



PAVLIUK NATALIA

National University «Kyiv-Mohyla Academy», Ukraine

INTERSEMIOTIC AND INTERLINGUAL FACTORS OF SEMANTIC CHANGES IN PROPER NAMES: CASE STUDY OF HAMLET AS A PROPER NAME

Proper names as special signs of any language exist in different forms and present an open system which is expanding and shrinking permanently. The expansion of the proper name stock is easily explained by new ways of nomination, new objects to be named, new fashion for extravagant names, like naming children Facebook or Twitter, as it used to be with Sputnik or other newly emerged notions. But the system of proper names is also transforming inside and shrinking when some names fall out of use, or they transform into common names through an intermediary stage of being connotonyms. In this paper I would like to dwell upon some ways of name transformation concentrating on the semantics of a poetonym with a vast semantic structure, having become legendary and widely referred to, played with and used for remaking of all kinds, the name of the Prince of Denmark, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

As soon as the aim of the paper is to discuss the semantic changes of this proper name, I would like to focus of the starting points and general approach to the semantics and meaning of a proper name used here. It would be only natural if we look at proper names as at a narrative, a container of all kinds of knowledge about the referent. In doing so it is necessary to stick to a generally broad approach to the semantics, including the meaning of a word. The broad concept of semantics supported by O. Jespersen, L. Shcherba, S. Katstelson and others is based on the idea that apart from a linguistic meaning expressing the dictionary, so to say, components of meaning, any word especially proper names have extralingual meanings comprising all the information humanity knows about the referent of the word. The more famous the referent is the greater is the number of meanings its semantics includes, therefore the artistic potential of such a proper name is much higher compared to others. There are no rigid boundaries between a purely linguistic and an encyclopedic meanings of a proper name, as both of them are closely connected. Only knowing the referent of a name we can state what its primary lexical meaning is: e.g. only the knowledge of typical male and female names of a certain nation gives us a chance to state the meaning of *John* as 'human, male' and *Mary* as 'human, female'; as well as being aware of why *Hamlet* was in Shakespeare's play we can make a conclusion as the lexical meaning of this poetonym is 'human, male, noble', etc. Using the lexical meaning of a name as a starting point for describing the complete semantic structure we can make it complete and clear-cut for understanding and analysis. As we can notice, a purely lexical meaning which any proper name possesses is extremely poor, so poor that makes linguists argue if it really has any meaning, though extralingual information about the referent of an onym so firmly sticks to it that they become indivisible, and the additional encyclopedic meanings turn to be a part of a proper name semantics.

Any artistic text actualizes is actually living only under condition of its interpretation by a reader. This triangle of an author, a text and a reader is a mandatory symbiosis for a literary text to become meaningful and significant for future generations. Therefore, semantics in its broad meaning include all the information a speaker brings up producing a statement (in our case, an author creating artistic images through literary texts) which needs to be perceived by a listener (or reader) to interpret it correctly.

Since all onyms are derived mostly from common names, their semantics is secondary and more complex. At the same time, for a correct understanding of a proper name it is often enough

to see what category it belongs to (a name of a person, of an animal, of a city or a ship, etc.) without further explanations, while to realize what a common name means it is necessary to understand a notion it signifies by describing some generative notions, what they look like, what their functions are, so on (it this notion is new for a listener). It is accounted for by the fact that proper names signify an object, while common ones are used to nominate notions. However, each proper name signifies an object belonging to a notion, and without understanding this notion a proper name might not be given any meaning.

The semantics of a poetonym is created within context and its components are actualized while the artistic text is unfolding. V. Kalinkin distinguishes different types of contexts, significant for understanding the semantics of a poetonym, from a micro-context, i.e. one word that makes a phrase where the poetonym is a head-word to a broad cultural context, and each layer of contexts, on a phrase, sentence, text and cultural level contribute to deciphering the complex semantics of a proper name within a literary work. (Калинкин 1999, 250). It is especially true for a protagonist's name. Such a name is frequently mentioned in an artistic text. Each time found in a new context, the poetonyms make up new phrases whose aggregate semantics affect the image created by the author, as well as the existing image of the referent in a reader's mind, both confirming what is already known, adding to it or contradicting the existing elements of semantics. The abovementioned phrases or simple sentences are micro-texts containing an onomastic component are linked into a chain whose elements form the semantics of the name in question, as its elements are strongly connected with one another. As a result, the context of the whole text and cultural context become common for each of them, and to analyze the semantics of a poetonym nominating a protagonist, we need to take into account all contexts and factual and conceptual information they comprise.

