

DOI: 10.18524/2307-4558.2023.40.300478

UDC [811.161+811.162]’362’255.2/.4:82-343.4:398.2

Oleh TYSHCHENKO,Prof., DrSc., University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava; Námestie Jozefa Herdu 577/2, Trnava, Slovakia; e-mail: olkotiszczenko@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0811-2123>**Marianna FIGEDYOVÁ,**Paed.Dr., Ph.D., odborný asistent, Univerzita sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave; Námestie Jozefa Herdu 577/2, Trnava, Slovakia; e-mail: marianna.figedyova@ucm.sk; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1221-6496>.**STRATEGIES OF COGNITIVE IMAGES TRANSLATION IN FAIRY TALES
(WESTERN AND EASTERN SLAVIC INTERCULTURAL PARALLELS)¹**

Summary. The *object* is the semantic-grammatical and figurative-cognitive structure of phraseological analogues and fixed comparisons (in Czech and Slovak fairy tale texts) is traced in detail, taking into account their transformations in translation and types of interlingual phraseological equivalents, cases of replacement of phrases and paraphrases by non-phraseological contexts are explicated, and vice versa, the use of figurative signs and idioms in the target text that are not present in the original text (units with spatial semantics, emotion metaphors, folklorem and cognitem related to social and marriage concepts) are analysed. The *purpose* of this article is the differences in the figurative and conceptual structure, some initial, medial and final formulas in parallel texts and in comparison with other linguistic cultures, in particular Ukrainian and Polish fairy tale discourse (the concept of the Way, the journey, typical for fairy tales) are briefly described. **Conclusions:** Differences can also be traced at the level of semantic variation in the ways of expressing the difficult tasks and ordeals of the heroes, for example, the idea of the impossible or certain pragmatic formulas and constructions. These and other transformations of plots and motifs are typical of fairy tales in different linguistic cultures. This gives grounds to refer to them as peculiar cognitem. Where relevant, authors provides ethnocultural comments on the motivation of the images, their connection with traditional folk culture, ritual and customary representations of a particular ethnic group, and highlights the specifics of the rendering of these cultural realia, the symbolic function of objects and characters in the compared languages (verbalisation of the concepts of old age, unmarriedness, laziness, ways of phraseological representation of the semantic opposition of friend and foe, good and evil, clean and dirty, etc.).

Key words: phraseological analogue, comparison, fairy tale formula, cultural cognitem, conceptualisation, translation transformations, equivalents.

Introduction. Formulation of the problem. A folk tale is a whole layer of national culture, which contains the age-old wisdom of an entire nation. “Inner poetry” of the text of fairy tale is created by the unique ornamentation of folklore language elements: folklore realia, fairy tale formulas, beginnings and repetitions, etc. Therefore, the main difficulty is the search for functional equivalence in a particular culture, as well as their cultural adaptation.

The term “adaptation” in modern translation theory is used to “denote a type of transformation that results not only in a change in the description of a subject situation, but also in the replacement of the subject situation itself”. This technique plays a very important role in the translation of folklore pieces, in particular, folk tales, the perception of which is impossible by speakers of another culture without the use of linguocultural adaptation.

As V. A. Fedorov and E. I. Baeva fairly note, “the translator is at the crossroads of two cultures, two worldviews, and one of their tasks is to convey and render cultural experience in an accessible way with minimal losses, so that the translated text is perceived by readers in the same way as the original is perceived by native speakers. Through a successful translation, the reader adds to his or her ‘cognitive baggage’. And the main goal of translation is to obtain a meaningfully and impressively equivalent text in the culture of the target language” [here and further, the overview theoretical part of folklore research is presented by: 9, p. 125–126].

In the process of translating a literary text, a translator cannot but encounter the mismatch of elements of the system of two languages, as well as the phenomenon of lacunarity (insufficiency). This phenomenon is called “linguocultural or ethnolinguocultural asymmetry”. “Ethnolinguocultural asymmetry is a complex phenomenon, the dichotomous nature of which determines opposite vectors of development of the translation process. In one case ethnolinguistic-cultural asymmetry leads to translation errors and inconsistencies, generating disharmony, quasi-adequacy. In another case, ethnolinguistic-cultural asymmetry leads to a harmonious translation text, which becomes the property of another language and another culture”.

¹ The study is published with the support of the international grant project Erasmus+ KA220-HED № 2021-1-SK01-KA220-HED-000022917 entitled *The innovation of the concept and curriculum of doctoral study programs and increasing their effectiveness.*

Literature Review. E. V. Zykova examines the concepts of “good” and “evil” on the fairy tale material of Russian and English culture, which “model a certain national image of the world and regardless of the peculiarities of their form, are built on the basis of value categories”. A number of studies are devoted to the study of folklore, phraseological units, and stable comparisons in fairy tales. An inexhaustible and relevant topic for the study of phraseology is the reconstruction of the “phraseological picture of the world”, the problems of correlation between national and international, language and culture, to fragments of the picture of the world, encoded in phraseological units; such, for example, are the works of S. I. Kotkova, O. A. Davydova, O. E. Frolova and others. Aleshchenko’s work “Ethno-linguistic picture of the world in the texts of folklore (on the material of a folk tale)” should also be mentioned in this connection. A. Birikh considers the composition of the language in the fairy tale folklore: a) phraseological units coinciding with phraseological units of literary language; b) phraseological units coinciding with the phraseological units of Russian folk dialects; c) fixed expressions used only in various folklore genres, i.e. folklore phraseological units proper, for example, *clear falcon, good fellow, red the sun, in a faraway kingdom, in a faraway state, neither in a fairy tale nor with a pen describe*, etc.).

Methods. First of all, let us briefly consider the main differences in the symbolism of objects and actions in the archetypal world model of Russian and West Slavic (Slovak and Czech) fairy tale text, its semantics, pragmatics and figurative component. Separately, we will talk about the cultural function of names in the actional, subject and verbal symbolic codes and their typology, we will dwell on the national and cultural specifics of fairy-tale realities, characters and related folklore formulas that are relevant in translation, ethno-cultural and semiotic correspondences.

For ages, a genetic connection has existed between a fairy tale and a myth and the archetypal representations associated with it. In this connection, several researchers of the structural typology of folklore draw attention to the fact that “a certain syncretism dominates in archaic narrative folklore: a fairy tale has not completely separated from myth, not yet, its varieties have only just begun to differentiate, a significant number of fairy tales have saved distinct relics of myth, and many stories are attached to popular mythical characters...”. Vladimir Yakovlevich Propp and Claude Lévi-Strauss once argued about the fundamental closeness of myth and fairy tale; while the first calls the fairy tale “mythical” (at least based on its genesis from myth), the second sees the fairy tale as only a slightly “weakened” myth.

According to T. V. Tsivyan, in terms of content, the archetypal model of the world is oriented towards the ultimate cosmologization of the existent and, thereby, to the description of the cosmologized modus vivendi and the main parameters of the universe — spatio-temporal, causal, ethical, quantitative, semantic, character. The latter, in her opinion, can be described through a set of binary semantic oppositions (she allocates up to 12 pairs of similar binary oppositions in the folklore and mythological test), which have positive and negative meanings.

Obviously, the basic constants of folk culture are closely connected with spoken folk art. The description of the conceptosphere of a fairy tale text is impossible without reference to folklore, because it is in this linguocultural layer that it is possible to identify the sources and ways of mental characteristics formation of a certain ethnic group.

The conceptosphere of folklore on the material of different folklore genres is the object of study of a number of scientific approaches (S. E. Nikitina, A. T. Khrolenko, etc.). Proceeding from this, some researchers endeavour “to identify key word-concepts correlated with several thematic classes, in particular, “Man”, “World”, “Faith”, “Soul”, “Home””.

On the other hand, the possibility of such comparative studies of folklore, according to A. Lisichkina, is conditioned by the fact that “the formation of the fairy-tale world is connected with the construction of a stereotypical image as a result of entering the system of certain cultural values. At this point, the encounter with the images of (other, alien) fairy-tale culture will inevitably contrast with the component structure of one’s own world”.

