
Pregledni rad
Rukopis primljen 20. 4. 2015.
Prihvaćen za tisak 25. 9. 2015.

Maksym O. Vakulenko

maxvakul@yahoo.com

Ukrainian Lingua-Information Fund, Kiev
Ukraine

Practical transcription and transliteration: Eastern-Slavonic view

Summary

This article discusses basic transcription approaches of foreign and borrowed words in Ukrainian, Russian, and Belarusian; Ukrainian words in Latin script. It is argued that the adopted and foreign words should be rendered on different bases, namely by invariant transcription and transliteration. Also, the current problems of implementation of the Ukrainian Latinics as an international graphical presentation of Ukrainian, are analyzed. The scholarly grounded simple-correspondent transliteration system for Belarusian, Russian, and Ukrainian, is given in the paper.

Key words: transcription, transliteration, Cyrillic script, latinization, foreign words

1. INTRODUCTION

Spelling of the words coming from another language is perhaps the most controversial issue in linguistics, so it is important to find a consistent scholarly approach to their proper rendering. There are two basic ways to do so: transcription and transliteration. Professionals should be able to render (transcribe) sounds, that is to know the "physics" (acoustics) of language. They need also to record the letters (phonemes) correctly – "literate" and transliterate – so to master the language "algebra". The subtleties of both approaches and their applicability in different cases will be discussed in this paper, based mainly on the material of the Eastern-Slavic languages.

2. PRONUNCIATION AND SPELLING

2.1. Approaches to transcription of foreign words

Transcription in its broadest sense is "an exact graphical rendering of some language or music sounds by conventional letters or special graphical signs independently according to the graphical and orthographical norms that have been historically shaped in the given language" (Bilodid et al., 1970–1980: 230), i.e. record (or rewrite) of information within another notation system. Examples of transcription are music notation, dance figures notation, record of messages by the Morse code and other ciphers, cryptograms, speech sound oscillograms, phonetic transcription, among others.

Borrowing presupposes the need for grammar transcription, i.e. reproduction of the word original sound by the apparatus of a recipient language. One kind of grammatical transcription is transcoding, or letter to letter or phoneme to phoneme transfer, of a primary lexical unit within the alphabet of the target language.

In linguistics, there is also the concept of transliteration that is "substitution of letters of a certain writing by the letters of another writing independently of their pronunciation" (Bilodid et al., 1970–1980: 230), i.e. rewriting the text within a different alphabet. Since it is about writing, not sound, then transliteration systems are inherently phonological.

Change in notation should not affect the sense of the given expression, so transliteration is actually a "language algebra". For example, the languages of the former Yugoslavia have two equivalent graphical representations: Latin (*gajevica*) and Cyrillic (*vukovica*). The notations *Hrvatska* and *Хрватска*, *Hrtkovci* and *Хртковци*,

Bosansko Grahovo and *Босанско Грахово*, *Oхрид* and *Ohrid* are fully equivalent, i.e. contain identical information. Transliteration is needed where the same text should be presented in a several – mostly two – equivalent graphical forms with the same information content: an international official communication (multilanguage forms, agreements, signs), identification documents (passports), various information banks, telecommunication networks, printed matter, bibliographic documentation and more.

Within the formal side, transliteration is a kind of transcription, in its broadest sense, that operates with letters of the different alphabetical system. However, the matter of transliteration is fairly opposite to that of grammatical transcription; they differ by the subject (letters for the first and the speech sounds for the second), and the first does not go beyond a single language, while the second concerns different languages.

2.2. Problems of foreign words rendering

When rendering foreign language forms, one should be aware of the extremes. Indeed, trying to accurately reproduce the sound source may result in unusual forms like **Елебеме* (*Alabama*), **Архентіна* (*Argentina*), **Мадрі* (*Madrid*), **Кува* (*Cuba*), **Саратаф* (*Саратов*). On the contrary, strict adherence to phonetic and morphological peculiarities of the recipient language would lead to **Пиліппіні* (*Philippines*), **Кравець* (*Taylor*), **Севастопіль* (*Σεβαστούπολη*), etc., thus unduly distorting words – because the Ukrainian language has adequate means for their accurate conveyance. A major drawback of this approach is multiplication of historical accidentals and errors in loans.

Given this, the so-called practical transcription is often used for the Eastern-Slavonic recipients (see Superanskaja, 1978) – simply put, a conglomerate of grammatical transcription and transliteration. The diacritical marks are not used in the practical transcription. According to this way of writing borrowed words, some sounds are transcribed and some letters are transliterated. It is believed that in the words *London*, *Manchester*, *Alabama*, *Cincinnati*, *Moskva*, etc. transliteration should be used (not to obtain unusually clumsy *Ландон*, *Менчісте*, *Елебеме*, *Сінсіннаті*, *Масква*), and the words *Middlesbrough* (*Міддлсбро*), *Cambridge* (*Кембрідж*), *Mexico* (*Мехіко*), *Gijón* (*Хіхон*), *Diderot* (*Дідро*), *Nantes* (*Нант*), *Renault* (*Рено*), etc., are transcribed (not to lose touch with the original pronunciation).

A noticeable drawback of practical transcription is its lack of clarity and consistency that leads to biasings in its application.

