УДК 81'26; 811.161.2

TRANSCODING AS ONE OF THE METHODS OF TRANSFERING UKRAINIAN ONYMS AND REALIA IN LATIN

ТРАНСКОДУВАННЯ ЯК ОДИН ЗІ СПОСОБІВ ПЕРЕДАЧІ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ОНІМІВ І РЕАЛІЙ ЛАТИНИЦЕЮ

Minkovska I.I.,
orcid.org/0000-0003-0245-2361
Postgraduate of the Department of the Ukrainian Language
H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University

The article updates the connection between such concepts as *realia* and *proper name* (*onym*). The problem of the translation of Ukrainian proper names by the means of the Latin alphabet is described, since in Ukraine, the consensus on which of the means – transcription or transliteration – should be used, or what the standard of Ukrainian-Latin transcoding should be, has not been reached yet. It was emphasized again that onyms are not only graphic expressions of encyclopedic information, but also contain important social, cultural, historical data about our country. So, the way of their translation should be chosen accordingly – that allows the recipient of information not only to understand the provided information correctly, but also to read the background. Transliteration as a subtype of transcoding (with the application of notes and explanations if necessary) is offered as the best option. The challenge is, nevertheless, the update of the official Ukrainian-Latin transliteration standard in accordance with the principles confirmed by the professional community.

Key words: transcoding, onym, proper name, realia, transliteration, transcription, theory of translation, Latin alphabet.

У статті акцентовано увагу на зв'язку між такими поняттями, як *реалія* та *власна назва* (*онім*). Описано проблему перекладу українських власних назв засобами латинського алфавіту, адже досі в Україні не було досягнуто консенсусу ні щодо того, який спосіб – транскрибування чи транслітерацію – необхідно використовувати, ні щодо того, яким же має бути стандарт українсько-латиничного транскодування. Вкотре наголошено на тому, що оніми не лише є графічними вираженнями енциклопедичної інформації, а й містять у собі важливі соціальні, культурні, історичні дані про нашу країну. Тому й спосіб їх перекладу має бути обраний відповідний – такий, що дасть змогу отримувачам інформації не лише правильно зрозуміти пропоновану інформацію, а й зчитати цей фоновий колорит. Транслітерація як підвид транскодування (із застосуванням за необхідності приміток і пояснень) пропонується як найкращий варіант. Викликом є оновлення офіційного наразі стандарту українсько-латинської транслітерації відповідно до принципів, визнаних фаховою спільнотою.

Ключові слова: транскодування, онім, власна назва, реалія, транслітерація, транскрипція, перекладознавство, латиниця.

В статье акцентировано внимание на связи между такими понятиями, как *реалия* и *имя собственное* (*оним*). Описана проблема передачи украинских имен собственных средствами латинского алфавита, ведь до сих пор в Украине не было достигнуто консенсуса ни относительно того, каким образом – посредством транскрибирования или транслитерации – нужно это делать, ни относительно того, каким же должен быть стандарт украинско-латиничного транскодирования. Снова подчеркнуто, что онимы не только являются графическими выражениями энциклопедической информации, но и включают в себя важные социальные, культурные, исторические данные о нашей стране. Поэтому и способ их перевода должен быть избран соответствующий – такой, который позволит получателям информации не только правильно понять предлагаемую информацию, но и считать этот фоновый колорит. Транслитерация как подвид транскодирования (с применением при необходимости примечаний и пояснений) предлагается как лучший вариант. Вызовом является обновление официального пока стандарта украинско-латинской транслитерации в соответствии с принципами, признанными профессиональным сообществом.

Ключевые слова: транскодирование, оним, имя собственное, реалия, транслитерация, транскрипция, теория перевода, латиница.

Introduction. In the context of the interpenetration of the political, economic, legal and cultural spheres of state-building all over the world and the lightning-fast exchange of information, translation studies are developing much more intensively than before, and therefore, the requirements for the quality of translation are also increasing.

The translation of realia – cultural objects that are characteristic for a particular people, nationalities or communities and express national identity and coloring, has always been in the focus. The class of onomastic realia consists of proper names, which are the object of onomastics studies as a socio-historically formed science; they arise and function in the specific conditions as the most important elements of communication and are an integral part of any activity.

Proper names perform not only a nominative function, naming the object, identifying it, separating it from a number of other objects, but also contain background information about the identity of the carrier of the proper name, i. e. their nationality, acting

as linguocultural markers in a communicative act based on established associative representations [9].

