

**IN SEARCH OF EQUIVALENT:
ISSUES OF TRANSLATION AND TEXT INTERPRETATION**

**В ПОШУКАХ ЕКВІВАЛЕНТА:
ПРОБЛЕМИ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ ТА ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЇ ТЕКСТУ**

UDC 811.111'255.4(045)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-20>

Yana BOIKO

*Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor,
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design (Ukraine)*
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0074-5665>

Vira NIKONOVA

*Doctor of Philology, Full Professor,
National Academy of Security Service of Ukraine (Ukraine)*
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0324-4217>

**SEMANTIC INTERPRETATION OF AUTHORIAL MODALITY
AS A COGNITIVE-DISCURSIVE CATEGORY
(Case Study of Shakespeare's Plays and Their Ukrainian
Retranslations)**

У статті зосереджено увагу на питанні авторської модальності як когнітивно-дискурсивної категорії, актуалізованої у семантиці лексичних одиниць, зокрема конотативно навантажених, що реалізуються в текстах п'єс Шекспіра, та їх різночасових українських ретрансляціях XIX–XXI ст. Метою дослідження є семантична інтерпретація авторської модальності як когнітивно-дискурсивної категорії, що здійснюється шляхом виявлення семантичного наповнення та визначення обсягу інформації ентропійних конотативно навантажених лексичних одиниць, що втілюють авторську модальність у п'єсах Шекспіра, віддалених у часі, та різночасових українських ретрансляціях XIX–XXI ст. Завданнями дослідження є: описати авторську модальність у термінах лінгвістичної теорії значення та інформаційної ентропії; проаналізувати та порівняти ентропійні конотативно навантажені лексичні одиниці, виділені з п'єс Шекспіра як зразки віддалених у часі оригінальних художніх текстів та їх різночасових українських ретрансляцій; обґрунтувати чинники, що зумовлюють різницю в обсягах інформації, зумовлену авторською модальністю оригінальних текстів та їх українських ретрансляцій у результаті різного тлумачення українськими перекладачами семантичного наповнення ентропійних конотативно навантажених лексичних одиниць.

Джерелом матеріалу дослідження постають дві трагедії В. Шекспіра – «Ромео і Джульєтта» (1594) і «Король Лір» (1608), які є зразками ранньої сучасної англійської мови на рубежі XVI–XVII ст., та їх хронологічно віддалені українські ретрансляції XIX–XXI ст.

Методологія дослідження включає як емпіричні методи – аналіз і синтез (для обґрунтування теоретичної бази дослідження), так і спеціальні лінгвістичні методи – дескриптивний, семантичний і стилістичний аналіз (для виявлення обсягу інформації, яку передають мовні одиниці як в оригінальних текстах, так і в їх українських ретрансляціях), а також методи порівняльного перекладознавства та трансформаційного аналізу (для порівняння мовних одиниць в оригінальних текстах з їхніми відповідниками в ретрансляціях, що допомагає виявити зміни в обсязі інформації, спричинені реалізацією авторської модальності різних перекладачів, які відрізняють різні українські ретрансляції, створені в різні хронологічні періоди).

У статті стверджується, що дослідження модальності як однієї з когнітивних здібностей особистості в лінгвістичних теоріях семантичної інтерпретації базується на складній психічно-

мовленнєвій сутності категорії модальності, яка виявляється у співвідношенні об'єктивної та суб'єктивної реальності, відображеної в людському розумі разом із різними засобами її вираження. Авторська модальність розглядається як когнітивно-дискурсивна категорія, оскільки вона відображає суб'єктивне сприйняття автором дійсності, втіленої в літературному творі, під впливом його /її мовних, культурних і національних цінностей, особистих мовленнєвих характеристик, індивідуальних психолого-естетичних уподобань. Суб'єктивність авторської модальності в п'єсах Шекспіра та їх українських ретрансляціях впливає на те, як Шекспір передає своє повідомлення (інформацію) у семантиці конотативно навантажених лексичних одиниць, які є високо ентропійними, та на те, як українські автори їх інтерпретують. Творчі особистості перекладачів відіграють ключову роль у подоланні інформаційної ентропії конотативно навантажених лексичних одиниць при роботі з віддаленими у часі п'єсами Шекспіра. Авторська модальність п'єс Шекспіра та їх різночасових українських ретрансляцій XIX–XXI століть виявляється в різному обсязі інформації, поданої Шекспіром та українськими перекладачами. Кожен перекладач усвідомлює власну авторську модальність як відображення моделі дійсності та її суб'єктивну оцінку під впливом високо ентропійних конотативно навантажених лексичних одиниць.

Ключові слова: лексична семантика, семантичний зміст, суб'єктивна модальність, конотативно навантажені лексичні одиниці, інформаційна ентропія, обсяг інформації.

For citation: Boiko, Ya., Nikonova, V. (2025). Semantic Interpretation of Authorial Modality as a Cognitive-Discursive Category (Case Study of Shakespeare's Plays and Their Ukrainian Retranslations). *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 1, issue 29, pp. 349-361, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-20>

The language, according to M.A.K. Halliday [Halliday, 2011, p. 187], is a product of social activity. Language is used by the speaker to exchange information or services among people, or to establish and maintain social relationships. On a deeper level, as G. Thompson claims, “the interactions will influence the behaviour and judgments of other people and reveal the speaker's attitudes in a certain case or purpose of certain action” [Thompson, 2008, p. 46], and the speaker is represented as a participant who has potential meaning in the communication. The speaker is using the semantic factor to express his attitude or judgment and affect the views and actions of readers [Yu, 2017, p. 222].

One of the means of expressing subjective attitudes towards the depicted reality is modality. In a general sense, modality refers to an expressed relationship to objective reality reflecting the unique characteristics of an individual's internal mental processes and their communicative intentions. The term “modality” is employed to encompass a broad spectrum of phenomena that vary in terms of semantic contents, grammatical properties, and the degree of elaboration across different levels of linguistic structure [Goloyukh, 2015, p. 62].

