

UDC 811.11-112:81'373:81'371

THE CONNOTATIVE COMPONENT IN THE SEMANTICS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL LEXIS AND PECULIARITIES OF ITS TRANSLATION

O. V. Tkachyk, V. A. Nikitina

Kyiv, National Technical University of Ukraine

“Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”

tkachik_helen@mail.ru, nikitina25@bigmir.net

This article is devoted to the study of the complex semantic structure of English phraseological units (PU) and elucidates the specific peculiarities of the connotative component in the process of reproducing it by means of the Ukrainian language. Actually, various views on what a PU is are taken into account as well as the typology of PU is studied carefully. In this respect, the authors provide the PU semantic field description (with its structure comprising all the integral components: the denotative, significative and connotative elements) presenting a comment on the specific features of the connotative component functioning within it. Also, several assumptions were made concerning possible ways of preserving the value of the connotative component studied in the process the PU decoding by means of Ukrainian language. The issue of English PU decoding by the potencies the target language appears to be a highly disputable question in modern linguistics which justifies the topicality of this article. The question of adequate PU translation is rather controversial and needs to be addressed carefully. Thus, the specific approach to the PU translation with the respect to the connotative meaning role as a determinative element of the idiom nature obviously requires complex and thorough investigation.

Key words: phraseological unit (PU), idiom, connotation, PU semantic field

Introduction. The topicality of the PU semantic field study is clearly determined by a number of factors. Even with the modern phraseology having in its arsenal a rich selection of special studies that provide a detailed description of the semantics of an English idiom, the peculiarities of the PU semantic components – especially the connotative element – is a controversial issue in modern linguistics. With the language renewing its resources, adjusting to modern life tendencies the existing dictionaries and translational techniques might become obsolete and ineffective. An idiom is regarded to be an integral part of both language and speech and an adequate PU decoding may well play a key role in any communicative act. Therefore, a translator, dealing with such specific language formations, should be aware of the specific peculiarities of the process of an idiom translation. Apparently, an experienced translator is supposed to have enough idiom correlations in both languages within his professional apparatus, yet he or she should be able to deal with those idioms not having such vivid equivalent. Special translational transformations should be put to the proper use aiming to preserve the natural value of an idiom – connotation. Thus, this article demonstrates how the idiom structure, its semantics field pattern influences the approach to the PU translation.

Tasks. The following tasks are hence set: to elucidate different approaches to the interpretation and classification of idioms in the English language; identify the specific semantic structure and functioning of modern English PU, namely the denotative, significative and connotative components; identify the ways of modern English idioms translation.

Modern Approaches to the Phraseological Unit Definition. There are more than 20 definitions of phraseological units in linguistics, yet none of them enjoyed unanimous general acceptance which obviously characterizes a PU as a formation of a particularly complex entity. Some linguists justly believe that the definition of

phraseological units is as complex as the definition of the word, for instance. This difficulty lies primarily in the fact that for both words and idioms we hardly reveal definite features applied directly and with no exceptions.

In particular, phraseological unit can be defined as:

- Stable word-combination, characterized by the loss of the original image, conveyed by words and possesses its peculiar metaphorical significance.
- unit of a language, which is characterized by its inherent integrity, resulting in weakening of the lexical meaning of its components – words.
- commonly used linguistic unit, possessing a single meaning yet composed of two or more meaningful words [1, p. 38].
- Stable word-combinations, peculiar to a certain language with its specific nature, fixed (i.e. permanent) in meaning, and structure [2, p.177].
- Specific language formation, endowed with integral, metaphorically significant value, able to establish connections with other words, predetermining the context [7, p.177].

Phraseological units should not be studied in isolation, but in close relations with other units of a language. Intertwining with the words and phrases, they appear to be integral elements of any communicative process. Idioms are of particular importance in the process of context shaping, giving it a special expression and stylistic colouring.

The Phraseological Units Typology: Semantic and Functional Approaches.