When a protagonist's name is found in different texts created as a result of interlingual, intralingual or intersemiotic translation, its semantics suffers considerable transformations, which is going to be discussed in this paper. R. Jakobson in his essay *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation* suggests distinguishing three ways of interpreting a verbal sign: it may be translated into other signs of the same language, into another language, or into another, nonverbal system of symbols. These three kinds of translation are given different names, i.e.: 1) Intralingual translation or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language. 2) Interlingual translation or *translation proper* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language. 3) Intersemiotic translation or *transmutation* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems. (Jakobson 1959, 232).

As soon as onyms, i.e. proper names, though different from common names, are still lexical units, they do have lexical meaning, both denotative and connotative, which can be proven by the componential analysis of onyms. Y. Otin introduced a term «connotonym» or «connotative proper name» to denote a proper name, whose referent is famous enough to raise associations in people's minds and be used figuratively as metaphors and other stylistic devices, or even, in literary texts, as names of characters to actualize the whole set of semantic components it contains (Otin 1978, 46).

A proper name is always a unit of secondary nomination, because there is a common name denoting the notion where the referent of the proper name belongs, i.e. for the name of John there is a common name «man» (i.e. «human, non-animal, male, non-female, adult, non-child»), as well as for the toponym Kyiv there is a common name «city» (i.e. «inhabited, non-deserted, large, non-small...») These common names, expressing the notion, are the primary nomination units. As far as the proper names are concerned, in their inner structure they contain the conceptual (denotative) meaning expressed by the corresponding common name, as well as all the additional connotative components of meaning it is given by the extralinguistic information about the referent. Geoffrey Leech singled out seven types of meaning mentioning the «conceptual (denotative or cognitive) meaning as the central factor in linguistic communication» (Leech 1985, 10). The analysis of word meaning is often seen as a process of bringing down the sense of a word into its minimal distinctive features, that is, into components which contrast with other components, he

claims, «the conceptual meanings of a language seem to be organized largely in terms of contrastive features» (Leech 1985, 11).

In G. Leech's classification of meanings, connotative meaning comes next. Its features singled out by the researcher are characteristic of the proper names with encyclopedic content (literary, mythological, geographical, etc.) that bear all the information about their referents. According to G. Leech, 1) «...connotative meaning is not specific to language, but is shared by other communicative systems, such as visual art and music»; 2) «connotations are relatively unstable: that is they vary considerably, ... according to culture, historical period, and the experience of the individual»; 3) «connotative meaning is indeterminate and open-ended: ... any characteristic of the referent, identified subjectively or objectively, may contribute to the connotative meaning of the expression which denotes it» (Leech 1985, 15).

Connotative proper names have a potential for the repeated use in literature, for they are the most economical means of introducing a massive load of information, both intellectual and emotional, into the literary text. The characteristics of connotative meaning pointed out by G. Leech open connotative proper names to semantic changes in case they are used in another context. In case a connotonym is found in some new surroundings it changes its inner structure, which will be demonstrated here on the example of one of the most well-known connotonyms of all times, that is Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. William Shakespeare's *HAMLET* is one of the canonic texts of the world literature, **basic** for many other literary texts and their translations, staged versions, and movies.

The intention of the paper is to trace the semantic changes of the connotative name, effected by different contexts. So I took the following texts for the analysis:

- 1 William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as the basic text;
- 2 The Ukrainian translation of *Hamlet* by Leonid Hrebinka;
- 3 F.Zeffirelli's film *Hamlet* (script);
- 4 Tom Stoppard's play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*.

