OLEKSANDR LYTVYNOV
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Foreign Languages Department of Faculties of Chemistry and Physics,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

TRANSLATION STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH-UKRAINIAN RENDERING OF DUAL-NUMBER QUANTIFIERS

Стаття присвячена розгляду стратегій перекладу англійських квантифікаторів двоїни *both, either, neither* українською мовою у сучасному художньому дискурсі. *Метою* роботи є виявлення локальних і глобальних стратегій та прийомів перекладу квантифікаторів на етапі узагальнення результатів перекладацького досвіду. Завдання включають встановлення типів перекладацьких трансформацій, прийомів і стратегій, застосованих для досягнення еквівалентності й адекватності українського перекладу. Еквівалентність розуміється як співвідношення між текстами оригіналу та перекладу зі збереженням семантичної (референційної, конотативної), стилістичної та прагматичної (функціонально-комунікативної) інформації при передачі змісту оригіналу. Адекватність трактується як якість перекладу, що дозволяє вважати його загально прийнятним або задовільним і передбачає відтворення змісту оригіналу з урахуванням прагматичної мети та без порушення мовних норм.

Дослідження виконано на матеріалі роману Дж. Роулінг «Гаррі Поттер і в'язень Азкабану» та його авторизованого перекладу, здійсненого В. Морозовим, із яких методом суцільної вибірки було відібрано 96 квантифікаторів двоїни. *Методи* і процедури дослідження наступні: 1) повна вибірка; 2) Аналіз одномовних і двомовних словникових статей; 3) Аналіз безпосередніх складових; 4) контекстуальний аналіз; 5) трансформаційний аналіз перекладу; 6) синтаксичний аналіз пропозицій і процедури кількісного розрахунку.

У результаті аналізу словникових дефініцій виявлено функціонально-семантичні властивості та прямі перекладні еквіваленти даних одиниць. За допомогою аналізу за безпосередніми складниками та контекстуального аналізу ідентифіковано 17 семантичних ролей референтів даних лексем у тексті оригіналу, найчастотнішими з яких є агенс (36,4%), локатив (14,6%), експерієнтив (11,4%). Виявлено 19 комбінацій семантичних ролей і синтаксичних функцій квантифікаторів у тексті оригіналу, серед яких найчастішим є агентивний підмет (37,5%); частота решти становить приблизно по 10%. Аналіз перекладацьких трансформацій дозволив установити основні прийоми перекладу квантифікаторів українською мовою, що включають опущення (62,5%), буквальний переклад за допомогою еквівалентів еквіваленти (21,9%) та лексичні заміни (15,6%). Доведено, що основними стратегіями перекладу, включаючи по дві «на оригінал» і «на читача», локальними стратегіями при відтворенні даних одиниць українською мовою є 1) комунікативний переклад (термін П. Н'юмарка) (68,8%) за допомогою опущення (компресії) зі зменшенням опущення, компресії, зменшення емфази, парафрази із синтаксичними змінами та зменшенням експліцитності, а також за допомогою еквівалентів із синтаксичними змінами, включаючи додавання, та зміною емфази; 2) буквальний переклад (15,6%) із використанням прямих (чистих) (4,2%) і непрямих (змішаних) еквівалентів (11,4%) зі зміною емфази та/або синтаксичними змінами; прямих і непрямих еквівалентів, 3) семантичний переклад (15,6%), включаючи синонімічні заміни, зміни емфази, парафразу синтаксичні зміни, модуляцію, усі з яких застосовано спільно з 4) глобальною стратегією «одомашнення» (100%), що забезпечують еквівалентність та адекватність англо-українського перекладу даних квантифікаторів.

Ключові слова: стратегія перекладу, прийом перекладу, квантифікатор, семантична роль, еквівалент, опущення, заміна, буквальний переклад, семантичний переклад, комунікативний переклад.

Introduction

Translation is a complex process that involves combinations of global and local strategies applied at every stage to attain equivalence and adequacy of the target text. Local strategies (translation procedures) "relate specifically to the translation of particular language structures and lexical items [Kearns, 2009. p. 283], to "individual expressions in the source text, such as words, grammar constructions, idioms, etc." [Romaniuk; Zapotichna, 2020, p. 127]. Global strategies (or translation methods) "operate at a more general level and pertain to broad questions of textual style and the choice between suppressing or emphasizing specific aspects of the source text [Kearns, 2009. p. 283]; being "applied to a text as a whole" and aimed at "reproduction of the whole conceptual image of the source text," and "the global translation strategies involve the local ones" [Romaniuk; Zapotichna, 2020, p. 127].

Equivalence is "a central concept in translation theory, but also a controversial one," commonly defined as "a relationship between a source text (ST) and a target text (TT)…or parts of STs and TTs… that allows the TT to be considered a translation of the ST" based on their referential or denotative, connotative, text-normative, formal, pragmatic aspects etc. [Kenny, 2009, p. 96]. P. Newmark (1988) claims that the overriding purpose, and a desirable result, of any translation, should be "to achieve 'equivalent effect,' i.e. to produce the same effect (or one as close as possible) on the readership of the translation as has been obtained on the readership of the original," called the 'equivalent response' principle" [Newmark, 1988, p. 48], also referred to by E. Nida as "dynamic equivalence" based on "the ST and TT words having the same effect on their respective readers" [Nida, Taber, 1969]. Adequacy of translation is viewed as its quality of being satisfactory or acceptable. According to Bakker et al., "adequate translation is a reconstruction of source text textemes and consists of an explicitation of the textual relations and functions of the source text [Bakker, Koster, Van Leuven-Zwart, 2009, p. 272].

Translation strategies are classified differently in modern translation studies; for instance, Catford (1965) proposes the term 'translation shifts' (level shifts & category shifts, structural & class shifts, unit shifts & intra-system shifts), defining translation as "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)," the term 'equivalent' being used as 'a key term,' [Catford, 1965, pp. 20–21] and, based on the extent, levels and ranks of translation, he distinguishes such types as full, partial, total, restricted, rank-bound and unbounded translation etc. A. Chesterman (1997) differentiates 'comprehension strategies' relating to the cognitive analysis of the ST and 'production strategies' relating to the production of the TT, dividing the latter into (mainly local) ten syntactic/grammatical, nine semantic and five pragmatic strategies, with subcategories in each group and no obvious distinction between them [Chesterman, 1997, pp. 92–112], describing strategies as 'ways in which translators seek to conform to norms . . . not to achieve equivalence, but simply to arrive at the best version they can think of' [Kearns, 2009, p. 285]. According to Chesterman (1997), translation strategies are text-manipulating, process-oriented, goal-oriented, problem-centered, consciously applied and inter-subjective. In regard to global translation strategies, L. Venuti (2001) distinguishes between 'foreignization' and 'domestication' strategies based on the translator's 'moving the reader towards the author or the author towards the reader' [Venuti, 2001]. These strategies involve translation methods, 'determined by cultural, economic, and political factors,' serving as the means of coping with translation problems [Venuti, 2008, p. 240]. P. Newmark (1988) equates global strategies to translation methods, which refer to the whole text, and local strategies to procedures regarded as a translator's options applied for sentences and smaller units, thus differentiating eight translation types based on the source text (language) focus and the target text (language) focus, the first including 'word-for-word, literal, faithful and semantic translation,' the second being 'adaptation, free, idiomatic and communicative translation' [Newmark, 1988]. L. Kyrychuk (2018) differentiates between "two basic, directly opposite in character, translation strategies, namely: the strategy of imitative, direct, ST-oriented translation and oblique, indirect, target receptor-oriented or functional translation" [Kyrychuk, 2018, p. 74]. E. Davies (2003) distinguishes seven strategies, namely: localization, globalization, addition, omission, preservation, transformation and creation (which, in particular, were used by W. Dukmak (2012) to describe the translation of culture-specific references in the Harry Potter books into Arabic). M. Baker (1992) proposes the eight most frequent strategies employed by

professional translators in dealing with translation problems, namely, translation by: a) a more general word, b) a more neutral / less expressive word, c) cultural substitution, d) a loan word or loan word plus explanation, e) paraphrase using a related word, f) paraphrase using unrelated words, g) omission, h) illustration [Baker, 1992, pp. 26–42].

Generally, translation strategies are regarded as a long-term set of rules, approaches and actions, methods and procedures aimed at adequate rendering of an original text into a foreign language in accordance with "the communication goal, cognitive needs and interests of the target audience" [Romaniuk, Zapotichna, 2020, p. 127], with cultural, linguistic and extra-linguistic factors taken into account. Moreover, they are the means of overcoming translation problems that arise from the inappropriateness of literal translation. According to Z. Owji (2013), provided that literal translation is acceptable, "the strategies may not be needed" [Owji, 2013].

Besides, every stage of the translation process involves translation tactics, which are different from local strategies, since, according to Romaniuk and Zapotichna (2020), they are 'directed to different objects,' i.e. local strategies are intended to 'reproduce conceptual meaning or the function of a certain piece of text,' while tactics are aimed at determining 'which semantic or formal characteristics of the language units of the original text are subject to reproduction in translation to achieve the specified strategy' [Romaniuk, Zapotichna, 2020, p. 127]. Local strategies are based on 'logically interrelated translation tactics' regarded as 'specific speech actions aimed at implementing a strategy and achieving the goal of translation at each stage' [ibid, p. 127]. The impossibility of adhering to one translation strategy solely leads to combinations of global and local strategies, including related methods – all depending on the type and genre of the text being translated.

To summarize various theories, **translation strategy** is herein defined as a long-term systematic plan of explicit mental and behavioural actions to render the semantic, pragmatic and cultural aspects of the original text semantic, pragmatic and cultural aspects of the original text or text segment (translation unit, i.e. a sentence, clause, phrase or word as a lower unit) by foreign language means, preserve its style, genre characteristics and imagery to ensure therefore equivalence and adequacy of the translated text or unit. According to P. Newmark (1988), translation units are divided into higher units (paragraphs and texts) and lower units (sentences, groups, clauses and words). "The largest quantity of translation in a text is done at the level of the word, the lexical unit, the collocation, the group, the clause and the sentence [Newmark, 1988, p. 54].