In order to provide a comprehensive understanding of the PU nature and specificity, heed should be paid to the peculiarities of their functioning in the language environment. Therefore, the typology of English phraseology is to be considered.

There are several PU classifications. Some of them contain a large number of types and subtypes, which makes them too complicated to operate with. V.V. Vinogradov presented a thorough classification which distinguishes three types of idioms: Phraseological fusions, phraseological unities and phraseological combinations.

Phraseological fusion is a semantically indivisible phraseological unit which meaning is never influenced by the meanings of its components [8, p.244].

Phraseological fusions hence show the highest possible degree of blending together. The meaning of components is neglected for the sake of the image, its expressiveness and emotional properties: *Blue Bonnet* - шотландець; *to ran away* – *накивати н'ятами*; *under the rose* – *тишком-нишком*.

Phraseological fusions as a kind of complex syntactic structures and are often regarded as idioms. Vinogradov emphasizes that their values have no relation to the value of its single components. The main feature of idioms is that their semantic potential can only be revealed and decoded as a whole, indivisible unity [10, p.144].

Phraseological unity can be defined as a semantically indivisible phraseological unit yet its meaning is partly motivated by the meanings of its components [8, p.245].

It should be mentioned that phraseological unities are peculiar as for their semantic duality. Such formations can function in the context both as figurative units and those with direct meaning: *one's place in the sun* – *місце під сонцем*; *Pandora's box* – *скринька Пандори*.

Phraseological combination (collocation) is a construction or an expression in which every word enjoys vivid and clear meaning while one of the components has a bound meaning [8, p. 246].

It means that phraseological combinations contain one component used in its direct meaning while the other is used figuratively: *To make an attempt* – *to try*; *to offer an apology* – *to beg pardon*.

Generally speaking, phraseological combinations are the phrases the meaning of which can be easily recognizable and understood with the help of its components. The meaning of the significant word is close to its ordinary meaning, and can be easily substituted, for instance: *the break of the day – dawn; prove a success – have a success.*

In addition, phraseological combinations possess relatively flexible syntactical relations the deviations from which will not threaten the whole image.

Besides, some scientists who are in favour of the general understanding of phraseology and refer to it communicational units (sentences) and winged words, define the fourth type of phraseological units: *it is not all gold that glitters – не все те золото, що блищить; charity begins at home – благодійність починається вдома; it's better to see once than to hear a hundred times – краще раз побачити ніж сто разів почути* [9, p.94].

Phraseological expression is a stable by form and usage semantically divisible construction, which components are words with free meanings [3, p.246].

The classification by V.V. Vinogradov played an important role in the development of the theoretical phraseology. It revealed the mechanism of idiomatic meaning. This classification organized and deepened the phraseological science knowledge, received wide recognition and was suitable not only for Russian, on the basis of which it was created, but might be successfully applied to other languages.

The Main Approaches to the Study of the PU Semantic Structure as a Specific Fragment of Objective Reality. The question of the structure and functioning of the PU semantic field is highly controversial in modern linguistics. To study the specific peculiarities of the PU connotative (emotive) component, it is necessary to elucidate all parts of its semantic structure, which comprises denotative, significative, and, eventually, connotative element [6, p.114].

In most cases the **denotative meaning** conceptualises the speaker's experience and names for the listener some objects spoken about. In other words, denotative component of a meaning assigns certain "markers" to the objects of objective reality to make them freely recognizable by any speaker.

Considering the PU as a type of objective reality reflection phenomena, researchers P. Kalbfliaysh and R. Konvilla assume that within the semantic field of words the denotative component is defined as "a direct link between the object and the sign, which is an indicator of this phenomenon in language" [12, p.146].

Another vital element of the PU semantic field is the **significative meaning**. A set of essential features that are inherent to the subject or phenomenon is called the significative meaning [4, p. 148].

