

УДК 81'373

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32447/2663-340X-2023-14.10>

LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE CLASSIFICATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS: TRANSLATION ASPECT

Maslova Svitlana Yakivna

*Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department "Philology"
Odessa National Maritime University
34, Mechnykova str., Odessa, Ukraine*

The research explores the emerging field of linguoculturology and its significance in analyzing language use. Highlighting the "humanization" of linguistics, the article emphasizes the role of the speaker's background and cultural context in shaping their communication style. Linguoculturology bridges the gap between language and culture, revealing how language reflects and embodies cultural values. The concept of "linguistic personality" refers to an individual's unique way of using language, influenced by their cultural background, experiences, and knowledge. The article acknowledges the challenges in analyzing the "linguocultural characteristics" of a speaker. It points out the limitations of traditional grammatical approaches and advocates for an interdisciplinary approach that incorporates linguoculturology alongside fields like psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. The research aims to explore the moral dimension of the linguoculturological approach and its influence on an individual's linguistic competence. The object of the study is the linguistic personality from the historical perspective, in a literary text from the point of view of national peculiarities of thinking. The subject of the study is, firstly, the linguocultural properties of words and phraseological units that determine the specificity of linguistic personality as a means of knowing the linguocultural value of words and phraseological units. The specific objectives outlined include: tracing the roots of linguoculturology within linguistics and philosophy; analyzing the impact of spatial and temporal aspects on a speaker's linguocultural personality; examining the characteristics of the English national character through the lens of linguocultural properties. By emphasizing the importance of linguoculturology, this study paves the way for a more comprehensive understanding of the intricate connection between language, culture, and individual identity. It calls for further research to develop a robust framework for analyzing a speaker's "linguocultural characteristics."

Keywords: *linguistics, linguoculturology, linguistic personality, linguocultural characteristics, sociolinguistics, linguistic competence.*

Introduction. In traditionally oriented linguistics at present, such problems and tasks are constantly being posed and formed, which can no longer be solved by means and methods rooted in science, but require the application of syncretic logical, linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic ways of research of text linguistics. In our opinion, linguoculturology as a special direction of analysis is brought to life by this very formulation of the question. The humanisation of the modern science of language brings to the foreground the problems related to the communicative personality, the person speaking and perceiving speech. The starting point here, therefore, is the understanding of linguistic personality "as a set of abilities and characteristics of a person, conditioning the creation and perception of speech works" (Yu. N. Karaulov).

Problem statement. The analysis of the dynamic existence of science is relevant, very complex and requires the development of an integral system of criteria for determining the justification of some language changes in this or that historical period and the inadmissibility of others. Scientific information

about language (along with information from other sciences) and the methodological principles underlying them form a person's scientific worldview, and understanding of how language works, serve as the basis of humanitarian education, the basis of the linguistic culture of the individual. At the same time, the notion of language culture is inextricably linked with the notions of value, and significance of language as a phenomenon and attribute of culture, the carrier of which is the person participating in communication. The cultural significance of language, the understanding that it reflects the picture of the world, the whole human life through human consciousness, is expressed at different levels of the language system (Ohiienko, 1991).

The linguistic culture of an individual is formed in the interaction of the phenomena "culture of language" and "culture of speech". It is based on the knowledge of norms of written and spoken speech, semantic and expressive possibilities of the system, and the study of exemplary literary, journalistic and some other rhetorical texts belonging to the classics.

When analysing linguistic means, artistic thinking and artistic taste of a linguistic personality are developed. Speech culture is, among many components, the ability to use expressive means of language; the traits of a linguistic personality are determined not only by the quantity but also by the quality of the readings; the properties of the speech works created are determined by the main characteristics of the regularly processed texts (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Despite the constant and close attention of linguists, psychologists, and ethnographers to the problems of linguistic personality, including in the aspect of its linguocultural characteristics, they have not yet been solved with a sufficient degree of completeness and specificity. The absence of a strictly described system of linguocultural characteristics of linguistic personality at different levels of realisation does not contribute to the identification and comprehension of its components in each specific case. The attempts of modern theoretical linguistics to solve the problems of linguistic personality by traditional grammatical means are not promising, because the content and axiological essences of this structure can be revealed only in the case of their comprehensive coverage, i.e. taking into account the influence of such fields of knowledge as linguocountry studies, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, and, first of all, linguocultural studies. A detailed study of these problems has not been carried out in linguistic science, which determines the relevance of this paper.