The **subject** of this study is translation strategies employed in rendering the English dual-number quantifiers (DNQs) *both, either & neither* into Ukrainian in modern fiction discourse. The **aim** is to analyze and identify the strategies and methods of adequate English-Ukrainian translation of the DNQs at the post-translation stage, as well as the post-translation strategy of generalizing the translator's experience. The **objectives** are: 1) to compile a register of English DNQs based on the novel by J.K. Rowling "Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban;" 2) to determine their functional-semantic characteristics and direct translation equivalents; 3) to identify their semantic roles and syntactic functions in the source text; 4) to specify the types of grammatical shifts translation shifts and methods of their rendering into Ukrainian; 5) to identify and analyze the respective translation strategies applied. The research **methods** and procedures are: 1) entire sampling; 2) monolingual and bilingual dictionary entries' analysis; 3) immediate constituents' analysis; 4) contextual analysis; 5) translation transformational analysis; 6) sentence parsing and quantity calculations procedures.

In recent years, English quantifiers were investigated within translation studies in various aspects, including, to name a few, contrastive studies of non-numerical quantificational NPs produced by English speakers and Mandarin & Korean learners of English [Crosthwaite, Choy, Bae, 2016], distributive quantifier scope in English-speaking learners of Japanese on "the syntax-semantics interface" [Marsden, 2009]; corpus-based cross-linguistic analysis of English and Lithuanian non-numerical quantifiers for practical applications in translation, lexicography and language teaching [Ruzaitė, 2009]; corpus study of determiners in English quantificational expressions used by Korean learners of English and native English-speakers [Yoo, Shin, 2019]; English lexical equivalents of Thai quantifiers based on English-Thai parallel corpora [Wijitsopon, 2021]; linguistic attributes of English numerals and denumerals [Kobyakova, Shvachko, 2019]; quanti-

fication in human languages "to build Natural Language Generation algorithms that mimic humans' use of quantified expressions" [Chen, Deemter, Pagliaro, Smalbil, Lin, 2019]; semantic, cognitive and pragmatic meanings of quantifiers [Knowlton, Trueswell, Papafragou, 2023] etc. Concerning translation difficulties, S. Finn and O. Bueno claim that quantifier variance in natural languages "faces a number of difficulties and… is not compatible with charitable translation" [Finn, Bueno, 2018]. At the same time, little attention has been given recently to analyses of translation strategies and methods employed in rendering the DNQs *both, either & neither* in contemporary fantasy fiction.

Applicable to this investigation are the following global and local strategies elaborated by different researchers: 1) domestication [Venuti, 2004] – an ethnocentric approach wherein the emphasis is laid on the linguistic and cultural values of the target language, and "the author approaches the reader;" 2) communicative translation [Newmark, 1998] – a target text-oriented strategy aimed at reproducing the exact message of the source text content into the target language with emphasis on naturalness and comprehensiveness of the target text readership; 3) semantic translation [Newmark, 1998] – a source text-oriented strategy aimed at preserving the meaning of the original text with emphasis on naturalness; 4) literal translation [Newmark, 1998; Chesterman, 1997], i.e. converting the original-text individual words and grammatical structures into the nearest equivalents in the target text, which according to Chesterman [1997], is a "default" strategy.

Besides, relevant to this research are the following direct (literal) and oblique translation strategies proposed by Chesterman [1997]: to local strategies, **semantic strategies**: 1) synonymy – selecting the closest synonym, which is not the first literal translation of the source text word or phrase; 2) antonymy – selecting a word with the opposite meaning, mostly combined with a negation; 3) emphasis change – increasing, decreasing or changing the emphasis of the translated text items in comparison to the original; 4) paraphrase paraphrase – creating a liberal approximate translation wherein some lexical items may be ignored, which corresponds to Davies' and Baker's omission, as well as related or unrelated-word paraphrase [Baker, 1992]; **syntactic strategies:** 1) literal translation – following the source text form as closely as possible without following the source language structure, which, according to Venuti [2004], is an oblique method of rendering a source language text into the appropriate idiomatic or grammatical equivalent in the target language; 2) transposition – changing one part of speech into another, which corresponds to Venuti's modulation, i.e. changing in viewpoint (e.g. changing a part of speech); 3) phrase paraphrase structure change – changing the internal structure of the noun phrase or verb phrase, although the source language phrase itself maybe translated by a corresponding phrase in the target language, which correlates with transformation [Davies, 2003, p. 86] – totally changing the text in a way that could be considered distorting to the original, i.e. substitution (replacement) of a reference with another one; 4) clause and sentence structure change – changing the organization of the constituent phrases, clauses or sentences; **pragmatic strategies:** 1) cultural filtering – concrete realization, at the level of language, of the global strategy of domestication universal strategy [Venuti, 2004] or target culture-oriented translation; 2) explicitness change – adding or deleting some information to make the text more or less explicit, which also corresponds to Davies' addition – preserving the original reference but supplemented with additional information judged necessary by the translator and omission – deleting an item "so that no trace of it is found" [Davies, 2003, pp. 77, 79]. The above strategies correlate with such translation methods as direct or oblique literal translation (i.e. by equivalent), equivalent translation, lexical substitution and omission or compression.

Results

By entire sampling at the first stage of the investigation, a total of 96 lexemes (100%) were selected from the source text, namely: *both* – 62 (64.6%), *either* – 31 (32.3%), *neither* – 3 (3.1%). According to monolingual dictionary entries, the following lexico-semantic variants of the lexemes under study exist:

Both: 1) **predeterminer, determiner, pronoun, quantifier**: used to refer to **two** people or things, regarded, identified and considered together; 2) **conjunction**: used in the structure *both… and…,* wherein *both* precedes words, phrases, or clauses joined by the coordinating conjunction

and, to refer to **two** facts or alternatives and emphasize that each of them is true or possible, to indicate that not just one, but also the other of the joined elements is included and that the statement being made applies to each of the alternatives. The phrase *to have it both ways* means "to benefit from two incompatible ways of thinking or behaving".

Either: 1) **conjunction**: used before the first of **two** (occasionally more) given alternatives, the other being introduced by 'or' in the structure: *either…or…*; 2) **adverb** (with negative): a) used to indicate a similarity or link with a statement just made; b) "for that matter; moreover", used to add an extra piece of information, and to emphasize that both are equally important; 3) **determiner, pronoun, quantifier**: a) "one or the other of **two** people or things"; b) "each of two" or "both"; c) used with a broad negative to refer to each of two things, people, or situations to indicate that the negative statement includes both of them. The phrase *either way* means "whichever of two given alternatives is the case".

Neither: 1) **determiner, pronoun, quantifier**: "not the one nor the other of two people or things; not either"; 2) **conjunction:** used before the first of two (or occasionally more) alternatives, the others being introduced by 'nor' in the structure: *neither…nor…*; to indicate that they are each untrue or each does not happen: 3) **adverb**: used to introduce a further negative statement and/or to emphasize another negative statement. Syn: *nor*. The phrase *neither here nor there* means "of no importance or relevance".

The source text contains DNQs that pertain to such functional-semantic classes as: the quantifier proper, determiner, predeterminer, pronoun, emphasizing (emphatic) emphasizing pronoun, pronominal adverb and conjunction. Immediate constituents' analysis revealed the most frequent types, which are the emphatic pronoun and determiner (more than 20% each), less frequent are the conjunction, adverb and quantifier proper (12–19%), the least frequent being the pronoun and predeterminer (less than 10%). These functional-semantic types influence the choice of local translation strategies with the corresponding translation methods and determine the types of grammatical shifts.

In this paper, the DNQs are analyzed in terms of **semantic roles** (**SR**), which are defined as "the underlying relationships that a participant has with the main verb in a clause", i.e. the actual roles a participant plays in some real or imaginary situation, apart from the linguistic encoding of those situations, also known as case frames [Fillmore, 1968] and thematic roles [Dowty, 1991]. In this paper, SRs are assigned not only to arguments in predicate-argument structures but also to adjuncts.

As a result of contextual analysis, the following semantic roles of the DNQs are identified: 1) agent (**Ag**), 2) experiencer (**Ex**), 3) patient (**Pt**), 4) recipient (**Rc**), 5) instrument (**In**), 6) locative (**Lc**), 7) event (**Ev**), 8) quality (**Ql**), 9) state (**St**), 10) source (**Sc**), 11) time (**Tm**), 12) goal (**Gl**), 13) manner (**Mn**), 14) theme (**Th**), 15) quantity (**Qn**), 16) similarity (**Sm**), 17) addition (**Ad**). The most frequent are Ag (35–36.4%), Lc (14–14.6%) and Ex (11–11.4%) in the source text, while all the other roles are found in less than 10% of cases each. Ag and Ex jointly constitute almost 48% of cases as they refer to human beings who are the characters and active participants of the plot. These semantic roles also have a significant impact on the choice of translation strategies and methods in their rendering into another language.

Grammatical shifts in rendering the DNQs are, for the most part, conditioned by their syntactic functions in the source text. As a result of the sentence parsing procedure, the DNQs are found in five surface syntactic functions (**SF**) in the source text: 1) subject (48–50%), 2) object (11–11.5%), 3) predicate predicative (6–6.25%), 4) attribute (2–2.1%); 5) adverbial modifier (29–30.2%). Generally, the most numerous are the subject and adverbial modifier (50% and 31.3%, respectively); while the object is much less frequent (11.5%), the predicate, predicative and attribute being the least frequent functions (less than 7% each). The procedure of detailed parsing revealed three deep SFs of the DNQs, namely: 1) determiner (22–22.9%), 2) subject & object complement compound (21–21.9%), 3) connector (19–19.8%). Distributed almost equally, the deep SFs are registered in 62 cases (64.6%), whereas in 34 cases (35.4%), the DNQs perform solely surface SFs.

Besides, 19 combinations of the DNQs' semantic roles and surface syntactic functions are registered in the source text, among which the most frequent is Ag subject (more than 35%); while Ex subject and AM of place and similarity are less frequent (more than 10% each), the oth-

er 16 combinations being considerably less frequent (less than 10% each). These combinations of semantic roles and syntactic functions determine the types of grammatical shifts in rendering the DNQs, as well as the translation methods incorporated in the local and global translation strategies.