There are more choices in pairs such as: Ukr. *Марк Твайн* and *Мак Твен* (Mark Twain), Ukr. *Ліверпуол* and *Ліверпул* (Liverpool), Ukr. *Лінекер* and *Лайнекер* (Lineker), among others. It turns out that in the name of the famous American writer Mark Twain the first word is "transliterated" and the second is "transcribed". For the toponym *Liverpool* (*Ліверпуль*) both approaches seem to be applied; the first part ("Liver") is "transliterated" while the second ("pool") is "transcribed". There is no unique opinion on how to render the name *Lineker* (the English footballer in the late 20th century) in Ukrainian: *Лінекер* or *Лайнекер*. In addition, it is still unclear for what reason the toponym *London* (*Лондон*) is "transliterated" and antroponym *Brown* (*Браун*) is "transcribed" because in both cases the letter "o" denotes the same sound.

Since language is based on the sound forms, borrowing requires use of grammatical transcription to render the sounds of the word regarded. The question is, how to use it.

In Ukrainian and Russian, by keeping the letter "a" in the word *Алабама* (Alabama), the letter "o" in the word *Лондон* (London), and the letter "r" in the word *маркер* (marker), we actually transcribe those mainframe allophones suitable for the recipient language. Indeed, in other positions and under other conditions, these letters, more or less, roughly match the sounds specified.

2.3. Speech nonlinearity and non-invariance in the word rendering

This seeming "violation" of precision of sound rendering is explained by nonlinearity and non-invariance of speech (Lea, 1983: 78–81), saying that the sound of the given phoneme (and transeme, syllable, etc.) depends on its position and surroundings.

The language nonlinearity and non-invariance is distinctly imported in the morphemic principle of Ukrainian spelling, meaning that the same writing of the same morphemes, despite possible variations of their pronunciation, depends on the neighborhood of other sounds. For example, in the word *село* (village), the "e" is written – as in stressed positions – though the corresponding sound is more like [и].

Keeping the "source" allophones in the above examples, we actually "eliminate" nonlinear interaction of phonetic and phonological elements resulting in pronunciation non-invariance. Thus, having put away nonlinear modification of speech, inherent exclusively to the original language, we get those forms of borrowed words that are more suitable for the recipient language.

Focus on writing helps one to find the right allophone, but in fact, as two languages are involved in this process, there is no real transliteration here; it is just a convenient, though not always reliable, practical stroke when the fact that a given word is taken from another language is disregarded.

This "linearization" avoids unnatural spelling complication. In fact, "transliteration" of the word *marker* is actually its transcription with previous linearization of transitions *a-r* and *e-r*. As a result of such linearization, the sound [r] that was dropped, has appeared again.

So, invariant (phonological) transcription is the rendering of the base allophone sound, mostly the main manifestation, of the given phoneme, either explicitly or implicitly present in the source language, by the base, primary of the recipient language allophone. This is a phonological modification of grammatical transcription that neutralizes interaction of the speech components, and thus "smoothes" excessively rough features of source pronunciation. Consistent application of invariant transcription during borrowing is particularly important for the Ukrainian language, because it adequately reflects its basic principles; phonetic ("as we hear, so we write") and morphemic ones (similar graphemes corresponding to the same morphemes).

The role and importance of invariant transcription for the Ukrainian language is clearly silhouetted in the light of modern linguistic theories of phonematic (phonemic) principle of the Ukrainian spelling (Pivtorak, 2004: 516; Vykhovanecj, 2007: 57–58). According to Ivan Vykhovanecj, "the phonemic principle is the writing in which the same alphabet letters render the given phoneme in its all sound variations not regarding how it is pronounced in this or that phonetic position. [...] Every morpheme consisting of the same phonemes, is always written the same. [...] This principle is based on the unity of a phoneme and an adequate to it letter" (Vykhovanecj, 2007: 57–58).

Thus, the invariant transcription provides the phonematic (phonemic) orthographic principle that combines phonetic and morphemic ones. Note that in this formulation, the phonemic principle is so generalized that it is common for all languages and ignores features of any individual language. Indeed, since the basis of every human language are speech sounds, the sound representations of phonemes that make up the phonetic component of the phonematic principle, they are necessary basis for this language. On the other hand, orthography is intended to formulate the most standard rules to write down the same morphemes – so that the morphemic principle is more or less present in every grammar, reflecting individual qualities of a

corresponding language. For example, in French and English, the morphemic principle reflects largely traditional spelling of certain letter combinations, while in Belarusian it is reduced to the consistency of the graphic rendering of the same morphemes, that in this case is very close to the pronunciation (i.e. complements the phonetic principle).

The phonemic principle also operates in the Russian language. For example, the word *хорошо* (well) is written with the phoneme /o/, although there are allophones close to [a]. The morphemes comprised of the same phonemes are written the same in Russian. There are certain exceptions: *рост* (growth) – *расту* (grow up); *залог* (bail), *положить* (put) – *полагать* (take), etc. In the examples a drive to maintain a compliance "phoneme – adequate to it letter" is manifested.

It is commonly recognized that "the Ukrainian spelling is built mainly on the phonetic (phonological) principle" (Sheveljov, 2012: 510). All this proves that the traditional formulation of the principles of Ukrainian orthography treating the phonetic principles as the main and morphemic as the complementary ones (the latter may take into account historical writing also), reflect the Ukrainian features more precisely than such broad theoretical generalizations as the above-mentioned phonemic principle. For example, the Ukrainian vowels are pronounced clearly, and their reduction (as the [e] and [и] in the unstressed position) is much smaller and not so common as compared to Russian, English, and other languages. Distinct vowels form distinct syllables. Therefore, the melody and beauty of Ukrainian language are explained primarily by its clear sound basis caused, in turn, by the pronounced phonetic basis of its orthography.