Results and Discussion. As an example, let us dwell on the differences in the symbolism of objects and actions in the compared texts of fairy tales. Differences are observed primarily in the actional code, in particular, in the non-identical symbolism of realities, magical attributes, and actions. Let us emphasize that exactly this feature of a fairy tale that makes the structure of characters capable of intra- and inter-plot transformations and makes it possible for semantically the same type of figures to play a wide variety of roles in the plot (for example, mother-giver, mother-harm, mother-victim, etc.), which significantly increases the variability of fairy-tale collisions.

Our comparisons of Slovak and Czech fairy tales also prove the fact that different characters can perform the same semantic function.

Pay attention to the roll-call-analogs of fairy tale motifs and plots, the symbolism of objects, and their functions in Russian and Slovak cultures. Thus, the motif of *Kashcheev’s death* in an egg, traditional for Russian fairy tales, echoes such a motif among the Slovaks (the strength of the hero is contained in the egg, which is in the deer grazing under the oak, and in the middle of the duck; the hero drinks the egg and takes away his strength, power from the sorcerer): “...пока он [мальчишка-чародей — О. Т., М. Ф.] ей [княжне — О. Т., М. Ф.] не открыл, что, мол, в горах за замком растёт дуб, под дубом

олень пасётся, в том олене утка, в той утке золотое яйцо. — А в том яйце, — говорит он, — в том яйце, душенька, вся моя сила” (“Солнечный конь” // “Sunshine horse”) [ЧСНС, с. 144].

It is significant that in the Slovak texts, the King of Water acts as an analog of *Kashchei*, who also identifies the victim by smell: “Вскоре появился Король воды и ещё в дверях закричал: Жена, что-то человеческим духом пахнет. Давай его сюда, а то тебе плохо придётся!”. The King of Water soon appeared and shouted at the door: “*Wife, something smells like a human spirit. Give it here, otherwise, you will have a bad time!*” (“Король времени” — King of the time) [ЧСНС, с. 130].

The motif of rewarding a hard-working stepdaughter and punishing her stepmother’s lazy daughter (the fairy tale “Morozko” and a number of others), characteristic of many fairy tales, is transformed in the Czech fairy tale tradition (“Про кошечку и собачку” // “About a cat and a dog”) through the image of the Kolobok’s Way (here this object is endowed with the symbolic function of an assistant indicating stepdaughter’s way to the road). However, a different verbal text is associated with it (the hero of a Czech fairy tale addresses him): “Колобок, колобок, куда мне идти, скажи, путь укажи!” — lit. *Kolobok, kolobok, where should I go, tell me, show me the way!* [ЧСНС, с. 82]. Wed the ritual (fatal) path of Kolobok and its verbal and archetypal code in Russian and Ukrainian fairy tales in the interpretation of T. V. Tsivian and other researchers.

Traditional formulas as genre-forming features of a fairy tale are deeply original, they give the language of fairy tales a bright national colouring, flavour, expressiveness, specific imagery, carry a lot of country-specific information and are a source of knowledge of peoples’ history and culture.

In connection with what has been said, we note that the semantic unity of the text is also ensured by its structure (composition, repetitions, configuration of motives, roll call with other texts, etc.), and — first of all — by its function, its communicative task, time, place, manner and other conditions of performance and all that, by analogy with linguistic (speech) pragmatics, can be called the pragmatics of a cultural text.

Wed a sentence in which the hero refers to a handkerchief as a means of reviving the dead: *Милый платочек ступай, вытри глаза убитым в лесу!* — lit. *Dear handkerchief, go, dry the eyes of those killed in the forest!* (“Ручная мельница” // “Hand Mill”) [ЧСНС, с. 92]. Wed Russian common motifs with rejuvenating living and dead water in Slavic fairy tales, according to L. N. Vinogradova and V. Ya. Propp.

A peculiar motive for inducing action and a locus in a Slovak fairy tale is not a hut on chicken legs, but a mill: *Мельница крутись, столлик появись, скатерть, растелись, дайте выпить-закусить* — lit. *Turn the mill, appear a table, tablecloth, spread out, give me a drink and a snack* (“Ручная мельница” // “Hand Mill”) [ЧСНС, с. 92], obviously correlated with a self-assembled tablecloth in many Russian fairy tales.

Traditional for fairy tales common cognitemes of the difficult task and the protagonist’s ordeal in fairy tales (motives of lack according to V. Propp) can also be different in various linguistic and cultural spaces.

For example, in some Polish fairy tales, the sister of the enchanted brothers’ **silence** and her **hard work**, including **spinning cloth** from which the heroine must **spin seven shirts**, can serve as both redemption and ordeal (to “odkruzyć” them, i.e. to break the spell, so that they could turn back into humans): “*Musisz, siostrzo, milceć, jak mileżą gwiazdy na niebie, jak mileżą kamienie w polu. Musisz milceć siedem lat i siedem miesięcy, i siedem tygodni, i siedem dni, i siedem godzin... — A pod tę porę len posiejesz, len wyrwiesz, len wysuszysz, len pokruszysz. I wprzędziesz z kądzieli nici, a z nici utkasz płótno. I uszyjesz z płótna siedem koszul. Bracia te koszule obłócą, bracia się w to oczymgnięcie odkruczą*” (“Siostra siedmiu kruków”) [Porazińska, s. 32].

The identification of pragmatic units is also important, for example, formulas as a source of fabulous, epic, song or “mysterious” text, correlation of national or international, cf. the analysis of the fairy tale formula lived in the Ugro-Finnish and Slavic areal-comparative aspects of O. Tkachenko [6] or the “impossible” formulas used for allegorical expressions of the concepts “never” and “nowhere” in German phraseology, the roots of which go back to called “poetry of nonsense”. By careful observation V. M. Mokienko, a comparison of Russian and German temporal phraseology reveals a common typological universal, previously described by well-known folklorists A. Taylor, P. G. Bogatyrev, N. Roshyan, — the so-called “impossible formula”.

The above-mentioned **then-when=never** model [3, с. 339] often appears in combination with narratives where the protagonist performs some extra, unnecessary work as punishment, ordeal or reward, and can be understood as a separate cognitive theme (dry-damp-wet, identified by C. Lévi-Strauss): *Вот и теперь приказала мачеха Настеньке идти в лесную чащу и найти там самый сухой пенёк. Велела поливать его до тех пор, пока на нём молодые цветочки не вырастут* — lit. *Now Nastenka’s stepmother ordered her to go into the forest and find the driest stump there. She told her to water it until young flowers grew on it* [Podlesnych, s. 10] — Chesh. *Tentokrát prikázala macecha Nástěnce, aby šla do hlubokého lesa a našla tam najsušší parez. Nařídila jí, aby ho zalívala do té doby, dokud na nem nevyrostou mladé kvítky* [Podlesnych, s. 11].

In O. Kolberg’s Pokutsko-Bukovyna fairy tales, the protagonist carries water with his mouth like a crayfish and waters a **dry beech tree**: він відміряв сорок кроків від потоку та й застромив той бук.

Каже, **аби нарацки (як рак), лазив до того потока, та й аби ротом носив воду, та й аби поливав той буж, аж поки не прийметься та не зародить** — lit. «...he measured forty steps from the stream and stuck the beech tree in. He says **to crawl like a crayfish to the stream, carry water with his mouth, and water the beech until it comes to life** (“Розбійник Іван” // The Rogue Ivan) [K 1990, с. 177].

It should be noted that such motives correlate with the cultural cognition of punishing unmarried women, especially old virgins, who, as a punishment, perform some heavy or unnecessary extra work, even after death see more details O. Tyshchenko [8, p. 129, 132].

The most interesting are **the analogues of phraseological units and formulas in the fairy tale text** in comparative, translation and linguoculturological analyses. Let us dwell on them in more detail. At the same time, the correspondence in the translation may not coincide in terms of the degree of figurativeness. According to V. Nelyubin, we are talking about “translation using an idiomatic analogue, i.e. an idiom that conveys the same idea, but is associated with a different imagery”.