Translation methods of English DNQs into Ukrainian include equivalent translation, lexical substitution and omission. According to bilingual dictionary entries, the following direct (pure) translation equivalents of the DNQs are available:

Both: 1) predeterminer, determiner, pronoun, quantifier: a) *обидва* (masculine and neuter gender)*, обидві* (feminine gender) – Ukrainian collective numerals that denote "each of the two mentioned or known persons, things, objects, phenomena etc.", syn. *обоє*; b) *той і другий; і той, і другий* – pronominal phrases comprised of the indicative pronoun *той [that]* and the ordinal numeral *другий [second]*, which corresponds to the cardinal numeral *one*, linked by the coordinate conjunction *i [and]*; **2)** adverb: *теж, також* – Ukrainian adverbs *[also, too, likewise, as well]*; **3)** conjunction *both… and…*: *як… так і…; і… і…; [and… and…]*, *не тільки… а (але) й… [not only but also]* – compound coordinate conjunctions that link homogeneous members of a sentence.

Either: 1) determiner, pronoun, quantifier: a) *той чи той* – indicative pronouns linked by the disjunctive conjunction *[that or that]*; *один з двох* – numerals *[one of two]*; *кожний* – attributive pronoun *[every, each; any]*; b) *обидва* – collective numeral *[both]*; *on either side* – *з обох боків, обабіч*; c) *будь-який* (з двох) – indefinite pronoun *[some, any; whichever, (of two)]*; *either will do* – *перший-ліпший підійде*; **2)** adverb: *також, теж* – adverbs that mean *also, too, likewise* used with negative; **3)** conjunction: *або* – disjunctive conjunction *[or]*; *either …or…* – *або … або … [or…or…]*.

Neither: 1) determiner: *ні той, ні інший*; (iterative negative particle with the indicative pronoun *той [that]* and attributive pronoun *інший [other, another, different]* – *[not that, not other]*]; *жоден* – negative pronoun used with the subject or object in negative sentences to express absolute negation; *ні один, ніякий [no one, not any, none, nobody]*; **2)** pronoun, quantifier: *ніхто* – a negative pronoun to express absolute absence of the animate subject or object of action *[nobody, no one, none]*; *жоден [no one, not any, none, nobody]*. **3)** adverb: *також не* – adverb *[also, too, likewise]* with the negative particle *не [not]*; **4)** conjunction: *neither … nor* – *ні … ні …* (negative emphatic coordinating conjunction comprised of the negative particle *ні [no, not, not any]* preceding each alternative); *neither here nor there* – *ні до ладу, ні до прикладу*; *не до речі*.

In this research, these equivalents are classified as pure equivalents that in translation practice can be blended, or mixed, with other elements, thus leading to modulation, emphasis change, grammatical shifts, etc.

Translation transformational analysis revealed the following local strategies applied in rendering the DNQs: 1) literal translation, which, borrowing Chesterman's idea, is regarded as a default strategy, 2) source text-oriented strategy of semantic translation, 3) target text-oriented strategy of communicative translation – each implemented alongside the target text-oriented strategy of domestication. Correlating with the above strategies are the following main translation methods: 1) equivalent translation, 2) lexical substitution and 3) omission.

Rendering 'both' into Ukrainian involves such methods as equivalent translation (10 of 62 cases (16.1%)), lexical substitution (3–4.8%) and omission (49–79%), which correlate with Chesterman's syntactic, semantic and pragmatic local strategies incorporated in literal, semantic and communicative translation strategies..

In particular, literal (equivalent) translation direct literal translation strategy of *both* is registered in 10 cases of 62 (16.1%), with *both* being a quantifier proper (1–1.6%), pronominal quantifier (i.e. pronoun) (5–8%), including a pro-form (1–1.6%), and a determiner quantifier (i.e. determiner) (4–6.4%).

As a **quantifier** and a **pronoun,** *both* is rendered into Ukrainian by means of the dual-number collective numerals *обидва, обоє [both, the two]* in the following phrases: *both of them, sitting* – *вони обоє сиділи* (quantifier)*; both very bright* – *обидва розумні* (pronoun)*; they both turned away to hide their laughter* – *відвернувшись, обоє пирснули сміхом; they both grinned обидва усміхнулися* (emphasizing pronoun). As a **determiner** *both* is rendered by the dual-num-

ber collective numeral *обидва / обидві* in the attributive function in the following word combi-nations: **both** *teams* – **обидві** *команди*; **both** *Bludgers* – **обидва** *важкі бладжери*; **both** *hands* – **обидві** *руки*; *from* **both** *wands* – *з* **обох** *чарівних паличок.*

The following fragment illustrates a direct literal translation strategy involving equivalent translation of the determiner *both* in the syntactic function of a recipient (malfactive) object:

(E) *Madam Hooch awarded* **both** *teams penalties.*

(U) *Мадам Гуч покарала* **обидві** *команди штрафними ударами.*

The following case is equivalent translation of *both* as a pronoun in the syntactic function of experiencer subject in an elliptical sentence by the dual-number collective numeral *обидва* asso-ciated with literal translation strategy:

(E) **Both** *very bright, of course – exceptionally bright, in fact.*

(U) **Обидва** *розумні... блискучий розум…*

Equivalent translation of *both* as a source object determiner is as follows:

(E) *A flash of blue-white light erupted from* **both** *wands.*

(U) *З* **обох** *чарівних паличок вистрілило сліпуче блакитно-біле світло*.

In this case, equivalent translation of *both* is affiliated with the local syntactic strategy of sentence structure change, resulting in word order change by shifting the prepositional object to the initial position followed by the predicate, with the subject in the final position, which is norm in Ukrainian whereby the theme of an utterance precedes the rheme in actual division. This syn-tactic strategy, in its turn, suggests the application of the target reader-oriented communicative translation strategy.

Below is equivalent translation of *both* as Ag subject by means of the dual-number collec-tive numeral *обоє* in the syntactic function of a postpositive attribute:

(E) *They were there,* **both** *of them, sitting outside Florean Fortescue's Ice Cream Parlor.*

(U) *Вони* **обоє** *сиділи біля «Кафе-морозива Флореана Фортеск'ю».*

This case illustrates the application of the communicative translation strategy incorporat-ing the syntactic strategy of sentence structure change by compression of the phrase *"they were there, both of them, sitting…"* reducing it to (literally) **they were both sitting*, which results in explicitness change on the pragmatic level and a slight decrease in emphasis. This, in turn, im-plies the application of the pragmatic strategy of explicitness change and the semantic strategy of emphasis change.

Equivalent translation of *both* as an emphatic quantifier in the function of Ag subject by the collective dual-number numeral *обоє* is as follows:

(E) *[…] they* **both** *turned away to hide their laughter […]*

(U) *[…] відвернувшись,* **обоє** *пирснули сміхом.*

In this fragment, the syntactic strategy of clause structure change is applied involving, first-ly, the predicate's shift to the initial position (before the subject) and its converting into a non-finite form (adverbial participle) and, secondly, deleting the first part of the subject *they both*, i.e. rendering the emphatic pronoun *both* by its neutral, emphasis-free equivalent, which leads to emphasis decrease, thus resulting in literally **turning/having turned away, both burst out laughing*. These transformations suggest implementing the target reader-oriented communica-tive translation strategy.

The following fragment illustrates equivalent translation of *both* as a pro-form in two simul-taneous syntactic functions, namely Ev object and Ev predicate connector, in an elliptical nomi-native sentence:

(E) *Did you check the lunar chart and realize that I was always ill at the full moon? Or did you realize that the Boggart changed into the moon when it saw me?" "***Both**,*" Hermione said quietly.*

(U) *Ти перевірила місячні фази і зрозуміла, що я завжди хворію під час повного місяця? Чи, може, помітила, що ховчик, коли мене бачить, завжди перетворюється на місяць? –* **І те, і те, І те, і те**, *– тихо відказала Герміона.*

In the above case, the pronoun *both* is rendered by the iterative coordinating conjunction *i [and]* comprising the structure *i…, i…*, whose pure (direct) equivalents is *both… and...*, with the addition of the iterative demonstrative pronoun *me* forming the phrase **i me, i me** *[*and that, and that]* with reference to the options expressed in the previous two interrogative sentences. In the function of Ev object, the reconstructed two-member sentence is **I did both,* which sug-

gests applying the syntactic strategy of phrase structure change in communicative translation. In the further reconstruction of this pro-form's referent, its function can also be defined as Ev predicate connector in the sentence *I both checked… and realized…*, which makes it possible to classify this case as a blended equivalent (with addition) employed in literal translation.

There is one case of equivalent translation of *both* as a conjunctive adverb in the structure *both… and* in a mixed locative-temporative semantic role and the syntactic function of adverbial modifier of place and time, whereby literal translation strategy is realized, e.g.:

(E) *"I knew your father very well, **both** at Hogwarts **and** later, Harry", he said gently.*

(U) *"Я дуже добре знав твого батька – **і** в Гоґвортсі, **і** пізніше", – м'яко вимовив він.*

Thus, in the target text, the Ukrainian pure equivalents of *both* include the dual-number collective numerals **обидва, обоє** [both, the two], the iterative coordinating conjunction **і…, і…** [and…, and…], and the compound conjunctive phrase **і те, і те** [*and that, and that], which is herein regarded as a blended equivalent. As a result of the analysis, the following strategies have been identified: the syntactic strategy of sentence/clause structure change, which includes, in particular, word order change, addition and compression, the semantic strategy of emphasis decrease and the pragmatic strategy of explicitness change. Besides, they are found incorporated into communicative translation strategy (5–50%) and literal translation strategy (4–40%), with 10% of cases displaying ambiguous, mixed characteristics, which is evidence of certain overlap as to their differentiation.

Lexical substitution of *both* is found in three cases, wherein it is substituted for the adverbs of time *двічі [twice]* and *водночас [simultaneously; at the same time]*, and the numeral *два [two]*. In these contexts, *both* explicitly manifests its genuine dual-number nature, which makes it logical to render them by numerals. Such cases illustrate the oblique semantic strategy of modulation and the semantic strategy of synonymic translation.

The sentence below shows lexical substitution of the quantifier *both* as an experiencer subject by the numeral *two*:

(E) *"You're nutters, **both** of you", said Ron shakily.*

(U) *"Ви якісь... **два** психи", – тремтячим голосом озвався Рон.*

The syntactic strategy of phrase structure change can be observed in the following case of lexico-grammatical substitution of the conjunctive adverb *both* in the structure *both… and…* in the St predicative function for the adverb of time *водночас* in the function of adverbial modifier of time:

(E) *Harry turned around to see Professor Lupin, who looked **both** shaken **and** pleased.*

(U) *Гаррі озирнувся й побачив професора Люпина, що здавався враженим і щасливим* **водночас**.

