

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.54.06.17>

How to Cite:

Vakhovska, O. (2022). The sin of the translator: On words and mental images in translation. *Amazonia Investiga*, 11(54), 178-188. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.54.06.17>

The sin of the translator: On words and mental images in translation

Гріх перекладача: про слова та ментальні образи у перекладі

Received: June 2, 2022

Accepted: July 19, 2022

*The closer the look one takes at a word,
the greater the distance from which it looks back*
K. Kraus

*Imagery is an ubiquitous and inherent property of language
and it is only from image to image that we can translate languages*
O.O. Potebnya

Written by:

Vakhovska Olha⁷²<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7720-0970>

Abstract

This paper explores the interface between the conscious and unconscious minds in translation and focuses on the inner word form that it considers to be the linchpin in this interface. This paper assumes that words pertain via their inner forms directly to archetypal images and via these images indirectly to archetypes, which underpins image-driven interpretations of individual words in translation.

This paper discusses Ukrainian гріх commonly translated as English a sin and shows that this translatability does not imply an interpretability as the words via their inner forms relate to two distinct archetypal images - of fire and of movement, respectively, - that uniquely transcend the cultures to the core and capture a different, culture-specific knowledge of SIN. Pictorially, these are different SINS, owing to which гріх means something different to a speaker of Ukrainian than a sin does to a speaker of English. Yet, ingredients and associations drawn into the archetypal images show that THE SHADOW, ANIMA, THE SELF, and TRANSFORMATIONS are the archetypes that jointly endow to speakers the same foreknowledge of SIN as mediated from within the collective unconscious. This way the inner word forms via their connection to archetypal images extend back beyond the conscious into the unconscious mind.

Анотація

У статті досліджено взаємодію свідомого й несвідомого у перекладі й охарактеризовано внутрішню форму слова як стрижень цієї взаємодії. Показано, що слова своїми внутрішніми формами прямо відносяться до архетипних образів й опосередковано - до архетипів. Розкрито роль таких відношень у керованому образами тлумаченні слів у перекладі.

На прикладі українського іменника гріх, який англійською, як правило, перекладається як a sin, доведено, що повна перекладність слова не дорівнює його повній витлумачуваності, адже гріх та a sin своїми внутрішніми формами відносяться до двох різних архетипних образів, які глибоко вкорінені у відповідних культурах і фіксують відмінне, культурно-специфічне знання ГРІХА: у внутрішній формі слова гріх зберігається архетипний образ вогню, а у внутрішній формі слова a sin - архетипний образ руху. Каринно, це різні ГРІХИ, через що гріх має для носія української мови дещо інше значення, ніж a sin для носія англійської. Утім, складники двох досліджених образів й асоціації, що із цими образами пов'язані, вказують, що в основі ГРІХА лежать архетипи ТІНЬ, АНІМА, САМІСТЬ, та ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ, які у своїй сукупності дають носіям обох мов однакове передзнання ГРІХА, витoki якого сягають колективного несвідомого. Так, внутрішні форми слів

⁷² Associate Professor, Dr. Department of English philology and philosophy of language Kyiv National Linguistic University Kyiv, Ukraine.



Key words: archetypal image, archetype, inner word form, interpretation in translation, mental image, word.

Introduction

This paper explores the interface between the conscious and unconscious minds in translation and focuses on the inner word form that it assumes to be the linchpin in this interface.

This is a follow-up paper to Vakhovska (2022a). The common ground for these papers is *the theory of image-driven interpretations in translation* that I develop in keeping with the agenda of cognitive translation research. In this theory, interpretation is viewed as ‘drawing’ images in the mind, with the mind’s phenomenal content converted into its propositional content, and the other way round when it comes to converting propositional into non-propositional thought. In effect, the meaning of a word in the source language must convert into a mental image; this mental image must re-convert into a meaning for a word to be picked in the target language so that what *this word describes* corresponds to what *this mental image depicts* in the world, which is non-trivial since both depicting and describing involve several different-stage *representational changes* in the content of the mind. The genuine translator commits to find in a language such words that make for mental images their optimal descriptions.

Though mental images are inherently conscious, their root and sustenance are in *the unconscious mind and its archetypes* (in Jung’s terms). For mental images, archetypes are the primary schemes that get filled with peculiar contents only upon entering *the conscious mind*. Images that crop up immediately at the interface between the minds are termed archetypal; *archetypal images* date back to the time in evolution when humans’ emerging consciousness would light upon their vast unconsciousness, with the mind increasingly populated by images from then on.

Thinking in images is evolutionarily older than thinking in words first coined as symbols whose visual and sound forms constituted a syncretic sacred whole; from the very onset, the form and the meaning of a word were intimately, inextricably linked. The element in the word’s makeup that reaches archetypal images is *the inner word form* (the term by Potebnya) as the

завдяки відношенню до архетипних образів простягаються за межі свідомого у несвідоме.