The "linear" understanding of grammatical transcription also protects from kinks towards undue distortion of authentic sound by the recipient language. Therefore, in the words of English, Spanish, and French origin, the letter *j* is to be represented by the Ukrainian *дж*, *х*, and *ж*, respectively, due to the sound of the corresponding basic allophones. If the French phoneme /u/ has only the front allophones, it is advisable to transcribe it by the Ukrainian "ю": *бюро* (*bureau*), *пюре* (*purée* 'mashed potatoes'), *дюшес* (*Duchess*), *Жюст* (*Juste*), *Жюль* (*Jules*), *жюри* (*jury*), among others (see Vakulenko, 2015: 19).

In addition, the recognized priority of the phonetic approach over the etymological one in the Ukrainian language (Тymoshenko, 1961: 23; Sheveljov, 2012: 510), requires one to choose such allophones that meet modern pronunciation, not historical (old) sound. Therefore, since the main allophone variations matching

the Latin *i* are entirely consistent with the set of allophones associated with the Ukrainian Cyrillic *i*, this is the basis to use such correspondence in the grammatical transcription. This is primarily about writing foreign proper names in Ukrainian.

One should clearly distinguish between the written denotation of transemes – that contain information about the nonlinear interaction of two or more phonemes (or other phonetic and phonological language elements) – and rendering letter combinations corresponding to one sounding phoneme. The latter include *oo* (Liverpool), *ou* (Fr. *bijou*), *eaux* (Fr. *Bordeaux*), etc., that represent one sound.

As for *Lineker*, the graphical representation (the letter *i*) "competes" with the sound, which partly depends on syllable closeness or openness. Transcribing this name, one should render the sound rather than letter writing: *Лайнекер*.

The name *Сан-Франциско* (San Francisco) is written in Ukrainian with the letter *ц*, but *Френсис* (Francis) is with *с*. In the first case, the significant impact of Latin is felt, and the second word has acquired French and English features.

The Spanish language actually borrows from Greek on the principle of invariant transcription. Here the Greek letter χ "chi" (produced as the sound [x]) is associated with the allophones of the phoneme /κ/ "kappa". There are numerous reasons for this; for example, the number "eight" in modern Greek is denoted by two equal (allophonic) words *οχτώ* and *οκτώ*. In turn, the Spanish *j* "jota" is correlated with the allophones of the Latin /j/ which comes from the Greek /ι/ "iota". Therefore, the Greek χ is rendered not by the favorite Spanish "jota" but by *c* (and by the digraph *qu* preceding the "i" and "e") read through as [k]: *caracterización* (characteristics), *chromosoma* (chromosome), *cronología* (chronology), *arquetipo* (archetype), *arquitectura* (architecture), *química* (chemistry).

In Ukrainian, the invariant transcription requires to render the Greek surname *Καλογεράκης* as *Καλογερακις* (although it sounds like "Καλοερακις").

Thus, the invariant transcription regulates writing loans, i.e. those words that came into the given language from another.

A different approach is acceptable for the foreign words, i.e. those which are only represented in the given language but belong to another one. These are primarily proper names and some terms. In this case, the text should be transliterated to exactly convey its content.

3. WRITING AND TRANSLITERATION

3.1. Need for transliteration

In the 19th century, the British linguist Richard Lepsius wrote about the need to create a universal transliteration system (Lepsius, 1863). Transliteration relates to letters belonging to different graphical systems, and under this conversion no shift to another language takes place. Jurij Maslov emphasized that scholarly transliteration relies on the principle of simple correspondence between initial graphemes and transliterated signs that is crucial for reverse transliteration that preserves information (Maslov, 2007: 284).

Andrij D'jakov, Taras Kyjak, and Zoja Kudeljko argue that "transliteration can be considered as part of terminology planning, bringing out unambiguous and standardized international writing lexical units of languages with non-Latin graphical systems" (D'jakov et al., 2004: 142).

The simple-correspondent transliteration system of the Ukrainian Latinics (UL) being an international graphical representation of the Ukrainian language, as well as its extension for the Eastern-Slavonic Latinics, also including Russian and Belarusian languages, together with the corresponding transliteration program, has been elaborated and proposed in the a series of works (Vakulenko, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1998, 1999, 2004, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, Vakulenko et al., 1995).

Table 1 presents the general (universal) Ukrainian Latinics using basic letters with the ASCII codes 0–127, along with the transcription column.

Table 1. General Ukrainian Latinics

Tablica 1. Opća ukrajinska latinica

№	Cyrillics	Latinics	Transcription
1	а А	a A	[a]
2	б Б	b B	[b]
3	в В	v V	[v]/[w]*
4	г Г	gh Gh	[ɣ]
5	г Г	g G	[g]
6	д Д	d D	[d]
7	е Е	e E	[e]
8	є Є	je Je	[je]/[ˈe]**
9	ж Ж	zh Zh	[ʒ]

№	Cyrillics	Latinics	Transcription
10	з З	z Z	[z]
11	и И	y Y	[y]
12	і І	i I	[i]
13	ї Ї	ji Ji	[ji]
14	й Й	j J	[j]
15	к К	k K	[k]
16	л Л	l L	[l]
17	м М	m M	[m]
18	н Н	n N	[n]
19	о О	o O	[o]
20	п П	p P	[p]
21	р Р	r R	[r]
22	с С	s S	[s]
23	т Т	t T	[t]
24	у У	u U	[u]
25	ф Ф	f F	[f]
26	х Х	kh Kh	[x]
27	ц Ц	c C	[ts]
28	ч Ч	ch Ch	[tʃ]
29	ш Ш	sh Sh	[ʃ]
30	щ Щ	shh Shh	[ʃʃ]
31	ю Ю	ju Ju	[ju]/[ʲu]**
32	я Я	ja Ja	[ja]/[ʲa]**
33	ь Ь	j J	[ʲ]**

Note: * – at the end of word and before the consonants;

** – following consonants

The apostrophe precedes *ja, ju, je, ji, jo* if no palatalization occurs and separates *j* from following vowels in *їа, їу, їе, їі, ъа, ъу, ъе*: *Ghryghor'jev, V'juny, pid'jom, Volynj'aghroprom, raj'uprava*.

