

TRANSLATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE INCLUSIONS IN V. BYKOV'S STORIES FROM BEARUSIAN INTO RUSSIAN

Передача иноязычных вкраплений в произведениях В. Быкова при
их переводе с белорусского языка на русский

Vasil Paputsevich
vvp2911@gmail.com
University of Granada (Granada, Spain)

Василий Викторович Попуцевич
vvp2911@gmail.com
Гранадский университет (Гранада, Испания)

ISSN: 1698-322X ISSN INTERNET: 2340-8146

Fecha de recepción: 30.04.2020

Fecha de evaluación: 23.12.2020

Cuadernos de Rusística Española nº 16 (2020), 265 - 279

ABSTRACT

This article presents the results of the original research, based on the semantic analysis of foreign language inclusions in the narratives “Obelisk” and “Sign of Misfortune” (“Абяліск” and “Знак бяды”) by the Belarusian writer Vasil Bykov and their translation in the Russian interpretations (“Обелиск” and “Знак беды”). Foreign language inclusions are considered as a noticeable feature in V. Bykov’s works that is essential in recreating the cultural environment and in rendering the cultural constituents of the historical events described in the narratives. Their adequate translation into other foreign languages may appear an obvious challenge for a translator who is supposed to select and apply certain strategies when introducing the mentioned inclusions into new interpretations in order to minimize translation losses.

Keywords: foreign language inclusions, V. Bykov, strategies of translation, adequacy of translation, cultural reference.

РЕЗЮМЕ

В статье представлены результаты оригинального исследования, основанного на семантическом анализе иноязычных вкраплений в произведениях белорусского писателя Василя Быкова «Абяліск» и «Знак бяды» и их переводе на русский язык («Обелиск» и «Знак беды»). Иноязычные вкрапления рассматриваются как отличительная черта произведений В. Быкова, которая необходима для воссоздания культурной среды и передачи культурных составляющих исторических событий, описываемых в повестях. Их адекватный перевод на другие языки может оказаться очевидным вызовом для переводчика, который должен выбрать и применить определенные стратегии при введении упомянутых включений в литературные интерпретации для минимизации потерь при переводе.

Ключевые слова: иноязычные вкрапления, В. Быков, переводческие стратегии, адекватность перевода, культурный компонент.

INTRODUCTION

Foreign lexical units inserted in a literary text have always attracted the attention of researchers in the field of linguistics and translation theory due to their high functional status, as they are commonly agreed to be poly-functional elements loaded with communicative expressiveness, and thus fulfilling various functions ranging from informative to expressive or even comic. Foreign words or expressions may implement various interpretative approaches. The author may use them to reduce the distance, to increase the expressiveness of the communicative intentions of the participants in communication, to add more authenticity to the text, to underline a specific spirit or to create the atmosphere or impression of erudition or scholarship, sometimes with a shade of comicality or irony (Vlakhov 1980: 263).

After having analyzed a variety of sources, we concluded that researchers do not have a common opinion regarding the term denoting such inclusions. Linguists define foreign lexical units in different ways and consequently use various terms for foreign elements in the literary text. We may come across such terms as “foreign words” and “loanwords”, “exoticisms” and “alienisms” (V.P. Berkov 2004: 60), “barbarisms” and “exotic words” (D.E. Rozental 1974: 80), etc. The meanings of the terms suggested by different scholars may coincide or differ as well as overlap; thus, their definitions remain evidently blurred. In our work, we will refer to foreign elements in the original text as “foreign language inclusions”. The term was introduced by S. Vlakhov and S. Florin to refer to a word or an expression in a language that is foreign to the original.

Foreign language inclusions in the text are one of the distinctive features in the style of Vasil Bykov, a classic author of Belarusian literature in the 20th century, famous for his works written in the genre of psychological realism. For our research, we chose two stories “Obelisk” and “Sign of Misfortune” (in Belarusian “Аб’яліск” and “Знак бяды” respectively) by V. Bykov with numerous foreign language inclusions and their Russian interpretations “Обелиск” and “Знак беды” respectively. This feature may appear to be a significant challenge for a translator when rendering the original into either a closely related or a distant language – due to the extra linguistic cultural meanings that they carry. Foreign language inclusions consist of words, word combinations, phrases, dialogues and even a mixture of all these elements, mainly from Polish, Russian and German. The process of selecting foreign language inclusions for doing research and presenting them had come through some difficulties, doubts and questions before the criteria were developed. In the end, we decided to make up a selection of foreign language inclusions based on their language representation (Polish, Russian and German), on their functionality and repetitions in the original text. The research methodology was represented by the continuous sampling method, quantitative (statistical, parametric), and analytical methods (contextual, descriptive-comparative). In addition, textual and semantic analysis of the units studied in the original texts with their equivalents in translation was applied.