As analogues with different internal motivation of the component composition, we will first of all give such examples presented in the texts of Russian-Czech fairy tales (meanings of emotion, inner experience of the hero, luck, happiness, good luck, diligence): **Твоя взяла, дед!** — lit. *Yours took, grandfather!* — Czech. **Vyhrál jsi, stařečku!** (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 15]; **Тысяча дел всегда было у Настеньки, и любая работа у неё спорилась** — lit. *Nastěnka always had a thousand things to do, and any work she did was arguable* — Czech. **Nastěnka měla vždy plno práce a vše se jí dařilo** (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 7]; **У старухи и её дочери от сердца отлегло** — *теперь можно не беспокоиться, что Настька Марфушеньке дорогу перейдёт* — lit. *The old woman and her daughter felt relieved from the heart — now you don't have to worry that Nastya Marfushenka will cross the road.* — Czech. **Stařene a její dceři se ulevilo — teď nemusí mít strach, že by Nastěnka Marfuše křížila cestu** (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 23].

The phraseological unit of the original and its translation have a typologically similar figurative structure, represented by synonymous lexical variants (belonging to the same lexical-semantic field) — to cross the road 'to interfere with someone. in achieving the goal, hindering the implementation of smth' and **křížila cestu** — lit. *crossed out, put an end to someone's road*. It is these correspondences that are presented in bilingual phraseography in dictionaries, cf. **zkřížit cestu komu** — lit. *to stand in someone's way; run across someone's path; meet on whose way* [CRFS, s. 65].

In addition, in the same fragment of the text, the phraseological unit **от сердца отлегло** — lit. *was translated from the heart* by a coarse grammatical transformation with an absent subject (an impersonal sentence with the meaning of the internal state) **se ulevilo** (it became easier) — Czech. **Stařene a její dceři se ulevilo — teď nemusí mít strach, že by Nastěnka Marfuše křížila cestu** (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 23].

The conceptualization of the cultural semantic opposition (*us-them*) in the studied folklore texts is clearly marked through the idea of someone else's property and the somatic code. For example, **Один князь женился на прекрасной княжне и не успел ещё на неё наглядеться, не успел с нею наговориться, не успел её послушаться, а уж надо было им расставаться, надо было ему ехать в дальний путь, покидать жену на чужих руках. Что делать! Говорят, век обнявшись не просидеть** — lit. *One prince married a beautiful princess and did not have time to look at her enough, did not have time to talk to her, did not have time to listen to her enough, and they had to part, he had to go on a long journey, leave his wife in someone else's arms. What to do! They say that one cannot sit for a century embracing* (“Белая уточка” // White duck) [HPC, с. 352].

In this original text, a stylistic repetition (anaphora) is presented that enhances the emotional intensity when conveying separation in a narrative narrative, stringing constructions with not, and the free, ugly construction in the original did not have time to hear it enough is conveyed by the metaphorical epithet **nestačil sa jej medového hlasu napočúvať**. The social idea of foreignness, foreign hands, property presented in the original text (**покидать жену на чужих руках** — Slovak. *A už sa museli rozlúčiť a kňažnú musel nechať doma na starosť iným*) leaving a wife in someone else's hands (“Biela kačička”) [RLR, s. 223] in the Slovak correspondence it is not transmitted at all and is not marked phraseologically, semiotically, and the Czech equivalent is as close as possible to the Russian original (with a slight replacement of leave for entrust — **svěřit do cizích rukou**) (“Bílá Kachnička”) [Ruské lidové, s. 352].

The spatial semantics of phrasemes in the original and in the translation is represented by the same somatic code of phraseological objects of different internal form, which also denote emotions, like melancholy, for example: **Отнёс Иван палку и побрёл куда глаза глядят**. Совсем одолела парня **тоска-кручина**, ниже плеч он голову повесил — lit. *Ivan took the stick and wandered wherever his eyes looked. The sadness completely overcame the guy, he hung his head below his shoulders* — Czech. **Ivan odnesl hůl a pak se vydal přímo za nose. Nadobro ho přemohl smutek, svěsil hlavu** (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 28–29].

In this case, the metaphor of sadness, deep sadness of melancholy appeared in Russian and in Slovak as an active subject with different predicates in the original and translated versions is completely omitted in the target text of the folklore **тоска-кручина** — sadness as a non-equivalent unit.

Let us consider another national-culturally marked expression, the inner form of which is associated with the value-semantic categorization of the concept sphere of impurity, garbage: *Хорошо, — сказала баба-яга, — что ты спрашиваешь только о том, что видела за двором, а не во дворе! Я не люблю, чтоб у меня сор из избы выносили, и слишком любопытных ем!* — lit. *Well, — Baba Yaga said, — why are you asking only about what you saw outside the yard, and not in the yard! I do not like to have rubbish taken out of my hut, and I eat too curious!* [НПС, с. 64] — Slovak. *Nemám rada, keď niekto strká nos do mojich súkromných vecí, a veľkých zvedavcov jem!* (“Krásna Vasilisa”) [RLR, s. 30]. The Gestalt structure (cognitemes) also differs in such interlingual phraseological correspondences (in the original, the figurative unit is associated with the concept of garbage, sewage, in contrast to the Czech correspondence, correlated with the somatic code and conceptualizing the mentioned idea of one’s own or another’s as interference in other people’s affairs (*poke one’s nose*) (cf. Russian. *Сунуть нос в чужие дела* — lit. *Poke your nose into other people’s affairs*).

Turning to the Russian idiom, it is worth noting that it is associated with such a circle of ideas and prohibitions, according to which at a certain time of Christmas time, they were careful not to take out the garbage from the house, so as not to take out their luck [4, с. 425]. This expression (A. Afanasiev, A. Potebnya, V. Mokienko, etc.) is a fragment of the ancient advice and ritual wedding performances and superstitious customs, according to which it was recommended to burn garbage in the oven, and not throw it over the threshold, since an evil person could supposedly send trouble to the owner; the guests who came to the wedding tested the patience of the bride by forcing her to sweep the hut; later, freed from the ritual coloring, this advice acquired a figurative meaning: not to disclose family troubles, squabbles and other “unpleasant” “trifles of everyday life.” The words *rubbish, garbage, nonsense, gibberish, dirt*, in which the original meaning was “wood debris, rubbish, garbage, dirt” were used in a figurative sense, got the meaning of noise, abuse, absurd and empty speeches [4, с. 659].

As part of phraseological analogues with ethnocultural semantics in Russian linguoculture, the cultureme — *воля* will function, which in a generalized metaphorical sense is presented in the following context: *Если ты люб Ольге-царевне, то пусть за тебя идёт; я с неё воли не снимаю* — lit. *If you are loved by Princess Olga, then let him go for you; I do not remove her will from her* [НПС, с. 101]. It corresponds to the concept of blocking the way in the Slovak language: *Ak si cárovnej Olge milý, nech je teda tvoja, v ceste jej stáť nebudem*, — lit. *I will not stand in her way* (“Marja Morevna”) [RLR, s. 166].

The image of the will is presented in Russian dialect phraseology: *Не снимать воли с кого* — lit. *Do not remove the will from someone* (Kursk dialects) “do not limit someone in actions, deeds”, removal of the will “marriage” (Olonets). The will in the symbolic language of traditional culture is associated with the motives of girlhood, the attributes of girlhood; it acquires the meaning of freedom of marriage choice, desire or unwillingness to marry; in the wedding ceremony, various ritual actions are known, aimed at the possession of the will, i.e. the power of one of the spouses over the other; the motive of will as a free girl’s life before marriage takes on different forms in the wedding ceremony, primarily in the Russian North [5, с. 430]; this item is used in the ritual of the bride’s farewell to girlhood, which is called *отдавать, сдавать, отнимать волю, снимать волю, жечь волю* — to give, surrender, take away the will, remove the will, burn the will.

An example of partial equivalents can be the following examples: *Иван вспомнил, что видел этого кота в свите Бабы Яги. Не успел Иван и глазом моргнуть, как кот шмыгнул в волшебные саночки и был таков* — lit. *Ivan remembered that he had seen this cat in the retinue of Baba Yaga. Before Ivan could even blink his eyes, the cat darted into the magic sledge and was like this* — Czech. *Ivan si vzpomněl, že tohoto viděl kocoura ve svitě baby Jagy. Ivan nestačil ani okem mrknout, jak kocour skočil do kouzelných saní a byl ten tam* (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 57].