Ключові слова: архетип, архетипний образ, внутрішня форма слова, ментальний образ, слово, тлумачення у перекладі.

archaic image that came to motivate this word at the moment of creation. Inner word forms are generally discovered in an etymological analysis carried out on the etymons of words.

The objective of this paper is to show that words via their inner forms pertain directly to distinct archetypal images and that it is via these images that the words relate indirectly to particular archetypes. Whereas archetypes are pan-human and cross the cultural divide, archetypal images do not: as transformations of the archetypes, they may have the same basic structure but tend to appear as specific, local variations across cultures worldwide. Hence, inner word forms bind word meanings with peculiar archaic images, and in doing so mediate the conscious and the unconscious minds; on that, inner word forms imbibe cultures, which is of particular relevance for translation as a form of cultural mediation engaged with the phenomenon of language.

The assumptions this paper makes have implications for the theoretical concept of *(un)translatability* in translation: I think the heuristic value of this concept will increase if the concept of *(un)interpretability* is introduced as a counterpart. Indeed, whereas the word A is effortlessly translatable as the word B, this does not imply their interpretability as the words via their inner forms bind their meanings with peculiar archetypal images that uniquely transcend the two cultures to the core. The genuine translator who is not a walking dictionary but a cultural mediator is a master of this transcendence.

This paper presents **the translation case study** of names of SIN in Ukrainian and English: the nouns *zpix* and *a sin*, respectively. This is an etymological exploration of words motivated by human (fore) knowledge of sin, with the surmise that these words, once coined, carry through time their original, archaic motivators as uniquely pictorial inner word forms. SIN is a universal human concept: its archetypes help humankind avoid perpetual evolutionary deadlocks and also grant the opportunity of *multeity*, which in different cultures translates into peculiar

archetypal images of SIN. Whereas translating *zpix* as *a sin* is straightforward, this study shows that pictorially these are very different SINS: two distinct archetypal images drive the interpretations of *zpix* (the image of fire) and of *a sin* (the image of movement) from within the Proto-Slavic and Proto-Germanic world models, with extensive cultural implications up to nowadays. This virtually overrides the straightforward translatability and makes the wording *zpix is translatable but not interpretable via a sin* very intuitive and even preferable if one is to genuinely respect the two cultures in their mediation.

In the view of cultural variation, total interpretability appears unattainable, though: there is no getting apple juice out of oranges, unless the fruit is genetically modified, which I find suboptimal. The genuine translator then can only strive for a total interpretability as for this translation's ultimate extent that otherwise threatens to become the cultures' vanishing point. It is with this idea of sin as an inherent imperfection in humans and in translations that this paper's title plays.

Theoretical framework

On inner forms in words and on sins in humans

The inner form of a word is a fragment of this word's meaning that motivated the emergence of this word in its peculiar form into the language (Potebnya, 1892). An inner word form is a primary, archaic image that shows the relation of the content of a thought to consciousness: 'отношение содержания мысли къ сознанию; она [внутренняя форма слова] показываетъ, какъ представляется челоѣку его собственная мысль,' as the original goes (*ibid.*, p. 102). In effect, the thought relates its content in a particular way to consciousness, and this relation (*отношение*, literally, as an offering that the thought carries along to give to consciousness) is an image.

Inner word forms are a linguistic community's shared archaic memories that, even when obliterated, preserve an influence upon the interpretive mind. On this view, words by their inner forms give rise to myths (*ibid.*) and myths come to be the 'first and foremost psychic phenomena that reveal the nature of the soul' (Jung, 1981, p. 6).

The theoretical concept of the inner word form derives from Humboldt's views on the inner form of language. Correspondingly, an inner word

form is treated as an active force, a spirit that sculpts this word's raw material and infuses into it a life of its own, which this paper's epigraph picks up as 'it looks back': as a creature capable of sight, the word looks back at a researcher, and in this eye contact there is a meaningful connection. In this light, translation 'is not a matter of knowing many words; it is a matter of going deep into their meanings so that the spirit of their content is not lost' (Vakhovska, & Isaienko, 2021, p. 248).

Practically, the inner word forms in Ukrainian *ведмідь* and in English *a bear*, for example, show that once bears were culture-specifically 'seen' via the images of honey and of the brown fur, and have remained pictorially different ever since (*ibid.*, p. 244). BEAR is a concrete concept; this paper takes up SIN which is abstract: whereas bears are generally tangible, sins are not, and *exposing in sins their unique visually perceived properties* is quite non-trivial. SIN is a propositional knowledge structure that, similarly to language, can describe but not depict. SIN sits on the universal set of propositions 'sin (X committed a sin), X did something bad, X knew that it was bad to do it, X knew that God wants people not to do things like this, X did it because X wanted to do it, this is bad' (Wierzbicka, 1996, p. 280-281) that indeed do not resemble sin in appearance. What is more, Ukrainian and English unlike Chinese or Japanese are not ideogram-based: in them, there is no counting on the outer word forms for a culturally-preferred pictorial resemblance to sin; this resemblance must be looked for in the words' inner forms instead.