In our research, we conducted the semantic analysis of foreign language inclusions in the original texts by V. Bykov by taking into account the context of their usage. This allowed us to presuppose that the author introduced foreign language elements in order to render a spectrum of cultural characteristics, which are essential in recreating

the atmosphere of the places and times described in the works. In order to succeed in conveying the cultural message through foreign language inclusions in the original texts, a translator is considered to be aware of some real historical events taking place in the territory of Belarus, which as a result massively influenced the map of languages spread in the communication between local people.

Historical Review of the Linguistic Picture in Belarus in the 20th Century

During the first half of the 20th century, Belarus was the centre of fights for territories between Russia, Germany, Poland and, later, the USSR. From the end of the 18th century to the beginning of the 20th century, the territory of the modern Belarus entirely belonged to the Russian Empire, which implemented a severe policy of russification among local people, with obvious success in the second half of the 19th century. It was one of the repressive measures taken to eradicate any separatist movements, which were widespread, especially among the local nobility, and a counter-action following the policy of polonisation carried out by the Polish Crown in the 17th–18th centuries. Only in the historical retrospective, we would find out that the Golden Age for the Belarusian language (called *Old Belarusian* nowadays) dated back to the epoch of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, particularly in the 15th–16th centuries, when it was widely used in politics, diplomacy, literature, art, etc. In fact, since 1696 Belarusian was officially replaced with Polish and Latin in all the important affairs of state and, later, with Russian. As late as the end of the 19th century, it remained a spoken language used only in daily life, mainly by the population in rural areas, and the varieties of this spoken language facilitated enormously Belarusian to revive and acquire the status of a modern literary language.

Coming back to the early 1900s, when Belarus was still part of the Russian Empire, the following tendency could be observed: the higher the personal social status people had, the sooner they considered themselves Russians if they were Orthodox or Poles if they were Catholic. The citizens, especially Orthodox believers, were considered as an integral part of one nation, and learning and speaking Russian by them was persistently encouraged and, in the end, it led to the total language assimilation (Alpatov 1997: 28). The policy resulted in a phenomenon of "multilingualism" when the language of culture and education was Russian, whereas Belarusian was not regarded as an independent language but only as a dialect of Russian, or even a group of dialects, like many other dialects of Russia, which were all united by a common literary language. The authorities looked on Belarusians as part of the Russian people with only minor ethnographic differences, and on their literature as literary works in local dialects. In Eastern Belarus, diglossia became quite typical: the Belarusian dialects were used in daily life and in folklore literature and the Russian literary language as the main written language was used in administration, schooling and generally in most spheres of communication in the empire.

The first attempts followed by active political actions to raise the awareness of national identity up to the state level and to restore the official status of Belarusian as a language were undertaken during World War I, after Belarus was no longer controlled by neighbouring empires. In 1918, on the territory occupied by the troops of the German

Empire, the national elite managed to proclaim the independence of the Belarusian People's Republic (BNR) that was recognized by a number of states but stopped its existence a year later. The years of 1919-1921 were known in history for the Polish-Soviet War that resulted in the Treaty of Riga, according to which Western Belarus was added to Poland and the Soviets took control of the entire Eastern Belarus, incorporated as a soviet republic into the Soviet Union (USSR) in 1922.

In the Soviet Union, it was politically beneficial to exploit the Belarusian national idea in the very beginning. That is why the local authorities were allowed to start the process of derussification. Most elementary schools switched to Belarusian as a language of instruction. Higher education institutions gradually did the same. (Zaprudnik 1996: 93-94). In 1924, a decree was introduced to declare the equality of the four main languages in the republic: Belarusian, Russian, Yiddish and Polish (<http://kamunikat.org/download.php?item=5584-7.html&pubref=5584>). Yet, the majority of the urban population did not speak Belarusian as it was neither native for lots of city-dwellers nor prestigious. In 1927, according to Article 22 of the Constitution, Soviet Belarus declared Belarusian as the main language for state, professional and public institutions and organizations. The government started actively to conduct belarusianization in all the spheres of life: developing the press in Belarusian, opening schools, special and higher education institutions, implementing Belarusian as a language of management in governmental establishments, parties, trade unions and other public organizations. Belarusian literature gained an impetus to explosive development. However, in the 1930s, Moscow dramatically changed the attitude towards national ideas in the republics, and the process of belarusianization was stopped and followed by the wave of repressions aimed at national intellectuals and activists.