The semantics of the proper names in the plays is formed by the characters' speech and stage remarks, so the dialogue discourse is here the main factor in forming the semantics of proper names. Dialogues and monologues contain all the information providing indirect characteristics to the personage, i.e. lexemes adding **components of meaning** to the semantics of the name. So the purpose was to study collocations of the proper name in question and trace the changes in its semantics, as it moves chronologically from Shakespeare's plays to Stoppard's, from plays to films, and from English to Ukrainian. I would like to point out that to study how the semantics of the proper names is formed in the play that is in dialogue discourse is even more exciting because you do not have much of an author to describe the personage, so you have just dialogues to form the semantics of the proper name. It means you have to study the vocabulary of the character, as well as the words referred to him/her by other personages.

As soon as Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is the basic text, the semantics of Shakespeare's Hamlet is the basic semantics to be contrasted to the semantics of the name Hamlet in other works. The semantics of the proper name Hamlet in Shakespeare's play was compared with the semantics of the same name in the abovementioned artistic texts and the film, the semantics of Hamlet in Shakespeare's play being primary for all the other texts and the film in question:

«The analysis of word meaning is often seen as a process of bringing down the sense of a word into its minimal distinctive features, that is, into components which contrast with other components» (G. Leech 1985). As soon as the connotonym itself is a secondary nomination unit, we need to find the corresponding common name to represent the primary nomination. I suggest that such a lexeme is «man» which can be analyzed into the following components of meaning:

| | | |
|----------|----------|---------|
| + human | + male | + adult |
| – animal | – female | – child |

To analyse the collocations of the name Hamlet I used AntConc tool for the corpora of texts about prince Hamlet, their translations into Ukrainian and scripts of the film made after it. Corpora

of the dialogue discourse texts include the marking of the ACT and SCENE opening and closing, STAGE DIRECTORIES, SPEAKER tags for dialogue boundaries.

| Shakespeare's play | Hrebinka's translation | T. Stoppard's play |
|---|---|---|
| <p><SCENE 4> <The Platform.> <STAGE DIR> <Enter Hamlet, Horatio, and Marcellus.> </STAGE DIR> <HAMLET> <15%> The air bites shrewdly; it is very cold. </HAMLET> <HORATIO> <15%> It is a nipping and an eager air. </HORATIO> <HAMLET> <15%> What hour now? </HAMLET></p> | <p><СЦЕНА 4> <Майданчик перед замком.> <STAGE DIR> <Входять Гамлет, Гораціо й Марцелл.> </STAGE DIR> <ГАМЛЕТ> Ну й холодно, аж забиває дух. </ГАМЛЕТ> <ГОРАЦІО> Заходять зашпори; мороз кусючий. </ГОРАЦІО> <ГАМЛЕТ> Котра година? </ГАМЛЕТ></p> | <p><Act Two>. <STAGE DIR> HAMLET, ROS and GUIL talking, the continuation of the previous scene. Their conversation, on the move, is indecipherable at first. The first illegible line is HAMLET's, coming at the end of a short speech ? see Shakespeare Act II, scene ii.</STAGE DIR> <HAMLET>: S'blood, there is something in this more than natural, if philosophy could take it out. <STAGE DIR>A flourish from the TRAGEDIANS' band.</STAGE DIR> </HAMLET></p> |

The semantic structure of the poetonym in question is complex, which is caused by the complexity of the tragedy itself. «Actually it would not be accurate to speak about a delayed revenge; it would be more truthful to point out that *Hamlet* is not just a tragedy of revenge. It would be more correctly to define it is as a tragedy of consciousness: Hamlet does not seek a revenge, he rather seeks to know, to learn the spectrum, the severity of truth, of life, but at the same time he fears to learn the truth, and to postpone the revenge, and to die, when it seems no longer possible to avoid it, and when nothing else is left to know» (Zazo 2018, 27).

We can now only imagine what Shakespeare's beholders knew about the name Hamlet, and what associations they could have at the time the play was staged. There are two sources that could be possibly remembered by them, i.e. the common name, archaic now but neutral at Shakespeare's times: *hamlet*, meaning 'small village', diminutive of *hamel* 'village' which is considered to have transformed into English *home* in the course of time. (Online Etymology Dictionary). The story itself could ultimately derive from a legend in *Gesta Danorum*, a history of the Danes composed in Latin around 1200 AD by the Danish author Saxo Grammaticus. The protagonist of the legend was Amleth, whose father and uncle are joint rulers of Jutland, the peninsula that forms the mainland portion of Denmark. In Saxo's tale, Amleth's father is killed by his uncle, who then marries the prince's mother. Amleth feigns madness to keep from being murdered by his uncle, but he eventually avenges his father's killing and becomes king of the Jutes (British Library).