The Eastern-Slavonic Latinics (ESL), including Ukrainian, Belarusian, and Russian languages, is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. General Eastern-Slavonic Latinics**Tablica 2.** Opća istočnoslavenska latinica

№	Cyrillics		Latinics					
			Belarusian		Russian		Ukrainian	
1	а	А	a	A	a	A	a	A
2	б	Б	b	B	b	B	b	B
3	в	В	v	V	v	V	v	V
4	г	Г	gh	Gh	g	G	gh	Gh
5	ґ	Ґ	–	–	–	–	g	G
6	д	Д	d	D	d	D	d	D
7	е	Е	e	E	e	E	e	E
8	є	Є	–	–	–	–	je	Je
9	ё	Ё	jo	Jo	jo	Jo	–	–
10	ж	Ж	zh	Zh	zh	Zh	zh	Zh
11	з	З	z	Z	z	Z	z	Z
12	и	И	–	–	i	I	y	Y
13	і	І	i	I	–	–	i	I
14	ї	Ї	–	–	–	–	ji	Ji
15	й	Й	j	J	j	J	j	J
16	к	К	k	K	k	K	k	K
17	л	Л	l	L	l	L	l	L
18	м	М	m	M	m	M	m	M
19	н	Н	n	N	n	N	n	N
20	о	О	o	O	o	O	o	O
21	п	П	p	P	p	P	p	P
22	р	Р	r	R	r	R	r	R
23	с	С	s	S	s	S	s	S
24	т	Т	t	T	t	T	t	T
25	у	У	u	U	u	U	u	U
26	ў	Ў	w	W	–	–	–	–
27	ф	Ф	f	F	f	F	f	F
28	х	Х	kh	Kh	kh	Kh	kh	Kh
29	ц	Ц	c	C	c	C	c	C

№	Cyrillics		Latinics					
			Belarusian		Russian		Ukrainian	
30	ч	Ч	ch	Ch	ch	Ch	ch	Ch
31	ш	Ш	sh	Sh	sh	Sh	sh	Sh
32	щ	Щ	–	–	shh	Shh	shh	Shh
33	ъ	Ъ	–	–	‘	‘	–	–
34	ы	Ы	y	Y	y	Y	–	–
35	э	Э	eh	Eh	eh	Eh	–	–
36	ю	Ю	ju	Ju	ju	Ju	ju	Ju
37	я	Я	ja	Ja	ja	Ja	ja	Ja
38	ь	Ь*	j	J*	j	J*	j	J*
39		’		’		–		’

* – following consonants

Additional Table 3 with diacritic (superscript) marks may be used where it is necessary to keep the number of positions for the letters.

Table 3. Eastern-Slavonic Latinics with diacritical marks

Tablica 3. Istočnoslavenska latinica s dijakritičkim znakovima

Cyrillics		Latinics					
		Belarusian		Russian		Ukrainian	
а	А	а	А	а	А	а	А
б	Б	b	B	b	B	b	B
в	В	v	V	v	V	v	V
г	Г	ğ	Ğ	g	G	ğ	Ğ
г	Г	–	–	–	–	g	G
д	Д	d	D	d	D	d	D
е	Е	e	E	e	E	e	E
є	Є	–	–	–	–	ë	Ë
ë	Ë	ë	Ë	ë	Ë	–	–
ж	Ж	ž	Ž	ž	Ž	ž	Ž
з	З	z	Z	z	Z	z	Z

Cyrillics	Latinics					
	Belarusian		Russian		Ukrainian	
и И	– –	i I	– –	y Y	– –	
і І	i I	– –	– –	– –	– –	
ї Ї	– –	– –	– –	– –	– –	
й Й	j J	j J	j J	j J	j J	
к К	k K	k K	k K	k K	k K	
л Л	l L	l L	l L	l L	l L	
м М	m M	m M	m M	m M	m M	
н Н	n N	n N	n N	n N	n N	
о О	o O	o O	o O	o O	o O	
п П	p P	p P	p P	p P	p P	
р Р	r R	r R	r R	r R	r R	
с С	s S	s S	s S	s S	s S	
т Т	t T	t T	t T	t T	t T	
у У	u U	u U	u U	u U	u U	
ў Ў	w W	– –	– –	– –	– –	
ф Ф	f F	f F	f F	f F	f F	
х Х	x X	x X	x X	x X	x X	
ц Ц	c C	c C	c C	c C	c C	
ч Ч	č Č	č Č	č Č	č Č	č Č	
ш Ш	š Š	š Š	š Š	š Š	š Š	
щ Щ	– –	š Š	š Š	š Š	š Š	
ъ Ъ	– –	‘ ‘	‘ ‘	– –	– –	
ы Ы	y Y	y Y	y Y	– –	– –	
э Э	é Ê	é Ê	é Ê	– –	– –	
ю Ю	ü Ü	ü Ü	ü Ü	ü Ü	ü Ü	
я Я	ä Ä	ä Ä	ä Ä	ä Ä	ä Ä	
ь Ь	j J*	j J*	j J*	j J*	j J*	
’	’	–	–	’	’	

* – following consonants

Additional Table 4, being a combination of Table 2 and Table 3, is closer to the real alphabets using the Latin script. So this last table is perhaps the most relevant for the Slavic studies.