V. Bykov's works under analysis in our research describe the events of the Belarusian history at the wartime, namely World War II. At the same time, we get familiar with the abovementioned pre-war historical events when reading about the life of the main characters, including their memories, to which the author sometimes dedicates the entire chapters. Depending on a social role or a particular communicative setting, the characters speak in different languages or a mixture of them. As for Russian transcribed in Belarusian Cyrillic, we can trace it in the dialogues with people, who are either strangers or city-dwellers, who were more educated or simply pretending so, or trying to demonstrate their power:

- a) — Цёплая, значыць, хата. Гэта харашо. Трэба раздзецца, не вазражаеш?¹
 — Дык, калі ласка. Можна і зняць. Вы сюды навесыце, на гэты цвік. (Bel. “Знак бяды”, р. 30);
- b) — *Аткрой, мамаша. Сваі.*²

1. — *The house seems warm. That's nice. I need to take off my coat, do you mind?*
 — *Please, do it. You can hang it here on this nail.*

2. — *Open the door, mother. We are not strangers.*
 — *What do you need?*
 — *Well, open it.*
 — *I won't. I am alone at home, sick, I won't open it.*

— *Чаго вам нада?*

— *Ну аткрой!*

— *Не адкрыю. Я адна ў хаце, хворая, не адкрыю* (Bel. “Знак бяды”, p. 299).

The situation in Western Belarus was radically different. According to the Treaty of Riga, the Polish government was obliged to provide Belarusians and other ethnic groups with all the rights and freedoms, including the right to choose a language for any social activities and religion. However, the authorities went on to carry out the policy of polonization, with one of the goals to expel Belarusian out of usage: Belarusian literature and press were banned, Belarusian schools and libraries were closed, Orthodox churches were converted into Catholic ones where liturgies were held exclusively in Polish. The term “*Belarus*” was forbidden, and all the Belarusian regions added to Poland were called *Kresy Wschodnie* (Eastern Borderlands). Nevertheless, despite the fact that the government almost immediately pursued the policy of assimilation after the Treaty of Riga was signed, and the USSR came back to the policy of russification only in the 1930s, the Belarusian culture and language were better preserved in the western regions of Belarus. Although all the Catholics were automatically considered Polish as well as part of local people identified themselves as Polish, they continued speaking Belarusian. This paradoxical phenomenon could noticeably be traced in 1939 when western and eastern regions were re-united into one country.

The events of V. Bykov's books generally take place in the western regions of Belarus. We can easily find some literary examples with the historical references pointing out to the linguistic situation there before World War II. One of the characters named Tkachuk, a representative of an educational department, described the schools where some teachers could not understand Russian and could hardly speak Belarusian, and students had problems with the Belarusian grammar because they had studied in Polish (Bel. “Абеліск”, p. 54). Besides, the speech of characters gives evidence that people used to speak by mixing up Belarusian with Polish, transcribed in Belarusian Cyrillic, in a natural way:

a) *Tkachuk*: “*Выхавання была самага гжэчнага...*”³ (Bel. “Абеліск”, p. 48);

b) *Mr. Yakhimouski*: “*Радуецца? Шчэнсца вам? Ганьба...*”⁴ (Bel. “Знак бяды”, p. 159).

On the territory of Belarus, particularly in some regions of Western Belarus under Polish authorities, there was a high percentage of population who did not identify themselves with any ethnicity or language. They called themselves “*tutejszy*” (literally meaning “*locals*” or “*from here*”) and their language “*mowa prosta*” (literally meaning “*simple speech*”) or “*język tutejszy*” (literally meaning “*the language from this region*” or “*the here-ish language*”). This language was described by K. Braunmüller and G. Ferraresi as “*basically an uncoded and largely undescribed Belarusian vernacular*”

3. *Tkachuk*: “*She had the finest education.*”

4. *Adolf Yakhimouski*: “*Glad? You're happy? Shame...*”

(Braunmüller 2003: 107). Referring to the literary text, we can see that the characters from the “Obelisk” also call the language spoken over there and people as “*tutejszy*” However, we do not find any equivalent of this phenomenon in translation:

- a) *Tkachuk*: “...узяў у гаспадара, дзе кватараваў, ягоны веласіпед, «ровар» па-тутэйшаму...”⁵ (Bel. “Абеліск”, р. 48);
- b) *Stsepanida*: “Гэта ж ашалець трэба! Лявон! Ты ж свой, тутэйшы, як жа можна так?”⁶ (Bel. “Абеліск”, р. 188).