The origins of the study of modality can be traced back about a thousand years to the time of Aristotle who initially explored the relationship between necessity and possibility. [Rui, Jingxia, 2018, p. 111]. The concept of modality originally arose in the field of logical research to describe logical relationships between statements based on different types of modal utterances. In the twentieth century, it found its interpretation in various fields of science, including linguistics [Goloyukh, 2015, p. 62] where it was studied from different angles [Declerck, 2011; Goloyukh, 2015; Halliday, 2011; Saeed, 2003; Thompson, 2008; Yu, 2017; Сунрун, 2008].

Despite the large volume of linguistic research on modality, many aspects of this problem remain unexplored in modern linguistics. Syntactic nature of modality in sentences has been carefully studied. Other aspects such as the modality in the text, authorial modality as an author's cognitive faculty, and subjective assessment of modality still require further study. The issue of the authorial modality as a cognitive-discursive category, realized in the time-remote original text and its chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations considered in the light of information entropy is new for modern linguistics and contributes to the study of the processing and acquisition of natural language.

The *objective* of the research is the study and semantic interpretation of authorial modality as a cognitive-discursive category, which is carried out by identifying the semantic contents and determining the scope of information of the entropic connotatively loaded lexical units that embody authorial modality in time-remote Shakespeare's plays and chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries.

Achieving the set goal requires solving the following interrelated *tasks*: 1) to describe authorial modality in terms of the linguistic theory of meaning and information entropy; 2) to analyse and compare entropic connotatively loaded lexical units selected from Shakespeare's plays as samples of time-remote original literary texts and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations; 3) to justify the factors that determine the difference in the scopes of information caused by authorial modality of the original texts and their Ukrainian retranslations due to the different interpretation by Ukrainian translators of semantic contents of entropic connotatively loaded lexical units.

The *research material* is taken from two tragedies by William Shakespeare, namely, "Romeo and Juliet" (1594), and "King Lear" (1608), which serve as samples of Early Modern English at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries. The *units of analysis* are connotatively loaded lexical units in Shakespeare's plays and their counterparts in Ukrainian retranslations.

The *research methodology* incorporates empirical methods, such as analysis and synthesis to establish the theoretical framework, and also specialized linguistic methods, such as descriptive, semantic, and stylistic analysis, is used to identify the scope of information conveyed by the connotatively loaded lexical units in both the source texts and their Ukrainian retranslations. Finally, to compare lexical units in the source texts and retranslations, methods of comparative translation and transformational analysis are used, which allows identifying changes in the scope of information due to the authorial modality of different authors, which distinguishes various Ukrainian retranslations at different chronological periods.

The grammatical definition of *modality* reduces modality to the use of modal verbs and represents only partial knowledge of the concept. However, even grammatical modality is an elusive concept, which can be illustrated by listing the possible meanings that "modal auxiliaries" can have [Declerck, 2011, p. 21]. Modality was further described as "a term for the means by which speakers express varying degrees of commitment to, or belief in, a proposition" [Saeed, 2003, p. 135] and important semantic category that operates at the sentence level.

In traditional linguistic studies of modality, the essence of modality is often characterized by terms such as "modality is the speaker's attitude to reality", "modality expresses the speaker's assessment of states-of-affairs", "modality is the speaker's cognitive, emotional or volitional qualification of the state-of-affairs", etc. [Kiefer, 2017, p. 73]. In this respect, modality is closely related to pragmatics, the field that studies how linguistic signs function in speech. This connection becomes apparent **when we delve deeper into the various aspects of communication. It covers the intention behind the utterance (for example, questions, requests, and apology), speech strategies, and types of speech, as well as the speaker's communicative purposes (including indirect expression, allusions, and allegories). It is also the speaker's attitude to what is said (structuring of the discourse around dominant themes and concepts), assessment of information, interpretation of the text, etc.** [Goloyukh, 2015, p. 63].

The appeal to the category of modality in the linguistic theory of meaning is due to the complex mental-speech essence of the category of modality, which is manifested in the ratio of objective and subjective reality reflected in the mind of a person, and various means of its representation [Голубенко, 2022, p. 74]. In particular, from the point of view of semantics, J. Lyons [Lyons, 1977, p. 53] defined modality as the opinion or attitude of the speaker regarding the statement or the situation described by the statement. He emphasized the important role of subjectivity in language learning. Thus, modal expressions are considered to indicate a certain attitude of the speaker to the proposition being expressed or the situation being described (usually in a statement) [Cruse, 2004, p. 298]. In other words, modality is a speaker's attitude to the content of a speech event or utterance [Winiharti, 2012, p. 533], which can be expressed not only by grammatical means (for example, modal verbs, modal words and expressions) but also by lexical units, namely the lexical meaning of a word, which is defined as a form of generalized reflection of reality in the consciousness of native speakers.

In different theories of semantics including truth-conditional semantics, semantic competence, referential theory of meaning, non-referential theory of meaning, generative theory of meaning, etc. that exactly capture meaning [Ramadan, Ababneh, 2013; Haverkamp, Hoeltje, 2021], scholars are unanimous in understanding word meaning as the most complex intangible

phenomenon which is difficult to understand. Considering word meaning as a complex unity of atomic elements, or semantic components [Evans, 2009, p. 5], among which denotative and connotative components are distinguished, we claim that the productive means of expressing modality as the speaker's attitude to the content of a speech event are connotatively loaded lexical units which in their lexical meanings realise any component of connotation (imagery, emotivity, evaluation, expressiveness or stylistic colouring).