If the image of Hamlet were not complicated and had just one characteristic of a revengeful son of a noble father, the number of semantic components would not be much lower. Using AntConc tool, I studied the collocations of the name in the play (5 words on the left and 5 words on the right), analyzed them and classified them in the following components of connotative meaning of Hamlet name. I must confess that first I thought of possible components of meaning, which were really found in the speech of characters, and they came in the following order. There were 6 of them that came to my mind in the following order of importance (noble man, man of ancient Denmark, doubting man, restless man, false madman, grieving man, loving man). While the results showed a great difference, first, in the number of components involved, and in the importance of them, based on the number of lexemes to support this additional meaning: noble man (*lord, prince, your lordship, greatness, etc.*), angry and disappointed man (*thoughts be bloody, let me be cruel, Frailty, thy name is woman, why she, even she, a beast would have mourned longer, most wicked speed, incestuous*

sheets! blood, sword, horrid, wicked tongue, slain, villain, etc.), doubting man (*doubt, good or bad, dream, shadow, I cannot reason. yet I, a dull and muddy-mettled rascal, can say nothing, Am I a coward? Who calls me villain? Breaks my head across?* – abundance of question marks), grieving man (*solemn black, forced breath, grief, woe, mourning duties, flesh would melt, resolve into a dew, self-slaughter, dead, bones, sepulture, dead, death, restless man, clever and inventive man, false madman, loving man, relentless man, thinking man, man of tragic fate, brave and well-trained man*), loving and obedient (*loving reply, with all my love, express his love and friending, my excellent good friends, by the fights of our friendship, ever-preserved love, o wonderful son, etc.*), clever and resourceful (*confession in your looks, discovery, secrecy, prophecy, I'll catch the conscience of the king, etc.* – he makes observations and judgements), man of tragic fate (*fortune, she is a strumpet, doomsday near, devil, power, whips and scorns of life*).

1. Ukrainian translation by Leonid Hrebinka.

There are seven Ukrainian translations of *Shakespeare's Hamlet*. I would like to like to study the semantic changes of *Hamlet* in one of them here, for it is a matter of an individual paper to analyze and compare the semantics of the name Hamlet in all the translations. I am going to have a look at L. Hrebinka's translation. It is the closest to the authentic text, therefore it is interesting to trace the changes in case the translator's strategy is to preserve the author's style and artistic images as much as possible. «Through the lenses of the folk character L. Hrebinka's translation is the most «Ukrainian» of all translations of *Hamlet* by its lingual-and-stylistic characteristics, it being the closest to the vernacular and baroque traditions of lower class, not falling down as far as travesty» (Kolomiets 2009, 174).

As soon as every new text containing the same name both inherits the semantics of the previous texts and adds something to it. So, the semantic components of Shakespeare's Hamlet are transported into the Ukrainian text in the memory of the intended reader who is aware of the original text, or the reader finds him/herself reading the translated text having a semantic structure of the connotonym existing in the environment they live. Thus, in Ukrainian literature and everyday use Hamlet means 'a hesitating, doubting person' (Лукаш 2017, 85). To see where a Ukrainian reader is getting when the translated book is read we should have a look at our corpus and study collocations of the onym.

Though the set of components the connotonym Hamlet contains is the same, we can trace some new hues and loss of certain nuances within the same inner structure: angry and disappointed man; noble man («pryncs» (prince – 124) instead of «lord» title - 190); doubting man; grieving man; restless man; clever and inventive man; false madman; loving man; relentless man; thinking man; man of tragic fate; brave and well-trained man. The whole semantic structure in its generalized coincide in the basic text and the Ukrainian translation. Despite the fact that the semantic structure is rather similar to the authentic one, it still differs. The semantic components are the same: noble man (*принц, пан*), brave man (*чого боятися, страх цей нас безволить, воля й сила*), (*гидкі, мерзенні, недоладні, пусті втіхи; Ганьба і сором! Здичілий сад, бур'яни, потворне й хиже зілля буює в нім; зрадливість - ось твоє наймення, жінко!*) so on.

