuty. Može, j bačyty snovyddja?
11. U c'omu j perepona. Ščo prysnytys'
12. Nam može u smertel'nim sni, koly
13. Vantaž zemnoji sujety my skynem?
14. Oce jedyne sponukaje znosyt'
15. Usi neščastja dovogogo žyttja;
16. Inakše – hto ž by sterpiv glum času,
17. Jarmo gnobyteľiv, pyhu zuhval'civ,
18. Znevaženu ljubov, sudy nepravu,
19. Nahabstvo vlady, pryčipky j znuščannja,
20. Ščo gidnyj zaznaje vid nedostojnyh, –
21. Hto b ce terpiv, koly udar kyndzhała
22. Use kinčaje? Hto b ce stav potity,
23. Vgynajučys' pid tjažarem žytt'ovym,
24. Jakby ne strah pered neznanyh čymos'
25. U tij nezvidanij kraŭni, zvidky
26. Šče ne vertavsja žoden podorožnij?
27. Myrytys' legše nam z vidomym lyhom,
28. Aníž do nevidomogo spišyty;
29. Tak rozдум robyt' bojaguziv z nas,
30. Riščosti pryrodženyj rumjanec'
31. Blidoju barvoju vkryvaje dumka,
32. I zbočuje velyčnyj namir kožen,
33. Imennja včynku tratjačy. Ta godi!
34. Ofelije! V svojij molytvi, nimfo,
35. Zgadaj moji grihy!

Translated by Kočur
(ŠEKSPIR 2004: 227–8)