Below is lexico-grammatical substitution wherein the Ev subject determiner *both* is substituted for the temporal adverb *двічі [twice]* in the function of adverbial modifier of time, which is reiterated in the target sentence to produce the stylistic effect of emphasis in accordance with the semantic strategy of emphasis change and paraphrase combined with the syntactic strategy of phrase structure change:

(E) *The fact remained, however, that it had now appeared twice, and **both** appearances had been followed by near-fatal accidents.*

(U) *Та хоч би там як було, а Ґрим з'являвся уже двічі, і* **двічі** *Гаррі ледь не загинув.*

In the above case, semantic and syntactic changes are incorporated into the target reader-oriented communicative translation strategy, whereby the translation is to a great extent distorting to the original.

Thus, the target text contains one lexical substitution of *both* for the cardinal numeral *два [two]* (33.3% of 3 cases) and two lexico-grammatical substitutions of *both* as a determiner and a conjunctive adverb for the adverbs of time *двічі [twice]* and *водночас [simultaneously; at the same time]* (66.7%). These cases exemplify the semantic strategy of modulation synonymic translation incorporated in semantic and communicative translation strategies.

Omission of *both* is registered in 49 of 62 cases (79%): as a quantifier proper (6–9.7%), emphatic quantifier (18–29%), determiner (5–8%), predeterminer (1–1.6%), pronoun (5–8%), conjunction (14–22.6%). The use of this translation method is evident in applying the communicative translation strategy combined with the syntactic strategy of clause and sentence structure

changes, semantic strategies of paraphrase and emphasis change, and the pragmatic strategy of explicitness change.

Omission of *both* as a quantifier proper occurs in such contexts as *teachers, **both** of whom had lasted only one year; **both** of them had their eyes open; **both** of them looked up at the ceiling; Ron edged away from **both** of them; confounded, **both** of them; **both** of you.* Below is omission of *both* as an Ag subject:

(E) ***Both** of them had their eyes open too, reflecting the starry ceiling.*

(U) *Вони лежали з розплющеними очима і розглядали зоряну стелю.*

In this case, the phrase structure change and paraphrase lead to explicitness change on the pragmatic level, which conveys the overall message in communicative translation. However, such changes distort the source sentence, altering it to (literally) *they were lying with open eyes / their eyes open…*

The following case is omission of Ex subject in an elliptical verbless sentence:

(E) *Confounded, **both** of them…*

(U) *Їх цілком збили з пантелику.*

In the above fragment, the phrase structure change causes explicitness change by deleting the reference to dual number, accompanied by word order change and paraphrasing by adding the adverbial modifier of degree *цілком [entirely, absolutely, completely, totally],* which, nonetheless, suffices to efficiently express the message in communicative translation, albeit in violation of the original, translated back literally as *they are entirely confounded*.

Omission of locative object is as follows:

(E) *Ron edged away from **both** of them, dragging his leg.*

(U) *Рон, притримуючи ногу, почав від них відповзати.*

This is a similar case of explicitness change on the pragmatic level, resulting from deleting the reference to a dual number, combined with word order change and substitution of the participle *dragging* for the adverbial participle that literally means *holding back* (unrelated-word paraphrase) to provide communicative translation with a certain disregard for accuracy of the information contained in the original.

Omission of *both* as an emphatic quantifier is registered in such contexts as: *he and Hedwig were **both** asleep; he poked them **both** awake; they were **both** abroad; they were **both** wide and muscley; I want to see you **both**; they **both** opened their books; they **both** had to stifle their laughs; Harry and Ron, who **both** staggered away; Ron and Hermione had **both** placed hands on the top of Harry's head; they were **both** staring at him; Harry and Ron **both** made furious moves; they **both** glared at Hermione; you're **both** mental; Black and Lupin were **both** out of their minds; Black and Lupin **both** looked staggered; Black and Lupin **both** gone; they **both** burst into speech; they **both** took a fourth piece of chocolate.* Such cases suggest applying the semantic strategy of emphasis decrease in communicative translation. For instance, omission of the emphatic quantifier *both* as an Ag subject is as follows:

(E) *"Right," said Ron as they **both** opened their books at pages five and six.*

(U) *"Так", – сказав Рон, коли вони розгорнули книжки на п'ятій і шостій сторінках.*

This fragment illustrates the decrease in the semantic strategy of emphasis and the change in the pragmatic strategy of explicitness by deleting the reference to dual numbers in providing communicative translation.

The next case is omission of *both* as an experiencer subject:

(E) *Black and Lupin **both** looked staggered.*

(U) *Блек і Люпин були приголомшені.*

This exemplifies the application of the semantic strategy of emphasis decrease and the pragmatic strategy of explicitness change in combination with unrelated-word paraphrase by substituting the link verb *look* in the compound nominal predicate for the verb of being, which is a more general word, literally translated back as *Black and Lupin were staggered.*

The following two are similar cases of emphasis decrease and explicitness change in communicative translation, e.g. omission of *both* as a patient object:

(E) *Harry sighed, then poked them **both** awake.*

(U) *Гаррі зітхнув, а тоді поштурхав їх, щоб розбудити.*

Below is omission of *both* being a goal object complement:

(E) *I want to see you **both**!*

(U) *Ви мені потрібні!*

Despite the fact that the latter case presents a scarce opportunity for valid word-for-word translation, the target sentence is transformed into (literally) *I need you by means of word order change and paraphrasing with omission of the verb *to see*.

Omission of *both* as a determiner occurs in the following word combinations: **both** *hands*, **both** *arms*, **both** *sets of front claws*, and as a predeterminer in one case **both** *its rotting hands*. The fragment below contains omission of *both* as an agentive instrument object determiner:

(E) *Harry threw himself forward, took **both** hands off his broom.*

(U) *Гаррі метнувся вперед і випустив з рук мітлу.*

This illustrates explicitness change by shifting the reference to dual number into implication, with the noun *hands* used in the plural implicitly indicating "a pair" in the target sentence.

Similarly, the dual number is implied in the following two fragments where the strategy of explicitness change is observed, e.g. omission of *both* as an agentive instrument subject determiner:

(E) *Crookshanks had joined the fray; **both** sets of front claws had sunk themselves deep into Harry's arm.*

(U) *У битву встряг Криволапик – його пазурі вп'ялися в Гарріну руку.*

Omission of *both* as a predeterminer in an agentive instrument object group is shown in the following sentence:

(E) *Then it raised **both** its rotting hands — and lowered its hood.*

(U) *Тоді підняв свої зогнилі руки... і відкинув каптур.*

Omission of *both* as a pronoun is found in the following contexts: **both** *waving frantically at him*, **both** *very pale*, **both** *smirking in a satisfied sort of way*, **both** *holding the Firebolt*, **both** *raised their wands*.

For example, omission of *both* as an agentive subject is as follows:

(E) *He and Hermione paused, gasping for breath, edging forward. **Both** raised their wands to see what lay beyond.*

(U). *Вони з Герміоною [...] Вони з Герміоною, відсапуючись, на хвильку зупинилися, підняли чарівні палички й зазирнули всередину.*

This case illustrates explicitness change in combination with sentence structure change involving deletion of the phrase *edging forward* as well as the DNQ *both* in communicative translation, which is to some extent a distortion of the source text.

Below is omission of *both* as an experiencer subject in a verbless clause:

(E) *Ginny and Neville looked back at him, **both** very pale.*

(U) *Сполотнілі Джіні з Невілом дивилися на нього.*

This communicative translation fragment contains clause structure change resulting from omission of the DNQ and the adverb of degree *very*, with word order change, which leads to changes in emphasis and explicitness.

The conjunctive adverb *both* in the structure *both… and* occurs in the following phrases: **both** *Harry* **and** *Ron*; **both** *Harry* **and** *Hermione*; **both** *Lavender* **and** *Parvati*; **both** *Ron* **and** *Hermione*; **both** *excited* **and** *apprehensive*; **both** *boring* **and** *useless*; **both** *inside* **and** *outside*; **both** *stunned* **and** *impressed*; **both** *the Ravenclaw* **and** *Hufflepuff tables*; **both** *Black* **and** *Lupin.* In such phrases omission of *both* causes emphasis decrease, e.g. the case below illustrates omission of *both* integrated into the agent subject that consists of two homogeneous members of the sentence expressed by proper names:

(E) ***Both** Ron **and** Hermione had tried to disarm Snape at exactly the same moment.*

(U) *Одночасно з ним Снейпа обеззброїли Рон і Герміона.*

Similarly, omission of *both* being part of an experiencer subject is as follows:

(E) ***Both** Ron **and** Hermione seemed to be much more frightened of Black than he was.*

(U) *Вони злякалися Блека значно більше, ніж він.*

In this case, omission of *both* results in a decrease in emphasis and is combined with replacement of the proper names by the personal pronoun *вони [they]*, thus reducing the target sentence subject to *they,* which manifests a concise way of presenting information with disregard for details in communicative translation.

Below is omission of *both* incorporated in an adverbial modifier of place:

(E) *There was a stunned silence, **both** inside **and** outside the common room.*

(U) *Запала приголомшлива тиша.*

(E) *The whole common room listened with bated breath. "Sir Cadogan, did you just let a man enter Gryffindor Tower?" "Certainly, good lady!" cried Sir Cadogan. There was a stunned silence, **both** inside **and** outside the common room. "You – you did?" said Professor McGonagall.*

(U) *Уся вітальня затамувала віддих. – Сер Кадоґан, чи впускали ви щойно у ґрифіндорську вежу якогось чоловіка? – Авжеж, милостива пані! – вигукнув сер Кадоґан. Запала приголомшлива тиша. – Ви... ви це зробили?*

In this fragment, the entire adverbial modifier of place is omitted, resulting in sentence structure change and explicitness change, which is presumably caused by an effort to focus more on the dynamism of the events being described, as well as on the characters' feelings and behavior, rather than on the details of the external surroundings in accordance with the global strategy of domestication, which directly correlates with the pragmatic strategy of cultural filtering in providing a target reader-oriented communicative translation.