Though the choice of lexemes affects the whole inner structure. Thus, instead of «mother» we find: «matusia» in Ukrainian which corresponds «mommy», which softens the relation and changes the emotion.

- the use of diminutive suffixes –sen'kyi, -n'kyi (samisin'kyi), change the whole mode from tragic to some milder atmosphere;

- word-for-word translation «*I do not set my life at a pin's fee;*» (pin - shpylka) when speaking of how low Hamlet values his life, does not make the same effect, as in English – shpylka sounds inappropriate, both in its sound form and its collocation, which reduces the power of metaphor. So the component of disappointment in life is not so brightly expressed.

«Looking for a stylistically adequate equivalent of Shakespeare's baroque theatre L. Hrebinka and T. Osmachka (*the author of another Ukrainian translation*) actualized the Ukrainian tradition of «lower class» or «folklore» baroque in the aspects of folk character and theatrical effectiveness of a poetic word. «Folk character» means rich, juicy, fancy, sharp, multi-stylistic (both beautiful and spicy)

folk language; «theatrical effectiveness» means ecstatic tension, ingenuity, paradoxical and aphoristic character» (Kolomiets 2009, 177).

2. Now let us have a look of the semantic structure changes in the film directed by Franco Zeffirelli. The text is Shakespeare's, though the semantics has somewhat altered. Despite the fact that the set of components is the same, some of them are enforced, and some are reduced by means of visual effect and some cuts in the Shakespeare's text.

- to make the emotion stronger, the monologue is cut and finishes with the strongest words, now being an idiom:

[12:00 – 12:24] «*Frailty thy name is woman*» so, the component of «angry man» gets even stronger thanks to this technique. It is also enforced by the actor's playing emotionally, his look, gesture, intonation. So, non-verbal means are of great importance. In the play there are 13 more lines, though in the lines Hamlet recollects how Gertrude was like Niobe in tears during his father's funeral;

- the component of «loving man» somewhat changes in the film, where it obtains more erotic characteristics as compared to the play: he kisses Ophelia passionately [1:13:05-1:13:22], his love to his mother is also of passionate character, which is supported by the emotional scenes between them;

- «false madman» is supported by his behaving as a buffoon, a king's clown and saying what he wants [1:09:24- 10:10:13].

So, the emotional part of the semantic structure is enforced, while all the rest are preserved though reduced to some extent.

3. Tom Stoppard's play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*.

The third way to change the semantics of a connotonym under the influence of the context is to use it in another literary work. To see how it is done I have studied Tom Stoppard's play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*. Hamlet is here not at the frontstage of the story, he is moved away from the main focus giving space to Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern experiencing their own existential crisis. So, the image is restricted in the play to a secondary part which affected the semantics of his name. We can see that out of 12 semantic components singled out in Shakespeare's play, only 5 were actualized here (noble man, angry and disappointed man, restless man, clever and resourceful man, false madman). The main components here are false madman and resourceful man. We see Hamlet for the first time when he is already playing mad, so only prepared readers can guess what is really going on. Other components are actualized in connection with the protagonists of the play, which we see later: angry man, relentless man, clever and resourceful man, and noble man. The rest components are left behind as not significant for the development of the story about Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern.

| | Shakespeare's play | L. Hrebinka's Translation | F. Zeffirelli's film | Tom Stoppard's play |
|--|--------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| 1. Noble man (according to the number of the uses of the title «lord») | + | + ! (‘pryncs’ (принц) is used less often than ‘lord’ in English) | + | + |
| 2. Angry and disappointed man (actually, the greatest number of lexemes) | + | + | + ! (enforced by the actor's emotions, sometimes incomplete monologues, shifts in order) | + |
| 3. Doubting man | + | + | + | |
| 4. Grieving man | + | + | + | |
| 5. Restless man | + | + | + | + |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| 6. Clever and resourceful man | + | + | + | + |
| 7. False madman | + | + | +(buffoon, a king's fool, clown) | + ! 1. (one can first see Hamlet in this state) |
| 8. Loving man | + | +(domesticated by means of diminutive suffixes, making him more tender) | +(visual effect of affection suggesting the love is of different character than mother-son, the idea about the Edip's complex) | |
| 9. Relentless man | + | + | + | |
| 10. Thinking man | + | + | + | |
| 11. Man of tragic fate | + | + | + | |
| 12. Brave and well-trained man | + | + | + | |