The object of the study is the linguistic personality from the historical perspective in a literary text from the point of view of national peculiarities of thinking.

The subject of the study is, firstly, the linguocultural properties of words and phraseological units that determine the specificity of linguistic personality as a means of knowing the linguocultural value of words and phraseological units.

The work aims to consider moral aspects in the linguocultural approach to the phenomena of language, which determine the specificity of the formation and area of competence of the linguistic personality. In this regard, specific objectives of the research are set:

1) to determine the place of linguoculturology in linguistic and philosophical traditions and identifying the sources of its formation;

2) to elucidate the specificity of prose and poetic texts in terms of their linguocultural characteristics;

3) to describe the linguocultural properties of linguistic personality in the aspect of spatial and

temporal characteristics in English phraseological units;

4) to present the components of the English national character from the point of view of their linguocultural properties in translation aspect.

Methodology of the research. The analysis of the subject's activity in the object world shows that the conceptual apparatus of the theories considered are less suitable for describing the subject's activity in the mental psychological plane, in particular, for describing the reflection of one's activity. Therefore, it is necessary to expand the initial meaning of semantic roles both for describing people's joint activity and for describing their communication. The deep roles of the subject (agent) of activity should also include such roles as the self-conscious "image of the subject's self", "image of Me", and "image of the Other" (counterpart or co-agent), which the subject attributes to the participant of joint activity or communication. Such deep roles as ideals, normative values, time, place of action, and movement in the subjective spaces of interacting subjects should also be included in the basic list of deep semantic roles.

Further development of the theory of activity and communication can, in our opinion, go both by ascending from the abstract to the concrete, i.e. by the movement of theoretical consciousness in psychology and linguistics and by ascending from the empirical data of natural language and fixed structures of everyday consciousness through their explication to theoretical models. Semantic spaces are a kind of meta-language of the initial language of description (in our case phraseological phrases), their construction consists in the allocation of generalised categories-factors, in the language of which the lexicon is written down. The obtained models characterise various aspects of control and expediency of the subject's behaviour.

Most of the selected phraseological expressions represent the negative pole of "inappropriate behaviour"; this can be explained by the fact that phraseology is more often used to assess inadequate behaviour than positive behaviour.

The presentation of the main material. One of the least studied layers of phraseology includes units indicating the homeostatic and heterostatic orientation of personality organisation. Homeostasis is an average state of consciousness, which indicates a perfect adaptation of the organism to constant and unchanging forces, i.e. a state of mental equilibrium, which is neither negative nor positive and corresponds to the physical or psychological norm. The conceptual system that we use in everyday life is found in the lexical structure of our language. This system, based on some ideas about

the world of everyday consciousness, is inextricably linked to the system of native speakers and thus ethno-semantically marked. Naturally, such sphere of the lexical level as phraseology is the most marked by national-cultural specificity. Of particular interest for the study is characterised by the metamorphosis of the general meaning - proverbs and sayings, phraseological phrases, which include in their semantic composition in one form or another the value of the middle of the axiological evaluation scale area (Mazepova, 2004).

The phraseology of any language is the most valuable linguistic heritage, which reflects the worldview, national culture, customs and beliefs, imagination and history of the people speaking it. The problems of phraseology are extremely significant both for practice and for the theory of translation; they often present great practical difficulties and arouse great theoretical interest, as they are connected with the difference of semantic and stylistic functions performed in different languages by words of the same material meaning, and with the difference of combinations into which such words enter in different languages. This paper considers only some of the many problems of translating phraseological units.