The following is omission of *both* in a compound nominal predicate expressed by two homogeneous participles participial adjectives that denote emotional state:

(E) *"Hermione!" Ron said again, sounding **both** stunned **and** impressed.*

(U) *«Герміоно!..» – не знаходив слів приголомшено-захоплений Рон.*

The above fragment displays the semantic strategy of emphasis decrease and the syntactic strategies of phrase structure change and modulation, as it contains a 'predicative'predicate→attribute' grammatical shift wherein the separate participles *stunned* and *impressed* are replaced by a synthetic form, namely the equivalent compound adjective *приголомшено-захоплений* used in the attributive function in the agentive subject group.

Omission of the conjunction *both* incorporated in homogeneous patient objects is observed in the fragment below:

(E) *He grabbed **both** Harry **and** Ron and pulled them into a bone-breaking hug.*

(U) *Він притулив до себе Гаррі й Рона і так їх стиснув, що аж затріщали кості.*

The overall message in the communicative translation above is not affected by a slight decrease in emphasis caused by omission of *both* in the object group.

Thus, the most frequent method of rendering *both* into Ukrainian in the target text is omission (49–79 %), which in some cases is not entirely justified with respect to the accuracy of translation but is widely employed in the implementation of the target reader-oriented communicative translation strategy that correlates with the semantic strategies of paraphrase and emphasis change, the syntactic strategies of phrase, clause & sentence structure change and modulation, as well as with the pragmatic strategy of explicitness decrease. The vast majority of cases contain omission of *both* as a conjunctive adverb in the structure *both… and…* (14 of 16 cases (87.5%)) and an emphatic pronoun (18 of 21 cases (85.7%)). Omission of *both* as a quantifier proper is registered in 6 of 8 cases (75%), as a pronoun in 5 of 7 cases (71.4%), and as a determiner and predeterminer in 6 of 10 cases (60%). Equivalent translation of *both* is found in 10 cases of 62 (16.1%), namely: as a pronoun – 5 (50% of 10), including a pro-form (1–10%), determiner – 4 (40%) and conjunction – 1 (10%), which suggests implementing the "default" literal translation strategy. Substitution of *both* as a determiner, quantifier and conjunction occurs in three cases (4.8% of 62), among which lexical substitution – one case (1.6%) and lexico-grammatical substitution – two cases (3.2%), which is evident in the application of synonymic translation strategy the syntactic strategy of modulation combined with phrase structure change and emphasis change in rendering *both* into Ukrainian in line with semantic translation.

Rendering 'either' into Ukrainian includes such methods as equivalent translation (9–29%) of 31 cases, lexical substitution (12–38.7%), and omission (10–32.3%) in accordance with literal, semantic, and communicative translation strategies.

Literal translation strategy is observed in the cases of equivalent translation of *either*, in particular with *either* as a pronominal adverb in negative sentences by means of the Ukrainian adverbial phrases ***також не*** *[neither; not either]*, ***теж нічого / нікого*** *[literally: *also nothing / nobody] [also nothing / nobody]*, **теж ніколи** *[literally: *also never] [also never]* in the syntactic function of adverbial modifier of similarity and addition; adverbial modifier of manner that

expresses similarity or addition. In this function, although the lexeme *either* cannot be classified as a DNQ proper, it nonetheless retains its dual-number nature as, according to monolingual-dictionary entries [John Sinclair, John M. Sinclair, 2008], it is used as an adverb at the end of the second negative statement to indicate "a similarity or link with a statement just made", to add "an extra piece of information and to emphasize that both are equally important". For this reason, such cases are also analyzed in this research.

For instance, below is equivalent translation of *either* as an adverb in the function of adverbial modifier of manner that expresses similarity in a negative sentence by the adverb *також*, which shifts to the position before the verb:

(E) *Harry's other best friend from Hogwarts, Hermione Granger, hadn't been in touch **either**.*

(U) *Ще одна добра Гарріна приятелька з Гоґвортсу Герміона Ґрейнджер, **також** не озивалася.*

The next case is equivalent translation of *either* in the function of adverbial modifier of addition, adverbial modifier of manner whose semantic role is the addition of another fact expressed in the negative statement: another object of the action performed by the agent:

(E) *"Your father didn't set much store by rules **either**",*

(U) *"І правила твій батько **також** не зневажав"*

(E) *"My dad didn't strut," said Harry, before he could stop himself. "And neither do I". – "Your father didn't set much store by rules **either**," Snape went on, pressing his advantage, his thin face full of malice.*

(U) *"Мій тато не задирав носа!" – не стримався Гаррі. – "І я також". "І правила твій батько **також** не зневажав", – не вгавав Снейп, а його худе обличчя спотворювала злоба.*

The following fragment illustrates equivalent translation of *either* by the adverb *теж*, whose function is adverbial modifier of manner expressing similarity is adverbial modifier of similarity**:**

(E) *"Harry! I forgot you weren't going to Hogsmeade **either**!"*

(U) *"Гаррі! Я й забув, що ти **теж** не їдеш у Гоґсмід!"*

As an adverb in negative sentences *either* also occurs in the following contexts: *Hermione Granger, hadn't been in touch **either** – Герміона Ґрейнджер, **також** не озивалася; Ron, who wasn't eating **either** – Рон, який **теж** нічого не їв; nothing there **either** – там **теж** нікого; she's never missed one of them **either** – вона **теж** ніколи не пропускає; you weren't going to Hogsmeade **either** – ти **теж** не їдеш у Гоґсмід; I haven't done it **either** – я **теж** його ще не написав.*

Equivalent translation of the determiner *either* by the collective numeral *обидва* is found one time (3.2%) of 31 in the following case:

(E) *They seated themselves **on either side** of Harry and didn't talk to each other for the whole class.*

(U) *Герміона з Роном сіли **по обидва боки** від Гаррі і не розмовляли до кінця уроку.*

Equivalent translation of *either* as a conjunction in the structure *either… or…* is registered one time (3.2%) by means of the iterative conjunction *або…або…*, e.g.:

(E) *"It was **either** a very big cat **or** quite a small tiger", said Harry.*

(U) *"**Або** величезний кіт, **або** маленький тигр, – відповів Гаррі".*

The above case illustrates literal translation combined with sentence structure change by compression, i.e. deleting the subject *it* and the linking verb *was*, resulting in an elliptical sentence, which can be regarded as oblique literal translation.

Thus, equivalent translation of *either* includes 9 cases of 31 (29%), with *either* being a pronominal adverb, determiner and conjunction, of which one case is direct literal translation (3.2%), and 8 cases (25.8%) contain pure equivalents accompanied by clause / sentence structure changes (mainly word order changes) that occur due to structural differences between the two languages. One blended equivalent (with substitution). It should be noted that no cases of equivalent translation of *either* as a quantifier proper have been found in the analyzed text.

The **semantic strategies** of synonymic translation, phrase structure change, emphasis change and modulation are observed in the cases of l**exical substitution** of *either* registered 12 times (38.7%) out of 31, with *either* being a determiner (6–19.3%) and an adverb (6–19.3%). It should be noted that the above strategies are implemented in line with the global strategy of domestication and the local target text-oriented strategy of semantic translation.

Lexical substitution of *either* as a determiner occurs in the locative phrase **on either side**, where it is rendered into Ukrainian by the adverbs of place (locative adverbs) **поруч** *[near, close by, side by side, beside]*, **пообіруч** *[on both sides]*, **обабіч** *[on both sides; on each side],* the adverb of manner **обіруч** *[with both hands]*; and in the adverbial phrase **either way** -- **так чи інакше** *[in either case, anyhow, somehow or other, by some means or other, right or wrong]*.

(which, in fact, are equivalents blended with substitution).

These cases are evidence of implementing the semantic strategy of related and unrelated-word paraphrase. For example, lexical substitution of the locative phrase *on either side* with the adverb of place *поруч* is illustrated below:

(E) *They went to sit down **on either side** of her. Harry prodded her awake.*

(U) *Вони посідали **поруч** і Гаррі легенько її штурхнув.*

The following is contextual lexical substitution of the phrase *on either side* for the adverb of place *пообіруч [on both sides, on all sides]*:

(E) *Without warning, twelve-foot wings flapped open **on either side** of Harry.*

(U) *Зненацька **пообіруч** від Гаррі розгорнулися десятиметрові крила.*

Lexical substitution of *either* as a determiner of a locative noun in the function of adverbial modifier of place for the Ukrainian locative adverb *обабіч* is as follows:

(E) *As the carriage trundled toward a pair of magnificent wrought iron gates, flanked with stone columns topped with winged boars, Harry saw two more towering, hooded Dementors, standing guard **on either side.***

(U) *Коли диліжанс підкотився до розкішних кованих залізних воріт, **обабіч** яких стояли кам'яні колони з крилатими вепрами угорі, Гаррі побачив ще двох дементорів у каптурах, що височіли біля воріт на варті.*

The context *gripping **on either side** of his neck – **обіруч** міцно обхопив шию*, where **обіруч** is an adverb of manner that means that translates *'with both hands'* (unrelated-word paraphrase strategy). These substitutions are caused by the differences in the grammatical structures of English and Ukrainian; in particular, analytical forms in English correspond to synthetic forms in Ukrainian. On the other hand, such cases could also be classified as omissions with compensation by unrelated-word paraphrase (*gripping on **either** side – **обіруч** обхопив [gripping with both hands]*) and compensation by synonymy (related-word paraphrase), e.g. the metonymic lexico-grammatical substitution of the locative phrase *on either side* with the adverb of manner **обіруч** *[with both hands]* is as follows:

(E) *"Get on – there's not much time," said Harry, gripping Buckbeak firmly **on either side** of his sleek neck to hold him steady.*

(U) *"Швиденько... мало часу!" – сказав Гаррі. Він **обіруч** міцно обхопив лискучу шию Бакбика, утримуючи його на місці.*

In the above case, the local strategy of semantic translation involves unrelated-word paraphrase strategy with noun structure change.

Lexico-grammatical substitution of *either* as a determiner of the action noun *way* in the function of adverbial modifier of manner is in the following sentence:

(E) *"It all depends on the points -- a margin of a hundred **either way**."*

(U) *"Все залежатиме від очок – **так чи інакше** усе вирішить якась сотня"*

This case contains a substitution of the noun phrase *either way* for two adverbs of manner linked by an alternative conjunction to form a phrase that literally means *[*so/like this (that) or otherwise]*.