The title of this paper echoes that of W. Benjamin's seminal work: 'The task of the translator' (2000[1923]) professed fidelity in the translation of individual words and came to fundamentally distinguish *what a word means* from *the manner in which this word means*. To Benjamin, words rather than sentences must be the primary elements of translation, and manners of meaning must be prioritized because they are unique, whereas meanings are not: to underline the manners of meaning in native vs. foreign words is the task of the translator. My views on the inner word form generally resonate with Benjamin's distinction. Though manners of meaning are never spoken of as mental images, let alone as archaic images that bind the unconscious and conscious minds in acts of word interpretation in translation, the point Benjamin makes, as well as his call to render the spirit but not the letter of the text, add a better clarity to this paper's approach.

If translated into Benjamin's terms, *sin* is *the object of intention* (the referent, in this paper's terms) that inherently remains the same in this world. SIN's set of propositions is *the intention* (the word meaning) that is the same for *zpix* and *a sin*; it makes the two words generally translatable via each other and is the *what*. The images of fire and movement are *the modes of intention* (the inner word forms) that make *zpix* and *a sin* different and uninterpretable via each other; they are the *how*. This proves a many-to-one relationship, with one and the same intention having two different modes. A one-to-many relationship, however, is also possible, with one and the same mode steering different intentions, as is shown in Vakhovska (2022b). Modes of intention do not lend themselves to translation and, if the translator treats language seriously, must be 'lovingly and in detail' (Benjamin, 2000[1923], p. 21) extracted and interpreted. They are the myriad different ways in which humans attempt to take this world into a linguistic possession (cf. also Weber's (2005, p. 72) point on translation as touching vs. taking). Yet, whereas a mode of intention is rather processional, an inner word form is not: it is a pictorial result of the meaning-making process going on in the archaic mind rather than the process itself.

Hence, *zpix* and *a sin* mean one and the same 'thing' but mean it in different manners, owing to which *zpix* means something different to a speaker of Ukrainian than *a sin* does to a speaker of English: *a sin* as a translation can only touch *zpix* as the original but never take it. The speakers may find themselves in a snare of semantic illusions unless there is the genuine translator able to operate in the different modes within nested frames of cultures and subjective experiences respecting the singularity of peoples as much as that of individuals. I discuss subjectivity in translation in Vakhovska (2021); in this paper however my focus is on collective rather than personal experiences having their way in translation. The collective SIN emerges into a culture in the form of distinct archetypal images mediated by archetypes from within the collective unconscious. The nature of these is discussed in the sections that follow.

Methodology

The investigation that this paper presents took three stages: (1) The etymons of the nouns *zpix* and *a sin* were exposed and analyzed. This showed the words' inner forms and (2) allowed to arrive via these forms at the archetypal images of SIN as given in the Proto-Slavic (the image of

fire) and Proto-Germanic (the image of movement) world models; the images were then 'drawn' as metaphorical narratives and their cultural implications were examined. (3) The archetypes of SIN that the images of fire and movement represent were considered next.

Archetypes and archetypal images from the Jungian perspective

Archetypes, according to Jung, are primordial elements of the human psyche: they are 'the chthonic portion of the psyche <...> through which the psyche is attached to nature' (Jung, 1970, p. 53). As 'forms without content' (Jung, 1936, p. 99), archetypes remain hidden from observation and it is only on entering one's consciousness that their content is supplied and arranged into a peculiar form.

Jung defines archetypes as *archaic, universal, eternal images* that are too abstract to be representable (Jung, 1981). Yet, as utter abstractions archetypes have the power to arrange elements of the psyche into still other images at different levels of generality. This appears a graded semantic continuum that scales from completely general through less general and more specific to completely specific mental images and has its poles in the unconscious and conscious minds (Jusuk, & Vakhovska, 2021). On this scale, the images immediately after the archetypes are those that Jung calls archetypal.

Archetypal images are triggered by archetypes and are a way for these archetypes to be given to humans and known by them. *An archetypal image* is a representation of a distinct archetype in consciousness; it is a form that this archetype takes on entering the conscious mind. While archetypes are irrepresentable, archetypal images 'appear in human consciousness in a complete pictorial form without applied intellectual effort' (Bradshaw, & Storm, 2013, p. 154) and thus are images *per se*. They make a subset in the set of mental imagery (Goodwyn, 2012, p. 28-59) and as such are non-propositional and ineffable. What distinguishes archetypal images is their 'numinosity and fascinating power' (Jung, 1947, p. 414). With this, archetypal images emerge as *symbols* (Jung, 1971, p. 474) with an inherent significance of their own. Extending far beyond themselves into many other things, symbols tend to make sense within particular cultures only: they bind the cultures' fundamental values and traits, while the cultures support symbols in their interpretation and use.