Table 4. Combined Eastern-Slavonic Latinics with diacritic marks

Tablica 4. Kombinirana istočnoslavenska latinica s dijakritičkim znakovima

Cyrillics		Latinics					
		Belarusian		Russian		Ukrainian	
а	А	а	А	а	А	а	А
б	Б	б	В	б	В	б	В
в	В	в	У	в	У	в	У
г	Г	ğ	Ğ	g	G	ğ	Ğ
г	Ґ	–	–	–	–	g	G
д	Д	d	D	d	D	d	D
е	Е	e	E	e	E	e	E
є	Є	–	–	–	–	je	Je
ё	Ё	ë	Ë	ë	Ë	–	–
ж	Ж	ž	Ž	ž	Ž	ž	Ž
з	З	z	Z	z	Z	z	Z
и	И	–	–	i	I	y	Y
і	І	i	I	–	–	i	I
ї	Ї	–	–	–	–	ï	Ï
й	Й	j	J	j	J	j	J
к	К	k	K	k	K	k	K
л	Л	l	L	l	L	l	L
м	М	m	M	m	M	m	M
н	Н	n	N	n	N	n	N
о	О	o	O	o	O	o	O
п	П	p	P	p	P	p	P
р	Р	r	R	r	R	r	R
с	С	s	S	s	S	s	S
т	Т	t	T	t	T	t	T
у	У	u	U	u	U	u	U

Cyrillics		Latinics					
		Belarusian		Russian		Ukrainian	
ÿ	Ÿ	w	W	–	–	–	–
ф	Ф	f	F	f	F	f	F
х	Х	x	X	x	X	x	X
ц	Ц	c	C	c	C	c	C
ч	Ч	č	Č	č	Č	č	Č
ш	Ш	š	Š	š	Š	š	Š
щ	Щ	–	–	š̂	Š̂	š̂	Š̂
ь	Ь	–	–	‘	‘	–	–
ы	Ы	y	Y	y	Y	–	–
э	Э	ê	Ê	ê	Ê	–	–
ю	Ю	ju	Ju	ju	Ju	ju	Ju
я	Я	ja	Ja	ja	Ja	ja	Ja
ъ	Ъ	j	J*	j	J*	j	J*
’	’	’	’	–	–	’	’

* – following consonants

In addition, it has an annex for diachronic (historical) Ukrainian orthographic systems, such as those by Mykhajlo Smotryckyj, Pantelejmon Kulish, Mykhajlo Maksymovych and others, by submitting transliteration pairs **θ** – **th/θ**, **ξ** – **x/ξ**, **ψ** – **ph/ψ**, **υ** – **ih/ι**, **s** – **s**, **ω** – **ooh/ο**, **κγ** – **qg**, **Ѡ** – **ieh/ē**, **и** – **dh/ḍ**, **ÿ** – **w**, **j** – **j**, **ы** – **yh/ý**, **ë** – **jo/ö**, **ъ** (at the word end) – **ah/ă**, **ь** (preceding yodated vowels) – **’**, **э** (at the word beginning) – **e**, **û** – **yhh/ÿ**, **ê** – **eh/ê**, **ô** – **oh/ô**, **ÿ** – **uh/û** for general and diacritic tables, respectively (see Vakulenko, 2012b).

The advantages of this system were acclaimed by the Ukrainian and international academic community (see Vakulenko, 1998, 1999, 2004, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c). In particular, Andrij D’jakov, Taras Kyjak, and Zoja Kudeljko estimate this product as the currently best system of Ukrainian Latinics and believe that it "could be introduced as a universal system for rendering Ukrainian words in Latin script" (D’jakov et al., 2004: 192, 194). That also resulted in its approval by the academic Transliteration commission (Head: Prof. Vasylyj Nimchuk) on November 16, 2000. Its superstructure is available at the service *Google Code*, <http://code.google.com/p/cyr2url/>, and it is used

in the Ukrainian online dictionaries (available at sum.in.ua, rymy.in.ua). However, this system is far from being generally adopted and therefore needs wider promotion.

3.2. Pseudo transliteration: causes and impacts

The Latin transformation of Ukrainian Cyrillics, during which English is treated as a mediator language, is still common in Ukraine (due to the Resolution of Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine № 55 from January 27, 2010) and in the United States (due to Library of Congress system and its analogs). This is caused mainly by the following reasons.

First, it is not commonly understood that the foreign words (proper names and certain terms) that remain inherent to the original language, are normally rendered on the basis of orthographic language interference, or orthographic transplantation (Superanskaja, 1978: 25), e.g.: *Hercules Poirot* (Fr.), *Coulomb* (Fr.), *San José* (Sp.), *Guadalajara* (Sp.), *junta* (Sp.), *Gijón* (Sp.), *Loch Ness* (Scot.), *Ajax* (Lat.), *Juventus* (Lat.), *Jensen* (Dan.), *Volkswagen* (Ger.), *Johannesburg* (Ger.), *Jari* (Fin.), *Jaworski* (Pol.), *Katowice* (Pol.), *Jagr* (Cz.), *Jihlava* (Cz.), *Sarajevo* (Bosn.), *Ljubljana* (Slov.), etc. If the producing and recipient languages are based on different alphabetic systems, such transplantation is accompanied with transliteration: *Beijing* (Chin.), *Hitachi* (Jap.), *Iraq* (Ar.), *Jerusalem* (Hebr.), etc. Wider use of orthographic transplantation contributes to the fact that the grammar of English, French and other languages, the spelling of which is based on etymological grounds, shows high tolerance to foreign inclusions. In particular, the digraphs *kh*, *gh*, *zh*, that represent specific sounds in the foreign words *khan*, *kolkhoz*, *Afghanistan*, *Zhukov*, and others, have been used in the English texts. In the modern Italian alphabet, the letter *j* is not present – but the name of the famous football club *Juventus* keeps the authentic form.