As is known, with partial equivalence, other components different from the FL can be traced, often synonymous replacements of components (as a rule, belonging to the same semantic field), a different structure of nominative units in the course of translation transformations. In this regard, let us give such an example: *Только что выгнал он кобылиц в поле, кобылицы задрали хвосты и все врознь по лугам разбежались; не успел царевич глазами вскинуть, как они совсем пропали* (“Марья Моревна”) [НПС, с. 104] — lit. *He had just driven the mares into the field, the mares lifted their tails and all scattered across the meadows; before the prince had time to raise his eyes, they completely disappeared* — Chesh. *Cárovič nestačil ani mrknúť a už boli preč* [Ruské lidové, s. 191] — Slovak. *Carevič ještě ani oči nepozvedl a už se docela ztratily* (synonymous options: *vschnout, mrgnout* — *throw up, blink* — *oči nepozvedl*) (“Marja Morevna”) [RLR, с. 177].

Full equivalents are also fairly common. When transferring the figurative basis (structure) of proverbs, the latter very often coincide, i.e. a literal, literal or very close to the original translation solution is presented: *Спрашивай; только не всякий вопрос к добру ведёт: много будешь знать, скоро состарешься* — lit. *Ask; only not every question leads to good: you will know a lot, you will soon grow old!* (“Василиса прекрасная” // “Vasilisa the Beautiful”) [НПС, с. 64].

Note that the original text does not present the form of the verb you will grow old, but the more archaic form you will grow old (*состарешься*). The Slovak correspondence is an adapted version of

a modified proverb with a different actant and grammatical structure: *Kto je veľmi zvedavý, bude skoro starý!* [RLR, s. 30]. An example of complete correspondences in a literal translation is this: *He бойся, Василиса Прекрасная! Поужинай, помолись да спать ложися; утро мудреней вечера!* — lit. *Do not be afraid, Vasilisa the Beautiful! Have dinner, pray and go to bed; the morning is wiser than the evening!* — Slovak. *Neboj sa, krásna Vasilisa! — odpovedala bábika., Zjedz, večeru, pomodli sa a chod spať, ráno je múdrejšie večera* (“Krásna Vasilisa”) [RLR, s. 28].

The most frequent cases are when in the text of a fairy tale a phraseological unit, an idiom in the target (Czech or Slovak) text is translated by a non-phraseological unit or the equivalent is represented by a construction in which there is no figurative or value-semantic, evaluative component of semantics: *Она ни тяжёлой, ни лёгкой работы не знала; одно только дело ей было по душе: очень любила Марфушка орехи щёлкать* — lit. *It is neither hard nor easy work knew; only one thing was to her liking: Marfushka loved to crack nuts very much — Neumela ani ľahkou, ani ťažkou práci; jediná vec, ktorou delala s obľubou, bylo louskáni orechů* (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 7]; *Был он первым парнем на деревне* — lit. *He was the first guy in the village — Byl nejlepším chlapcem ve vesnici* (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 12–13].

The latter presents a literal translation with minor lexical substitutions: the former with better and chlapcem, which is a more general and neutral inter-style translation.

Nationally-marked, folklore epithets (*белый свет* — lit. *white light*) and other folk poetic elements (*от зари до зари* — lit. *from dawn to dawn*) are transmitted by neutral, colloquial semantic equivalents, and figurative signs of nomination are generally omitted during translation: for example, *На всём белом свете никого у Ивана не было, кроме старой матушки. От зари до зари трудилась она не покладая рук, в чистоте и порядке держала своё хозяйство* — lit. *Ivan had no one in the whole wide world, except for the old mother. From dawn to dusk she worked tirelessly, kept her household clean and tidy* — Czech. *Nikoho na svete neměl kromě staré maminky. Pracovala bez ustání od svítání do soumraku, udržovala domácnost v čistotě a pořádku* (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 13], where, as we see, the *PO не покладая рук* is tirelessly replaced by the prepositional case form (adverbial) *bez ustání*, which occupies a different place in the translated construction than in the original language (the order of the syntactic components has changed, the components of the syntactic construction in Czech).

The repeatedly mentioned ways of conveying national cultural vocabulary (ritual and marriage and family designations, realia, cf. the realities of celibacy, old virginity) in the compared languages are mainly associated with the symbolism of cultural realities, and in the source language are represented by figurative means that are absent in another language. At the same time, phraseologisms, proverbs and folklorem-epithets (folk poetic vocabulary) are full equivalents: *Кончилось лето красное, пришла зима. Много воды с той поры утекло. Мачеху тоска-кручина одолела. Вся извелась старая, что её любимая дочка Марфушенька-душенька в девках сидит* — lit. *Red summer is over, winter has come. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then. The sadness overcame the stepmother. The old woman is all exhausted that her beloved daughter Marfushenka-darling is sitting in the girls* — Czech. *Skončilo krásné leto a prišla zima. Mnoho vody za tu dobu uplynulo. Macechu přemohlo trápení. Soužilo ji, že její milovaná dcérka Marfuška-dušička stále ještě nemá ženicha* (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 33].

Wed phraseological unit associated with the symbolic language of culture, in particular the concept of celibacy: *сидеть в девках* — lit. *to sit in girls*, which in the target language does not have a figurative correlate (*ještě nemá ženicha*), but is represented by a free and coarse construction. In this regard, let us pay attention to the specifics of the transmission of verbal predicates with the meaning of physical impact, which is combined with the metaphorical representation of emotions encoded using synonymous associative pairs of *melancholy-gritty*): *тоска-кручина одолела* — *melancholy-gritty* — *overcame přemohlo trápení*.

The motif of old girlhood in Czech fairy tales is presented in the translation by an individual author’s translation transform *киснуть в девках* — lit. *to turn sour in the girls*, which arose on the basis of the folk *сидеть в девках* — lit. *sit in the girls*, the expressiveness of which is enhanced by the folk poetic repetition: *Жила в деревне старая девка по имени Кача. Были у неё домик и сад, к тому же и денежки водились, но будь она хоть золотом увешана, на неё самый распоследний батрак не польстился бы, до того была она сварлива и зла... Ко всему прочему была Кача нехороша собой. Ей недалеко было до сорока, а она всё кисла в девках, видно, суждено ей было одной век вековать* — lit. *There lived an old girl named Kacha in the village. She had a house and a garden, besides, she had money, but even if she was hung with gold, the most last farm laborer would not be flattered by her, she was so grumpy and angry... In addition, Kacha was not good-looking. She was not far from forty, and she was still sour in the girls, apparently, she was destined to live one century* (“Чёрт и Кача” // “Devil and Kacha”) [ЧНС, с. 106].

When transferring cultures and translation strategies, there is such a type of correspondence when there is no phraseological unit in the original, that is, a free coarse context or a combination of words, a construction is presented, and when translating, a phraseological equivalent or a figurative sign of

a nomination, an idiom or a comparative phrase is selected. Let's look at some examples: *Купец женился на вдовушке, но обманулся и не нашёл в ней доброй матери для своей Василисы* — lit. *The merchant married a widow, but was deceived and did not find in her a good mother for his Vasilisa* — Slovak. *Ako sa neskôr ukázalo, nemal šťastnú ruku, dobrú matku pre svoju Vasilisu v nej nenašiel* (“Krásna Vasilisa”) [RLR, s. 22].

So, in the target text (in the Slovak translation), instead of the ugly construction-sentence, the *Девушки работали. Вот нагорело на свечке* — lit. *Girls worked. Here the phraseological unit Dievčatám šla práca od ruky* (“Krásna Vasilisa”) [RLR, s. 23].