Results and discussion

From etymons of SIN's names to the archetypal images of SIN

One of the major archaic concepts, SIN got its first names in myths and it is in myths that SIN became a concept *per se*. According to my lexicographic sources, the etymon of the Ukrainian noun *zpix* is the Old East Slavic noun *zpxъ* with the meaning 'a mistake; a confusion, a mess' (Miklosich, 1886; Brugmann, 1892; Berneker, 1908-1913; Preobrazhensky, 1959; Makovsky, 1992; Melnichuk, 1982-2006), while the etymon of the English noun *a sin* is the Old English noun *synn* with the meaning 'a mistake; a bad act' (Brugmann, 1892; Onions, 1966; Makovsky, 1992, 2000; Levitsky, 2010). Both words did not have either ethical or religious connotations, and it is only later that they came to develop the meaning 'a violation of the will of God' as primary.

Old East Slavic *zpxъ* ascends to **the Proto-Slavic root **grěxъ*** whose meaning evolved as 'a burning sensation of the body > something that burns one's body and causes physical suffering and pain > a burning sensation of conscience; scruples; remorse, guilt > something that burns one's conscience and causes moral suffering and pain;' cf. Old Indo-Aryan *tápas* 'heat > pain' and Proto-Indo-European **gher-* 'to burn.'

The archetypal image of fire apparently is the bedrock for Ukrainian *zpix*. Fire sustained life and was a sacred object in the archaic world model. Its symbolism was vast. Interweaving of flames in particular symbolized the connection of the three worlds: the upper world with light gods in it, the middle world populated by people, and the lower world where dark forces abode. This interweaving was also the connection of the times: the past, the present, and the future, and this tribe's connection with its (animal) ancestors.

Flames had a symbolism of their own: Proto-Slavic **grěxъ* ties up with **groikso-/ *groiso-* 'a curve, a wryness' and relates to the (near-)universal archaic opposition of straight 'good' to wry 'evil.' The meanings 'curved' and 'to burn' were connected: literally, these curves were the flames that got interwoven in the fire; their quick movement enchanted and made one lose consciousness.

Entangling in flames was used in witchcraft as a means to cast a spell and take one's will away. The meaning 'to burn' of Proto-Indo-European

**kei-/ *kai-* reconstructed in English *soon* and in Ukrainian *сунію* 'blue' merged into this archaic idea of sins committed in a loss of consciousness. Archaic symbolism of the blue color embraced the lower (dark blue) and the upper (light blue) worlds: **kei-* meant 'dark colors in the color range of a burning fire,' with blue at the bottom, or in the lower world whose dark forces made one commit a sin. Colors of the fire were taken to be the sacred chakras, and their interplay was mystical. Blue as the lower chakra connected the fire and the Mother Earth who gave birth but also was the furnace cremating the buried dead; cf. English *Earth* < Proto-Indo-European **ar-* 'to burn.' Each of the chakras symbolized a different cosmic level and was a higher step in the staircase connecting the three worlds. Fire was the journey of a soul transcending the different cosmic levels. The top as the hottest point was the chakra where the soul reached catharsis through suffering: the meaning 'a fire' links with 'to purify;' literally, this was a ritual purification of meat; cf. English *flesh* and *a flash*.

Flames interwove so tightly that this was a grip of fear, torment, and pain; cf. German *Angst* 'fear' < Proto-Indo-European **angh-* 'tight, narrow' from **ag-/ *eg-* 'a fire.' Suffering was taken as a blessing and the greatest good bringing one closer to the light god(s) and to the truth; cf. Latin *punire* 'to punish' but Old Indo-Aryan *punya* 'good, beautiful; sacred,' and Proto-Indo-European **andh-* 'to burn' but Hittite *handaz* 'the truth' and *handai* 'to set in order.'

Old English *synn* ascends to **the Proto-Germanic root **sunđjō-/ sunjō-*** whose meaning evolved as 'movement > a trespass on a territory that must not be trespassed > any violation > an incongruity, a mismatch;' cf. Old Saxon *sundia*, Old Frisian *sende*, Old Norse *synd*, Old High German *sunta* all developed their meaning 'a sin' this way.

The archetypal image of movement hence is the bedrock for English *a sin*. Movement, and particularly continuous movement along a way, had a mystical significance and rested on the fundamental opposition of center to periphery. The circle this opposition drew was the circle of life; nested into it were the Cosmos as opposite to the Chaos and this tribe's territory ('us') as opposite to that of another ('them'). So, one's trespass was beyond this sacred circle whose boundaries stood between the realms of the good and evil.

When moving to the center, one was in order and harmony; when moving away, one apprehended

transience and corruption; stepping outside was entirely forbidding. German *Weg* 'a way' but *Weh* 'a pain' resonate with this mysticism; cf. also Old Indo-Aryan *juti* 'to go, to move' but German *gut* 'good' and Russian *жуть* 'horror.'

Cognates of Old English *synn* draw on the same archetypal image of movement but highlight it differently. Old High German *sind* develops the meaning 'movement > something that happens once; one time, an occasion > a blemish': if we adopt a mythological view and compare continuous movement along a way to a dynamic sequence of scenes, then 'an occasion' is a static snapshot of one scene in this sequence, while 'a blemish' is a graphic depiction of this scene as a point on the trajectory curving the way.