Usually, it is accepted to indicate the equivalence of a phraseological unit to a word. However, the theory of full equivalence is outliving itself. This does not mean that phraseological units and words have nothing in common, which is considered by the theory of correlation of some types of phraseological units and words, which, however, is based on somewhat different principles. The most characteristic for phraseological turns stable combinations of words are in principle equal in their meaning to a single word, differing from it, as a rule, a certain expressive and stylistic colouring (Forceville, 1996).

Let us dwell in more detail on the definition of periphrasis and its modern interpretation of phraseology. The dictionary definition states that periphrasis is an expression that is a descriptive transfer of the meaning of another expression or word. We understand periphrasis as a secondary name of a denotation that has a general linguistic primary name. Periphrasis is created to replace the primary name for certain pragmatic or aesthetic purposes.

Another common way to form a secondary name is to specify in it a new feature of the denotative itself, i.e. with the use of another signifier of the same concept. It is customary to refer to periphrases and the primary name of the denotation to a synonym. We believe, however, that periphrastic relations differ from synonymic relations. Synonyms denote close but different notions about

close but different denotations. Synonyms are created not as signs of the same denotation, but as signs of different denotations, which later turned out to be close in human perception. Periphrases, on the other hand, are created as signs of the same denotation, they differ in terms of the pragmatic impact of a person, in terms of expressiveness. Periphrases relate to primary names as variants, not as synonyms, forming a group of signs of the same denotation. Relations of this type are called periphrastic (Shymanovych, 2007).

The classification of phraseological units also contains the theoretical knowledge necessary for the translator, with the help of which one will be able to identify the phraseological unit in the text, then analyse it and, based on this analysis, give the most accurate translation in the given context. The most legitimate can be considered the consideration of phraseological unit in three aspects: semantic, structural-grammatical and component. Taking into account these levels, the following types of interlingual relations are distinguished:

1) phraseological equivalents (full and partial) – phraseological units with identical semantics, structural-grammatical organisation and identical components of composition;

2) phraseological analogues (full and partial) – phraseological units expressing the same or close meaning, but characterised by complete difference approximate similarity of the internal form;

3) non-equivalent phraseological units – phraseological units that have no correspondence in the phraseological system of another language.

Since phraseology is distinguished by its functions in language and speech, it requires a special approach to the process of translation. The main difficulty lies in the fact that no dictionary can provide for all the false uses of a phraseological phrase in context (Lakoff&Johnson, 1980).

Phraseological units similar in internal form in different languages are by no means always identical in meaning as a result of their reinterpretation, so one cannot rely on the similarity of the figurative basis. The methods of translating phraseological units are different: from complete replacement of the imagery to complete preservation of the image in translation. And yet, common and characteristic for all of them is the preservation of imagery in translation. But at the same time, the standard and traditional in the original should be transferred to the standard and traditional in the translation. When translating, it is important to observe stylistic homogeneity with the original phraseological units. Expressive usage is almost not studied. Meanwhile, this problem is of undoubted interest for lexicography and translation (Kocherhan, 2004).

Along with the absence of corresponding phraseological units in Ukrainian, it may seem that a Ukrainian phraseological unit with the same semantic content does not correspond to English in stylistic or expressive terms. Of course, ideally one should strive for full equivalence of the means used, but in practice one often has to sacrifice functional-stylistic correspondence to preserve expressiveness. Phraseological substitutions in translation must weave the national flavour of the original language. The original, rich in phraseological phrases, should retain its phraseological saturation in translation (Newmark, 1988).

One of the requirements that have long been put forward by the theory and practice of translation activity is the requirement of equivalence of texts - one and the final one. Equivalence is ensured using transformations provided that the latter are semantically or pragmatically motivated. Freestyle in translation is allowed only when necessary.