During World War II, the local population had to communicate with Nazi invaders. Even if we take into account that there were unlikely to be many people having good command of German, some simple communication was not extremely complicated as the contacts between local people and German troops had already taken place during World War I. Besides, at those times, Belarusians used to hear Yiddish, a language that is quite close to German and was widely spoken by the Jews, who made a significant percentage of the urban population in big cities and were a dominant ethnic group in small towns in Belarus. In his works, dedicated to tragic pages of the country’s war history, V. Bykov introduced numerous micro-dialogues that include basic German words and phrases completely transcribed in Belarusian Cyrillic when presenting the scenes of communication between the main characters and Nazi soldiers:

- a) — *Іст гут!*⁷
— *Гут? — успомніў Пятрок знаёмае яшчэ з той вайны нямецкае слова...* (Bel. “Знак бяды”, р. 64);
- b) *Немец паставіў за парог вядро і выпрастаўся.*⁸
— *Біттэ, біттэ.*
— *Во дзякуй! — сказаў Пятрок...* (Bel. “Знак бяды”, р. 66).

As we can conclude, the linguistic map of Belarus was far from being homogeneous. Although most Belarusians spoke their language in daily life, especially in rural areas, within their history they were always exposed to a linguistic diversity due to political events, economic contacts, ethnic and cultural varieties.

5. *Tkachuk*: “...I took the bicycle of my landlord, his bicycle, “rovar” as they say here... “

6. *Stsepanida*: “This is craziness! Liavon! You are ours, from here! How is it possible?”

7. — It is good!

— Good? — *Piatrok* remembered the familiar German word from the previous war.

8. The German put down the bucket behind the threshold and straightened back.

— Here it is.

— Oh, thanks! — said *Piatrok*.

Translation of Foreign Language Inclusions in the Works by V. Bykov into Russian

In world literature, there are two main approaches to introducing foreign language inclusions in the original. Within the first one, the author inserts foreign units without explanations, mostly relying on the contextual understanding and competences of the reader or considering them as elements of spirit, or atmosphere. In order to experience this spirit or atmosphere, their semantic perception is unnecessary and sometimes even obstructive, i.e. what is important is the form but not the information included in it. Within the second approach, the author somehow brings the meaning of the foreign word or phrase to the reader. Such units may be used in their foreign spelling or may be transcribed without morphological or syntactic changes.

Unlike writers, who are totally free to insert foreign language inclusions with different reasons in the original version when creating a new world in their works and can employ any techniques to make their readers feel the effect that the written text is intended to generate, translators are supposed to reproduce the literary creation in the way that is most suitable to retain the author's style, the plot and the atmosphere of the works with all possible cultural nuances. In the context of translating foreign language inclusions, one of the leading roles belongs to such strategies as *domestication* and *foreignization* that were first formulated by Friedrich Schleiermacher. In recent studies, the American translation theorist Lawrence Venuti defines them as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home" and "an ethnovegant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad" respectively (Venuti 1995: 20). Being an advocate of a foreignizing method, L. Venuti argues that "domestication and foreignization deal with 'the question of how much a translation assimilates a foreign text to the translating language and culture, and how much it rather signals the differences of that text'" (Venuti 1998: 102). However, when translators face the dilemma of whether to preserve the authenticity of the literary work as much as possible and, consequently, issue a bigger challenge for the readers to understand the cultural constituents or to adapt the text to the readers' cultural background and, thus, to sacrifice the cultural originality of the work, it is up to them to make up a decision in finding an appropriate translation solution.

In the following part, we are going to concentrate our attention at the foreign language inclusions in the original text, and their translation into a closely related language, i.e. Russian. Before analyzing the data, we consider it reasonable to mention here that the author leaves the readers without explanatory translations or notes about the meaning of the foreign language inclusions used. The readers are obliged to have some cultural background knowledge in order to handle all these foreign language constituents, or they might extract the ideas from the context while reading the stories. Moreover, the author embodies all the foreign language inclusions in the Belarusian Cyrillic transcription and, thus, makes the plot more plausibility of the plot as being presented by the main characters, who were mainly Belarusian speaking.

Polish Language Inclusions in the Original and their Translation in the Russian Texts

Targeting our objective, we are focused on the Polish inclusions in the Belarusian text. The example below is a sentence from the story of Tkachuk, one of the main characters, when rendering his meeting with Pani Yadzia, a Polish schoolteacher: “*Проша звiнiць, пан шэф, я, проша пана, па педагагічнай справе*”⁹ (Bel. “Абеліск”, p. 48).

It actually represents a mix of Belarusian and Polish constituents, transcribed in Belarusian Cyrillic and illustrating the way a non-Polish interlocutor might render Polish speech, though, not necessarily grammatically correct. Moreover, this is the way the characters intend to portray the person being described with a grain of irony as a typical old-fashioned Polish representative.