This static snapshot is the here and now, or the there and then, of the traveler making their way. On that, Old English *soð* develops the meaning 'movement > something that currently exists > true' traced back to Proto-Indo-European **es-* 'to be;' cf. Gothic *bi-sunjanē* 'around' and *sunja* 'the truth' and English *sooth* 'true.' *Soð* later develops from 'true' to 'a true guilt as the guilt that has verily been proven;' cf. Latin *sons* 'guilty, criminal' (from *sum (esse)* 'to be, to exist') and Old Norse *verð sannr* 'at 'to be found guilty.'

The traveler whose here and now is their truth is a corruptible and transient mortal, which is another truth: Proto-Germanic **sunð-/sanþ-a/ja-* develops the meaning 'true > worldly, carnal > mortal,' which comes close to Proto-Indo-European **ost-* 'a bone (a symbol of human nature as of mortal flesh);' cf. Old Indo-Aryan *sant-* 'the existing, the true,' Old Indo-Aryan *ásthi-* and Latin *os* 'a bone.'

An archetypal image 'can be something as simple as a static dream image or it can be an entire narrative in complexity, as stories can be metaphors just as static images can' (Goodwyn, 2012, p. 56). Fire and movement appear not as single images but as image sequences, or **narratives**, that capture certain regularities of how the images got arranged within their cultures. Whereas each image is emotionally moving by itself, their cumulative impact climaxes in the narrative.

The narrative for Ukrainian *zpix*: One is in a confusion and commits a sin because their will and consciousness were taken by dark forces. The world vertically splits into the lower, middle, and upper worlds against the continuum of time. Dark forces are in the lower world. This sin is

committed in the middle world where humans live. The upper world is where light gods abide. The three worlds are connected by the sacred fire.

On committing this sin, one is in the fire whose flames become a tight grip of fear, torment, and pain (burning of the body → burning of the soul). Up the fire, one's soul takes steps to the upper world and transcends the different cosmic levels from bottom to top. One is mortal and the bottom of this fire is where their body burns to ashes when buried. The top is the hottest; this is the point where the soul suffers the most and gets purified through suffering and pain. Here, the soul becomes closest to light gods and to the truth. This purification sets things in order.

The narrative for English *a sin*: One moves continuously along a way (the life) and trespasses on a territory that is forbidden (commits a sin). This trespass is a bad act because in it one violates the sacred order of the horizontally marked up world. This world is the nested circles of the Cosmos vs. Chaos and of this vs. another community's territory that have their center as the good and their periphery as the evil. One goes beyond the boundaries of these circles in sin.

Whereas one's movement is a dynamic sequence of scenes, a sin is a scene in this sequence only (a moment in life). A sin is an occasion in the journey (the life) and a blemish on the trajectory that curves one's way (a line of life) but the journey continues and is not terminated by the sin. This sin is this traveler's natural lot because all humans are corruptible and mortal. This sin is a true fact about the traveler. Their guilt in committing this sin is verily proven.

The two narratives obviously capture **a different knowledge of SIN** and are two very different metaphors: (THE CONSEQUENCE OF) SIN *is* BURNING IN THE FIRE for *zpix*, and (THE CIRCUMSTANCE OF) SIN *is* MOVING THE WRONG WAY for *sin*; entailments of these metaphors are bracketed in the narratives. While both metaphors are grounded in embodied cognition, they explain mental experiences of sin in terms of peculiar and unrelated primary experiences of the body. **Pictorially, these are different SINS.** The world for *zpix* is organized vertically from bottom to top. This sin is one's moral state after committing a bad act, i.e. *zpix* is not action-oriented but relates to moral consequences of the bad act for the sinner. This state is that of fear and guilt; the burning sensation of the body with its suffering and pain is transferred metaphorically to one's soul's experience in sin: *zpix* is something that burns

one's conscience, and is a lasting sensation. There is repentance and internal admonition against sin rather than external inhibition or judgment in the face of the community: the focus is on one's relation to the light gods and to the truth, cf. Ukrainian *совість* 'conscience' from Old East Slavic *свьѣсть* 'knowledge, understanding that comes together with another, tenably a divine, one.'

The world for a *sin* is organized horizontally from center to periphery. This sin is a bad act, i.e. a *sin* is action-oriented and highlights the nature or, rather, the circumstance of the bad act but not the moral consequence of this act for the sinner: a *sin* is when one moves beyond and trespasses a boundary, which may be momentary. This is external rather than internal admonition against sin since there must be someone in the community (or this must be the community as a whole) who proves the sinner guilty of the bad act, cf. *corpus delicti* in Western law.