The problem of translating realia and proper names as their subclass is one of the most typical for translators. Since realia denote concepts that are not present in other cultures, it is always a particular challenge in the translation process. On the other hand, there are different types of translation, and the practice of translating foreign-language proper names suffers from disorder and spontaneity, which results in differences in the translation variants.

Thus, the topicality of the study is due to the need to develop methods of qualitative reproduction of Ukrainian proper names by means of the Latin alphabet and to update the standard of Ukrainian-Latin transcoding as their necessary component.

Analysis of the research background. Many scientists have studied various aspects of the formation and functioning of onomastic vocabulary, including V. Vynohradov, G. Tomakhin, O. Superanska, A. Vezhbytska, N. Bahryntseva, D. Yermolovych, I. Hromova, Yu. Karpenko, Ye. Mahazannyk, O. Foniakova, A. Hudmanian, R. Zorivchak, O. Cherednychenko and others.

A. Horniatkevych, M. Kocherhan, D. Shmeliov, O. Superanska, M. Berezhna, L. Chernovaty and others have been studying the influence of normative factors on the assimilation of foreign-language words in the language and their phonetic structure. The results of their work are presented in scientific journals, dictionaries and reference literature, as well as in discussions around the new edition of the Ukrainian Spelling.

This work is a part of the series of our studies devoted to the development of the Ukrainian Latin in the XVII–XXI centuries and its connection with modern translation. In the XIX century, M. Drahomanov, B. Didytskyi, P. Zhytetskyi, J. Yirechek, A. Krymskyi, J. Lozynskyi, I. Ohiienko, O. Potebnia, I. Franko, O. Shakmatov and M. Shashkevych were involved in the analysis of the historical development of spelling and phonetics and the history of spelling. In the 1920–1930s – O. Syniavskyi, V. Simovych, M. Nakonechnyi, Ye. Tymchenko; in the 1950–1980s – L. Bulakhovskyi, M. Zhovtobriukh, Y. Maslov, S. Pylypenko, A. Reformatskyi, Ya. Rudnytskyi, Yu. Sheveliov, L. Shcherba, R. Jacobson. Today, this issue is being developed by I. Kulchytskyi, O. Ponomariv, B. Rytsar, Yu. Blonarovych, A. Kostenko, V. Kostyrko, M. Vakulenko, V. Hrytseliak, A. Dulichenko, A. Dyakov, M. Lesiuk, N. Malinevska, V. Nimchuk, S. Partyko, P. Shekera.

The problem setting. The aim of the work is to review and update the classification of the ways of translating proper names and socio-economic realia, and to prove the need to revise and complete the standard of Ukrainian-Latin transcoding as an integral element of modern Ukrainian translation studies.

Results and discussions. The language is always a bearer of national identity, which should not be lost while translating. It is difficult for translators to reproduce an original text so that it does not lose its original national coloring, but at the same time becomes part of the language of translation.

In translation studies, "realia" as a term appeared in the 1940s. It was first introduced by A. Fedorov. Realia are characteristic of the language of fiction and media, inextricably linked with the culture of a certain people. R. Zorivchak gives the definition of realia as follows; "it is a mono and poly lexemic unit, the main lexical meaning of which holds the traditional set of ethnocultural information, which is alien to the objective reality of the perceptive language". It is important that the concept of realia is a variable and relative category that becomes clear in the binary contrastive matching of specific languages and cultures. The amount of the realia of the source language constantly changes depending on the vocabulary of the target language, the peculiarities of the material and spiritual culture that perceives, on the intensity of cultural and ethnic contacts of the respective linguistic groups.

According to the views of S. Vlakhov and S. Florin, realia can be classified according to the object and local features (depending on national and linguistic dependence) [16, p. 18–93].

Proper names or onyms – as a class of realia – are considered as a category of individuality, uniqueness, uniqueness in time and space; this is part of the vocabulary that is related to the needs of society and is determined by socio-historical, economic, socio-cultural factors [6]. O. Boka believes proper names are a kind of cultural-historical and linguistic indices, a source of studying the lexical richness of a language, since they reflect the names of objects-realia and concepts, therefore they are specific to each country or nation.

In addition, the proper names are also an integral part of international communication between countries, institutions, companies and individuals: they are used in official documentation (multilingual forms, agreements, signboards), in the work of telecommunication networks, information banks, in official communication and correspondence at the international level, in print products intended for a foreign reader, to identify a person (in court, in a bank, during a trade, at a post-office, etc.), to identify long-distance vessels, on

geographic maps and in various types of international lists of settlements, in international bibliographic lists [21, p. 119].