"Squeezing" the given phonetic system into the Procrustean bed of another, different one, is principally impossible. The English letter combination *ch*, for example, has itself various kinds of pronunciation in the words *Christy*, *Loch Ness*, *attach*, *check*, *Chicago*. However, even in the "binary" schemes (as in the Library of Congress one) the need to go beyond pure transcription is felt. When reflecting the Slavic pronunciation, besides the above mentioned digraphs *kh*, *gh*, *zh*, the letters *a*, *o*, *u*, *i*, *y*, *e*, *g*, *r*, are "forced" to acquire the relevant phonetic values. This is a step towards the authentic writing using the national Latinized script.

Further, the focus on a foreign language does not allow one to achieve exact correspondence between initial and final forms of a word. This is incompatible with

the computer use and breaks down the original pronunciation (the latter is not crucial but is desirable). For example, the "simplified" (and incorrect) form "Kyiv" corresponds to 4 Cyrillic forms: К`їв / Київ / Кийв / Київ – with a rather atypical pronunciation. The form *Cherniatskyi* "multiplies" the original Ukrainian name by the factor 16 (!): *Черніатський / Черніатский / Черніацкїї / Черніацкїй / Черніацкїї / Черніацкїй / Черняцкїї / Черняцкїй / Черніатськїї / Черніатськїй / Чернятськїї / Чернятськїй / Черніацькїї / Черніацькїй / Черняцькїї / Черняцькїй*.

The reversibility is sadly violated also by correspondences "и/й" – у, "і/й/ї/ь" – і: *Рії – Пії/Пії/П`ї/Пії/Пії*.

Neglecting the "ь" would make the Ukrainian names *Булькін* and *Булкін*, *Паньківська* and *Панківська*, *Гальченко* and *Галченко* "equivalent". The use of *ц* as *ts*, *ш* as *shch* (or *sch*) sweeps out the difference between *ц* and *тс*, *ш* and *шч* (or *сч*) that is important feature in names *Реформатський*, *Шишченко*, etc. Also, it causes artificial "equivalence" of different names: *Левицький* – *Левитський*, *Тоцька* – *Тотська*, *Чернятський* – *Черняцький*, *Лященко* (from "Ляц") – *Ляшченко* (from "Ляшко"), *Сущенко* (from "Сушко") – *Суценко* (from "Суций"), etc. Rendering the yodated sounds through "i+vowel" makes it impossible to differentiate *Лялько* and *Ліалко* (*Lialko*), *Медіана* and *Медяна* (*Mediana*), *Возіанов* and *Возянов* (*Vozianov*), *Гундеріан* and *Гундерян* (*Hunderian*), *Годулян* and *Годуліан* (*Hodulian*), *Лар`їн* and *Ларін* (*Larin*), *Мар`ян* and *Маріан* (*Marian*), *Клаузіус* and *Клаузіус* (*Klausius*), etc. Naturally, the rules of original spelling are violated as well. This is not compatible with the conservation information requirement in corpora transformation and results in breakup between internal (Cyrillic) and external (latinized) communication. Within such systems, the identification of a person is then impossible, so the schemes of this kind are especially inconvenient for official and legal use (passports, documents, agreements, maps, etc.).

Artificially "multiple" names arise also as a result of transcription into several languages. So, the "English" *Шевчук* appears as *Shevchok / Shevchouk / Shevchuk / Shevchook / Shevchouck / Shevchuck*, "French" as *Chevtchouc / Chevtchoucque*, and "German" as *Schewtschuk / Schewtschuck* – that does not agree to the name writing practice of the Japanese, Czechs, Germans, French, Arabs, Greeks and other nations that have unique writing systems for their names in any foreign language. Such phonetic adaptation to the recipient language is reasonable only for completely assimilated words appearing at the localization stage – e.g., for the name of an American of Ukrainian origin. Therefore, different forms of the same original name

(such as *Шевчук*) are warranted, for example, if the corresponding countries issue passports for their citizens.

Second, the use of such systems implicitly assumes "priority" of the foreign language rules, in contrast to Resolutions of the United Nations Organization: IV/20 (1982) – "On decreasing the number of exonyms" – and V/13 (1987) – "On priority of the national official forms of geographical names". After years of political dependence of our country, Ukrainian academic community as a whole is not mentally ready to let Ukrainian language acquire all attributes of the national language of an independent state, including external representation of Ukrainian proper and other names. Some Ukrainians still regard Russian as a more advanced and prestigious language, some tend to treat English as the new master (new "older brother") of Ukrainian. It is not then surprising that latinization of Ukrainian names in the "English" manner is often accompanied with their "russification": *Україна* – "Ukraina". Therefore the drawbacks of English-oriented approach make it hardly acceptable for Ukrainian transliteration.