SIN is a universal human concept always delivered in culture-specific configurations. In the course of time, the images of fire and movement have continued to shape cultures sustaining the implicit basic constants of their unique worlds. Archetypal perceptions indeed have manifested themselves in the Biblical prototype and in the evolution of SIN in the Christian world model (Vakhovska, 2011). In The Old Testament in particular SIN tends to regulate the social life of a community rather than the spiritual life of an individual (cf. also Hanba et al., 2022), and it is in The New Testament that SIN acquires a pronounced spiritual value. Notably, Eastern Christianity places a big emphasis on repentance and atonement for sin, whereas Western Christianity locates sin in humans' corrupted free will and in the imperfection of human nature that cannot but be sinful. Western Christianity treats sins as deliberate acts and with great precision classifies these; attitudes to sin are rather rational and pragmatic: sin proves of a fairly legal nature, e.g. an indulgence could reduce the punishment for sin. This way SIN's archetypal images are reflected distinctively in the light of the differences that Christianity has accommodated for the interpretations of SIN.

From SIN's archetypal images to the archetypes of SIN

SIN rests on certain 'schemes of human spirit' (Florensky, 1914) and is incomprehensible in terms of rational reflection. In SIN, the collective

unconscious finds a manifestation and abides in an individual who conceives of sin.

Archetypes as abstractions can only be recognized from the effects that they produce: 'the archetype may not quite be 'in' the brain, rather it *uses* the brain' (Haule, 2010, p. 21) and can be recognized in this usage. Archetypes are an orchestra striking music in the dark: there is no seeing the instruments but each can be recognized by the tones it produces. I believe SIN's archetypes, too, can be recognized by the 'ingredients or associations' (El-Shamy, & Schrempp, 2005, p. 481) drawn into the archetypal images of SIN. These indicate that SIN is mediated by THE SHADOW, ANIMA, THE SELF, and by non-personified TRANSFORMATIONS from among the archetypes cataloged by Jung. The four archetypes jointly endow to humankind *the same foreknowledge of SIN*.

Jungian psychology maintains that any personality is holistic but yet splits into partial personalities whose names are the various archetypes, each contributing to the whole (below, the nature of the archetypes is given according to Jung (1921; 1936; 1947; 1970; 1971; 1981)). **THE SHADOW** is one's relatively autonomous 'fragmentary' personality that accumulates the adverse, evil inclinations suppressed as incompatible with the good and consciously preferred ones. When in sin, THE SHADOW comes to dominate over the other partial personalities.

ANIMA (Latin 'the vital principle, a soul, a life') rests with the animal ancestors of humankind and is a major regulator of behavior in humans. ANIMA induces spontaneous responses in the psyche and is irrational; striving for life, ANIMA strives equally for good and evil: such categories are simply absent from her nature; the life of the body and that of the soul have neither a modesty of their own nor a conventional morality in themselves, which only makes them healthier. ANIMA, the soul's female part, is addicted to everything that is unconscious and dark, ambiguous and chaotic in a woman.

THE SELF is an archetype of order; it is the center of existence for all human creatures: the point of beginning and that of end, THE SELF is an aspect of God. SIN plugs into THE SELF as the idea of one's integrity and wholeness that sin violates. Sin splits THE SELF apart; it is a moral evil, cause of fragmentation, root of corruption and dissociation in humans. Sin deprives the soul of its substantiality.

TRANSFORMATIONS actuate the other archetypes in sin. The evil derives from the good and verily cannot originate from anything other than the loss of good (Augustine of Hippo, 426). The good, too, cannot but originate from the evil, and if there had not been the evil of the Original sin, there would not have been the good of *felix culpa* with an even bigger good of Redemption (Jung, 1960): ‘opposites attract and combine to make up wholes greater than the sum of the opposing parts. <...> any given entity contains within itself its own opposite’ (El-Shamy, & Schrempf, 2005, p. 482). To the archaic mind, all that exists came from the darkness, and in the

Biblical account the light, too, comes from the darkness. In the human psyche, nothing is unambiguous or single-valued: ANIMA may appear as an angel of light, and THE SHADOW may induce a range of good and morally right urges such as normal instincts, creative impulses, and insights. This ambivalence sustains sin as well.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize my findings. There, the symbolism of ingredients and associations in the archetypal images of SIN is given according to Makovsky (1996; 2012).

Table 1.
From the archetypal image of fire to the archetypes of SIN.

<i>Archetypal image</i>	<i>Ingredients and associations</i>	<i>Archetypes</i>
Fire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the <i>blue color</i> in the archaic world model symbolized the <i>unconscious</i> and the <i>otherworldly</i> ▪ the <i>quick movement of flames</i> was believed to make one lose consciousness and symbolized the <i>unconscious</i> ▪ <i>fire</i> was a symbol of the <i>soul</i> ▪ <i>fire</i> symbolized the intertwining of <i>life</i> and <i>death</i> ▪ <i>fire</i> was a symbol of the <i>(animal) ancestor's soul</i> 	THE SHADOW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>blue</i> symbolized the <i>confusion</i> in which dark forces made one commit a sin ▪ <i>blue</i> was a sacred color of the Mother Earth, or the <i>feminine</i>, the <i>passive</i>, and the <i>unconscious</i> 	ANIMA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>fire</i> was a symbol of <i>integrity</i> and <i>wholeness</i>: the <i>fire vertical</i> connected the three worlds that represented the <i>divine cosmic integrity</i> ▪ <i>suffering</i> was believed to give <i>integrity</i>, <i>wholeness</i> and to set <i>the world in order</i> ▪ <i>flames</i> were <i>curves</i>, and curving symbolized <i>transformation</i> and <i>change: bending, curving</i> had a mystical symbolism of a <i>re-birth</i> and were believed to <i>restore</i> the order and harmony that had previously been <i>broken</i> ▪ <i>interweaving of flames</i> symbolized the <i>connection</i> of times and of the three worlds, and also the <i>connection</i> to (animal) ancestors 	THE SELF TRANSFORMATIONS

Table 1 shows that the region most densely populated with ingredients and associations of

fire is that of ANIMA, which sides with the peculiar knowledge stored in *apix*.