M. Kocherhan points out that, in contrast to common names, proper names serve to distinguish their named object from a number of similar ones, to its individualization and identification [8, p. 186–187], and offers the following classification of proper names: 1) anthroponyms – names of people; 2) toponyms – geographical names; 3) theonyms – names of deities; 4) zoonyms – names of animals; 5) astronyms – names of heavenly bodies; 6) cosmonymes – names of zones of outer space and constellations; 7) chrononyms ("quasi-names") – names of the segments of time associated with historical events; 8) ideonyms – names of objects of spiritual culture; 9) chrematonyms – names of objects of material culture; 10) ergonyms – names of associations of people: societies, organizations, etc.; 11) hydronyms – names of reservoirs (rivers, lakes, seas, swamps); 12) ethnonyms – names of peoples, ethnic groups [8, p. 186–187]. There are also well-known classifications by D. Shmeliov, O. Kyrylovych, S. Ulman, O. Leonovych, A. Hardyner and L. Bulakhovskyi.

Thus, it is clear that there really is a very strong connection between proper names and realia. Therefore, the consideration of proper names in the further analysis should be based on the fact that a proper name is part of the term of *realia*.

The translation of proper names is an equally important issue in the terms of studying them. There are different strategies to translate proper names and it is not always easy to decide which one to use in every particular case.

The most common methods of reproducing realia by means of Latin alphabet include transcoding, creating a calque, descriptive translation, transposition, and equivalent (or analogue) translation. Often, notes and explanations are used, transplantation (foreign language insertions), translation by choosing one of the possible lexical variants and transformation. For translation of neologisms and abbreviations other strategies are used.

The problem of correlating different types of transcoding while conversing foreign words in Ukrainian is not new. For example, in the XVIII and XIX centuries the dominating tendency was to transfer proper names through transliteration (*Newton – Невтон, Robinson Crusoe – Робінзон Крузое*) [13]. On the contrary, there are currently known proposals to transfer Ukrainian proper names by means of Latin letters made by J. Lozynskyi, J. Yirechek, M. Drahomanov, V. Simovych, S. Pylypenko,

G. Shkurupii and I. Rudnytskyi only in the XIX and XX centuries[1].

Later, since around the middle of the XXI century, transcription began to be preferred. Although researchers [15] drew attention to the overuse and misuse of transliteration in the transmission of foreign language proper names in the mid of the XX century, there is still no unambiguous approach and clear criteria for choosing different types/strategies of transcoding, both from Ukrainian and into Ukrainian, in Ukraine[2].

Based on the content of the problem, which is briefly summarized above, we would like to focus more on the notion of *transcoding*, as well as consider *the notes and explanations* as one of the ways to reproduce proper names with Latin letters.

As you know, transcoding is defined as a translation method, in which the pronounced and/or a graphic form of the source language is completely or partially conversed by means of the alphabet of the translation language [7]. In this case, there are two types of transcoding:

1) transcribing (transcription of the word with the alphabet of the target language according to the source language's pronunciation rules: *action – екшн*);

2) transliteration (the character by character conversion of the original lexical unit using the alphabet of the target language: *London – Лондон*).

Speaking about transcribing, the "Dictionary of the Ukrainian language in ten volumes", edited by I. Bilodid, coins the term "transcription" as "the exact transmission of sounds of a certain language or musical sounds by letters (characters) of any language using special letters or special graphic symbols, regardless of graphic or spelling rules, historically formed in this language". Along with the term "transcription" we find the term "to transcribe", which means "to write a transcription of something" [12, p. 230]. It should be added that at that time transliteration was equated to transcription with the mark "rarely".

In the "Recommendations on transliteration of the Ukrainian alphabet in English, French, German and Italian" (dated April 25, 2001), which can be found on the official website of the State Intellectual Property Service of Ukraine, section 3 provides a glossary of terms. It defines the concept of transcribing – "cop-

[1] More about the development of the Ukrainian Latin alphabet can be learned from the studies of the author *Польська, чеська та угорська латинки для української мови у 17–18 століттях [Polish, Czech and Hungarian Latinas for the Ukrainian language in the 17th and 18th centuries] and Букви і політика: українські латиниці у XIX–XX століттях [Letters and politics: Ukrainian Latins in XIX–XX centures].*

[2] Variants of Ukrainain-Latin transliteration, e. g. in the XXI century, are analysed in the author's article *Транскрибування і транслітерування: можливості і проблеми застосування в Україні [Transcribing and transliterating: opportunities and problems in Ukraine].*

ying sounds of a certain language with transcription signs" and transcription – "the text received as a result of transcribing". Here we can see a small change in the terminology: now, transcription only means the text received as a result of transformations, and the process is called transcribing [10].