The analysis of this corpus demonstrates changes in the collocations of the proper name under analysis, resulting in shifts in its semantics, with the images of the characters acquiring new hues each time the referent, setting or audio-visual effects change in the context of films. A similar pattern is observed in the English scripts and their translations. It would be interesting to study the names of all the central characters of the play and find certain regularities in the semantic changes of the names under the impact of interlingual and intersemiotic factors.

References

- КАЛИНКИН, В. (1999): *Поэтика онима*. Донецк: Юго-Восток.
- КОЛОМІЄЦЬ Л. (2009): Українські перекладачі "Гамлета" В. Шекспіра: Пантелеймон Куліш, Юрій Клен, Леонід Гребінка, Михайло Рудницький, Ігор Костецький, Григорій Кочур, Юрій Андрухович. В: *Ренесансні студії*. Запоріжжя: Видавництво Класичного приватного університету. Вип. 12–13, с. 163–188.
- ЛУКАШ (2017): *Словник конотативних власних назв*. Вінниця: ДонНУ імені Василя Стуса.
- ОТІН, Е. (1978) Конотативна ономастична лексика. *Мовознавство*. №6, с. 46–52.
- СТОППАРД, Т. (2015): *Розенкранц і Гільденстерн мертві*. Брустурів: Дискурсус.
- ШЕКСПІР, В. (2012): Гамлет, принц Данський. *Вільям Шекспір. Вибране*. Київ: Національний книжковий проект, с. 85–208.
- BALTES, P. (1991): Semantic Variation in the Connotations of Personal Names. In: *Deseret Language and Linguistic Society Symposium*. № 1(17), p. 75–86.
- British Library. *Saxo's legend of Amleth in the Gesta Danorum* <<https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/saxos-legend-of-amleth-in-the-gesta-danorum>>
- GENTZLER, E. (2001): *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- JAKOBSON, R. (1959): On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. *On Translation*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, p. 232–239
- KIANBAKHT, S. (2016): Cultural Conceptualizations, Semantics and Translation. In: *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. № 11 (6), p. 2169–2174.
- LECKIE, G. (2013): The double life of proper names. *Philosophical Studies*. (165), p. 1139–1160
- LEECH, G. (1985): *Semantics. The Study of Meaning*. London: Penguin Books.
- LONGOBARDI, G. (1994): Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-Movement in Syntax and Logical Form. In: *Linguistic Inquiry*, № 25 (4), p. 609–665.
- NEWMARK, P. (1981): *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press.
- OLTEAN, S. (2009): On the Semantics of Proper Names and of Common Names. In: *Studia Universitatis*

- Babes-Bolyai, Philologia*, LIV, 4. Cluj: Editura Presa Universitara Clujeana, p. 157–168.
Online Etymology Dictionary. <<https://www.etymonline.com/word/hamlet>> [online].
PORTER, H. H. (2005): *What Is Meaning? Fundamentals of Formal Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
SAEED, I. J. (1997): *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
SHAKESPEARE, W. (1943): Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 870–907.
STOPPARD, T. (1994): *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*. New York: Grove Press.
ZAZO, A. L. (2018): Amleto. Un itinerario, una maschera. In: *Amleto*. Milano: Mondadori Libri, p. xxiii–xxxvii.

Профіль автора:

Павлюк Наталія Веніамінівна
Кандидат філологічних наук, доцент
Перекладознавство, ономастика
Національний університет «Києво-
Могилянська академія»
natalia.pavliuk@ukma.edu.ua

Author's Profile:

Pavliuk Nataliia
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
Scientific interests: Translation Studies, Onomastics.
National University «Kyiv-Mohyla Academy»
natalia.pavliuk@ukma.edu.ua