Using free translation, the translator exceeds his authority as a linguistic intermediary. Certain regularities can be established when translating phraseological units with a figurative basis. Mainly it concerns phraseological unities with "deducible" internal form. Somewhat simplifying the issue, we can divide four different ways of their transfer: 1) with complete preservation of the monolingual image; 2) with partial change of imagery; 3) with complete loss of imagery; 4) with removal of imagery (Kulchytskyi, 1992).

The most interesting from the creative point of view are the phraseological units in which it is necessary to completely replace their figurative basis. The complete replacement of the image may be connected with the preservation of expressive colouring, which is often even more important, and the transfer of functional and stylistic belonging to the phraseological phrase. Translation of phraseological units with the removal of imagery is not the best way out of the situation, as it is connected with the loss of expressiveness.

Phraseological units devoid of imagery, in which emotional-expressive meaning is combined with subjective evaluation of reality, are characterised by complex semantics. These phraseological units are simultaneously modal-introductory words and expressions. As a rule, they are polysemantic and polyfunctional. As in all other areas, there is no difficulty in translating phraseology that could not be overcome with the help of compensation.

Conclusion. We have determined that linguoculturalology is at the intersection with many fields of knowledge, i.e. it is intertwined with ethnolinguistics, ethnopsychology, psycholinguistics, cultural anthropology, cultural history, cultural

psychology, etc. Linguoculturology has its methodological and theoretical basis in cultural studies. Linguoculturology in search of the boundaries of the circle of interests as a science still, apparently, in the stage of formation, has as its methodological and theoretical basis culturology, which in turn was formed from such areas of human research as history, philosophy, sociology, psychology of culture, etc. Describing the linguocultural properties of words and phraseological units, we sought to emphasise their role in the formation of specific features of linguistic personality.

In general, if culturology studies the picture of the world, linguoculturology is aimed at studying the linguistic picture of the world. The concepts we are analysing go beyond the aesthetic field proper and its problems and invade the field of hermeneutics. Lawful necessity sets its conditions and develops a dialogue between very different directions, albeit slowly, but encouragingly. However, in the process of synthesising scientific fields, it is always necessary to beware of abrupt transitions and to find that line which reconciles the polemicising sides.

Conceptual and linguistic pictures of the world are closely connected with the notion of memory and cultural heritage of words, which therefore form a fairly stable system of concepts of a particular language. When a concept is learnt, an individual assimilates certain procedures, and rules of encoding and decoding of linguistic expressions. The content of the conceptual system can be more or less close to the cognised reality but is not completely determined by it. Since our everyday life is a more complex organisation than, for example, half a century ago, in connection with the involvement of people in various spaces of life activity, people's worldviews can also be represented in the form of an ambiguous structure or system. Ambiguity comes from the obviousness of explicit and hidden contradictions in our lives. In such cases, a broad view of things is productive; it is important to overcome conservatism not only towards oneself but also towards other members of society and the world in general.

It is not by chance that the main directions in linguistics and philosophy at the turn of the third millennium are developing under the sign of language. This is explained by the fact that the human being has become the object of close attention. Man has imprinted his image in language, reflected in it everything he has learnt about himself and wanted to communicate to others. There is an interest in the infinite fullness of his relations, which include the following aspects: relation to himself, to the world and another person. The main

tendencies in the development of the problems of intersubjectivity, dialogue and communication, refracting differently in the context of different theories, have determined a number of directions of modern linguistics, linguistic philosophy, text theory, and semiotics. The phrase "linguistic personality" is intended to bring together the problems of interdisciplinary sciences in the general direction of the pragmatic stream of issues to the extent that the personality manifests the competence of the speaking person. The degree of competence appears to be the concept that is intended to regulate both successes and failures in the communication process since competence is felt both ontologically and phylogenetically.