Such linguists as Yu. Maslov [18, p. 262], P. Cubberley [17, p. 50] and A. Reformatskii [19, p. 21] differentiated three types of transcriptions: phonetic, phonemic, and practical. When it is necessary to convey the details of the phonetic manifestation of any linguistic units or speech formations more precisely than the ordinary letter-writing allows, it is advisable to turn to phonetic transcription. In order for each spoken audio to be recorded with each pronounced sound graphically, it is allowed to use any alphabet for phonetic transcription, as well as different diacritical marks. This type of transcription is used in dictionaries of foreign languages, in textbooks for learning languages, in dialectal notes, and so on.

The phonemic transcription differs from the phonetic one that it transcribes only the composition of the phonemes and does not cover the options that appear in weak positions. Each phoneme, regardless of its position, must be recorded with the same sign. This transcription is used in the depiction of examples and paradigms of grammar, where the structure is important.

But if you need to enter words and phrases of one language in the lexical body of another language, then we can only use the last type of transcription – practical. A foreign proper name, written using means of another alphabet, is reproduced in the letters of its real alphabet and by the letters that are common to this spelling system. New letters or special diacritical marks are not used, everything happens within this alphabet. At the same time, some spelling variations are possible here (for example, in Russian the practical transcription allows writing *ы* after *к, й, ш, ж* and at the beginning of the word – *Кызыл-Ырмак, Йыытс*, etc.). The rules of reading remain the same as the ones used for the text written in the target language.

This principle is used for the work of the Royal Geographical Society and the Library of the US Congress. Any non-Latin text is transcribed by 26 letters of the Latin alphabet, as well as by digraphs and polygraphs characteristic of English (*ch=ч, sh=ш, zh=ж, kh=x, shch=щ*). According to A. Reformatskii, a practical transcription has three important advantages: first, such transcription almost completely retains the full completeness of the lexical, grammatical, phonetic and graphical characteristics of the word, and second, geographical and bibli-

ographic practice uses these unified established rules, and third, reading of texts does not require special knowledge of languages [20].

However, the practical transcription has one drawback. Different peoples can use Latin alphabet for writing, but the composition of their alphabets and their spelling rules can be different. Thus, the same surname, for example, *Лапшин*, in English will look like *Lapshin*, in French like *Lapchine*, in German – *Lapschin*, in Polish – *Lapszyn*, etc.

Ukrainian linguist M. Vakulenko had a different view on the question of transcription, but he also criticized the practical transcription. According to the scholar, the practical transcription is a combination of grammatical transcription and transliteration, so for writing foreign words some phonemes are transcribed, and some letters are transliterated. The biggest problem of this approach is the fuzziness and inconsistency of the rules, which leads to voluntarism and subjectivity in its use by linguists [1, p. 6–7].

M. Vakulenko also distinguished grammatical and invariant transcriptions. The grammatical transcription is intended to recreate the original pronunciation of the word by graphic means of the target language. The result of this transformation is often unusual and inconvenient, because in this case we have to write, for example, *Елебеме* (Alabama), *Архентіна* (Argentina), *Кува* (Cuba), etc. On the contrary, trying to make the pronunciation as similar as possible to the peculiarities of the target language, one will have to write *Пилипини (Philippines),* etc. [1, p. 6–7]. Thus, the disadvantages of the grammatical transcription are the distortion of words, the multiplication of contingencies and errors in borrowing.

M. Vakulenko speaks of the invariant transcription as a phonological modification of the grammatical transcription. Creating the sound of an original allophone (its main manifestation) of a certain phoneme with an allophone of the target language (also the main one) allows neutralizing the most acute features of the pronunciation of the original source [1, p. 7].

What are the features of the second approach – transliteration? According to the concept of M. Vakulenko, transliteration is "mapping from one system of writing to another, typically grapheme to grapheme" [1, p. 8]. In the "Recommendations on transliteration of proper names with the letters of the Ukrainian alphabet", which we analyzed above, two terms are given: transliterating as "writing a text written in one alphabet with letters of another alphabet" and transliteration as "the text received as a result of transliterating" [10].