It should be noted that with the help of the same phrase in the Slovak linguistic culture, the contextual metaphor of the original was translated with the meaning of fire, temperature to denote good work (intense, fast): *Старушка купила льну хорошего; Василиса села за дело, работа так и горит у неё, и пряжа выходит ровная да тонкая, как волосок. Набралось пряжи много; пора бы и за тканье приниматься, да таких берд не найдут, чтобы годились на Василисину пряжу* (“Василиса прекрасная” // Vasilisa the Beautiful) [HPC, c. 65] — lit. *The old woman bought good flax; Vasilisa sat down to work, the work burns with her, and the yarn comes out smooth and thin, like a hair. A lot of yarn has accumulated; it's time to start weaving, but they won't find such reeds that are suitable for Vasilisa's yarn* — Slovak. *Práca jej šla od ruky, radosť pozerat', a priadza bola jemná, a tenká ako vlások* (“Krásna Vasilisa”) [RLR, s. 23].

In this regard, let us pay attention to the specifics of the transfer of the weaving reality, the *berdo* tool as *tkáčsky stav*, although the Slovak language also has the *berdo* lexeme (and phraseological connections of units with this weaving term), i.e. a terminological replacement by a phrase in the target language was carried out.

Another example of this type of correspondence is the following: the absence of a phraseological unit in the original when translated as an idiom in one of the compared languages (Slovak), and in Czech there is no such translation solution and is almost a literal equivalent: *Много плакала княгиня, много князь её уговаривал, заповедовал не покидать висока терема, не ходить на беседу, с дурными людьми не ватажиться, худых речей не слушаться. Княгиня обещала все исполнить* (“Белая уточка”) [HPC, c. 190] — lit. *The princess cried a lot, the prince persuaded her a lot, commanded not to leave a high tower, not to go to a conversation, not to hang out with bad people, not to listen to bad speeches. The princess promised to fulfil everything* [“White duck”] — Slovak. *Kňažná veľmi plakala a knieža jej kládol na srdce a zaprisahával ju, aby nevychádzala zo svojej komnaty, s nikým zbytočne nehovorila, nestýkala sa so zlými ľuďmi, neposlúchala nikoho, kto by sa jej snažil čokoľvek nahovoriť* (“Biela kačička”) [RLR, s. 223] — Czech. *Kněžna velice plakala, tuze jí kníže domlouval, aby vysoký palác neopouštěla, na žádné táčky nechodila, se špatnými lidmi aby se nestýkala a zlé řeči aby neposlouchala* (“Bílá Kachnička”) [Ruské lidové, s. 352].

Further we will briefly examine the figurative structure of some **initial and final, in particular comparative formulas** in the compared folklore texts with the involvement of facts from different Slavic languages. In the study of O. I. Bodnar, the following typology of the Ukrainian folk tales beginnings was proposed: existential-possessive, existential, existential-locative-temporal, dating-temporal, beginning with a prologue, starting with an epigraph, starting with an address [1, c. 87], see also [2, c. 481].

The initial formulas of some Ukrainian fairy tales present motifs of the impossible: *Це було давно-давно, коли кури несли телят, а вівці — писанки, файніші, ніж у Косові...* — lit. *It was a very long time ago, when chickens bore calves and sheep — Easter eggs more beautiful than in Kosovo* (“Чарівне горнятко” // “The Magic Cup”) [УНС 1988, c. 196].

By the way, it should be emphasized that we find similar topographical motifs in Polish fairy tales, cm. *Za górami, za lasami, za bystrymi dunajami, w pewnej wiosce, na uboczu stała zagroda* [Porazińska, s. 176] — *Hen.... za górą wysoką, hen za dunajem głębokim było królestwo bogate, piękne i rozległe* („Trzej synowie”) [Porazińska, s. 54].

The image of the Danube is also represented in the middle topographical formulas of Polish fairy tales (with verbs of movement repetition) to denote a road, a long journey: *Jechał, jechał... trzy wysokie góry przebył, trzy wgłębokie dunaje przepłynął* („Popieluszka”) [Porazińska, s. 143].

It should be noted that the mentioned folklore image of the Danube (*za bystrymi dunajami*), according to the testimony of the Polish ethnolinguist E. Bartmiński, is reconstructed as “zmitologizowany obraz wielkiej wody, centrum swojskiego świata, droga i zarazem granica ziemi błogosławionej; poetyzm o podstawowym znaczeniu ‘wielkiej, głębokiej, odległej wody’; w przysłowia i pieśniach przybiera bogate znaczenia symboliczne: swobody, młodości, miłości oraz początku i końca granicy przestrzennej i życiowej” [7, s. 167].

Then let us consider the **end formulas**, which have a common lexical composition and are quite similar in imagery and are transferred by means of rhyming constructions: *Был у Иванушки колодец, в колодце рыба елец, а моей сказке конец* — lit. *Ivanushka had a well, in the well a fish eletz, and my fairy tale is over* (“Иванушка-дурачок” // “Ivanushka the Fool”) [HPC, c. 233]; an almost literal translation in Slovak: *Ivanko mal sud, v tom sude bol sumec a rozpravky je koniec* (“Hlúpy Ivanko”) [RLR, s. 83].

Also compare rhymed endings with the symbolism of utensils and alcoholic treats, the motif of drinks in A. Afanasyev: **Тем сказке конец, а мне водочки корец** — lit. *The fairy tale is over, and I'll have some vodka* (“Хитрая наука” // “The Cunning Science”) [НРС, с. 187].

The individual end formulas are analogues with different inner forms in Russian and Czech (translation with a rhyming structure of the final part): **Тут и сказке конец, а кто слушал — молодец!** — lit. *Here is the end of the tale, and good for whoever listened!* — Chech. **Zazvonil zvonec a pohádka je konec!** (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi”) [Podlesnych, s. 65]; **У той коровы был колокольчик-звонец, тут и сказке конец** (“Король времени” // “King of Time” [ЧНС, с. 131].

Typologically similar endings with variation of lexical components can be found in Ukrainian and Polish fairy tales, where rhyme is also functionally significant; the symbolic function of loci also changes (the typically Ukrainian symbol of the willow tree is actualised): **І всі живуть собі щасливо, ще і днесь, як не помирали. На вербі дзвінчик, нашій казці кінчик** — lit. *And everyone lives happily, even now, if they have not died. On the willow-tree there is a bell, our fairy tale ends* (“Тайгай” // “Науґай”) [УНС 1988, с. 187]; compare also: **Waśniczka miła czy niemiła — już się skończyła** (“Dwie Dorotki”) [Porazińska, s. 17].

Some final (ending) formulas of analogue type are correlated with national-cultural realities and images, e.g. **Дед как узнал всё это, рассердился на жену и расстрелил её; а сам с дочкою стал жить да поживать да добра наживать, и я там был, мёд-пиво пил; по усам текло, в рот не попало** — lit. *Grandpa learned all that, got angry at his wife and shot her; and he and his daughter started living and making a good living, and I was there, drinking honey and beer; it flowed out of mouth and did not come in* contain synonymous repetitions (like **honey-wine**) (“Баба-Яга”) [НРС, с. 61].

Variants of this traditional repetition are presented in Russian and Polish fairy tales: **А те прилетели домой, все обрадовались, стали жить да быть да животы наживать** — на славу всем людям — lit. *And they flew home, everyone was happy, they began to live and make a living — to the glory of all people* (“Царевна-лягушка” // “The Frog Princess”) [НРС, с. 195] — Polish. **I ja tam byłam, miód, wino piłam, a com usłyszała, tom w gadulce podała** (“Popieluszka”) [Porazińska, s. 153].

Similar motifs of the wedding feast can be traced in some Ukrainian texts: **І я там був, мёд-вино, хоч в роті не було, а по бороді текло — тим вона в мене й побіліла** — lit. *And I was there, honey and wine; though not into the mouth, but it ran down my beard — that's why it turned white* (“Ох” // “Okh”) [УНС 1988, с. 196]; **Вийшла й царівна; як побачила — аж засміялась: який у неї гарний чоловік буде! От їх швидко й повінчали, такий бенкет задали, що аж до неба дим пішов!** (“Летючий корабель”) [УНС 1992, с. 100].

Compare also Russian endings: **И я там был, мёд-вино пил, по усам текло, во рту не было; подали белужины — остался не ужинавши** — lit. *And I was there, I drank honey with wine, it ran down my moustache, didn't get into my mouth; they served me beluga meat — I remained without dinner* (“Королевич и его дядька” // “The King and His Uncle”) [НРС, с. 76].