Table 2.

From the archetypal image of movement to the archetypes of SIN.

<i>Archetypal image</i>	<i>Ingredients and associations</i>	<i>Archetypes</i>
Movement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the <i>outside</i>, the <i>periphery</i> of the sacred circle were taken to be the <i>Chaos</i> and symbolized the <i>unconscious</i> ▪ the meanings ‘a <i>boundary</i>, an <i>edge</i>’ and ‘the <i>evil</i>’ were immediately connected ▪ as a symbol of the <i>unconscious</i>, the Mother Earth related to Old Indo-Aryan <i>ardha</i>- ‘<i>outside</i>, on the <i>periphery</i>’ that was a manifestation of the <i>Chaos</i> 	THE SHADOW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the <i>center</i> of the sacred circle symbolized the ordered <i>Cosmos</i> ▪ the ideas of <i>movement</i> and <i>integrity</i> were in a close connection ▪ <i>trespassing the boundaries</i> symbolized a <i>loss of integrity</i> 	ANIMA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the <i>boundary</i> marked up the sphere of the <i>unconscious</i>; cf. also the wall that, as a metaphor, separates the conscious and the unconscious minds in (Krishtal, 2020) ▪ the <i>Cosmos</i> meant the <i>good</i>, while the <i>Chaos</i> meant the <i>evil</i> 	THE SELF
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ life <i>changing</i> to death and death <i>changing</i> to life were the divine integrity symbolized by the sacred circle 	TRANSFORMATIONS

Table 2 shows that the region most densely populated with ingredients and associations of movement is that of THE SELF, which resonates with the culture-bound knowledge in *a sin*.

Archetypes ‘present themselves as ideas and images, like everything else that becomes a content of consciousness’ (Jung, 1947, p. 435). Whereas this paper concentrates on the pictorial presentation of SIN’s archetypes, I approached the archetypes of SIN as ideas, but never as images, in Vakhovska (2011): these proved the same four archetypes as discussed above, which I believe validates this paper’s approach. The two approaches as complementary ways to positively arrive at a concept’s archetypes feel like reaching the top of a mountain, which is singular, but having climbed there up this mountain’s different sides. Yet, this paper’s concern is the word and the mental image(s) it uniquely imparts but not the sentence and the idea(s) it conveys in the form of propositions.

Conclusion

This paper has shown that words pertain via their inner forms directly to archetypal images and via these images indirectly to archetypes, which underpins image-driven interpretations of individual words in translation. This paper has

chosen Ukrainian *zpix* commonly translated as English *a sin* as its case study; yet, the theoretical assumptions that frame this case are intended as equally effectual for the other world’s languages that engage into the dialogue of cultures.

The prospect of this paper is to substantiate its assumptions in the context of university translation education with reference to students’ translation intelligence, cultural awareness, and humanistic values.

Bibliographic references

- Augustine of Hippo. (426). On the city of God against the pagans. Book XI, Chapter 9. Recovered from <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120111.htm>
- Benjamin, W. (2000[1923]). The task of the translator. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader*, 15-25. London & New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429280641>
- Bradshaw, S., & Storm, L. (2013). Archetypes, symbols and the apprehension of meaning. *International Journal of Jungian Studies*, 5(2), 154-176. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19409052.2012.685662>