In recent decades, there has been a growing interest in modality as a means of establishing a connection between the content of an utterance and the external context of the real world. In this regard, modality is interpreted as one of the cognitive faculties of an individual, with the help of which his / her life experience, subjective values and attitudes, knowledge and ideas about the surrounding reality are reflected [Голубенко, 2022, p. 74]. This increased interest is reflected in the significant amount of research being conducted in the field of grammar and linguistic stylistics. In linguistic stylistics and text linguistics, modality is interpreted as a category that emphasizes the subjective perspective and psychological self-disclosure of the author, which is influenced by the increased impact of emotional involvement on the recipient [Goloyukh, 2015, p. 61]. For example, researchers [Супрун, 2008] **use a modal structure to analyse a literary text. This structure involves studying how the authors' worldview, their attitude to the presented information, explicit or implicit forms of expression, as well as their methods of interaction with the reader are realized in the text [Goloyukh, 2015, p. 62].**

In translation studies, the authorial modality of the source text and its reproduction in translation becomes a matter of great concern, especially when it comes to chronologically distant retranslations, which means several translations of the same time-remote original text. The author of the original work always reveals his own way of constructing an image of specific situations and events described in his text. In other words, the author and translators have certain features of the individual process of reflecting the reality, in particular, subjective nature of assessments, knowledge that is used and activated in this process, as well as individual experience of the textual activity itself [Засєкін, 2020, p. 234]. **The personal features of the authors are manifested in the authorial modality implemented in the message at the verbal level, that is, metacognition actively affects the structuring of verbal information, which is due to involuntary (unconscious) operations. Accordingly, the authorial modality of the messages in the English time-remote literary texts, such as Shakespeare's plays, and their Ukrainian chronologically distant retranslations may be preserved only partially (if not completely changed) due to differences in the personalities of the author and translators. This substantiates the status of authorial modality as a cognitive-discursive category in translation studies.**

Authorial modality varies in different retranslations of the same source text due to its information entropy. As T. Hermans argues, by creating multiple translations, we "repress the more uncontrollable aspects of texts, their loose ends, their gaps, their unintended or unattributable features, their plurality and heterogeneity. Translation further aggravates and intensifies this steady growth. Translations temporarily fix interpretations that, as verbal constructions, are themselves open to interpretation" [Hermans, 2006, p. 9]. So, according to F. Farahzad [Farahzad, 2024, p. 2], the presence of multiple translations of a source text into a target language is evidence that translation, among other attributes, has the property of indeterminacy, at least in certain aspects.

In this context, information entropy refers to the uncertainty for the translator regarding the choice of target language units compared to source language units. Translation implies that the translator has several potential methods of translating a given source element, and the more options available, the more complex the decision-making process becomes [Vanroy, De Clercq, Macken, 2019, p. 924]. Therefore, information entropy in translation is defined as "a measure of uncertainty of information about the object of translation (the translator's information deficit) which causes erroneous translation decisions at any level of the system of self-organization of special translation" [Дорофеєва, Андрущенко, 2019, p. 98]. Such uncertainty can manifest itself in different ways: 1) at the objective level of translation units in the source text, involving linguistic features of the translated units; 2) at the objective level of the communicative situation, which arises as a result of a lack of information regarding the factors in the communicative context presented in the source text; 3) at the objective level of the discourse, which arises due

to noticeable differences between the norms governing the source and target specialized discourses; 4) at the subjective level, under the influence of the translator's competence, which includes language proficiency, translation skills, discourse comprehension, and professional expertise [Дорофеева, Андрущенко, 2019, p. 98]. It is the subjective factors of the information entropy of the entire text and, in particular, the authorial modality of the author of the source text and its translators that constitute the problem of the diachronic plurality in translation.

In the case of information entropy, the main purpose of translation is to convey the author's message, which covers all significant components of information for effective communication. Therefore, the source text is considered not simply as an object for interlingual transformation, but rather as a vessel containing various forms of information. The translation process, therefore, is not only about making linguistic changes, but revolves around the study and transfer of information, including the attitude towards the information presented, that is, the authorial modality [Дорофеева, 2016, p. 10]. The authorial modality here acts as a means of displaying the author's subjective perception of reality, since it involves examining reality through the prism of linguistic, cultural, and national values, as well as through a unique linguistic interpretation of the world, guided by individual and psychological characteristics and aesthetic features. The authorial modality in translation is based on the translator's intelligence, aesthetic preferences, and personal speech; it reflects aspects of a cultural, historical, national, and social character [Goloyukh, 2015, p. 65].

Information entropy can manifest itself at various stages of the process of translating a literary text as a communicative act, and at all linguistic levels. The concept of entropy, representing a measure of uncertainty, implies a certain parallelism between the source text and its translation. In particular, when it comes to original works from ancient times, such as Shakespeare's plays, the translators' perception of the source texts is strongly influenced by their personal worldview, which is formed in various social-historical and cultural-aesthetic contexts [Boiko, 2022a]. Thus, modern research claims that the decisive factor in overcoming information entropy when translating time-remote source texts is the creative personality of the translator [Рибій, 2012; Boiko, 2022] who in one way or another formulates the message created by the author of the source text, while preserving a certain authorial modality in translation.

Authorial modality as a cognitive-discursive category structures the author's model of reality reflected in the text and subjective assessment as determinants of modality. All words in the text, all the sentences, and the text as a whole actualize a certain authorial modality; they act as specific subjects and markers of a real presentation of facts and situations, and the basis of the description of the authorial modality is rhythmic, compositional, and verbal-speech means [Goloyukh, 2015, pp. 65–66], the latter of which are designated in this study as connotatively loaded lexical units, which are highly entropic.

The reflection of the authorial modality in Shakespeare's tragedies demonstrates the writer's positioning of the worldview he created. To illustrate the above, let's consider a fragment from Shakespeare's play "Romeo and Juliet" (Act I, Scene 5), and its chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations performed by P. Kulish (1901; edited by M. Voronyi in 1998), V. Mysyk (1932), A. Hozenpud (1937), I. Steshenko (1952) and Yu. Andrukhovych (2016):

(1) **W. Shakespeare:** *If I profane with my unworhiest hand this holy shrine, the gentle sin is this: my lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready stand to smooth that rough touch with a tender kiss* [Shakespeare, 2004, p. 49].