Thus, the significative meaning is believed to be the core of the PU semantic field. The significative meaning is not only aimed at marking certain objects but establishes a number of more complex features, peculiar to the phenomenon concerned. For instance, in the Ukrainian word "захоплюватися" ("admire") in the academic dictionary of the Ukrainian language are the following features represent the significative element of meaning: "Emotional state aimed at an object, such as the state affection, admiration". Then let us consider the PU, including the word "admire": *Do not admire someone's cheese. – не чінай чужого добра.* As you can see, the definition in the dictionary is of no use in the process of the PU decoding.

Taking that into account we can justly assume that the only semantic component left – **connotative element** – appears to be a decisive tool in the PU adequate decoding.

The complexity of the nature of the connotative component is the main reason why modern linguists cannot provide a unanimously agreed definition for this very notion. On the one hand, the connotative component is widely regarded as that to convey additional information about the object. I. V. Arnold and V. P. Berkov support this point of view. On the other hand, with the connotation being an essence on the PU nature, this semantic component contains information about the attitude of the speaker to the object category (revealing the pragmatic aspect) and plays a crucial role in the PU image shaping.

Therefore, our aim is to pay particular heed to the peculiarities of connotative component functioning and study the ways of its adequate interpretation by means of Ukrainian language.

Ways of English PU Translation with the Respect to the Connotative Component of its Semantic Field. In order to clarify the most effective ways of adequate PU decoding several approaches to the idioms translation were taken into account. According to L.F. Dmytrieva, a **calque translation technique** appears to be quite appropriate only with the PU image coinciding or at least being natural for the Ukrainian native speaker [5, p.62]. For instance: *to put the cart before the horse* – “*ставити віз попереду коня*”, *to keep a dog and bark oneself* – *притримати собаку, а гавкати самому*.

The calque technic is particularly effective when the special image needs to be preserved even though the equivalent PU is present in the target language: “*it was raining cats and dogs and a little puppy got on my page* - *був такий дощ, ніби, як кажуть англійці, з неба сипалися кішки і собаки, і одне маленьке цуценя впало мені на сторінку.*”

Another way to decode an English PU is an **equivalent method**. Such language and image correlations can be full (“*to stew in one's own juice* – *варитися у власному соку*; *wolf in sheep's clothing* – *вовк в овечій шкурі*”) or partial (“*like a squirrel in a cage* – *як білка в колесі* (дослівно як білка в клітці); *to get out of bed on the wrong side* – *встати не з тієї ноги* (не з тієї сторони)”)

An **analogue method** can also be successfully applied, which means that a Ukrainian PU conveys the very same image (connotation) but is partially or completely different in its structure: “*As stiff as a poker* (дослівно “*застиглий як кочерга*”) – *немов аршин проковтнув*; *a fly in the ointment* (дослівно “*муха в мазі*”) – *ложка дьогтю в бочці меду*; *as like as two peas* (дослівно “*схожі як дві горошини*”) – *як дві краплі води.*”

We cannot but mention the descriptive translation technique as a highly productive one. According to N.F. Smirnova and E.A. Martinkevych, this way of the PU decoding is put into practice due to the absence of both analogue and equivalent PU in the target language. That is why, a translator (interpreter) is allowed to make certain transformations to the grammatical structure of the idiom for the sake of image – connotative component of the PU semantic field: “*A skeleton in the cupboard* – *сімейна таємниця; неприємність, приховувана від сторонніх*; *grin like a Cheshire cat* – *посміхатися у весь рот*; *Peeping Tom* – *людина з нездоровою цікавістю, таємно стежить за іншими*; *the real McCoy* – *унікальна річ, щось дуже цінне*; *give a wide berth* – *унікати, ухилитися*”.

Notably, that such idioms require broad background knowledge to deal with the image transformation. The word-by-word translation will result in misleading interpretation of an image peculiar to the English language only and will not be successfully perceived and understood by Ukrainian speakers [11, p.56-57].