To date, the spheres of manifestation of human activity in language appear to be: 1) the formation of the picture of the world in language and the creation of the linguistic inventory; 2) the generation of speech; 3) the role of the human being in the communication process. At the same time, we say that it is necessary to pay special attention to the analysis of the three main stages of speech generation: the preverbal stage (formation of the speaker's intention); the stage of the choice of linguistic means and the linguistic realisation of the idea. We believe that defining the area of competence of a linguistic personality to identify universals resulted in the necessity to take into account the so-called language game, which, from the standpoint of logical-semantic structures, as well as from the standpoint of pre-cultural realities, is understood precisely as a kind of universal frame. The approximate structuralisation allows us to talk about the prospect of further detailing the human context, specifying the context both within it and around it. The interaction of internal and external contexts of human parameters in each case forms a specific picture of the world, a picture created by this very person, exactly with these characteristics, exactly in this place and exactly at this time. Thus, the following relations are formed: a person and his/her language – a person's use of language (his/her construction and reconstruction of words and phraseological units and their meanings). Thus, the following relations are formed: man and his language – the use of language by man

(his construction and reconstruction of words and phraseological units and their meanings), as well as language and the world picture – the correlation of the linguistic and conceptual picture of the world.

Thus, the fundamental factor of human existence is neither the individual nor the collective. The peculiarity of the human world should be seen precisely in the relationship between man and the other, in that "something" which cannot be found anywhere else in the living world. Language serves only as a means of expressing this "something", and all other manifestations of culture are merely conditioned by this "something".

We believe that since linguoculturology has a synthesising beginning, it comprehensively considers the relationship between language and thinking, i.e. it covers both the internal and external sides of language. Therefore, it is necessary to study language in the closest connection with "cultural zones" the dominant ideas of people, and their joint creativity. Being one of the signs of a nation, its social interaction, language is the main form of expression and existence of national culture. It is not only a means of communication, but also a means of accumulating cultural knowledge. This possibility comes from the semiotic nature of language. Culture, like language, is also a semiotic system capable of transmitting information, but unlike language, it is not capable of self-organisation, as culture is a complex semiotic system, its function is memory and its main feature is accumulation. Language and culture are joined by the third element – personality (human factor at the level of individual and nation (people) at the level of general), which participates in the dialogue of cultures, and activates language and culture. On this basis, "language – nation (personality/national personality) – culture" can be considered as elements of the central triad of linguoculturology.

Cultural studies is emerging as a field that can be interpreted along the lines of the sciences close to it in terms of methodological basis, which studies man and his environment. Considering culture as a "process", "result", "activity", "method", "attitude", "norm", "system", it is necessary, in our opinion, to interpret it as a spatio-temporal object in which the subject plays a very important role.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Кочерган М. П. Зіставне мовознавство і проблема мовних картин світу. Мовознавство, 2004.
2. Кульчицький О. Світовідчуження українців. Українська душа. Київ: Фенікс, 1992. 51-70 с.
3. Мазепова О. В. Метафора як засіб створення мовної картини світу. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: Збірник наукових праць*. Київ, 2004. 21-27 с.
4. Огієнко І. Українська культура. Коротка історія культурного життя українського народу. Київ: Абрис, 1991. 76 с.
5. Чернишенко І. А. Фактори формування національних мовних картин світу. *Вісник Житомирського держ. ун-ту ім. І. Франка*, 2007. 158-162 с.

6. Шиманович Г. М. Метафора як когнітивний механізм номінації та її роль у мовній картині світу. *Культура народів Причорномор'я*, 2007. 35-38 с.
7. Forceville C. *Pictorial metaphor in advertising*. London. New York: Routledge, 1996.
8. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, L. : The University of Chicago Press, 1980. 242 p.
9. Newmark P. *Approaches to Translation*. New-York: Prentice Hall, 1988. 100-120 p.
10. Pulara D. *Visible Differences. Why Race Will Matter to Americans in the Twenty-First Century*. New York-London: Continuum, 2002.