In the Russian version, we can still detect the broken Polish vocabulary that is also transcribed in Cyrillic and more russified that makes the meaning more transparent; therefore, there is no need in translation: “*Прошу извинить, пан шэф, я, проше пана, по педагогическому вопросу*” (Rus. “Обелиск”, p. 47).

The next dialogue is held between Stsepanida, the main character, and Adolf Yakhimouski, a representative of poor nobility, in whose house Stsepanida is a worker as well as a dweller. On the one hand, only Yakhimouski mixes up two languages, i.e. Polish and Belarusian. On the other hand, there is no obstacle for Stsepanida to understand her landlord. Both of them are accustomed to interacting with a language blend that might give a clue to a social segregation:

- *Даруйце нам, пане Адоля, — сказала Сцепа́ніда...*
- *Пан Езус даруе, — сказаў Яхімоўскі...*
- *Вы ж ведаеце, мы не самі. Ці ж мы прасілі? Нам далі.*
- *Але ж вы не адмовіліся...*
- *Ну як жа адмовіцца, пане Адоля? Адалі б яшчэ каму. Вунь Ганчарыкам нічога не дасталася.*
- *Цёнгле быў грэх квапіцца на чужое. На чужым і дармовым шчэнся не бэндзе. Мне шкада вас... Але ж нічога не зробіш, — сказаў ён, пачакаўшы.*
- *Я не жычу вам блага, хай Езус, Марыя памогуць вам...*¹⁰ (Bel. “Знак бяды”, p. 163-164).

In the Russian text, the dialogue is completely monolingual and presented in Russian. Only the form of addressing in the vocative case, which is untypical of Russian, from Stsepanida to Adolf Yakhimouski and his reference to Jesus Christ in the Polish

9. *I beg your pardon, Mr. Director. I am very sorry. I am here to talk about a pedagogical issue.*

10. — *Forgive us, Mr. Adolf, — said Stsepanida.*

— *May Jesus Lord forgive you, — said Yakhimouski...*

— *You know, it's not our fault. Did we ask for it? It was granted to us.*

— *But you did not refuse ...*

— *How could we, Mr. Adolf? They would've given it to anyone else. The Hancharyks got nothing.*

— *It's a sin to have your eyes on what is not yours. It won't make you happy. I'm sorry for you... But it can't be changed, — he said later. — I do not wish you anything bad. May Jesus and Mary help you...*

praying tradition can give an idea to the readers about his origin and social status and keep a reminder of the local linguistic atmosphere.

- Простите нас, **пане Адоля**, — сказала Степанида...
- **Пан Езус** простит, — сказал Яхимовский...
- Вы же знаете, мы не сами. Разве мы просили? Нам дали.
- Но вы же не отказались...
- Как же было отказаться, **пане Адоля**? Отдали бы еще кому. Вон Гончарикам ничего не досталось.
- Грех зариться на чужое... Но ничего не сделаешь, — сказал он походя. — Я совсем не желаю вам зла. Пусть **Езус**, Мария помогут вам... (Rus. “Знак беды”, p. 67).

We suppose that the artistic effect upon the recipient is generally retained in the examples of the Russian translation due to keeping some Polish language inclusions in the text as they convey the atmosphere where the characters act out.

Russian Language Inclusions in the Original and their Translation in the Russian Texts

The Belarusian text contains many dialogues with Russian language inclusions, though the speakers are not necessarily Russian. The first conversation is held between Stsepanida and Guzh, a Nazi collaborationist, or a *polizei* called in the German manner and with an extremely negative attitude by local people. Their speech is full of insert Russian words and expressions, including terms and concepts that were widespread in Russian at those times. At the same time, the interaction gives out the intentions to express irony by Guzh and to pretend innocence and play at misunderstanding by Stsepanida. The Russian inclusions in the Belarusian text increases the effect of irony in the conversation between the characters:

- Ты ж знаеш, што цябе трэба вешаць як бальшавіцкую акцявістку. А ты яшчэ хвост паднімаеш! На што ж ты расчываееш?
- А ні на што не расчываю. Я цёмная жэнічына.
- Гэта ты цёмная жэнічына? А хто баб у хату-чытальню збіраў? Цёмная жэнічына? А раскулачванне?
- Раскулачванне ты не забудзеш, канешне, — сказала яна...¹¹ (Bel. “Знак бяды”, p. 226).