The **combinational technique** deserves to be elucidated just as well. In fact, this translational tools implies the combination of the analogue translation and the descriptive translation. For instance, “*spick and span – елегантний, франті; far cry (далекий крик) – як небо і земля; a millstone about smb's neck (жорно на чийсь шиї, тягар навколо шиї) – камінь на шиї; важка відповідальність; to live on the fat of the land (дослівно жити на жирній землі) – кататися як сир у маслі; жити в розкоші, жити розкошуючи*”.

Conclusions. So, we can make the following conclusions: The PU (or idiom) was defined as a stable word-group with partially or fully transferred meaning. Therefore, the typology of the PU comprises several classifications with the most suitable in terms of our research developed by V.V. Vynogradov who gave a strong impetus to a purely lexicological treatment of the material. Considering the Vinogradov's classification, all phraseological units are divided into phraseological fusions, phraseological unities and phraseological combinations. The motivation of an idiom can be explained by the interrelation of three components of its semantic field: denotative, significative and connotative meaning with the latter being the most important in the PU decoding. Thus, the basic types of PU translation according to the linguists mentioned are calking, analogue translation, descriptive translation, and, finally, the combination of an equivalent idiom in the Ukrainian language and the descriptive translation.

REFERENCES

1. Арбекова Т.И. Лексикология английского языка: учебное пособие для II – III курсов / Т.И.Арбекова. – М.: Высш. шк., 1997. – 240 с.
2. Влахов С.Д. Непереводимое в переводе / С.Д.Влахов, С.К.Флорин. – М: Международные отношения, 1980. –343 с.
3. Гак В.Г. Фразеология, образность и культура / В. Г. Гак // Советская лексикография. Сборник статей. – М. Высш. шк., 1988. – 272 с.
4. Городецкий Б.Ю. До проблеми семантичної типології / Б.Ю. Городецкий. – М.: Наука, 1969. – 564с.
5. Дмитриева Л.Ф. Английский для студентов. Курс перевода / Л.Ф. Дмитриева, С.Е. Кунцевич, Е.А. Мартинкевич, Н.Ф. Смирнова. – Ростов на Дону: МарТ, 2005. – 304 с.
6. Комиссаров В.Н. Лингвистика перевода / В.Н. Комиссаров. – М.: Высш.шк., 2002. –207с.
7. Корунец І.В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов: навч. посібник / І.В. Корунець. – В.: Нова книга, 2003. – 464 с.
8. Кочерган М.П. Вступ до мовознавства: підручник для студентів філологічних спеціальностей вищих навчальних закладів освіти / М.П. Кочерган. – К.: Академія, 2002. – 368с.
9. Мостовий І. М. Лексикологія англійської мови/ І.М.Мостовий. – Х.: Основи, 1993. – 255 с.
10. Ужченко В.Д. Народження і життя фразеологізму / В.Д.Ужченко. – К.: Рад. школа, 1988. – 279с.
11. Cowie. A.P. Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications / A.P. Cowie – Oxford:Clarendon Press, 1988. – 258с.
12. Zaghwani Y.O. A Review of General Semantics/ Y.O. Zaghwani /Academic Journal Article – Vol. 69, 2012. – p.307.