(2) **P. Kulish:** *Коли моя рука торкнулась недостойно до дивної краси, до святищів живих, мої уста, **прочане** два, пристойно ніжним цілунком най спокують сей гріх* [Шекспір, 1901, p. 31].

[When my hand unworthily touched the strange beauty, **the sanctities** of the living, my lips, forgiven two, with a decently gentle kiss atone for this sin]

(3) **P. Kulish & M. Voronyi:** *Коли моя рука торкнулась недостойно до дивної краси, до святищів живих, мої уста, мов два **прочанина**, пристойно ніжним цілунком хай спокують цей гріх* [Шекспір, 1998, p. 29].

[When my hand unworthily touched the strange beauty, the sanctity of the living, let my mouth, like two **pilgrims**, atone for this sin with a decent, tender kiss]

(4) **V. Mysyk:** Коли зганьбив негідною рукою твою красу небесну – ось пеня; вустами грубий доторк заспокою – цими **прочанами палкими** – я [Шекспір, 2025а, р. 40].

[When I dishonored your heavenly beauty with an unworthy hand – here is a stump; with my lips a rough touch of comfort – with these **fervent prayers** – I]

(5) **A. Hozenpud:** Коли тепер моя рука негідна, торкнулась недостойно рук святих, мої вуста – два **піліґрими бідні** – спокутують цілунком ніжним гріх [Шекспір, 1937, р. 44].

[When now my unworthy hand touched the hands of the saints unworthily, my lips – two **poor pilgrims** – atone for the sin with a tender kiss]

(6) **I. Steshenko:** Коли торкнувсь рукою недостойно і осквернив я цей олтар святий, уста – два **піліґрими** – хай пристойно цілунком ніжним змиють гріх тяжкий [Шекспір, 1985, р. 335].

[When I unworthily touched this holy altar with my hand and defiled it, the mouths are two **pilgrims**, let them decently wash away the grave sin with a gentle kiss]

(7) **Yu. Andrukhovych:** Якщо руками, надто шкарубками, я шкоди завдаю святині цій, мої вуста, два **спрагли піліґрими**, готові цілувати дотик мій [Шекспір, 2016, р. 55].

[If with hands that are too rough, I harm this shrine, my lips, two **thirsty pilgrims**, are ready to kiss my touch]

In the fragment of the source text (1), there is a connotatively loaded lexical unit of analysis *blushing pilgrims*, the metaphoric meaning of which is 'red lips'. According to Merriam-Webster's Dictionary Online [Mish, 2025], *blushing*: adj. 1. 'marked by blushes'; 2. often used conventionally to suggest (sometimes ironically) an appearance of youthful; *pilgrim*: n. 1. 'one who journeys in foreign lands: wayfarer'; 2. 'one who travels to a shrine or holy place as a devotee'. Thus, in this example, Romeo is talking about his own lips, also emphasizing his youth and beauty, as well as his devotion to Juliet as a saint. In (1), the lips are thus associated with youth, red colour, warmth, travelling, holy places / people, representing the image of a person kissing a loved one – passion and worship, demonstrating Shakespeare's authorial modality in picturing youthful love and passion.

Information entropy of these units of analysis causes translators' different interpretations in chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations.

In P. Kulish's translation (2), (3), *blushing pilgrims* is represented as *прочане* (2) or *прочанин* (3) (*прочанин*: arch. 'pilgrim' [Білодід, 2025]). Thus, the informational component related to worship and travel is preserved while the linguistic unit *blushing* does not find its representation in translation. The difference between these two versions of the translation also lies in the style – both are archaic but *прочане* also represents an archaic way of forming the plural form of a noun in Ukrainian. In this case, information entropy associated with the creative personality of P. Kulish as the representative of Ukrainian romanticism shifts the modality of the message from passion to the idea of perceiving the loved as a saint.

Neoclassicists V. Mysyk (4) and I. Steshenko (6) have two different approaches to the representation of Shakespeare's authorial modality in translation. In particular, I. Steshenko (6) uses the bookish word *піліґрим* (*піліґрим*: 1. 'pilgrim'; 2. transf., arch. 'traveler' [Білодід, 2025]) emphasizing turn focus on holiness, not passion. As a theatre actress, I. Sheshenko sacrifices a part of the image for the sake of "readability and stage performance of the work" [Яценко, 1997, р. 27].

In the translation style of V. Mysyk (4), it is important to preserve brightness of the image and the structural clarity of the original work [Гриців, 2017, р. 14], therefore, the authorial modality and the scope of information embodied in the source text are preserved. In particular, *blushing pilgrims* in (1) is represented as *прочанами палкими* in V. Mysyk's (4) version (*прочанин*: see meaning above; *палкий*: 1. 'which burns well, quickly'; 2. 'which has a very high temperature and emits a lot of heat; hot, burning'; 3. transf. 'who has an extremely hot temper; full of energy, passion'; 4. transf. 'which is very easily excited; too fiery' [Білодід, 2025]).

The neo-baroque translator A. Hozenpud (5) strives to create a distorted meaning of the original message crossing out the author's intention and causing the reader to wonder. In particular, the metaphor of passion *blushing pilgrims* in (1) is replaced in (5) by the metaphor of suffering *піліґрими бідні* (*піліґрим*: see meaning above; *бідний*: 1. 'who lives in need, deprivation; scant'; in contrast to rich '*багатий*'; 2. 'such as a poor man has; poor; inexpensive, unpretentious'; 3. 'which evokes sympathy; unhappy, poor' [Білодід, 2025]).