As an adverb *either* occurs in the syntactic functions of adverbial modifier of manner whose semantic roles are addition and similarity. In the former case, *either* is rendered into Ukrainian by means of the adverbial phrases *до того ж [besides; moreover; in addition]*, *а ще [more, in addition, as well, too]* and coordinating connective conjunctions *й [and]*, *і [and]*. In the latter case *either* is rendered by the emphasizing interrogative particle **чи** *[is that so?, really?]* and the negative compound coordinating conjunction *ні… ні… [neither… nor…]*.

Below is lexical substitution of *either* as an adverb in the function of adverbial modifier of addition for the adverbial phrase *до того ж [literally *to that]*, whose pure equivalents are *besides; moreover; in addition*:

(E) *Harry was still an underage wizard, and he was forbidden by wizard law to do magic outside school. His record wasn't exactly clean **either.***

(U) *Гаррі й досі був неповнолітнім чарівником, якому за чаклунськими законами заборонялося вдаватися до магії поза школою. **До того ж** минулого літа Гаррі вже отримав офіційне попередження.*

This fragment illustrates unrelated-word paraphrase with sentence structure change, which is a distortion of the original presumably resorted to in implementing the communicative translation strategy.

Lexical substitution of *either* in the function of adverbial modifier of addition for the adverb **ще** *[more, in addition, as well, too]* with the coordinating connective conjunction **a** *[and]* in the phrase **a ще** *[literally *and more]* is as follows:

(E) *[…] they were both abroad, and with Hedwig gone, he had no means of contacting them. He didn't have any Muggle money, **either**.*

(U) *[…] вони були за кордоном, а без Гедвіги він навіть не міг з ними зв'язатися. **А ще** він зовсім не мав маґлівських грошей.*

In this case, the local semantic synonymic translation strategy is combined with the paraphrase strategy, which is realized through the addition of a connective conjunction **a** *[and]* at the beginning of the sentence.

The following case illustrates lexical substitution of the synonymic translation strategy combined with emphasis change and sentence structure change, e.g. contextual lexical substitution of *either* as an adverb in the function of adverbial modifier of addition for the coordinating connective conjunction **й** *[and]*, which is close in meaning to the particles *теж, також [also, too, likewise, as well]*:

(E) *But Hermione didn't turn up all lesson… Hermione wasn't at lunch **either**.*

(U*) Але Герміона так і не з'явилася на уроці… Герміона не прийшла **й** на обід.*

Lexical substitution of *either* in the function of adverbial modifier of addition in a negative sentence for the coordinating connective conjunction **i** *[and]* is below:

(E) *It wasn't a horse. It wasn't a unicorn, **either**. It was a stag*.

(U) *То був не кінь. **І** не оноріг. То був олень.*

Lexical substitution Antonymic translation strategy with paraphrase and sentence structure change can be observed in the following case of *either* being an adverb in the function of adverbial modifier of similarity in a negative sentence for the negative compound coordinating conjunction **ні… ні…** *[neither… nor…]*:

(E) *The Dursleys didn't sign my permission form, and Fudge wouldn't **either.***

(U) ***Ні** Дурслі, **ні** Фадж не підписали мені дозволу.*

The next case illustrates unrelated-word paraphrase strategy combined with emphasis change via lexical substitution of *either* as an adverb in the syntactic function of adverbial modifier of similarity in a negative sentence for the emphatic interrogative particle **чи**, which is used for emphasis at the beginning of rhetorical questions with the meaning *is that so?, really?* to express confidence or certainty about a contrary answer:

(E) *"Don' listen properly, do they? Don' look properly **either**"*.

(U) *"А хіба вони взагалі щось чують? **Чи** бачать?"*

On the whole, the target text contains cases of lexical substitution of *either* as a pronominal adverb or as a determiner, with no cases of *either* as a quantifier proper, pronoun, or conjunction.

Omission of *either* is found in 10 cases (32.3%), where *either* is a quantifier (3–9.7%), determiner (5–16.1%), adverb (1–3.2%) and conjunction (1–3.2%). The main translation strategies in these cases are domestication and communicative translation with clause / sentence structure changes. In these cases, the meaning conveyed by *either* is not necessary in adequate comprehension of the target text and in many a case the translation is, to a great extent, target reader oriented.

Omission of the quantifier *either* as Ex subject is shown in the following fragment, wherein the subject *you* employed alone suffices in the target sentence:

(E) *"Have **either** of you ever seen anything in a crystal ball?"*

(U) *"А ви бачили хоч що-небудь у тій кришталевій кулі?"*

The following case illustrates omission of the quantifier *either* as Ag subject accompanied by clause structure change:

(E) *Before **either** of them could say another word, something ginger streaked past Harry; Crookshanks leapt onto Black's chest and settled himself there, right over Black's heart.*

(U) *Тієї миті щось руде метнулося повз Гаррі – Криволапик стрибнув Блекові на груди, мовби захищаючи йому серце.*

In this case the temporal clause *before **either of them** could say another word* is rendered into Ukrainian by means of the temporal phrase *мієї миті [at that moment; in an instant, in a flash*], whereby the translator resorts to compression, replacing the entire adverbial clause with an adverbial temporal phrase, presumably focusing on providing only essential details relating to the duration of the events being described in the dynamically unwinding situation, with disregard for other details in communicative translation.

Omission of *either* as a determiner is registered in the locative phrases **on either side** of him / her / them **from either side**. *on **either** side of the window frame* in the syntactic function of adverbial modifier of place, e.g.

(E) *Black placed a hand on **either** side of the window frame.*

(U) *Блек ухопився за віконну раму.*

(E) *Black placed a hand on **either** side of the window frame and heaved his head and shoulders out of it.*

(U) *Блек ухопився за віконну раму і висунув надвір голову й плечі.*

The above target sentence contains predicate paraphrase with compression of the locative object group, resulting in **Black gripped / seized the window frame.*

Omission of *either* as an adverb in the function of adverbial modifier of manner expressing similarity in a negative sentence is as follows:

(E) *"Neville, I believe you live with your grandmother?"<…> "But – I don't want the Boggart to turn into her **either**".*

(U) *"Невіле, здається, ти живеш з бабусею?" <…> "Але... я не хочу, щоб ховчик перетворився на бабусю".*

In the above target sentence, the adverb *також / теж* is omitted without affecting the overall message in communicative translation.

There is one case of omission of *either* as a conjunction within a compound verbal double predicate compound nominal predicate of state in a negative sentence:

(E) *To his great surprise, Hermione did not appear **either** excited **or** intrigued by the news. On the contrary, her face fell, and she bit her lip.*

(U) *На його превеликий подив, Герміона спохмурніла й закусила губу.*

In this case, the original fragment *"did not appear **either** excited **or** intrigued by the news. On the contrary"* is deleted from the target text, which implies an unjustified blending of partial translation with communicative translation.

Generally, omission is predominantly observed in the cases of *either* being a quantifier proper and a determiner in the locative phrase '*either side*', whereas in the cases of *either* as an adverb and a conjunction omission is much less frequent.

Thus, the analysis has shown that literal translation, lexical substitution and omission are almost equally employed in rendering *either* into Ukrainian – around 33% respectively. The most frequent method is lexical substitution, found in 12 out of 31 cases (38.7%); slightly less frequent are translation by equivalent and omission, registered in 9 (29%) and 10 cases (32.3%), respectively. It should be noted that in some cases omission does not appear completely justified. is omission These translation methods correlate with the local strategies of semantic, literal and communicative translation. The most recurrent semantic translation strategy (38.7%) incorporates synonymic translation, phrase structure change, emphasis change and clause /sentence structure changes. Less recurrent are literal translation via pure and/or blended equivalents (29%) and communicative translation (32.3%) that involves related- and unrelated-word paraphrase, emphasis change, clause / sentence structure change and explicitness change – all of these being an inseparable part of the global strategy of domestication.

Rendering 'neither' into Ukrainian involves the methods of equivalent translation (2–66.7%) and omission (1–33.3%), which primarily correlate with literal and communicative translation strategies.

Direct **equivalent translation** of *neither* is shown in the following fragment, wherein *neither* is a conjunctive adverb in the negative structure *neither… nor* with reference to two homogeneous experiencer subjects:

(E) ***Neither*** *Ron* **nor** *Hermione felt like going, however…*

(U) *Але **ні** Рон, **ні** Герміона не палали бажанням туди їхати…*

The following case illustrates the application of the local literal translation strategy using direct equivalent translation method combined with omission of the negative particle *не*, i.e. a blended equivalent. In this case, *neither* is an adverb in the syntactic function of adverbial modifier of manner in a negative sentence used in the character's informal speech:

(E) *"My dad didn't strut," said Harry, before he could stop himself "And **neither** do I".*

(U) *"Мій тато не задирав носа!" – не стримався Гаррі. – "І я **також**".*

The fragment above involves the syntactical strategy of sentence structure change, namely: word order change and the grammatical shift: (SL) "two-member sentence with inversion and negation" → (TL) "one-member (nominative elliptical) sentence with no negation, i.e. omission of the negative particle *не*," which is caused by differences in the grammatical structures of the source and target languages.

Omission is observed in the following case with *neither* as the first component of a compound experiencer subject whose meaning is not necessary to reproduce in accordance with the target-reader oriented strategy of communicative translation:

(E) *The day was fine and breezy, and **neither** of them felt like staying indoors, so they walked past the Three Broomsticks and climbed a slope…*

(U) *День був ясний, повівав легенький вітерець, тому вони проминули 'Три мітли» і вирішили прогулятися ще.*

In the above fragment, the rendering of the phrase *neither of them* is reduced to the usage of the personal pronoun *вони [they]* in the syntactic function of the subject in the target sentence. In this case, omission can possibly be explained by the universal tendency towards minimizing the use of language means to avoid redundant wordiness in the target text.

In the above fragment, the clause *neither of them felt like staying indoors* is omitted, which is distorting to the original. Such clause structure change can be clarified by the translator's focus only on essential information, which is a rather subjective approach, in an effort to concisely convey the overall message in the target text to comply with communicative translation and domestication strategies.