11. — *You know you must be hanged as a Bolshevik activist but you dare to thrust out your head! What do you hope for?*
 — *I don't hope for anything. I'm an ignorant woman.*
 — *You're an ignorant woman?! And who gathered women in the reading room? An ignorant woman?! What about dispossession?*
 — *Of course, you won't forget dispossession, — she said.*

In the Russian version, the text is translated completely in Russian with all the Soviet realias that are most probably known to Russian readers. At the same time, it does not make use of any foreign language inclusions, which intensify the ironic effect in the original text. We can still observe some irony, though to a lesser extent and only due to the context:

- Ты же знаешь, что тебя надо повесить как большевистскую активистку. А еще хвост поднимаешь! На что ты рассчитываешь?
- А ни на что не рассчитываю. Я темная женщина.
- Это ты темная женщина? А кто колхозы организовывал? Кто баб в избучитальню сгонял? Темная женщина! А раскулачивание?
- Раскулачивание ты не забудешь, конечно, — задумчиво сказала она... (Rus. “Обелиск”, р. 90—91).

The second short dialogue is a conversation between a stranger and Stsepanida. In the original text, the stranger’s part is mostly Russian, hinting at his being a visitor, and, probably, from the authorities due to his speech full of political vocabulary, namely popular in those times the Sovietisms, and familiar to Stsepanida, one of the local activists. That is why she interacts in the same way, i.e. using the political terms in Russian:

- Хазяін, у калхозе састайш? Ці аднаасобнік?
- У калхозе, анягож, — звывкла азвалася за гаспадара Сцэпаніда. — З першага дня мы.
- Ну і як? Зажытачны калхоз?
- А, які там зажытачны! Беднаваты калхоз...¹² (Bel. “Знак бяды”, р. 274).

In the Russian version, the dialogue is translated in Russian and completely monolingual. However, the vocabulary related to the Soviet realias is preserved. In addition, the general context around may help in constructing the elements of the atmosphere described in the scene:

- Хозяин, в колхозе состоишь? Или единоличник?
- В колхозе, а как же! — привычно отозвалась за хозяина Степанида. — С первого дня мы.
- Ну и как? Зажиточный колхоз?
- А, какой там зажиточный! Бедноватый колхоз... (Rus. “Обелиск”, р. 111).

12. — Host, are you at the kolkhoz? Or an individual?
 — At the kolkhoz, of course, — answered Stsepanida as usual instead of the host. — From the very first day.
 — How is it? A prosperous kolkhoz?
 — Ah, prosperous?! Quite poor.

As we can conclude from the above-presented dialogues, the Russian language inclusions from the original text are rendered in their authentic forms in the Russian text. Having merged with the rest of the text, translated from Belarusian into Russian, they neither look nor sound emphasized anymore and, as a result, lose a subtle effect of foreignness and its functionality, i.e. increasing a degree of irony, pointing out to the origin or social status, etc. In their minds, the Russian readers can envision the historical background and feel the atmosphere conveyed by the author, though it is mostly related to the common cultural and historical heritage, thus, the differences may drop out of the readers' attention.

German Language Inclusions in the Original and their Translation in the Russian Texts

The original text also contains numerous mini-dialogues with German language inclusions, mostly carried out between Nazi invaders and the local population during their acts of communication. As a rule, these inclusions consist of simple words and short phrases spoken out by the parties of different social statuses and even ethnicities in order to transmit the message to other communicative participants. As we notice, the author leaves all the German constituents untranslated and transcribes them in Belarusian Cyrillic. The readers are supposed to predict their meaning from the context or their basic knowledge of the foreign language while becoming familiar with the war-thematic literature and cinematography. German was also the most popular foreign language at that time in Belarus.

The first dialogue taken as an example is acted out by Nazi officer and Piatrok, the main character. The officer is absolutely careless about being impolite when talking to Piatrok in a rude voice with uncompromising military-like orders and simplified lexical units. The language barrier does not contribute to the success of their communication. The officer applies his poor Russian vocabulary using incorrect forms and even vulgarisms to make the conversation somehow smoother:

- *Ком! Ком—ком...*
- *Я?*
- *Я, я. Ты,— пацвердзіў фельдфебель...*
- *Клазет ніхт? — запытаў фельдфебель раптам спыняючыся.*
- *Каго? — не зразумеў Пятрок.*
- *Сральня ніхт?*
- *Няма... Дык гэта, калі трэба, дык...*
- *Офіцёрклазет! — аб'явіў ён рашуча.— Драй час врэмя. Фэрштэйн? Панятнё?*
- *Дык панятна, — не зусім упэўнена сказаў Пятрок.*¹³ (Bel. “Абеліск”, p. 112—113)

13. — *Come! Come, come...*
 — *Me?*
 — *Yes, yes. You, — confirmed the sergeant major...*
 — *No lavatory? — asked the sergeant major after a sudden stop.*