In the 21st century translation by Yu. Andrukhovych (7), the initial Shakespearean passion rises again – *blushing pilgrims* in (1) is conveyed as *спрагли пілігрими* (*спраглий*: 1. ‘who really wants to drink, feels thirsty’; 2. transf. ‘who expresses passion, strong feeling; hot’; 3. transf. ‘who craves something, greedy for something, for something’; 4. transf. ‘who longs for something’ [Білодід, 2025]; *пілігрим*: see meaning above).

Comparing the linguistic units *blushing pilgrims* and their Ukrainian counterparts that metaphorically convey the image of the young man’s red lips in the original text with those in the Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries, we can notice the difference in the authorial modality of presenting the image of a passionate kiss, which is manifested in variations in the scope of information about it in the corresponding passages, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

The authorial modality in relation to the image of *blushing pilgrims* in W. Shakespeare’s “Romeo and Juliet” and its Ukrainian counterparts in chronologically distant retranslations

Author / Translators	Means of verbalizing	The scope of information
W. Shakespeare	<i>blushing pilgrims</i>	youth, passion, worshipping, devotion, religion
P. Kulish	<i>прочане</i>	worshipping, devotion, religion
P. Kulish (M. Voronyi)	<i>прочанина</i>	worshipping, devotion, religion
V. Mysyk	<i>прочанами палкими</i>	youth, passion, worshipping, devotion, religion
A. Hosenpud	<i>пілігрими бідні</i>	suffering, worshipping, devotion, religion
I. Steshenko	<i>пілігрими</i>	worshipping, devotion, religion
Yu. Andrukhovych	<i>спрагли пілігрими</i>	passion, thirst, worshipping, devotion, religion

So, as it can be seen from the table, the semantic contents of the connotatively loaded lexical units that embody authorial modality in the source text and Ukrainian retranslations differs in the scope of information presented by Shakespeare and the Ukrainian translators. In particular, with regard to the image of the red lips of the young man conveyed by *blushing pilgrims* in W. Shakespeare’s “Romeo and Juliet”, the authorial modality is equally represented only in V. Mysyk’s translation, while the authorial modality in other retranslations reflects the peculiarities of the creative personalities of the translators: P. Kulish and I. Steshenko narrowed it down to worship and piety, A. Hosenpud lost the information components “youth” and “passion” while adding “suffering”, and Yu. Andrukhovych lost only the “youth” component focusing on passion by adding the “thirst” information component.

Let us dwell on the following fragment from Shakespeare’s tragedy “King Lear” (Act I, Scene 1) depicting a daughter’s love for her father and its chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations performed by P. Kulish (1880), P. Myrnyi (1897), M. Rylskyi (1941), V. Barka (1969) and O. Hriaznov (2008):

(8) **W. Shakespeare:** *Good my lord, you have begot me, bred me, loved me: I return those duties back as are right fit, obey you, love you, and most honour you* [Shakespeare, 2024].

(9) **P. Kulish:** *Мій добрий повелителю! мене ви зродили, виховали і любили. Вертаю вам усі довги, як личить, корюсь вам і люблю й шаную вельми* [Шекспір, 1902, р. 7].

[My good lord! you gave birth to me, raised me and loved me. I repay you all debts, as I see fit, I obey you and I love and respect you very much]

(10) **Р. Мърні:** *Мій любий таточку! Я всім повинна вам: життя мені дали, зростили і навчили, як треба в світі жити, поводитись із людьми. Звичайною за се плачу я вам ціною: корюся вам, люблю і поважаю* [Шекспір, 1970, р. 516].

[My dear dad! I owe you all: you gave me life, I grew up and I was taught how to live in the world and treat people. I pay you the usual price for this: I obey, love and respect you]

(11) **М. Рилський:** *Владарю мій, мені дали життя ви, мене зростили й виховали ви, плачу за це належною ціною: шанобою, любов’ю та слухнянством* [Шекспір, 1986, р. 240].

[My lord, you gave me life, you raised me and raised me, I pay the due price for it: respect, love and obedience]

(12) V. Barka: *Мій добрий пане, мене родили, викормили і любили. Я – обов'язки звертаю, як годиться, люблю і слухаюсь, найбільш шаную* [Шекспір, 1969, р. 20–21].

[My good lord, I was born, fed and loved. I fulfill my duties as I see fit, I love and obey, I respect the most]

(13) O. Hriaznov: *Меніжиття дали ви, добрий батьку, росли і любили. Вам плачу я вдячністю, покірністю, любов'ю* [Шекспір, 2025].

[You, good father, gave me life, raised me and loved me. I cry to you with gratitude, humility, and love].

In (8), the authorial modality of Shakespeare is revealed by the key words chosen by the playwright to show his attitude to the concept of a traditional family: *good* 1. virtuous, right, commendable; 2. kind, benevolent; 3. loyal, close; *lord* 1. one having power and authority over others; 2. a man of rank or high position; 3. the male head of a household; *duty* 1. conduct due to parents and superiors; 2. obligatory tasks, conduct, service, or functions that arise from one's position; 3. a moral or legal obligation; *to obey* 1. to follow the commands or guidance of; 2. to conform to or comply with; *to love* 1. to feel strong affection for another arising out of kinship or personal ties; 2. warm attachment, enthusiasm, or devotion; *to honour* to regard or treat (someone) with admiration and respect [Mish, 2025].

As a representative of romanticism, P. Kulish (9) transmits all the components of the traditional attitude to father including both love and duty which is expressed in such key words: *добрий*: 1. 'who is benevolent, friendly, empathetic towards people'; 2. 'who expresses kindness, sincerity'; *повелитель*: 1. 'the one who commands by right of his power (about monarchs, rulers, etc.)'; 2. 'a person who has power over someone; head'; 3. convers. 'husband towards his wife'; *довгу (боргу)*: 'that which is borrowed'; *коритися*: 'to obey someone, to be subject to someone, for something'; *любити*: 1. 'to feel deep devotion, attachment to someone, something'; 2. 'to feel heart affection for family members (children, mother, etc.)'; *шанувати*: 1. 'to feel or show deep respect, reverence for someone, something'; 2. 'to show or take care of someone' [Білодід, 2025].