Transliteration has a number of features that distinguish it from transcription:

1) the object of the first one is the letters, and the second one – the sounds; the first process takes place within the given language, and the second one works in different languages [1, p. 7];

2) on the basis of transcription, words of one language are "implemented" into another and obey the rules of the "new" language, that is, enrich the class of borrowed words. Transliteration, however, deals with words that belong entirely to their "native" (original) language, and they are only depicted in another language. These words continue to belong to their original languages and obey their laws;

3) A. Reformatskii considered the independence of transliteration of the assortment of letters of a certain national alphabet as the the main difference between transliteration and transcription [20].

It is a mistake to understand transliteration as a mechanical swapping letters in a predictable way. In any case, as Yu. Maslov emphasized, "scientific transliteration should be based on the principle of a one-to-one correspondence between transliterational signs and graphemes of the original language. This provides one hundred percent reverse conversion of the transliterated record" [18, p. 262]. A. Reformatskii [19, p. 21], and M. Vakulenko [2, p. 15] also insisted on this peculiarity of transliteration.

In addition to the above mentioned, A. Reformatskii distinguished three more compulsory principles for the future of the system of transliteration: it should be international, unambiguous and regulated by elementary rules, understanding of which does not require either knowledge of foreign languages or knowledge of specific linguistic terminology [20].

In Section 1 of "The Recommendations on transliteration of proper names with the letters of the Ukrainian alphabet", it is pointed out how important the use of the system of Ukrainian transliteration in the system of legal protection of industrial property objects is, as well as in the work of representatives on matters of intellectual property (patent attorneys), in name indices and in information retrieval systems [10].

Not everyone knows that such proper names as *Hitachi*, *Hirosima*, *Kawasaki*, *Burma*, *Hong Kong*, *Taiwan*, *Java*, *Jamaica*, *Delhi*, *Afghanistan*, *Jerusalem*, *Iraq*, *Iran* are not written in English, but with the corresponding national Latin letters [3]. In fact, according to world standards and agreements (in particular such UN resolutions as: IV/20 – "Reduction of exonyms" and V/13 – "Precedence of national official forms of geographical names"), proper names in a different language must be kept authentic: *San Jose* (a city in the USA), *Cojíjo* (a province in Canada). If the original form is written in a non-Latin alphabet,

it is transliterated with the Latin alphabet of the original language.

The analysis of the peculiarities of transliteration and transcription processes, several dozens of differently used Ukrainian-Latin transliteration algorithms, makes it possible to conclude that for the international written variants of Ukrainian proper nouns that are subject to the jurisdiction of our state, transliteration based on the principles of the Ukrainian Latin is required.

Unfortunately, theoretical knowledge may not always help us in real life; for example, how should we converse the following: *Kvitka-Osnov'janenko street* or *vul. Kvitky-Osnov'ianenka*, or maybe *Kvitka-Osnovyanenko street*, or *vul. Kvitky-Osnov''ianenka*? What about *Бурсацький узвіз*? Will it be *Bursacjkyj descent*? Or *Bursats'kyi uzviz*? Will the identification of the person be interfered with the fact that my last name is *Minkovska* in my international passport, and my father's one is *Mynkovskyi*, and from a legal point of view, we are even not relatives? And if you correct this error, then how to write our last name: *Minkovskyj*, *Minjkovsjkyj* or *Minkovskyi*?

The issue of writing foreign-language onyms by means of the Ukrainian language and vice versa leads to the need for a deeper study of the problems of adapting proper names. Nevertheless, this problem, generated, first of all, by practice, requires the development of theoretical basis. The functioning of the Ukrainian literary language in close contact with Russian in the Russian Empire, as well as with the Polish, German, Czech and Hungarian languages in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and Poland caused certain differences in the written form of Western European borrowings, which became one of the features that distinguished East-Ukrainian and Western Ukrainian orthographic practice during the studied period. The linguists' findings and the standards of Ukrainian-Latin transliteration helped us prove that each letter/grapheme in these systems has always depended very much on who, where, when, and for what it was developed. These facts did not contribute to the stabilization of the forms of foreign-language lexems in Ukrainian and vice versa during the period under investigation, although, in general, certain progress in this direction has undoubtedly been made: only 150 years ago, the Ukrainian progressive people seriously discussed the use of the Latin alphabet in the Ukrainian language writing system. During just a century linguists were able to agree on the reproduction of a large number of letters. Only such letters as *є, я, ю, ї, ґ, г, ж, й, х, ц, '* and *ь* still remain disputable.