Afanasyev's fairy tales also present an ending that contains negative constructions associated with ritual disorder (the hero is driven away from the wedding banquet, he refuses to eat, and the possibility of his being beaten or physically punished is simulated). In this case, we are probably talking about the motives of anti-etiquette, anti-hospitality, outrage and even humiliation: **отняли лоханку от быка да налили молока** — lit. *they took the bullock's pail and poured milk on it*; **Хоть долго я воевал, да молодую жену достал! — лит. Even though I fought a long war, I got a young wife!** **А вы, братцы, садитесь — ка на печи да гложите кирпичи!** — lit. *And you, brothers, sit on the furnace and eat bricks!* **На том пиру и я был, мёд-вино пил, по усам текло, да в рот не попало** — lit. *I was at that feast too, I drank honey-wine, it flowed down my moustache but didn't get into my mouth; Тут меня угощали: отняли лоханку от быка да налили молока; потом дали калача, в ту ж лоханку помоча. Я не пил, не ел, вздумал утираться, со мной стали драться; я надел колпак, стали в шею толкать! — lit. *Here they treated me: they took away the bull's loaf and poured milk; then they gave me a loaf helping me. I didn't drink, I didn't eat, I tried to wipe myself, they began to fight with me; I put on a cap, they began to push me in the neck!* (“Иван Быкович” // “Ivan Bykovich”) [НРС, с. 91]. In Russian fairy tale endings, the repetition of honey with wine (мёд-вино) sometimes appears not as a wedding motif but as an attribute of the funeral ceremony: **И я тут был — поминал, кутью большой ложкой хлебал, по бороде текло — в рот не попало!** — lit. *Ivan Tsarevich put him to a fierce death; the priests buried him, performed the funeral service and went to the wake; and I was here, commemorating, eating kutia with a big spoon, it ran down my beard — but it didn't get into my mouth!* (“Притворная болезнь” // Pretend Illness) [НРС, с. 147].*

Traditional repetitions (*they live, they eat bread*) with positive ending motifs are also found in Ukrainian fairy tales: **А вони zostалися і живуть, хліб жують і постолом добро возять!** — lit. *And they stayed and they live, chewing bread and carrying good things with a still!* (“Про Гришу і змію” // “About Hrysha and the Snake”) [УНС 1992, с. 167]; **Отак вони собі живуть і хліб жують, коромислом сіно возять, оберемком воду носять** — lit. *So they live and chew bread, carry hay with a pole, carry water with an armful...* (“Дідова дочка й бабина дочка” // “Grandfather's Daughter and Grandmother's Daughter”) [УНС 1988, с. 249]. Compare Polish: **A Dratewka z raną z wieżu garaz**

huczne wesele wyprawili i w czarownicy zamku zamieszkali. Żyją tam szczęśliwie do dziś dnia („Szewczyk Dratewka”) [Porazińska, s. 53].

Similar hyperbolic images of the hero's miraculous arrival at the wedding feast with the help of some means or animals are found in the Pokuttia-Bukovyna fairy tales in O. Kolberg's records: *Але я сів собі на бочку з вином, А бочка пукла, вино розіллялося, як вода, та й мене аж сюди занесло* — lit. *But I sat down on a barrel of wine, and the barrel cracked, the wine spilled like water, and I was carried right here* (“Купець і цисарівна” // “The Merchant and the Tsisarivna”) [K 1990, c. 47].

Examine the semantic and figurative structure of comparisons. Stable comparisons form the oldest layer of the phraseological repository in any language (which stems from the very nature of comparison) being a valuable source of information regarding cultural and historical spiritual values. The depictions of numerous comparative units trace their origins to the universal phenomena of the animal and plant world, everyday perceptions, history, spiritual culture (rituals and superstitions, religious perceptions). Typically, they are based on reinterpretation of the principal, most common signs, features specific to these phenomena.

Initially, attention should be directed to the translation of comparatives, with a notable portion presenting almost **complete equivalents**: *Василиса всё переносила безропотно и с каждым днем все хорошела и полнела, а между тем мачеха с дочками своими худела и дурнела от злости, несмотря на то, что они всегда сидели сложа руки, как барыни* — lit. *Vasilisa endured everything uncomplainingly and was getting prettier and plumper every day, meanwhile her stepmother with daughters were getting thinner and uglier with anger, despite the fact that they were always sitting with folded hands like boyar ladies* [HPC, c. 61]. — Slovak. *Vasilisa všetko bez reptania znášala. Napriek tomu bola zo dňa na deň krajšia, kým mачochine dcéry od samej zlosti chudli a oškaredeli, hoci celé dni len sedeli so založenými rukami ako milost'paničky* („Krásna Vasilisa“) [RLR, s. 22].

Previously, V. M. Mokienko effectively proved the mythological origin of the phraseological unit related to the ancient ritual of digging a circle around the village, portraying it as an apotropaic measure, particularly during times of epidemics or diseases. Its functioning in fairy tales differs in typological similarity: *Василиса обомлела от ужаса и стала как вкопанная* — lit. *Vasilisa became paralyzed with horror and stood as if dug into the place.* — Slovak. *Vasilisa stuhla od hrôzy a zostala stát' ako prikopaná* (“Krasna Vasilisa”) [RLR, s. 24]; *Вдруг едет опять всадник: сам чёрный, одет во всё чёрном и на чёрном коне; подскакал к воротам бабы-яги и исчез, как сквозь землю провалился, — настала ночь* — lit. *Suddenly, a horseman rides again: he himself is black, dressed all in black, riding a black horse. He rode up to the Baba Yaga's gates and disappeared as if he had fallen through the ground, night descended* (“Василиса Прекрасная” // “Vasilisa the Beautiful”) [HPC, c. 62] — Slovak. *Zrazu okolo znovu pretefel jazdec — celý bol čierny... Docválal až k bránke a zmizol, akoby sa pod zem prepadol* [RLR, s. 24].

Discrepancies can also be discerned in the substitution of lexical synonyms within the linguistic cultures under comparison: *вкопанная* — *prikopaná*, *провалился* — *prepadol* or rendering of lexical equivalents denoting fear: *обомлела от ужаса* — *stuhla od hrôzy*. The latter conveys the symbolism associated with the mythological concept of the bottom, abyss, and failure. Compare the hideous and somewhat not successful (close, inaccurate, almost descriptive) translation of this phrase in another fairy tale, this time rendered into Czech: *А ну, давай попробуем, давай поиграем! — промолвил старичок, прозвенел колокольчиком и исчез, как сквозь землю провалился* — lit. *Come on, let's try, let's play! — the old man said, rang a bell and disappeared as if he had fallen through the ground* — Czech. *No tak zkusíme! — řekl stařeček, zazvonil zvonečkem a zmizel tak, jak se objevil* [Podlesnych, s. 13].

When the lexical component and a set of standard images coincide in comparative expressions (while a certain commonality of their grammatical structure is traced, as well as comparable objects), synonymic variants and grammatical differences are observed in the verb paradigm forms (*lost* — *ztratili*) and other semantic and grammatical differences (in the SL — comparative expression, and in the TL — construction without comparison with the noun *gift* omission): *У гостей словно дар речи пропал, не ждали они, что такое сокровище было от них скрыто* — lit. *The guests' gift of speech disappeared, they did not expect that such a treasure was hidden from them* (“Pohádka o Mrazíkovi” // “The Tale of Morozko”) — *Hosté ztratili reč, nečekali, že před nimi ukrývali takový poklad* [Podlesnych, s. 25]; *Ах, Иван-царевич, а уж мы не чаяли тебя видеть. Ну, да недаром же ты хлопотал: такой красавицы, как Марья Моревна, во всём свете поискать — другой не найми!* — lit. *Oh, Ivan Tsarevich, we were not expecting to see you. Well, not in vain did you bother: such a beauty as Marya Moryevna, look for in the whole world- won't find another one!* Upon careful examination of these contexts, it can be observed that some comparative expressions in the closing (final) formulas differ in their grammatical design in the compared linguocultures (“Марья Моревна” // “Marya Moryevna”) [HPC, c. 106] is rendered into Slovak utilizing a one-part definite-personal sentence and a syntactic transformation involving a different syntactic structural-semantic replacement with a component order rearrangement: *Nikde bys nenašel, nikde bys nenašel, i kdybys jí hledal po celém světě* („Marja Morevna“) [RLR, s. 193] — Czech. *Ach, cárovič Ivan, už sme ani nedúfali, že ňa ešte uvidíme. Vskutku nie nadarmo si*

znášal všetky ťažkosti, druhú takú krásavicu, ako je Marija Morevna, v celom šírom svete nenájdeš! (“Marija Morevna”) [Ruské lidové, s. 180].