In the line with realism, P. Myrnyi (10) describes the character's feelings for her father with such key lexical units, making love a more down-to-earth phenomenon: *любий*: 1. 'that causes self-love; dear and close to the heart'; 2. 'same as beloved'; 3. 'the one who is loved, loved'; *таточко* (diminutive *тато*): convers. same as *батько* 'a man in relation to his children'; *ціна*: 1. 'the price of the product expressed in monetary units'; 2. transf. 'the value, meaning of something'; *коритися, любити*: see meaning above; *поважати*: 'to feel respect, reverence for someone, something' [Білодід, 2025].

In (11), the neoclassicist M. Rulskyi uses high-flown language to describe a daughter's love for her father, for example, *владар (володар)*: ceremonial 'one who has power over someone, something, freely disposes of someone or something; master'; *ціна*: see meaning above; *шаноба*: 'feeling of respect, based on the recognition of great virtues, social importance or positive qualities of someone, something; respect'; *любов*: 1. 'feeling of deep affection for a person of the opposite sex; love'; 2. 'feeling of deep heartfelt attachment to someone, something'; *слухнянство* (occasionalism of *слухняність*): property of being *слухняний* 'who obeys someone, who always obeys, contradicts no one; obedient' [Білодід, 2025].

The modernist V. Barka chooses the translation option that is closest to the source text, using in (12) such words as *добрий*: see meaning above; *пан*: 'one who has power over others; owner'; *обов'язки*: 'that which must be unconditionally followed, which must be carried out without fail in accordance with the demands of society or based on one's own conscience'; *любити*: see meaning above; *слухатися*: 1. 'to follow someone's advice, requests, instructions'; 2. 'to obey someone, something, obey someone's orders, instructions, etc.' [Білодід, 2025]; *шанувати*: see meaning above.

In accordance with the tendencies of postmodernism, O. Hriaznov in (13) uses a simple clear laconic construction with key words such as *добрий*: see meaning above; *батько*: 'father, a man in relation to his children'; *вдячність*: 'feeling of gratitude, willingness to thank for service, help'; *покірність*: property of being *покірний* 'who always obeys, does not contradict, concedes in everything; obedient' [Білодід, 2025]; *любов*: see meaning above.

By comparing the description of a daughter's feelings for her father in the source text and in Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries, we can notice some differences in the semantic contents of the compared lexical units which depict a daughter's love for her father. These variations in the scope of information expressed by the connotatively loaded lexical units cause different levels of detail in conveying this concept, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

The authorial modality in relation to the image of a daughter's feelings for her father in W. Shakespeare's "King Lear" and its Ukrainian counterparts in chronologically distant retranslations

Author / Translators	Means of verbalizing	The scope of information
W. Shakespeare	<i>good my lord, ... return those duties back ..., obey you, love you, and most honour you</i>	1) father: good, authority, head of a household; 2) attitude: debt, obedience, love, high respect
P. Kulish	<i>мій добрий повелителю! ... вертаю вам усі довги, ... корюся вам і люблю й шаную</i>	1) father: good, authority; 2) attitude: debt, obedience, love, respect
P. Myrnyi	<i>мій любий таточку! ... за се плачу я вам ціною: корюся вам, люблю і поважаю</i>	1) father: good, family member, loved one; 2) attitude: childish, debt, obedience, love, respect
M. Rylskyi	<i>владарю мій, ... плачу за це ... ціною: шанобою, любов'ю та слухнянством</i>	1) father: authority; 2) attitude: paying, respect, love, obedience
V. Barka	<i>мій добрий пане, ... обов'язки звертаю, ..., люблю і слухаюсь, найбільш шаную</i>	1) father: good, authority; 2) attitude: obligation, love, obedience, high respect
O. Hriaznov	<i>добрий батьку, ... вам плачу ... вдячністю, покірністю, любов'ю</i>	1) father: good, family member; 2) attitude: paying, gratitude, obedience, love

The fragments given above vividly show that the authorial modality both in the source text and in retranslations is revealed in the scope of information transmitted by the author of the source text and the authors of the retranslations through the use of connotatively loaded lexical units. Considering the depiction of the daughter's feelings for her father in the fragment from Shakespeare's "King Lear" and its chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations, Shakespeare's authorial modality was changed in all the retranslations. In particular, M. Rylskyi and O. Hriaznov speak about payment, and V. Barka - about obligation, not about debt; and in P. Myrnyi's retranslation, the heroine shows a more childish attitude towards her father. As a result, Shakespeare's authorial modality changes in Ukrainian retranslations, which indicates different attitudes of translators to family relations in Ukrainian societies of different historical periods of the 19th–21st centuries.

Conclusions. The proposed study explores the concept of modality in linguistic and translation studies, emphasizing the complexity and various dimensions of this phenomenon. Modality is a multifaceted concept related to linguistic, cultural, and personal factors. An interaction between modality and pragmatics was observed demonstrating that modality plays a significant role in communication, by influencing authors' intentions, speech strategies, and attitudes toward the content they present. In addition, there is a growing interest in modality in the context of linguistics and text linguistics from the perspective of the author's subjective point of view and the emotional impact on the reader.

The study of modality in linguistic theory of meaning is based on the complex mental-speech essence of the category of modality, which is manifested in the ratio of objective and subjective reality reflected in the human mind, together with various means of its expression. In modern translation studies, the principle of retranslations means that the translation of a literary work by

translators of different historical periods preserves the authorial modality of the original message to varying degrees. This is achieved by considering the differences in the creative personalities of the author and the translator. In this regard, authorial modality is interpreted as one of the cognitive faculties of an individual, with the help of which his / her life experience, subjective values and attitudes, knowledge and ideas about the surrounding reality are reflected.