M. Vakulenko, drawing on the work of the scientists who had contributed to this area before him,

developed the scientific principles for the transliteration standard of the Ukrainian Latynka. He states that the basis of this standard – the transliteration table – should be based on the following principles:

– *consistency* (the elements of Latin alphabet (Latynka) do not exist separately, but are interconnected by certain features);

– *accuracy* (obligatory in all cases, which is not subject to discussion, adequate representation of each letter of the Cyrillic alphabet);

– *mutual unambiguousness* (a mutual correspondence between each letter of the Cyrillic alphabet and the Latin alphabet, which may include several letters);

– *reversibility* (the ability to restore the original text after repeated transliteration);

– *absence of an intermediary language* (English, French, Russian, etc.);

– *traditionalism* (taking into account phonetic and graphic traditions of the Ukrainian language and the use of certain graphemes of the Latin alphabet);

– *normativity* (compliance with the norms of the modern Ukrainian orthography);

– *suitable for coding* (use of Latin characters with codes ASCII 0-127 – without diacritical marks, which is necessary for computer transmission).

The Draft Ukraine National Standard for transliteration of Ukrainian texts from Cyrillic to Latin alphabet 2009 designed by L. Masenko, R. Mykulchyk, V. Morhuniuk, L. Pshenychna, O. Ponomariv, B. Rytsar, R. Rozhankivskyi, N. Totska states that there is a developed system of transliterating Ukrainian texts from Cyrillic to Latin alphabet in accordance with the generalized requirements of international standards, as well as Ukrainian school. It has the following features:

– *normativity* (full compliance of the system with the Ukrainian orthography, which may make it an integral part of the latter);

– *error-free* (the system does not make information mistakes in the texts);

– *systemic character* (based on the rules given in the transliteration table);

– *universality* (the ability of the system to fulfil various tasks of international exchange of text information);

– *provision of a set of letters* (provides the required set of Latin letters with diacritics for the computer version of the system);

– *based on one language* (only on Ukrainian);

– *traditionalism* (taking into account the traditional phonetic and aesthetic norms of the Ukrainian language, the world traditions of using the Latin alphabet, creating the transliteration pairs, closest to the pronunciation and international transcription);

– *completeness* (the ability of the system to translitarate any texts, including abbreviations and foreign-language borrowings);

– *unambiguousness* (each Ukrainian letter has a correspondent unique Latin letter);

– *reversibility* (the ability to accurately reproduce the Cyrillic text from the Latin transliteration);

– *suitable for designing programmes* (suitable for developing software and computer application of the system);

– *simplicity* (suitable for quick transliteration of a text by automated means or manually);

– *absence of an intermediary language* (does not to build words by the means of any intermediary language) [11].

Currently, in the world there are more than 20 Ukrainian-Latin alphabet transliteration standards that are used to a greater or lesser extent. Some of them (academic, ALA-LC, British, BGN/PCGN, ISO 9, Ukrainian Latynka, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese) were created by foreigners and approved by governments of other countries. The others were designed on the territory of Ukraine – GOST 1971, GOST 1986, TKPN 1994, Derzhstandart 1995, UKPPT 1996, GOST 7.79-2000 B, Passport 2004, Passport 2007, V. Hrytseliak's system, the Draft National Standard 2009 edited by B. Rytsar, Ukrainian URL 2013. Among the known ones there are experimental websites that promote the use of the Latin alphabet in the Ukrainian language – *Na chasi* and *UKRAJINA.tak.today*. This list can be supplemented by systems of certain countries, such as Poland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Latvia, Estonia, etc., which differ from the above listed standards and use letters and their combinations that are characteristic of the national languages of these countries. In Ukraine, the so-called Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine 2010 is an official standard system at the current time.

We can see that the standard developed by the TKPN of Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University is currently one of the best developed systems, as well as the Draft National Standard 2009 edited by B. Rytsar. But the interested parties have not reached the consensus on them.

Some elements of GOST 7.79-2000 B, BGN/PCGN and ISO 9:1995 systems can also help scientists to develop an adequate scheme. All these systems are well-known and widespread both on the home and international levels, but none of them is approved at the Ukrainian official level. The standard of transliteration, which is officially used in Ukraine (namely, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine 2010),

does not meet the basic principles of transliteration in the best way.