In the Russian version, the dialogue is almost similar as it is translated into Russian with the German units transcribed in Russian Cyrillic, however, with vulgarisms omitted and replaced with repetitive authentic German words, most probably due to the censorship that was indefeasible before publishing any literary work in the USSR. The Russian readers also understand the meaning quite easily owing to the context and the linguistic and cultural background knowledge:

- *Ком! Ком—ком...*
 — *Я?*
 — *Я, я. Ты, — подтвердил фельдфебель. (ст.45)*
 — *Клозет ништ? — спросил фельдфебель, вдруг остановившись.*
 — *Кого? — не понял Петрок.*
 — *Клозет ништ? Ферштейн? Клозет, клозет?*
 — *Так это... Если кому надо, так...*
 — *Офицерклозет! — объявил он решительно. — Драй час врэмя. Ферштейн? Понятие?*
 — *Так, понятно, — не совсем уверенно сказал Петрок (Rus. “Обелиск”, р. 46).*

The next dialogue demonstrates a communicative contact between Piatrok, the main character, and Karl, a German kitchen helper with no relevant social status, and between Piatrok and a German soldier on guard. Defining their communication as a grammatically correct dialogue is complicated because it includes such elements of broken or simplified language as exclamations, affirmations, short military orders at some moments, and objects and body languages exploited by the participants. However, the interaction objective is achieved:

- *Гэта... Можна апасля, пан Карла? Ведаеце, лепш, каб вы далі гэта самае... Прыкурыць.*
 — *Курыц! — зразумеў Карла.— Я! Яволь!*
І ён дастаў з кішэні пачак цыгарэт...
 — *Я гэта... пакладу. Ну, каб апасля,— паказаў ён на мяса і на істопку.*
 — *Я, я,— пагадзіўся Карла.*
Пятрок хуценька падаўся да сенцаў, але тут ад палаткі рашуча ступіў вартавы.
 — *Хальт! Ферботэн!*
 — *Што?*
 — *Хальт! Цурук! — абвясціў ён...¹⁴ (Bel. “Абеліск”, р. 114-115).*

— *What? — said Piatrok.*

— *A shithouse?*

— *No ... So, if necessary, then ...*

— *An officer lavatory! — he said firmly. — Understand? Clear?*

— *Well, clear; — said Piatrok dubiously.*

14. — *Ah, I'll put it here... Well, for later; — he pointed to the meat and the barn.*

— *Yes, yes — agreed Karl.*

In the Russian version, the translation solution applied to the example is the same, i.e. the German language inclusions remain untranslated but are transcribed in Russian Cyrillic, and the Belarusian text is entirely translated in Russian. The Russian readers are unlikely to come across difficulties in understanding the meaning of the German language inclusions within this quite similar cultural context:

- *Это... Может, потом, пан Карла? Знаете, мне бы лучше это самое... Прикурить.*
 — *Курить! — понял Карла. — Я! Яволь.*
Он достал из кармана пачку сигарет...
 — *Я это... подожду. Ну, потом чтоб, — показал он на мясо и на истопку.*
 — *Я, я, — согласился Карла.*
Петрок быстренько подался к сенцам, но тут от палатки решительно шагнул часовой.
 — *Хальт! Ферботэн!*
 — *Что?*
 — *Хальт! Цурюк! — металлическим голосом гаркнул тот... (Rus. "Обелиск", p. 45).*

As we can see, the German language inclusions are present in the Russian version, and they substantially contribute to retaining some features of the original text and the perlocutive effect, in general. As a result, it helps the readers create the historical atmosphere where the story events take place. Although we can detect some losses in the Russian text, it still transmits the peculiarities of the foreign language inclusions quite precisely. The understanding is achieved due to the fact that Belarusian and Russian are closely related languages, and there is also cultural similarity at the extralinguistic level.

CONCLUSIONS

As we can see, the author floods his stories with numerous foreign language inclusions for various reasons. They evidently assist in depicting the atmosphere of the historical periods described in the stories and supply readers with references to certain events and clues to the profiles of the characters. The literary technique employed may lead to some issues the readers may encounter due to their belonging to different generations and origins. At the same time, it may be considered a perfect decision to reconstruct authentic images that are essential to the genre, in which V. Bykov used to write his works.

Piatrok quickly leaned toward the porch but the guard rapidly stepped out of the tent.

— *Stop! Forbidden!*

— *What?*

— *Stop! Keep back! — he shouted out...*

Having completed the research presented, we can declare that the translators exploited the following translation strategies: transcription (or transliteration) and complete translation, domestication and foreignization. In the translated texts, we observe the results of all these strategies. In addition, we have detected a correlation between a degree of using a certain strategy and the target language as well as a correlation between a selection of strategies and the language of the foreign inclusions. The statistical data of our research count as many as 94 foreign language inclusion units: 13 — Polish, 54 — Russian, and 27 — German. Making use of numerous inclusions in these languages is justified by the historical events described traced in the narratives and taking place in Western Belarus under Polish rule, as part of the USSR and occupied by the Nazis. The three languages mentioned constructed an obvious linguistic diversity of Belarus.