The study examines the concept of information entropy in translation, which introduces uncertainty and challenges into the decision-making process for translators. Subjective aspects of translation entropy, particularly authorial modality, contribute to the diachronic plurality in translation. It is very important to effectively transmit the author's message in translation, considering the authorial modality as a way of reflecting the author's unique view of reality. The authorial modality in this case is considered as a reflection of the author's subjective perception of reality under the influence of linguistic, cultural, and national values, personal language usage, and individual psychological and aesthetic preferences. Viewed as a cognitive-discursive category, subjective authorial modality affects the way the author and translators transmit information and how they relate to it.

The study shows that the translator's creative personality plays a key role in overcoming information entropy when dealing with chronologically distant source texts, helping to transmit the author's message and the authorial modality in translation. The authorial modality is discussed as a reflection of the author's model of reality and its subjective evaluation, under the influence of various linguistic stylistic elements in the text, in particular, connotatively loaded lexical units, which are highly entropic.

The authorial modality in the source text and in Ukrainian retranslations depends on the scope of information provided by the author of the source text and the translators, and each translator presents his / her own authorial modality in the retranslation.

Identifying the influence of translation interpretations of cases of information entropy on the ways of direct expression of the translators' authorial modality through the choice of means of its expression in translation and, as a consequence, on the choice of certain translation means by the translator within the framework of the transformational approach to translation, seems promising for further research.

References

- Bilodid, I.K. (Ed.). (2025). *Akademichnyi tlumachnyi slovnyk ukrainskoi movy* [Academic Explanatory Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language]. Retrieved from <http://sum.in.ua/> (in Ukrainian).
- Boiko, Ya. (2022). Information Entropy of Shakespeare's Plays in the Light of Plurality in Translation: Cognitive Perspective. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18, Special Issue 2, 1218-1228.
- Boiko, Ya. (2022a). Interpretation Module in the Framework of the Cognitive-Discursive Model of Diachronic Plurality in Translation of Shakespeare's Plays. *Topics in Linguistics*, 23 (1), 1-14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2022-0001>
- Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Declerck, R. (2011). The Definition of Modality. In A. Patard, F. Brisard (Eds.), *Cognitive Approaches to Tense, Aspect and Epistemic Modality* (pp. 21-44). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.29.05dec>
- Dorofieieva, M. (2016). *Informatsiina entropiia u perekladi spetsialnykh tekstiv* [Information entropy in the translation of special texts]. *Foreign Philology*, 1 (49), 9-14 (in Ukrainian).
- Dorofieieva, M., Andruschenko, T. (2019). Information Entropy in Translation: Psycholinguistic Aspects. *Psycholinguistics*, 26 (2), 91-113. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2019-26-2-91-113>
- Evans, V. (2009). *How Words Mean: Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models, and Meaning Construction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Farahzad, F. (1999). *Plurality in Translation*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/full-text/ED429449.pdf>
- Goloyukh, L. (2015). The Author's Modality as a Scientific Paradigm of Literary Text Research. *Лінгвостилістичні студії*, 3, 61-69.

- Halliday, M.A.K. (2011). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpersonal Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Haverkamp, N., Hoeltje, M. (2021). Semantic Theories, Linguistic Essences, and Knowledge of Meaning. *Synthese*, 199, 14459–14490. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-021-03429-5>
- Hermans, T. (1996). Translation's Other. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/1668908.pdf>
- Holubenko, N. (2022). *Aktualizatsiia modalnosti khudozhnoho tekstu v intersemiotychnomu perekladi* [Actualization of the modality of the literary text in intersemiotic translation]. I.S. Shevchenko (Ed.), *Multimodality and Transmediality: Cognitive, Pragmatic, and Semiotic Vantages* (pp. 74-75). Kharkiv: V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Hrytsiv, N.M. (2017). *Vasyl Mysyk: Riznohrannyi diament ukrainskoho khudozhnoho perekladu* [Vasyl Mysyk: The Multifaceted Diamond of Ukrainian Literary Translation]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Kiefer, F. (2017). On Defining Modality. *Folia Linguistica*, 51 (1000), 67-94. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/flin-2017-1003
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. London: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620614>
- Mish, F.C. (Ed.). (2024). *Merriam-Webster: America's Most Trusted Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>
- Ramadan, S.M., Ababneh, T.I. (2013). Theories of Semantics: Merits and Limitations. *Arab World English Journal*, 4(3), 308-316.
- Rebrii, O.V. (2012). *Suchasni kontseptsii tvorchosti u perekladi* [Modern Concepts of Creativity in Translation]. Kharkiv: V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Rui, Z., Jingxia, L. (2018). The Study on the Interpersonal Meanings of Modality in Micro-blogging English News Discourse by the case of "Donald Trump's Muslim Entry Ban". *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9 (2), 110-118. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.9n.2p.110>
- Saeed, J.L. (2003). *Semantics*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Shakespeare, W. (2004). *Romeo and Juliet*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Shakespeare, W. (1901). *Romeo ta Dzhulietta* [Romeo and Juliet]. Transl. by P. Kulish. Lviv: Ukrainsko-ruska vydavnycha Spilka Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (1902). *Korol Lir* [King Lear]. Transl. by P. Kulish. Lviv: Ukrainsko-ruska vydavnycha Spilka Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (1937). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo and Juliet]. Transl. by A. Hozenpud. Kyiv: Mystetstvo Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (1969). *Korol Lir* [King Lear]. Transl. by V. Barka. Stuttgart – New York – Ottawa: Vydannia "Na hori" Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (1970). *Korol Lir* [King Lear]. Transl. by P. Myrnyi. In N.L. Kalenychenko (Ed.), *Panas Myrnyi. Collected Works in 7 volumes* (Vol. 6, pp. 511-682). Kyiv: Naukova dumka Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (1985). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo and Juliet]. Transl. by I. Steshenko. Kyiv: Dnipro Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (1986). *Korol Lir* [King Lear]. Transl. by M. Rylskyi. In V.V. Koptilov (Ed.), *Works in 6 Volumes* (Vol. 5, pp. 235-343). Kyiv: Dnipro Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (1998). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo and Juliet]. Transl. by P. Kulish, edited by M. Voronyi. Kyiv: AltPress Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (2016). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo and Juliet]. Transl. by Yu. Andrukhovych. Kyiv: A-ba-ba-ha-la-ma-ha Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (2024). *King Lear*. Retrieved from <https://www.ucm.es/data/cont/docs/119-2014-02-19-6.%20King%20Lear.pdf>
- Shakespeare, W. (2025). *Korol Lir* [King Lear]. Transl. by O. Hriaznov. *Library of Ukrainian Literature*. Retrieved from <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=9052> (in Ukrainian).
- Shakespeare, W. (2025a). *Romeo i Dzhulietta* [Romeo and Juliet]. Transl. by V. Mysyk. *Library of Ukrainian Literature*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/world/printit.php?tid=1> (in Ukrainian).
- Suprun, L.V. (2008). *Katehoriia modalnosti v zahalnomovnii interpretatsii* [The category of modality in common language interpretation]. *Linguistic Studies*, 16, 37-42 (in Ukrainian).