Translating a Russian phraseological unit, which conveys a sense of comparison into Czech, an analogous phraseological unit is employed, demonstrating similarity in both component and lexical composition: *Теперь тебе никогда не видать Марьи Моревны, как ушей своих!* — lit. *Now you'll never see Marya Morjevna as your own ears!* (“Марья Моревна”) [НПС, с. 102]. It demonstrates syntactic parallelism of relevant adverbial components (*jako-tak*): *Tak jako nikdy nespatriš své uši, tak už nikdy neuvidíš Marju Morevnu!* [Ruské lidové, s. 190]. On the contrary, in Slovak language a free nonfigurative construction is utilized: *Teraz už Mariju Morevnu nikdy neuvidíš* [RLR, s. 177].

Finally, observe an example of comparative units that differ in comparison standards (the object of comparison is *white colour*, according to V. N. Teliа's terminology) in the compared languages: *На княжьем дворе, белы, как платочки, холодны, как пласточки, лежали братицы рядышком* — lit. *In the prince's yard, white as handkerchiefs, cold, as small layers, the brothers were lying side by side* (“Белая уточка” — White duck) [НПС, с. 191] — Slovak. *Tam na nádvorí ležali vedľa seba bratia, bieli ako sneh, chladní ako ľad* („Biela kačička”) [RLR, s. 227] — Czech. *Na knížecím dvoře leží bratříčkové vedle sebe, byli jako šátečky, chladní jako kusy ledu* [Ruské lidové, s. 353].

Analogues to traditional formulas can be found in Polish fairy tales, including comparison formulas etc. Compare Polish: *Takie zapachy, takie kolory, takie w powietrzu muzyki - że słowo tego nie opowie, pióro tego nie opisze* (“Dwie Dorotki”) [Porazińska, s. 8], *Hej, ani słowo nie opowie, ani pióro nie opisze*, jaka radość zapanowała na zamku (“Siostra siedmiu kruków”) [Porazińska, s. 44], *Ani pióro nie opisze, ani słowo nie opowie, jakie tam krainy napotkali* („Trzej synowie”) [Porazińska, s. 56]. The latter in Russian fairy tales Afanasyeva replies: “*Что ни в сказке сказать, ни пером описать*” (“*What can't be told in a fairy tale can't be described with a quill*”).

Naturally, they are also represented in Ukrainian folklore: *Де-не-десь, у якімсь царстві, жив собі цар та цариця, а в них — три сини, як соколи. От дійшли вже ті сини до зросту, — такі парубки стали, що ні задумати, ні загадати, хіба в казці сказати!* — lit. *Once upon a time, in a kingdom, there lived a king and queen, and they had three sons like falcons. Now those sons had grown up, and they were such young men that it was impossible to think or to make a wish, but to tell it in a fairy tale!* (“Царівна жаба” // Princess Frog) [УНС 1988, с. 136]; *Ох знову звелів наймити дрова рубати; той знов заснув. Ох підпалив дрова, наймита спалив, попiлець по вітру розвіяв, вуглину сприснув живучою водою — з того ледачого парубка та став такий моторний та гарний козак, що ні здумати, ні згадати, хіба в казці сказати* — lit. *Okh ordered the hired man to chop wood again; the man fell asleep again. Okh set fire to the wood, burned the hired man, scattered the ashes in the wind, sprinkled the coals with life-giving water - from that lazy boy he became such a nimble and good Cosack that it is impossible to think of or remember, except to tell in a fairy tale* (“Okh”) [УНС 1988, с. 190].

Conclusions. Thus, the main translation aspects of cognitive images in the folklore text of fairy tales in comparative typological and translation studies have been examined. Several A. Afanasyev's translations of fairy tales into Czech and Slovak were chosen for the analysis. Translations of Slovak fairy tales were also fragmentarily used. In addition, in some cases, the plots, motifs and figurative formulas of the fairy tales were compared with Polish and Ukrainian texts (comparisons, openings, endings as well as medial formulas and cognitemes), and their typology, common cultural topoi and structural semantic, in particular, ethnic and cultural differences were identified.

The article presents the types of interlingual equivalents of phrasemes in terms of their lexical, grammatical and semiotic transformations and means of conveying realia. The peculiarities of verbalisation and conceptualisation of ethno-cultural meanings and symbols, and reconstructs their figurative and semantic structure are also traced.

We see the **prospect** of the research in the analysis of transformations and dynamics of traditional formulas, folklore, similes, conceptual metaphors and pragmas in modern corpora of texts with the use of corpus-oriented as well as linguistic and statistical methods. The analysis of proper names and means of characterising the characters, including their nicknames and mythologies, and more broadly, the toponymic code of fairy tales, which require separate consideration, is also of great importance. For example, worthy of attention are the Czech and Slovak names of fairy tale characters that do not appear in other fairy tales, e.g. Ukrainian or Afanasyev's, but their actions and functions are quite similar to those of the heroes of other fairy tales.

References I

1. Боднар О. І. Часова структура української народної казки. *Мова та стиль українського фольклору* : зб. наук. праць. Київ : ІЗМН, 1996. С. 85–101.
2. Гиряк М. Вступні формули українських народних казок Східної Словаччини. *Науковий збірник Музею української культури у Свиднику*. Пряшів, 1976. № 7. С. 481–508.

3. Мокиенко В. М. О методологии сопоставительного исследования русской и немецкой фразеологии. *Rossica Olomucensia*. Olomouc, 1999. Svazek XXXVIII. Část 2. S. 337–350.
4. Славянская мифология. Энциклопедический словарь. Изд. 2-е. 2002. 512 с.
5. Славянские древности : этнолингвистический словарь. Том 1. А-Г. 1995. 584 с.
6. Ткаченко О. Б. Сопоставительно-историческая фразеология славянских языков и финно-угорских языков. Киев : Наукова думка, 1979. 300 с.
7. Bartmiński J., Majer-Baranowska U. Dunaj w polskim folklorze. *Etnolingwistyka*. Lublin : UMCS, 1996. T. 8. S. 167–184.
8. Tyshchenko O. V. To the Conceptualization of marriage relations in the Slavic language and cultural space. *Zbornik Radova 2. Međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa "Kroatistika unutar slavističkoga, europskog i svjetskog konteksta"*. Pula, 2021. P. 121–143.
9. Tyshchenko O., Fignedyová M. The Image base of fairy tale formula in the structure of folklore text (based on Russian, Slovak, and Czech Fairy Tales and their Translations). *Slavistica Vilnensis*, Vilnius : Vilnius University Press, 2023. Vol. 68 (2). P. 115–127.

Sources I

- К 1990** — Кольберг О. Казки Покуття / Упоряд., підгот. текстів, вступ, ст., приміт. та слов. І. В. Хланти. Ужгород : Карпати, 1990. 327 с.
- НРС** — Народные русские сказки : Из сборника А. Н. Афанасьева. Москва : Худож. лит., 1990. 270 с.
- УНС 1988** — Українські народні казки : для молодшого та середнього шкільного віку / упоряд. та передмова Л. Ф. Дунаєвської. Київ : Веселка, 1988. 285 с.
- УНС 1992** — Українські народні казки / Передм., упоряд. та адаптація текстів Л. Ф. Дунаєвської. Київ : Веселка, 1992. 367 с.
- ЧНС** — Чешские и словацкие народные сказки. Пер. с чешского и словацкого. Москва : Худож. лит., 1990. 478 с.
- ČRFS** — Mokienko V., Wurm A. Česko-ruský frazeologický slovník. Olomouc : Univ. Palackého v Olomouci, 2002. 659 s.
- Podlesnych** — Podlesnych A. (2012), Ruské pohádky. Dvojjazyčná kniha. Brno : Edika, 2012. 144 s.
- Porazińska** — Porazińska J. Za górami za lasami. Warszawa : Nasza księgarnia, 1956. 270 s.
- RLR** — Alexander Nikolajevič Afanasiev : Baba Jaga : Ruské ľudové rozprávky. Bratislava : Albatros, 2020. 280 s.
- Ruské lidové** — Alexandr Nikolajevič Afanasjev : Ruské lidové pohádky. Praha : Odeon, 1984. 604 s.