REFERENCES

1. Arbekova, T.I. (1997). Lexicology of the English language. Moscow, USSR:Vyssh. Shk. [In Russian].

2. Vlahov, S.D & Florin. (1980). Untranslatable in translation. Moscow, USSR: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija [In Russian].
3. Gak, V.G. (1988). Phraseology, imagery and culture. Soviet lexicography. A collection of articles. Moscow, USSR: Vyssh. Shk. [In Russian].
4. Gorodeckij, B.Ju. (1964). To problems of semantic typology. Moscow, USSR: Nauka [In Russian].
5. Dmitrieva, L.F., Kuncovich, E.A., Martinkevich, N.F. & Smirnova, S.E (2005). English for students. Course of translation. Rostov-on-Don, USSR: MarT [In Russian].
6. Komisarov, V.N. (2002). Linguistics translation. Moscow, Russia Vyssh. Shk [In Russian].
7. Korunec', I.V. (2003). Comparative typology of English and Ukrainian languages. Tutorial. Vinnitsa, Ukraine: Nova kniga [in Ukrainian].
8. Kochergan, M.P. (2002). Introduction to Linguistics: Textbook for students of philology higher educational establishments. Kiev, Ukraine: Akademija [in Ukrainian].
9. Mostovij, I. M. (1993). English Lexicology. Kharkov, Ukraine: Osnovi [in Ukrainian].
10. Uzhchenko, V.D. (1988). The birth and life phraseologism. Kiev, Ukraine: Rad.Shkola [in Ukrainian].
11. Cowie, A.P. (1988). Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications. Oxford, GB: Clarendon Press [in English].
12. Zaghvani, O.Y. (2012). A Review of General Semantics. Academic Journal Article, 69, p.307

О. В. Ткачик, В. А. Нікітіна. Конотативний компонент у семантиці фразеологічної лексики та його відтворення в перекладі.

Стаття присвячена вивченню специфічних особливостей семантичної структури англійських фразеологічних одиниць (ФО), а також висвітлює характерні особливості функціонування конотативного компонента в процесі перекладу англійських стійких виразів українською мовою. Для досягнення цієї мети, ретельно розглянуто типологію англійських стійких виразів та виокремлено ряд класифікацій в межах цієї типології. Таким чином, автори статті надають детальний опис семантичного поля ФО (його структури, що містить відповідно денотативний, сигніфікативний і конотативний компоненти), а також приділяють особливу увагу питанню функціонування конотативного елемента значення в рамках семантики ФО. Більш того, авторами були зроблені важливі припущення щодо можливих способів збереження значення конотативного компонента в процесі перекладу. Немає жодних сумнівів у тому, що сучасний перекладач повинен мати особливі навички перекладу ФО, включаючи вміння застосовувати адекватний трансформаційний інструментарій. Питання декодування англійських ФО є досить суперечливим питанням сучасної лінгвістики, що виправдовує актуальність цієї статті. Таким чином, переклад ФО очевидно вимагає уваги і ретельного вивчення, оскільки правильне відтворення специфічної природи стійкого виразу часто є запорукою адекватного перекладу.

Ключові слова: фразеологічна одиниця (ФЕ), ідіома, конотація, семантичне поле

Е. В. Ткачик, В. А. Никитина. Коннотативный компонент в семантике фразеологической лексики и его воспроизведение в переводе.

Данная статья посвящена проблематике исследования вопроса об особенностях семантической структуры английских фразеологических единиц (ФЕ) и разъясняет ключевые моменты функционирования коннотативного компонента в процессе их перевода на украинский язык. Таким образом, авторы статьи предоставляют описание семантического поля ФЕ (особенностей его структуры, содержащей денотативный, сигнификативный и коннотативный компоненты), а также уделяют особое внимание функционированию конотативного элемента значения в рамках семантического поля ФЕ. Следует отметить, что авторы статьи также уделяют должное внимание вопросу типологии ФЕ и рассматривают ряд классификаций устойчивых выражений. Более того, были сделаны предположения о возможных способах сохранения значения конотативного компонента в процессе его воспроизведения на украинский язык. Очевидно, вопрос декодирования английских ФЕ является весьма спорным и противоречивым в современной лингвистике что оправдывает актуальность данной статьи. Не вызывает сомнений тот факт, что современный переводчик обязан владеть необходимыми навыками применения соответствующих переводческих трансформаций. Следовательно, перевод ФЕ очевидно требует внимания и тщательного изучения. Таким образом, правильное декодирование такой специфической структуры, как идиома часто является определяющим фактором адекватного перевода.

Ключевые слова: фразеологическая единица (ФЕ), идиома, коннотация, семантическое поле