The Ukrainian Linguistic/Scholarly transcoding system adopted in 2009 by the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, is a bit more advanced in comparison to the English-oriented tables, since it treats Czech as a romanization target of Ukrainian (except of correspondence $x-x$) that belongs to the Slavonic family as well. However, such "priority" of Czech over Ukrainian is not granted anyway. In addition, denotation of palatalization by the apostrophe (or gravis) is unnatural; it does not allow one to distinguish between the large and small soft signs ("Ь" and "ь"), and the apostrophe in Ukrainian denotes separate pronunciation. This "transliteration" system had been heavily criticized by Ivan Franko and other Ukrainian intellectuals in 1859 when Jozef Jireczek tried to introduce Latin script into the Ukrainian based on the Czech language (Nimchuk, 2004: 219).

By imposing an unhistorical and ungrounded correspondence "г" – "h", such Czech writing breaks continuity of Ukrainian orthography where the Cyrillic letter "г" had arisen from the Hellenic "γ" (gamma) that corresponds to the Latin "g": *geography, Gregory, gigant*, etc. Besides, the historical facts state that the Protocyrillic script that already existed at the time of outreach of Cyril and Methodius to Kiev, had the Hellenic roots also (Brajchevsjkyj, 2009: 15). Interestingly, deciphering the runic writing of Khazars (the last quarter of the first millennium) displays the transliteration correspondence "h" – "x" (Brajchevsjkyj, 2009: 77–79). Thus, the Ukrainian Cyrillic

script has a long-lived transliteration tradition that does not associate the letter "r" with the "h".

Attempts to push the letter "g" from the Czech language itself led to the fact that this letter is still used in the borrowed words (*geografie, grafolog, grobian, groš, guslar, guturala, Jagr*).

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Ukraine remains the only Cyrillic-using country that, due to certain reasons, resides beyond the Interstate transliteration standard GOST 7.79–2000 "Rules of transliteration of Cyrillic script by Latin alphabet" where our propositions on the Eastern-Slavonic Latinics were taken into account. Absence of such standard in Ukraine, gives rise to certain difficulties in its international and computer communication (passports, documents, letters, agreements, certificates, library catalogues, geographical maps and other printed production, and e-mail, telegrams, sign-boards, various information banks, etc.). This problem requires a solution in the context of world globalization processes, European perspectives of Ukraine and its intensive international contacts.

The Ukrainian Latinics produces equivalent Latinized forms (authonyms) for the Ukrainian Cyrillic words that must be the highest priority as compared to other forms, in accordance with the above-mentioned UN resolutions V/20 (1982) and V/13 (1987). Further, they may be adopted by any individual language for its according to the grammar of the given language. For example, the form *Ukrajina* should be regarded as the fundamental one for the *Україна*, whereas the exonyms *Ukraine* (Eng.), *Ucrania* (Span.), *Ukraina* (Pol.), etc. may have local use in the corresponding countries.

The widespread adoption of Ukrainian Latinics, as a base for spreading Ukrainian realities in foreign languages, is a question of international prestige and European future of Ukraine.

REFERENCES

- Bilodid, I. K., Lysenko, P. S., Radčenko, É. M., Stojan, L. M., Cvjah, V. D., Jacenko, G. T.** (1970–1980). *Slovník ukrajinskjkoji movy: v 11 tt. [Dictionary of Ukrainian Language: In 11 Vol.]* (eds. A. A. Burjačok & G. M. Gnatjuk). Vol. X. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.
-

- Brajchevsjkyj, M.** (2009). *Pokhodzhennja slov'jansjkoji pysemnosti [Origin of Slavic Writing]*. Kyjiv: KM Akademija.
- D'jakov, A. S., Kyjak, T. R., Kudeljko, Z. B.** (2004). *Osnovy terminotvorennja: semantychnyj ta sociolinghivistychnyj aspekty [Fundamentals of Term Creation: Semantic and Sociolinguistic Aspects]*. Kyjiv: VD Academia.
- Lea, W.** (ed.). (1983). *Metody avtomaticheskogo raspoznavanija rechi: v 2-kh kn. [Methods of Automatic Speech Recognition: In 2 Vol.]*. Moscow: Mir. Vol. 1.
- Lepsius, C. R.** (1863). *Standard Alphabet*. London: Williams Norgate.
- Maslov, Ju. S.** (2007). *Vvedenie v jazykoznanie [Introduction to Linguistics]*. Moscow: Academia; Saint Petersburg: Filol. fak. SPbGU.
- Nimchuk, V. V.** (ed.). (2004). *Istorija ukrajinsjkojho pravopysu XVI-XX stolittja: khrestomatija [History of Ukrainian Spelling of 16th-20th Centuries: Reader]* (Eds. V. V. Nimchuk & N. V. Purjajeva). Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.
- Pivtorak, Gh. P.** (2004). Pravopys [Spelling]. In V. M. Rusanivsjkyj, O. O. Taranenko, M. P. Zjabljuk et al. (eds.), *Ukrajinsjka mova: encyklopedija [Ukrainian Language: Encyclopedia]*, 514–516. Kyjiv: Vyd-vo "Ukr. encykl." im. M. P. Bazhana.
- Sheveljov, Ju.** (2012). *Narys suchasnoji ukrajinsjkoji literaturnoji movy ta inshi linghivistychni studiji (1947–1953 rr.) [Sketch of Modern Ukrainian Literary Language and Other Linguistic Studies (1947–1953)]*. Kyjiv: Tempora.
- Superanskaja, A. V.** (1978). *Teoreticheskie osnovy prakticheskoij transkripcii [Theoretical Backgrounds of Practical Transcription]*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tymoshenko, P. D.** (1961). *Khrestomatija materialiv z ukrajinsjkoji literaturnoji movy. Chastyna II [Reader of Materials on Ukrainian Literary Language. Part II]*. Kyjiv: Rad. shkola.
- Vakulenko, M.** (1993). Pravopys – druga natura? [Spelling as a second nature?]. *Ukrajinsjka mova i literatura v shkoli* 11, 59–61.
- Vakulenko, M.** (1994). Ukrajinsjka latynka: pravyljne vidtvorennja nashykh vlasnykh nazv [Ukrainian Latinics: Correct rendering of our proper names]. *Tezy 3-oji MNK Problemy ukrajinsjkoji naukovo-tekhnichnoji terminologhiji*, 118–119. Ljviv.
- Vakulenko, M. O.** (1995). Ukrajinsjka latynka: vidtvorennja bez spotvorennja [Ukrainian Latinics: Rendering without deshaping]. *Dopovidi ta povidomlennja Mizhnarodnoji naukovoji konferenciji "Vidtvorennja ukrajinsjkykh vlasnykh nazv*
-