Thus, the dominant translation strategy (66.7%) in rendering *neither* into Ukrainian has been proved to be a literal translation, involving the method of equivalent translation by direct (pure) equivalent (33.3%) and blended equivalent, i.e. with sentence structure change (33.3%). In particular, these equivalents include the pure equivalent *ні… ні…* (as a conjunction in the structure *neither… nor*…) and the blended equivalent *також* with omission of the negative particle *не* (as an adverb) in an elliptical sentence, which is typical of Ukrainian colloquial speech. The second local strategy has been found to be communicative translation (33.3%) by omission, with *neither* being the first component of the pronominal of-phrase *neither of them*, whose meaning is not expressed in the target text, which results in explicitness decrease on the pragmatic level. In addition, these strategies are implemented alongside the global strategy of domestication, which is herein regarded as an integral part of the local strategies.

As a result of the investigation, three principal local strategies in rendering the English DNQs *both, either & neither* into Ukrainian have been identified, namely: the source text-oriented strategies of literal and semantic translation as well as the target text-oriented strategy of communicative translation – all integrated into the global strategy of domestication regarded herein as an integral part of the local strategies. The latter include three subtypes, in particular, 1) semantic strategies (synonymic translation, emphasis change and paraphrase), 2) syntactic strategies (phrase / clause / sentence structure change and modulation), 3) pragmatic strategy (explicitness change). Besides, all of the above strategies are closely linked with the main translation methods, such as equivalent (literal) translation, substitution and omission. The results are summarized in Tables 1, 2 and 3 below, which show the translation methods and strategies applied in rendering the English DNQs into Ukrainian.

Table 1

Translation methods in rendering English dual-number quantifiers

№	DNQ	AF	Translation method					
			equivalent		substitution		omission	
			AF	RF	AF	**RF**	**AF**	**RF**
1	*both*	62	10	16.1%	3	4.8%	49	79%
2	*either*	31	9	29%	12	38.7%	10	32.3%
3	*neither*	3	2	66.7%	-	-	1	33.3%
Total AF & RF		**96**	**21**	**21.9%**	**15**	**15.6%**	**60**	62.5%

Hence, the main translation methods employed in rendering the English DNQs into Ukrainian are equivalent translation, lexical substitution and omission. The most recurrent is omission, which occurs in 60 out of 96 cases (62.5%) due to the application of the communicative translation strategy aimed at concise presentation of the target reader-oriented message, notwithstanding a certain degree of imprecision compared to the source text. Equivalent translation is found in 21 cases (21.9%) and lexical substitution in 15 cases (15.6%). The combinations of translation methods and strategies are shown in Table 2:

Table 2

Translation strategies & methods in rendering English dual-number quantifiers

#	Strategy	Translation method		
		equivalent	**substitution**	**omission**
1	semantic	emphasis change	synonymy; emphasis change	emphasis change; paraphrase
2	syntactic	clause / sentence structure change; addition	phrase structure change: modulation; clause / sentence structure change	clause / sentence structure change
3	pragmatic	-	-	explicitness change
4	ST-oriented	**literal**	**semantic**	-
5	TT-oriented	**communicative** domestication	- domestication	**communicative** domestication

The semantic strategy of emphasis change was used with all three methods, i.e. translation by equivalent, lexical substitution and omission. Synonymic translation was found combined with substitution, and paraphrase with omission. The syntactic strategies of phrase structure change and modulation were applied in translation by lexical substitution, whereas clause / sentence structure change was used in translation by all three methods. The pragmatic strategy of explicitness change was implemented with omission. Besides, it is to be noted that equivalent translation by pure or blended equivalent was found in two types of strategies: literal and communicative. In contrast, substitution and omission were found in semantic and communicative strategies, respectively. Generally, the most frequent strategies have been proved to be syntactic (88–91.7%), less frequent being semantic (62–64.6%) and pragmatic (60–62.5%) ones. The data obtained are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Translation strategies in rendering English dual-number quantifiers into Ukrainian

#	Strategy	*both* (62)	*either* (31)	*neither* (3)	Total
1	**Semantic:**				**62–64.6%**
	1. Synonymy	-	1	-	1–1%
	2. Emphasis change	40	4	-	44– 45.8%
	3. Paraphrase	8	9	-	17–17.7%
2	**Syntactic:**				**88–91.7%**
	1. Phrase structure change	25	6	-	31–32.3%
	2. Clause / sentence change	29	23	2	54–56.3%
	3. Modulation	3	-	-	3–3.1%
3	**Pragmatic:**				**60–62.5%** 60–
	1. Explicitness change	49	10	1	62.5%
4	**ST-oriented:**				**30–31.2%**
	1. **Literal:**	**4**	**9**	**2**	**15–15.6%**
	1.1) direct	2	1	1	4–4.2%
	1.2) oblique	2	8	1	11–11.4%
	2. **Semantic**	3	12	-	**15–15.6%**
5	**TT-oriented:**				**66–68.8%**
	1. **Communicative**	55	10	1	**66–68.8%**
	2. Domestication	62	31	3	96–100%

As a result, the most frequent syntactic strategy has been found to be clause and sentence structure change (56.3%), the less frequent is phrase structure change (32.3%), and the least frequent one is modulation (3.1%). Within the semantic strategies, the most recurrent is emphasis change (45.8%), the least recurrent one is synonymic translation (1%), with paraphrase being in the middle (17.7%). The pragmatic strategy of explicitness change has been registered in 62.5% of cases.

Thus, the source text-oriented strategies of literal and semantic translation of English DNQs into Ukrainian have been identified in 15 cases (15.6%) each, whilst the target reader-oriented strategy of communicative translation has been found in 66 cases (68.8%), thus being the most frequent strategy applied. Direct literal translation has been registered in 4 cases (4.2%), while oblique translation, i.e. by equivalent with emphasis change and clause / sentence structure change, mainly word order change and/or addition, has been found in 11 cases (11.4%). The global strategy of domestication is observed in 100% of cases. These strategies are combined with translation methods local strategies, such as 1) equivalent translation, i.e. via pure equivalent or blended equivalent (with emphasis change and clause / sentence structure change and/or addition) in both literal and communicative translations; 2) lexical substitution in semantic translation by synonymy, phrase structure change, emphasis change, modulation and clause & sentence structure change; 3) omission in communicative translation involving, related and unrelated-word paraphrase, emphasis decrease, clause & sentence structure change and explicitness decrease.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis has revealed the following global and local translation strategies that include two ST-oriented and two TT-oriented ones in rendering the English DNQs *both, either & neither* into Ukrainian, which jointly ensure equivalence, adequacy and naturalness of the target text: 1) literal translation (ST), 2) semantic translation (ST), 3) communicative translation (TT), applied alongside the global strategy of domestication (TT) 1) domestication in correlation with three main translation methods, namely: equivalent translation, lexical substitution and omission.

The obtained results can be explained by several factors. First, recurrent application of communicative translation strategy in combination with the global strategy of domestication, which involves omission in rendering the DNQs into Ukrainian, is caused by a) the intrinsic features of the Ukrainian language structure, b) the translator's efforts to convey the message concisely by creating a target reader-friendly text with focus on the most essential details contained in the original notwithstanding the violation of the source text; b) the universal tendency towards

minimizing excessive use of language means to avoid unjustified wordiness; c) stylistic peculiarities of the target text typical of the genre of imaginative fiction. Second, the literal translation strategy, employing pure and blended equivalents, is implemented as a default strategy using corresponding target language means that adequately convey the meanings of source language units. Third, semantic translation strategy that involves lexical substitution through synonymy, emphasis change, phrase structure change, as well as clause and sentence structure changes. It is applied as the second (after literal translation) most suitable ST-oriented strategy alongside the global strategy of domestication to attain due adequacy and naturalness of the target text.

The research prospects include investigation into translation strategies implemented in rendering English paucal quantifiers into the Ukrainian language for the purpose of further applying the obtained data in academic practice.

Bibliography

Балла, М.І. (2004). *Новий англо-український словник*. Київ: Чумацький шлях.

Бусел, В.Т. (Ред.). (2005). *Великий тлумачний словник сучасної української мови*. Київ, Ірпінь: Перун – VIII.

Кобякова, І.К., Швачко, С.О. (2019). Лінгвістичні атрибути англійських числівників та де-нумеративів. *Записки з романо-германської філології*, 2 (43), 136-148. DOI: 10.18524/2307-4604.2019.2(43).186298

Роулінг, Дж.К. (2002). *Гаррі Поттер і в'язень Азкабану*. Київ: А-БА-БА-ГА-ЛА-МА-ГА.

Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.

Bakker, M., Koster, C., Van Leuven-Zwart, K. (2009). Shifts. M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 269-274). London, New York: Routledge.

Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Assay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Crosthwaite, P., Choy, L.L.Y., Bae, Y. (2016). 'Almost People': A Learner Corpus Account of L2 Use and Misuse of Non-Numerical Quantification. *Open Linguistics*, 2, 317-336. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2016-0015

Davies, E.E. (2003). "A goblin or a dirty nose? The treatment of culture-specific references in translations of the Harry Potter books". *The Translator*, 9 (1), 65-100. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2003.10799146

Dowty, D. (1991). Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language*, 67 (3), 547-619. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/415037

Dukmak, W. (2012). *The Treatment of Cultural Items in the Translation of Children`s Literature. The case of Harry Potter in Arabic*. Leeds: The University of Leeds.

Fillmore, Ch. (1968). The Case for Case. E. Bach & R.T. Harms (Eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory* (pp. 1-88). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Finn, S., Bueno, O. (2018). "Quantifier Variance Dissolved". *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement*, 82, 289-307. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s135824611800005x.

Guanyi, Ch., van Deemter, K., Pagliaro, S., Smalbil, L., Lin, Ch. (2019). QTUNA: A Corpus for Understanding How Speakers Use Quantification. Ch. Lin, K. van Deemter, H. Takamura (Eds.), *Proceedings of The 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation* (pp. 124-129). Tokyo: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Kearns, J. (2009). Strategies. M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 282-285). London, New York: Routledge.

Kenny, D. (2009). Equivalence. M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 96-99). London, New York: Routledge.

Knowlton, T., Trueswell, J., Papafragou, A. (2023). Keeping quantifier meaning in mind: Connecting semantics, cognition, and pragmatics. *Cognitive Psychology*, 144, Article no. 101584. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2023.101584

Kyrychuk, L. (2018). Translation Strategies, Methods and Techniques: In Pursuit of Translation Adequacy. *Research Trends in Modern Linguistics and Literature. International Journal*, 1, 64-80. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29038/2617-6696.2018.1.64.80

Marsden, H. (2009). Distributive Quantifier Scope in English-Japanese and Korean-Japanese Interlanguage. *Language Acquisition*, 16 (3), 135-177; DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10489220902967135

McKean, E. (Ed.). (2005). *New Oxford American Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York, London: Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. Taber, Ch. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J Brill.