References II

1. Bodnar, O. I (1996), “The temporal structure of the Ukrainian folk tale”, *Language and style of Ukrainian folklore : a collection of scientific works* [“Chasova struktura ukrajyns'koyi narodnoyi kazky”, *Mova ta styl' ukrajyns'koho folkloru: zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*], Institute of teaching content and methods, Kyiv, pp. 85–101.
2. Huryak, M. (1976), “Introductory formulas of Ukrainian folk tales of Eastern Slovakia”, *Scientific collection of the Museum of Ukrainian Culture in Svydnyk* [“Vstupni formuly ukrajyns'kykh narodnykh kazok Skhidnoyi Slovachchyny”, *Naukovyi zbirnyk Muzeju ukrajyns'koyi kul'tury u Svydnyku*], Pryashiv, Issue 7, pp. 481–508.
3. Mokienko, V. M. (1999), “On the methodology of comparative research of Russian and German phraseology”, *Rossica Olomucensia XXXVIII* [“O metodologii sopostavitel'nogo issledovaniya russkoy i nemetskoj frazeologii”, *Rossica Olomucensia XXXVIII*], Olomouc, Část 2, pp. 337–350.
4. *Slavic antiquities : ethnolinguistic dictionary* (1995), [*Slavyanskiye drevnosti : etnolingvisticheskiy slovar'*], Tolstoy, N. I. (ed.), Moscow, Volume 1 (A-G), 584 p.
5. *Slavic mythology. Encyclopedic Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (2002), [*Slavyanskaya mifologiya. Entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'*, Izd. 2], Moscow, 512 p.
6. Bartmiński, J., Majer-Baranowska, U. (1996), “Danube in Polish folklore”, *Ethnolinguistics*, Marie Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, pp. 167–184.
7. Tkachenko, O. B. (1979), *Comparative and historical phraseology of Slavic languages and Finno-Ugric languages* [*Sopostavitel'no-istoricheskaya frazeologiya slavyanskikh yazykov i finno-ugorskikh yazykov*], Naukova dumka Publishing House, Kyiv, 300 p.
8. Tyshchenko, O. V. (2021), “To the Conceptualization of marriage relations in the Slavic language and cultural space”, *Zbornik Radova 2. Međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa "Kroatistika unutar slavističkoga, europskog i svjetskog konteksta"*, Pula, p.121–143.
9. Tyshchenko, O., Fignedyová, M. (2023), “The Image base of fairy tale formula in the structure of folklore text (based on Russian, Slovak, and Czech Fairy Tales and their Translations)”, *Slavistica Vilnensis*, Vilnius University Press, Vilnius, Vol. 68 (2), pp. 115–127.

Sources II

- К 1990** — Kolberg, O. (1990), *Tales of Pokuttya* [*Kazky Pokuttya*], I. V. Hlanta (ed.), Karpaty Publishing House, Uzhgorod, 327 p.
- НРС** — *Russian folk tales : From the collection of A. N. Afanasyev* (1990) [*Narodnye russkiye skazki : Iz sbornika A. N. Afanasyeva*], Khudozhestvennaya literatura Publishing House, Moscow, 270 p.
- УНС 1988** — *Ukrainian folk tales* (1988) [Ukrainian folk tales], L. F. Dunayevska (ed.), Veselka Publishing House, Kyiv, 285 p.

УНК 1992 — *Ukrainian folk tales* (1992) [Ukrainski narodni kazky], L. F. Dunaevska (ed.), Veselka Publishing House, Kyiv, 367 p.

ЧСЧС — *Czech and Slovak folk tales* (1990), Translated from Czech and Slovak [*Cheshskiye i slovatskiye narodnye skazki*], Khudozhestvennaya literatura Publishing House, Moscow, 478 p.

CRFS — Mokienko, V, Wurm, A. (2002), *Česko-ruský frazeologický slovník*, Univ. Palackého v Olomouci, Olomouc, 659 s.

Podlesnych — Podlesnych, A. (2012), *Ruské pohádky, Dvojazyčná kniha*, Nakladatelství Edika, Brno, 144 s.

Porazińska — Porazińska, J. (1956), *Za górami za lasami*, Wydawnictwo Nasza księgarnia, Warszawa, 270 s.

RLR — Alexander Nikolajevič Afanasiev (2020), *Baba Jaga : Ruské lidové rozprávky*, Vydavateľstvo Albatros, Bratislava, 280 s.

Ruské lidové — Alexandr Nikolajevič Afanasjev (1984), *Ruské lidové pohádky*, Nakladatelství Odeon, Praha, 604 s.

ТИЩЕНКО Олег Володимирович,

доктор філологічних наук, професор Університету Святих Кирила і Мефодія в Трнаві; площа Юзефа Херду, 577/2, Трнава, Словаччина; e-mail: olkotiszczenko@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0811-2123>

ФІГЕДЬОВА Маріанна,

д-р педагогіки (Ph.D.), доцент Університету Святих Кирила і Мефодія в Трнаві; площа Юзефа Херду, 577/2, Трнава, Словаччина; e-mail: marianna.figedyova@ucm.sk; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1221-6496>

СТРАТЕГІЇ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ КОГНІТИВНИХ ОБРАЗІВ У КАЗКАХ (ЗАХІДНОСЛОВ'ЯНСЬКІ ТА СХІДНОСЛОВ'ЯНСЬКІ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНІ ПАРАЛЕЛІ)

Анотація. *Об'єктом* дослідження є семантико-граматична і образно-когнітивна структура фразеологічних аналогів і фіксованих порівнянь в текстах чеських і словацьких казок. У *результаті* проведеного дослідження детально простежено їх трансформації під час перекладу і використання певних типів міжмовних фразеологічних еквівалентів; експліковано випадки заміни фраз і парафразів нефразеологічними контекстами. Проаналізовано також використання в перекладах образних знаків і ідіом, яких немає в оригінальних текстах (одиниці із просторовою семантикою, емоційні метафори, фольклорні когнітеми, які висвітлюють соціальні концепції, в тому числі концепції шлюбу). *Метою* цієї статті є короткий опис відмінностей в образній і концептуальній структурі, деяких початкових, медіальних і фінальних формул у паралельних текстах у порівнянні з іншими лінгвокультурами, зокрема українським і польським казковими дискурсами (концепт шляху, подорожі, типовий для казок). **Висновки:** відмінності простежуються на рівні семантичної варіативності у способах вираження важких завдань і випробувань героїв, наприклад, ідеї неможливого або певних прагматичних формул і конструкцій. Ці та інші трансформації сюжетів і мотивів типові для казок в різних лінгвокультурах. Це дає підставу називати їх своєрідними когнітемами. Там, де це доречно, автори дають етнокультурні коментарі щодо мотивації зображень, їх зв'язку із традиційною народною культурою, ритуальними та загальноприйнятими уявленнями конкретної етнічної групи, а також висвітлюють специфіку передачі цих культурних реалій, символічну функцію об'єктів і персонажів у порівнюваних мовах (вербалізація понять *старість, неодруженість, лінь, способи фразеологічної репрезентації семантичних опозицій друг і ворог, добро і зло, чисте і брудне* і под.).

Ключові слова: фразеологічний аналог, порівняння, формула казки, культурна когнітема, концептуалізація, перекладацькі трансформації, еквівалент.

Статтю отримано 20.10.2023 р.