REFERENCES

1. Chernyshenko, I. A. (2007). Faktory formuvannia natsionalnykh movnykh kartyn svitu. [The Factors of formation of National Pictures of the World]. *Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho derzh. un-tu im. I. Franka*. [in Ukrainian]
2. Forceville, C. (1996). *Pictorial metaphor in advertising*. London. New York: Routledge.
3. Kocherhan, M. P. (2004). Zistavne movoznavstvo i problema movnykh kartyn svitu. [Contrastive Linguistics and Problems of Linguistic Pictures of the World]. *Movoznavstvo*. [in Ukrainian]
4. Kulchytskyi, O. (1992). Svitovidchuvannia ukrainsiv. *Ukrainska dusha*. [The Worldview of Ukrainians. Ukrainian Soul]. Kyiv: Feniks. [in Ukrainian]
5. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, L. : The University of Chicago Press.
6. Mazepova, O. V. (2004). Metafora yak zasib stvorennia movnoi kartyny svitu. [Metaphor as the Means of Creation of the Linguistic Picture of the World]. *Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]
7. Newmark, P. (1988). *Approaches to Translation*. New-York: Prentice Hall.
8. Ohienko, I. (1991). *Ukrainska kultura*. [Ukrainian culture]. *Korotka istoriia kulturnoho zhyttia ukrainskoho narodu*. Kyiv: Abrys. [in Ukrainian]
9. Pulara, D. (2002). *Visible Differences. Why Race Will Matter to Americans in the Twenty-First Century*. New York-London: Continuum.
10. Shymanovych, H. M. (2007). Metafora yak kohnityvnyi mekhanizm nominatsii ta yii rol u movnii kartyni svitu. [Metaphor as Cognitive Mechanism of Nomination and its role in Linguistic Picture of the World]. *Kultura narodov Prychornomoria*. [in Ukrainian]

ЛІНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЧНИЙ ПІДХІД ДО КЛАСИФІКАЦІЇ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИХ ОДИНИЦЬ: ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКИЙ АСПЕКТ

Маслова Світлана Яківна

кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри "Філологія"

Одеського національного морського університету
вул. Мечникова, 34, Одеса, Україна

У статті досліджується нова галузь лінгвістики, лінгвокультурологія, та її значення для аналізу використання мови. Висвітлюючи "гуманізацію" лінгвістики, стаття підкреслює роль походження та культурного контексту мовця у формуванні його комунікативного стилю. Лінгвокультурологія долає розрив між мовою і культурою, показуючи, як мова відображає і втілює культурні цінності. Поняття "мовна особистість" стосується унікального способу використання мови людиною, на який впливає її культурне походження, досвід і знання. У статті визнаються виклики в аналізі "лінгвокультурних характеристик" мовця. Вона вказує на обмеженість традиційних граматичних підходів і виступає за міждисциплінарний підхід, який включає лінгвокультурологію поряд з такими галузями, як психолінгвістика і соціолінгвістика. Метою дослідження є вивчення морального виміру лінгвокультурологічного підходу та його впливу на мовну компетенцію особистості. Об'єктом дослідження є мовна особистість в історичній перспективі, в художньому тексті з погляду національних особливостей мислення. Предметом дослідження є, по-перше, лінгвокультурні властивості слів і фразеологічних одиниць, що визначають специфіку мовної особистості, по-друге, засоби пізнання лінгвокультурної цінності слів і фразеологічних одиниць. Серед конкретних завдань: простежити коріння лінгвокультурології в лінгвістиці та філософії; проаналізувати вплив просторових і часових аспектів на лінгвокультурну особистість мовця; дослідити особливості англійського національного характеру крізь призму лінгвокультурних властивостей. Підкреслюючи важливість лінгвокультурології, це дослідження прокладає шлях до більш повного розуміння складного зв'язку між мовою, культурою та індивідуальною ідентичністю. Воно закликає до подальших досліджень, щоб розробити надійні рамки для аналізу "лінгвокультурних характеристик" мовця.

Ключові слова: лінгвістика, лінгвокультурологія, мовна особистість, лінгвокультурні характеристики, соціолінгвістика, мовна компетенція.