Owji, Z. (2013). Translation Strategies: A Review and Comparison of Theories. *Translation Journal*, 17 (1). Retrieved from https://translationjournal.net/journal/63theory.htm

Romaniuk, O.M., Zapotichna, R.A. (2020). The Notion of Translation Strategy: The Main Principles. *International Humanitarian University Herald. Philology*, 45 (1), 125-128. DOI https://doi.org/10.32841/2409-1154.2020.45-1.30

Rowling, J.K. (1999). *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Ruzaitė, J. (2009). Corpora for Applied Purposes: A Case Study of Quantifiers in English and Lithuanian. *Estonian Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 5, 239-250. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5128/ERYa5.16

Sinclair, J., Sinclair, J.M. (2008). *Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Soanes, C., Stevenson, A. (Eds.). (2005). *Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Venuti, L. (2001). Strategies of Translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 240-244). London & New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator`s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, L., Baker, M. (Eds.). (2004). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge.

Wijitsopon, R. (2021). A Corpus-based Study of Thai and English Quantity Word Equivalents: 'Lǎay', 'Several' and 'Many'. *rEFLaction*, 28 (2), 188-207. DOI: https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v28i2.252502

Yoo, I.W., Shin, Y.K. (2019). Determiner Use in English Quantificational Expressions: A Corpus-Based Study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54 (1), 90-117. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.539

TRANSLATION STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH-UKRAINIAN RENDERING OF DUAL-NUMBER QUANTIFIERS

Oleksandr O. Lytvynov, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)
e-mail: oleksandr14124@gmail.com

The article deals with translation strategies implemented in English-Ukrainian rendering of dual-number quantifiers 'both,' 'either,' 'neither' that occur in modern fantasy fiction. The study *aims* to identify local and global translation strategies and methods of their adequate rendering at the post-translation stage of generalizing the translator's experience. The research *objectives* are: 1) to compile a complete register of the lexemes under investigation based on J.K. Rowling's "Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban" and its authorized Ukrainian translation produced by V. Morozov.; 2) to determine their semantic and functional characteristics and direct translation equivalents; 3) to identify their semantic roles and syntactic functions in the source text; 4) to specify the types of grammatical shifts and methods of their rendering into Ukrainian; 5) to identify and analyze the translation strategies applied by the translator to reach equivalence and adequacy of translation. The research material comprises 96 dual-number quantifiers used in the original text and their translations in the corresponding Ukrainian text fragments. In the course of the study, the following *methods* were employed: 1) entire sampling to compile a register of the lexemes and accomplish the source and target text levelling; 2) dictionary entries' analysis to establish the lexical-semantic and functional properties of the quantifiers and their direct Ukrainian translation

equivalents; 3) contextual analysis and immediate constituents' analysis to identify their semantic roles and syntactic functions in the source text; 4) comparative-contrastive translation transformational analysis to specify the translation methods and types of grammatical shifts applied in their rendering; 5) to identify and analyze the translation strategies implemented by the translator; 6) quantity calculations to determine the frequencies of the analyzed phenomena. As a result, based on dictionary entries' analysis, the main functional-semantic classes of the quantifiers have been found to be the determiner, pronoun, conjunction and pronominal adverb. By means of immediate constituents' and contextual analysis, 17 pure and blended semantic roles of the lexemes' referents in 'state of affairs' situations have been identified, the most frequent being the agent (36.4%), locative (14.6%) and experiencer (11.4%). By way of sentence parsing, 19 combinations of the semantic roles and syntactic functions have been established, the most frequent one being the agent subject (37.5%), the others showing frequencies around 10%. With the aid of translation transformational analysis, the most common methods of rendering the dual-number quantifiers into Ukrainian have been found to be omission (62.5%), equivalent (literal) translation (21.9%) and lexical substitution (15.6%). Correspondingly, the main translation strategies, including ST-oriented and TT-oriented ones, have been proved to be 1) communicative translation (68.8%) by omission with emphasis decrease, related and unrelated-word paraphrase, clause/sentence structure change and explicitness decrease, and by equivalent with emphasis change and clause/sentence structure change and/or addition; 2) literal translation (15.6%) including direct translation (4.2%) by pure equivalent and oblique translation (11.4%) by blended equivalent. i.e. with emphasis change and/or clause/sentence change; 3) semantic translation (15.6%) involving synonymy, emphasis change, phrase structure change, modulation, clause/sentence structure change and explicitness decrease, 4) domestication (100%) incorporated in the above three strategies, all applied to ensure equivalence and adequacy of the translation.

References

Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A coursebook on translation. London, Routledge, 317 p.

Bakker, M., Koster, C., Van Leuven-Zwart, K. (2009). Shifts. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (eds.). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London, New York, Routledge, pp. 269-274.

Balla, M.I. (2004). *Novyi anhlo-ukrainskyi slovnyk* [Modern English-Ukrainian Dictionary]. Kyiv, Chumatsky Shlyah Publ., 668 p.

Busel, V.T. (ed.). (2005). *Velykyi tlumachnyi slovnyk suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy* [Large Explanatory Dictionary of the Modern Ukrainian Language]. Kyiv, Irpin, Perun – VIII Publ., 1728 p.

Catford, J.C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Assay in Applied Linguistics. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 103 p.

Chesterman, A. (1997). Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 219 p.

Crosthwaite, P., Choy, L.LY., Bae, Y. (2016). 'Almost People': A Learner Corpus Account of L2 Use and Misuse of Non-Numerical Quantification. *Open Linguistics*, vol. 2, pp. 317-336. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2016-0015

Davies, E.E. (2003). "A goblin or a dirty nose? The treatment of culture-specific references in translations of the Harry Potter books". *The Translator*, vol. 9, issue 1, pp. 65-100. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2003.10799146

Dowty, D. (1991). Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language*, vol. 67, issue 3, pp. 547-619. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/415037

Dukmak, W. (2012). The Treatment of Cultural Items in the Translation of Children's Literature. The case of Harry Potter in Arabic. Leeds, The University of Leeds, 317 p.

Fillmore, Ch. (1968). The Case for Case. In E. Bach & R.T. Harms (eds.). Universals in Linguistic Theory. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 1-88.

Finn, S., Bueno, O. (2018). "Quantifier Variance Dissolved". *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement*, vol. 82, pp. 289-307. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s135824611800005x.

Guanyi, Ch., van Deemter, K., Pagliaro, S., Smalbil, L., Lin, Ch. (2019). QTUNA: A Corpus for Understanding How Speakers Use Quantification. In Ch. Lin, K. van Deemter, H. Takamura (eds.). Proceedings of The 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation. Tokyo, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 124-129.

Kearns, J. (2009). Strategies. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (eds.). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London, New York, Routledge, pp. 282-285.

Kenny, D. (2009). Equivalence. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (eds.). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London, New York, Routledge, pp. 96-99.

Knowlton, T., Trueswell, J., Papafragou, A. (2023). Keeping quantifier meaning in mind: Connecting semantics, cognition, and pragmatics. *Cognitive Psychology*, vol. 144, Article no. 101584. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2023.101584

Kobyakova, I., Shvachko, S. (2019). Linguistic Attributes of the English Numerals and Denumerals. *Writings in Romance-Germanic Philology*, vol. 2, issue 43, pp. 136-148. DOI: 10.18524/2307-4604.2019.2(43).186298

Kyrychuk, L. (2018). Translation Strategies, Methods and Techniques: In Pursuit of Translation Adequacy. *Research Trends in Modern Linguistics and Literature. International Journal*, vol. 1, pp. 64–80. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29038/2617-6696.2018.1.64.80

Marsden, H. (2009). Distributive Quantifier Scope in English-Japanese and Korean-Japanese Interlanguage. *Language Acquisition*, vol. 16, issue 3, pp. 135-177. DOI: 10.1080/10489220902967135

McKean, E. (ed.) (2005). New Oxford American Dictionary. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2096 p.

Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. New York & London, Prentice Hall. 292 p.

Nida, E., Taber, Ch. (1969). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden, E.J Brill, 218 p.

Owji, Z. (2013). Translation Strategies: A Review and Comparison of Theories. *Translation Journal*, vol. 17, issue 1. Available at: https://translationjournal.net/journal/63theory.htm (Accessed 05 May 2024).

Romaniuk, O.M., Zapotichna, R.A. (2020). The Notion of Translation Strategy: The Main Principles. *International Humanitarian University Herald. Philology*, vol. 45, issue 1, pp. 125-128. DOI https://doi.org/10.32841/2409-1154.2020.45-1.30

Rowling, J.K. (1999). Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban. London, Bloomsbury Publishing, 317 p.

Rowling, J.K. (2002). *Harri Potter i viazen Azkabanu* [Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban]. Kyiv, A-BA-BA-HA-LA-MA-HA Publ., 384 p.

Ruzaitė, J. (2009). Corpora for Applied Purposes: A Case Study of Quantifiers in English and Lithuanian. *Estonian Papers in Applied Linguistics*, vol. 5, pp. 239-250. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5128/ERYa5.16

Sinclair, J., Sinclair, J.M. (2008). Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary. New York, HarperCollins Publishers, 1744 p.

Soanes, C., Stevenson, A. (eds.). (2005). Oxford Dictionary of English. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2088 p.

Venuti, L. (2001). Strategies of Translation. In M. Baker (ed.), Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London & New York, Routledge, pp. 240-244.

Venuti, L. (2008). The Translator`s Invisibility: A history of Translation. London, Routledge, 319 p.

Venuti, L., Baker, M. (eds.). (2004). The Translation Studies Reader. London & New York, Routledge, 524 p.

Wijitsopon, R. (2021). A Corpus-based Study of Thai and English Quantity Word Equivalents: 'Lăay', 'Several' and 'Many'. *rEFLaction*, vol. 28, issue 2, pp. 188-207. DOI: https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v28i2.252502

Yoo, I.W., Shin, Y.K. (2019). Determiner Use in English Quantificational Expressions: A Corpus-Based Study. *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 54, issue 1, pp. 90-117. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.539

Одержано 19.08.2023.