(*antroponimiv i toponimiv*) inozemnymi movamy". Kyjiv, 7-8 ghrudnja 1993 roku, 48–52.

- Vakulenko, M. O., Vakulenko, O. V., Bilodid, O. I., Kornilov, M. Ju., Neroznak, S. V.** (1995). *Vzajemnoodnoznachne komp'juterizovane peretvorennja ukrajinsjkykh tekstiv iz kyrylyci v latynycju i navpaky metodom transliteraciji (ukrajinsjka latynycja) [Simple-Correspondent Computerized Transformation of Ukrainian Texts from Cyrillic to Latin Script and Vice Versa by Transliteration (Ukrainian Latinics)]*. Certificate № 21 of the State Copyright Agency of Ukraine, 13 November 1995.
- Vakulenko, M. O.** (1998). Vostochnoslavjanskaja latinica v mezhdunarodnom kontekste [Eastern-Slavonic latinics in the international context]. *Slavia* R 67, 333–339.
- Vakulenko, M. O.** (1999). Transliteration through a Slavonic Latin alphabet: Saving information and expenses. *Visn. Kyjiv. ling. univ., Series Filologhija* 2, 1, 85–94.
- Vakulenko, M.** (2004). Simple-correspondent transliteration through a Slavonic Latin alphabet. *J. of Language and Ling. Studies* 3, 2, 213–228. Available at: http://webpace.buckingham.ac.uk/kbernhardt/journal/3_2/vakulenko3_2.pdf [24.09.2015]
- Vakulenko, M. O.** (2012a). O nauchnoj transliteracii ukrainskikh nazvanij [On scientific transliteration of Ukrainian names]. *Slavjanskije jazyki i kuljture v sovremennom mire: II Mezhdunarodnyj nauchnyj simpozium (Moskva, MGU imeni M. V. Lomonosova, filologicheskij fakuljtet, 21-24 marta 2012): Trudy i materialy* (ed. M. L. Remnjoval), 356–357. Moscow: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta. Available at: <http://www.philol.msu.ru/~slavmir2012/participants/?l=%D0%92> [04.04.2014]
- Vakulenko, M.** (2012b). Pytannja kyrylychno-latynychnoji transliteraciji u konteksti systematyzaciji bibliohrafichnykh danykh [Questions of Cyrillic-Latinic transliteration in the context of bibliographic data systematization]. *Bibl. visnyk* 2, 15–21. Available at: http://nbuv.gov.ua/j-pdf/bv_2012_2_3.pdf [09.06.2015]
- Vakulenko, M.** (2012c). Pro naukovi zasady formuvannja ukrajinsjkoji latynyci jak mizhnarodnogho kodu [On scholarly principles of forming the Ukrainian Latin alphabet as an international code]. *Mova i suspiljstvo [Language and Society]: Scholarly Journal. Ljviv : Ivan Franko Nat. Univ. of Ljviv* 3, 333–343. Available at: <http://lnu.edu.ua/publications/collections/ms/ua/issues/03/39.pdf> [09.06.2015]
-

-
- Vakulenko, M.** (2015). Borrowings in Ukrainian: Etymological, semantic, and orthographic issues. *Slavia, Praha, sešit 1*, 1–24. Available at: www.twirpx.com/file/1740458/ [20.08.2015]
- Vykhovanecj, I.** (2007). Pravopysni pytannja na tli totalitarnoji nenaukovosti [Spelling questions on the background of totalitarian non-scholarity]. In *Dop. ta povid. VI Mizhmar. konghresu ukrajinstiv [Reports of VI Intern. Ukrainian Congress]*, *Movoznavstvo 5*, 55–62. Kyjiv: Donecjk.
-

Maksym O. Vakulenko

maxvakul@yahoo.com

Ukrajinska jezično-informacijska zaklada, Kijev

Ukrajina

Transkripcija i transliteracija u praksi: istočnoslavenski pogledi

Sažetak

Ovaj rad opisuje temeljne principe transkripcije tuđica i posuđenica u ukrajinskom, ruskom i bjeloruskom pisanim latinicom. Smatra se da se posuđenice i tuđice moraju prilagođavati na različite načine, invarijantnom transkripcijom i transliteracijom. Također, u radu se raspravlja o trenutačnom problemu primjene ukrajinske latinice kao međunarodnog grafičkog prikaza ukrajinskog jezika. Prikazan je znanstveno utemeljen, jednostavan sustav transliteracije za bjeloruski, ruski i ukrajinski.

Ključne riječi: transkripcija, transliteracija, ćirilično pismo, latinizacija, strane riječi