The system suggested by V. Hrytseliak in 2013 also raises many questions, because in its essence it combines two opposing schemes, is not accurate and mutually unambiguous.

We have no reason to make the so-called German or French transliteration standards official because they do not comply with one of the basic principles of the Ukrainian Latynka, namely the principle of absence of an intermediary language. The same can be said about the traditional academic standard and ISO/R 9:1968.

It is worth noting that the State Intellectual Property Service of Ukraine does not quite understand the importance of developing a Ukrainian transliteration system based on the Ukrainian orthography and pronunciation without the use of any intermediary language. In the "Recommendations on Transliteration" mentioned above, in section 4 called "Transliteration Rules" it is stated that in order to write an English, French, German or Italian proper name with the letters of the Ukrainian alphabet, it is necessary to transcribe it first, and then to transliterate it [10]. A. Reformatskii, on the other hand, suggests the possibility of using transliteration as an intermediate link between the original writing and the future practical transcription (for example, *Чайковский* – *Čajkowskij* and further in different languages: English *Chaykovsky*, French *Tchaïkovsky*, German *Tschajkowsky*, Polish *Czajkowski* and so on further) [19, p. 21].

M. Vakulenko is also convinced that the use of intermediary language inevitably generates transcription rather than transliteration, and such schemes can not be considered as the basis for the transliteration table [4, p. 16–17]. In addition, the scheme proposed on the state website requires special linguistic knowledge, which can not be demanded from its future users.

It is obvious that such a number of variants leads to constant problems associated with errors caused by the ambiguity of the reverse transliteration, as well as to legal conflicts of the international level. As a result, we have a written form of Ukrainian surname *Ющенко* in 13 ways: *Juschtschenko, Joesjtsjenko, Iouchtchenko, Juszczenko, Jusjtjenko, Juscsenko, Yushenko, Iúsxenko, Yúshchenko, Juštšenko, Iușcenko, Yuşçenko, Yuşşenko;* Ukrainian toponym *Харків* is conversed in 6 different variants: *Kharkiw, Kharkiv, Charkiw, Jarkiw, Harkiv* and even, *Kharkov*; Ukrainian name *Сергій* was conversed during 1971–2013 as follows: *Sergy, Sergiy, Serhiy, Sergii.*

In addition, we would like to dwell on the notes and explanations as one of the ways to write Ukrainian proper names with the Latin alphabet. If an original text contains author's footnotes or notes, of course, they need to be transferred to the final translation product. However, in some cases, translators themselves are forced to give some explanations or notes that are not in the original text, since it is necessary to explain some realia unknown to the reader of the target language. So, using the transcoding technique, translators can not always be sure that the meaning of such a neologism in translation will be completely understandable from the context. In this case, they give an explanation that interprets the meaning of the word that is transcoded. Such explanations are given only during the first use of the word in transcription/transliteration. In the future, the new word is used in translation without further explanation. For example, the article *«Підвищення кваліфікації: як і куди зростати українському вчительству?»* (official web-portal *«Нова українська школа»*) should be translated as *«Teachers' Professional Development: How and Where Shoud Ukrainian Teachers Grow?»* (official web-portal *«Nova Ukrainska Shkola» (New Ukrainian School)*).

Conclusions and perspectives of further research. The question of the translation of proper nouns and proper names has long been the subject of the interests of linguists and translators. In their opinion, the main task of the translators is to make the translation of proper nouns/names adequate to the source language of the original, so that the recipients get a complete understanding of the realia conversed by them, that is, the attention should be focused not only on the form but also on the cultural-historical and linguistic-culturological information coded in these onyms. As K. Zaitseva says, a properly selected name shows both the connection of form and value, and also enhances the emotional impression [5, p. 6].

The lack of a systematically organized approach to the rules for writing foreign proper names in the Ukrainian language, as well as writing Ukrainian realia and onyms by means of the Latin alphabet, the presence of more than 20 variations of Ukrainian-Latin transcoding system in Ukraine and the world, and the lack of consensus on their use predetermine the instability of the manifestation of Ukrainian proper nouns abroad, which in turn leads to confusion, and sometimes to the incorrect interpretation of events in our state.