Thompson, G. (2008). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. 2nd Edition. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203785270>

Vanroy, B., De Clercq, O., Macken, L. (2019). Correlating Process and Product Data to Get an Insight into Translation Difficulty. *Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 27, 924–941. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2019.1594319>

Winiharti, M. (2012). The Difference between Modal Verbs in Deontic and Epistemic Modality. *Humaniora*, 3 (2), 532-539. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v3i2.3396>

Yatsenko, M.T. (Ed.). (1997). *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury* [History of Ukrainian literature]. Kyiv: Lybid Publ. (in Ukrainian).

Yu, H. (2017). Interpersonal Meaning of Mood and Modality in English Public Service Advertising Texts. *Advances in Computer Science Research (ACSR)*, 76, 222-227. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2991/emim-17.2017.48>

Zasiekin, S.V. (2020). *Psykholinhvalni zakonomirnosti vidtvorennia khudozhnoho tekstu v perekladi (na materiali anhliiskoi ta ukrainskoi mov)*. (Dys. dokt. filol. Nauk) [Psycholinguistic regularities of reproducing literary texts in translation (based on the English and Ukrainian languages). (Doctor thesis)]. Kharkiv: V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University Publ. (in Ukrainian).

SEMANTIC INTERPRETATION OF AUTHORIAL MODALITY AS A COGNITIVE-DISCURSIVE CATEGORY (Case study of Shakespeare's plays and their Ukrainian retranslations)

Yana V. Boiko, Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design (Ukraine)

e-mail: [yana.boyko.85@gmail.com](mailto: yana.boyko.85@gmail.com)

Vira H. Nikonova, National Academy of Security Service of Ukraine (Ukraine)

e-mail: [nikonovavg@gmail.com](mailto: nikonovavg@gmail.com)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-20>

Key words: *lexical semantics, semantic contents, subjective modality, connotatively loaded lexical units, information entropy, scope of information.*

The article focuses on the issue of authorial modality as a cognitive-discursive category as addressed in semantics of lexical units, in particular, connotatively loaded ones, which are realised in the texts of time-remote Shakespeare's plays and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries. The *objective* of the research is the study and semantic interpretation of authorial modality as a cognitive-discursive category, which is carried out by identifying the semantic contents and determining the scope of information of the entropic connotatively loaded lexical units that embody authorial modality in time-remote Shakespeare's plays and chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries.

The *research material* is taken from two tragedies by William Shakespeare, namely, "Romeo and Juliet" (1594), and "King Lear" (1608), which serve as samples of Early Modern English at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries. The *units of analysis* are connotatively loaded lexical units in Shakespeare's plays and their counterparts in Ukrainian retranslations.

The *research methodology* incorporates empirical methods, such as analysis and synthesis to establish the theoretical framework, and also specialized linguistic methods, such as descriptive, semantic, and stylistic analysis, is used to identify the scope of information conveyed by the connotatively loaded lexical units in both the source texts and their Ukrainian retranslations. Finally, to compare lexical units in the source texts and retranslations, methods of comparative translation and transformational analysis are used, which allows identifying changes in the scope of information due to the authorial modality of different authors, which distinguishes various Ukrainian retranslations at different chronological periods.

The article argues that the study of modality as one of an individual's cognitive faculties in linguistic theories of semantic interpretation is based on the complex mental-speech essence of the category of modality, which is manifested in the ratio of objective and subjective reality reflected in the human mind, together with various means of its expression. The authorial modality is considered a cognitive-discursive category since it reflects the author's subjective perception of reality embodied in a literary work under the influence of his / her linguistic, cultural, and national values, personal language usage, and individual psychological and aesthetic preferences. The subjectivity of authorial modality in Shakespeare's plays and their Ukrainian retranslations affects the way Shakespeare conveys his message (information) in the semantics

of connotatively loaded lexical units, which are highly entropic, and the way Ukrainian authors interpret them. The creative personalities of translators play a key role in overcoming the information entropy of connotatively loaded lexical units when working with time-remote Shakespeare's plays. The authorial modality of Shakespeare's plays and their chronologically distant Ukrainian retranslations of the 19th–21st centuries is manifested in different scope of information presented by Shakespeare and Ukrainian translators. Each translator realises his / her own authorial modality as a reflection of the model of reality and its subjective evaluation under the influence of highly entropic connotatively loaded lexical units.