In the Russian version, there are examples of Polish language inclusions, though to a lesser degree than in the original. The numerous Russian language inclusions are predictably dissolved in the Russian text, and there is no hint at foreignness in the dialogues carried out by the characters; they logically remain authentic but in a different form of presentation, i.e. Belarusian Cyrillic changed for Russian Cyrillic. German language inclusions are adaptively preserved almost in the same amount as they are found out in the original. In the end, we can conclude that in the target closely related language, i.e. Russian, the dominant strategies applied are transcription and foreignization, with the exception of Russian foreign inclusions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BRAUNMÜLLER, K., FERRARESI, G. (2003). *Aspects of multilingualism in European language history*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- VENUTI, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- VENUTI, L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. Taylor & Francis US.
- АЛПАТОВ, В. М. (1997). *150 языков и политика: 1917 – 1997. Социолингвистические проблемы СССР и постсоветского пространства*. М: Ин-т востоковедения.
- БЕРКОВ, В. П. (2004). *Двуязычная лексикография*. Москва: Астрель, АСТ, Транзиткнига.
- БЫКАЎ, В. (2006). *Абеліск. Поўны збор твораў у чатырнаццаці тамах. (Т. 6)*. Мінск: Время.
- БЫКАЎ, В. (2013). Знак бяды. У кн.: *Пакахай мяне, салдацік. Аповесці. Анавяданні* (ст. 3-339). Мінск: Мастацкая літаратура.
- БЫКОВ, В. (2015). *Обелиск*. Москва: Эксмо.
- БЫКОВ, В. (2015). *Знак беды*. https://royallib.com/author/bikov_vasil.html
- ВЛАХОВ, С., ФЛОРИН, С. (1980). *Непереводимое в переводе*. Москва: Международные отношения.
- ЗАПРУДНІК, Я. (1996). *Беларусь на гістарычных скрыжаваннях*. Мінск: Бацькаўшчына.
- КУЛЬТУРА БЕЛАРУСІ В ГОДЫ СОВЕТСКОЙ ВЛАСТИ /Філаматы. Бюлетэнь Рэспубліканскага грамадскага аб'яднання Таварыства аматараў ведаў (філаматаў)

// Беларуская Інтэрнэт-Бібліятэка: <http://kamunikat.org/download.php?item=5584-7.html&pubref=5584>

РОЗЕНТАЛЬ, Д. Э. (1974). *Практическая стилистика русского языка*. Москва: Высшая школа.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (transliterated)

- ALPATOV, V. M. (1997). *150 yazykov i politika: 1917 – 1997. Sotsiolingvisticheskiye problemy SSSR i postsovetskogo prostranstva*. M: In-t vostokovedeniya.
- BERKOV, V. P. (2004). *Dvuyazychnaya leksikografiya*. Moskva: Astrel', ACT, Tranzitkniga.
- BRAUNMÜLLER, K., FERRARESI, G. (2003). *Aspects of multilingualism in European language history*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- BYKAŪ, V. (2006). *Abelisk. Poŭny zbor tvoraŭ u chatyrnatstsatsi tamakh*. (V. 6). Minsk: Vremya.
- BYKAŪ, V. (2013). *Znak byady*. U kn.: *Pakakhay myane, saldatsik. Apovetsi. Apavyadanni* (pp. 3-339). Minsk: Mastatskaya litaratura.
- BYKOV, V. (2015). *Obelisk*. Moskva: Eksmo.
- BYKOV, V. (2015). *Znak bedy*. https://royallib.com/author/bikov_vasil.html
- KUL'TURA BELARUSI V GODY SOVETSKOY VLASTI /Filamaty. Byuleten' Respublikanskaga gramadskaga ab'yadnannya Tavarystva amatarau vedaŭ (filamataŭ) // Belaruskaya Internet-Bibliyateka: <http://kamunikat.org/download.php?item=5584-7.html&pubref=5584>
- ROZENTAL', D. E. (1974). *Prakticheskaya stilistika russkogo yazyka*. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola.
- VENUTI, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- VENUTI, L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. Taylor & Francis US.
- VLAKHOV, S., FLORIN, S. (1980). *Neperevodimoye v perevode*. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.
- ZAPRUDNIK, YA. (1996). *Belarus' na gistarychnykh skryzhavannyakh*. Minsk: Bats'kaŭshchyna.