P. Newmark believes, the most optimal way to translate proper nouns is to reproduce the graphic form of a word from the source language into the target language [14, p. 70] – that is, to use translitera-

tion as a subtype of transcoding with the use of notes and explanations if necessary. Ukrainian linguists M. Vakulenko, L. Masenko, O. Ponomariv, B. Rytsar, I. Kulchytskyi agree with this concept.

One of the challenges and at the same time the prospective we see is a deep and comprehensive analysis of the official standard of the Ukrainian-Latin transliteration of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine 2010 by the linguistic community to check its compliance with the principles described in the study, its following improvement, and communication at the public and state levels abroad.

REFERENCES:

1. Вакуленко М. Наукові засади відтворювання запозичених та іншомовних слів: інваріантна транскрипція і транслітерація. *Вісник Книжкової палати*. Київ, 1999. № 10. С. 6–9.

2. Вакуленко М. Наукові засади відтворювання запозичених та іншомовних слів: інваріантна транскрипція і транслітерація. *Вісник Книжкової палати*. Київ, 1999. № 11. С. 15–18.

3. Вакуленко М. Українська латиниця як засіб представлення державної мови в міжнародному спілкуванні. Київ, 2016. URL: https://hostmaster.ua/docs/UL.html.

4. Вакуленко М. Штрихи до фасаду державної мови. *Вісник Книжкової палати*. Київ, 1999. № 10. С. 16–17.

5. Зайцева К. Английская стилистическая ономастика : тексты лекций. Одесса, 1973. 67 с.

6. Зорівчак Р. Реалія і переклад (на матеріалі англомовних перекладів української прози) : монографія. Львів, 1989. 215 с.

7. Карабан В. Переклад англійської наукової і технічної літератури : у 2 ч. Вінниця : Нова книга, 2001. Частина 2 : Лексичні, термінологічні та жанрово-стилістичні труднощі. 303 с.

8. Кочерган М. Вступ до мовознавства : підручник. 2-ге вид. Київ : ВЦ «Академія», 2008. 368 с.

9. Лєпухова Н. Переклад ономастичних реалій як лінгвокультурологічного компонента казкового тексту. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*. 2014. Т. 1. № 47. С. 613–623.

10. Рекомендації щодо транслітерування та транскрибування літерами української абетки власних назв, поданих англійською, французькою, німецькою та італійською мовами / В. Моргунюк, А. Войцехович, Ю. Котіков, Н. Куземська, А. Новікова, Л. Пшенична, Л. Шрамко. *Офіційний вебпортал Державного департаменту інтелектуальної власності*. 2010. URL: https://web.archive.org/web/20160307020619/http://sips.gov.ua/ua/transliteruvannja.html.

11. Транслітерування українських текстів з кирилиці на латиницю (проект, перша редакція) / Л. Масенко, Р. Микульчик, В. Моргунюк, Л. Пшенична, О. Пономарів, Б. Рицар, Р. Рожанківський, Н. Тоцька. URL: http://tc.terminology.lp.edu.ua/TK_translit.htm.

12. Словник української мови : в 11 т. / за ред. І. Білодіда. Київ : Наукова думка, 1979. Т. 10 : Т – Ф. 658 с.

13. Черноватий Л., Шех В. Проблеми передачі вузькоспеціальної англомовної термінології українською мовою. *Наукові записки Кіровоградського державного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Винниченка. Серія «Філологічні науки»*. 2009. Вип. 81(4). С. 109–116. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzs_2009_81%284%29__29.

14. Newmark P. A textbook of translation. New York : Prentice Hall, 1988. 292 p.

15. Бархударов Л. Язык и перевод (вопросы общей и частной теории перевода). Москва : Международные отношения, 1975. 240 с.

16. Влахов С., Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. Москва : Международные отношения, 1980. 343 с.

17. Кабберли И. Транслитерация и транскрипция: общие и специфические проблемы. *Русский язык за рубежом*. 1994. № 2. С. 49–56.

18. Маслов Ю. Введение в языкознание. Москва : Высшая школа, 1987. 272 с.

19. Реформатский А. Введение в языкознание / под ред. В. Виноградова. Москва : Аспект Пресс, 1996. 536 с.

20. Реформатский А. Транслитерация русских текстов латинскими буквами. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1960. № 5. С. 96–103.

21. Щерба Л. Транслитерация латинскими буквами русских фамилий и географических названий. *Известия Академии наук СССР. Отделение литературы и языка*. Москва : Изд-во АН СССР, 1940. № 3. С. 118–126.