- El-Shamy, H., & Schrempf, G. (2005). Union of opposites, or Coniunctio Oppositorum, various motifs. In J. Garry & H. El-Shamy (Eds.), *Archetypes and motifs in folklore and literature: A handbook*, 481-489. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315097121>
- Florensky, P. (1914). The Pillar and the assertion of the Truth: An experience of the Orthodox theodicy in twelve letters. M.: Put'. [in Russian, pre-reform orthography] Recovered from https://viewer.rusneb.ru/ru/000199_000009_004201077?page=1&rotate=0&theme=white
- Goodwyn, E. (2012). *The neurobiology of the gods: How brain physiology shapes the recurrent imagery of myth and dreams*. London & New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203141526>
- Haule, J. (2010). *Jung in the 21st century, vol. 1. Evolution and Archetype*. London & New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203833612>
- Hanba, O., Liashuk, R., Ivashkova, T., Balendr, A., & Olytskyi, O. (2022). The archaic law. Mononorms and archaic relations of the primitive communal society. *Amazonia Investiga*, 11(52), 37-48. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.52.04.4>
- Jung, C. (1921). Psychological types. In *Collected works of C.G. Jung, volume 6*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C. (1936). The concept of the collective unconscious. In *Collected works of C.G. Jung, volume 9i*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C. (1947). On the nature of the psyche. In *Collected works of C.G. Jung, volume 8*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C. (1960). Good and evil in analytical psychology. *Journal of analytical psychology*, 5, 91-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-5922.1960.00091.x>
- Jung, C. (1970). Mind and Earth. In R.F.C. Hull (Ed.), *Collected works of C.G. Jung, volume 10*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400850976.29>
- Jung, C. (1971). *The portable Jung*. J. Campbell (Ed.). Penguin Books.
- Jung, C. (1981). Archetypes and the collective unconscious. In G. Adler & R.F.C. Hull (Eds.), *Collected works of C.G. Jung, volume 9, part 1*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jusuk, F., & Vakhovska, O. (2021). Image-driven interpretations in professional communicative mediation: Bringing translation and psychotherapy together. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 48(261), 63-67. <https://doi.org/10.31174/SEND-HS2021-261IX48-11>
- Krishtal, O. (2020). *To the singing of birds: A private journey to myself*. Oleg Krishtal: Independently published.
- Potebnya, A.A. (1892). *Thought and language*. Kharkiv: Adolf Darre's Typography. [in Russian, pre-reform orthography] Recovered from https://archive.org/details/libgen_00702348/page/n11/mode/1up?view=theater
- Vakhovska, O. (2011). *Linguistic manifestation of SIN in the English discourse of the 14th-21st centuries* (PhD thesis in Cognitive Linguistics). Kharkiv: V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine. [In Russian] Recovered from https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OLTgpJQC3Pv_-o6Wt36Pv-SP9voDQqAY/edit?usp=sharing&oid=115064855619366908284&rtpof=true&sd=true
- Vakhovska, O. (2021). Subjectivity in metaphor translation: A case for Russian translation of English metaphors of depressive emotions. *Cognition, communication, discourse*, 23, 99-117. <http://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2021-23-07>
- Vakhovska, O. (2022a). Imperatives of today and translation: From a translation theory to the university translation classroom. In Babelyuk O. (Ed.), *Innovative pathway for the development of modern philological sciences in Ukraine and EU countries*. Scientific monograph. Volume 1, 242-267. Częstochowa: Polonia University in Częstochowa. [In Ukrainian] <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-196-1-10>
- Vakhovska, O. (2022b). Must the pot of seven holes be a translation theorist's riddle? *KELM Knowledge, Education, Law, Management*, 4(48), (in publication). To appear at <http://kelmczasopisma.com/home>
- Vakhovska, O., & Isaienko, O. (2021). Language, culture, and image-driven interpretations in translation: A case for the university translation classroom in Ukraine. *Amazonia Investiga*, 10(47), 240-249. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2021.47.11.25>
- Weber, S. (2005). A touch of translation: On Walter Benjamin's 'Task of the translator.' In Bermann, S., & Wood, M. (Eds.), *Nation, language, and the ethics of translation*, 65-79. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400826681.65>

Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Lexicographic sources

Berneker, E. (1908-1913). *A Slavic etymological dictionary [Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch]*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's University Bookstore. [in German]

Brugmann, K. (1892). *Indo-European research: Journal of Indo-European linguistics and ancient studies [Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde]*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trubner, The Publisher. [in German]

Levitsky, V. (2010). *An etymological dictionary of the Germanic languages: In 3 volumes*. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyga. [in Russian] Recovered from http://www.library.univ.kiev.ua/ukr/elcat/new/detail.php3?doc_id=1472060

Makovsky, M. (1992). *A linguistic genetics: Issues of the word's ontogenesis in the Indo-European languages*. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian] Recovered from <https://djuv.online/file/9lsF48S8oOGwI>

Makovsky, M. (1996). *A comparative dictionary of mythological symbolism in the Indo-European languages: An image of the world*

and the worlds of images. Moscow: The VLADOS Humanitarian Publishing Center. [in Russian]

Makovsky, M. (2000). *A historic and etymological dictionary of the Modern English language: The word in the mirror of human culture*. Moscow: The Dialogue Publishing House. [in Russian]

Makovsky, M. (2012). *The phenomenon of TABU in the traditions and in the language of Indo-Europeans: The nature, forms, and development*. Moscow: The LIBROKOM Book House. [in Russian]

Melnichuk, O. (Ed.). (1982-2006). *An etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language: In 7 volumes*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. [in Ukrainian] Recovered from <http://resource.history.org.ua/item/0007831>

Miklosich, F. (1886). *An etymological dictionary of the Slavic languages [Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen]*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, The Publisher. [in German]

Onions, C. (Ed.). (1966). *The Oxford dictionary of English etymology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Preobrazhensky, A. (1959). *An etymological dictionary of the Russian language*. Moscow: The State Publishing House of Foreign and National Dictionaries. [in Russian]