

## COMPARATIVE STUDY ON MORPHOLOGICALLY MOTIVATED LACUNAE (ENGLISH-UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE PAIR)

**Mariia Onyshchuk**

**Abstract.** The research undertaken addresses the untranslatability issue at word level in distantly-related languages. It investigates lacunary units lacking one-word correlates in the contrasted language due to structural properties viewed through the prism of their derivational categories (agentive, attributive, instrumental) in the English and Ukrainian languages. In the article, we hypothesize that lacunae constitute a special domain, which involves lexical units whose structural and content properties can be revealed by implementing a comparative analysis. We propose to analyze non-equivalent nouns with different morphological composition, suggest the ways of rendering their meaning in Ukrainian and discuss their textual realization during literary translation. Implementing J.P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet's concept of equivalence, the paper offers a contrastive analysis of referentially transparent and nontransparent lacunary units within derivational categories, signaling possible shifts in their morphological status, since lacunae usually represent complex language units undergoing structural and semantic transformations during translation. The research methodology assumes an integrated analysis combining comparative, structural and interpretation methods. In the first part, certain approaches to the lacunarity study are reviewed, then the interlingual correlates for the source language (hereafter-SL) are described with reference to their lexical-morphological properties. Next, the lexicographic approach is undertaken to identify the lacunae which constitute full or partial correlates in the target language (hereafter-TL). Acknowledging the asymmetry of conventional lexicographic representation, the study revealed predominance of lacunae's motivated derivational meanings. The material of substantive lacunary units of the English language analyzed in the investigation clearly suggests that their form is represented by both univerbs and specific words which actualize lacunae's lexico-grammatical properties, the morphological processes remaining productive. Constituting primarily full equivalents with different structural properties, the base derivatives in English at the interlanguage level are characterized by intensive abstraction and generalization of motivational traits. The contrastive study of English nouns and Ukrainian correlates proves that the relations of partial equivalence embrace the correlates characterized by the compositional uniformity of lexical meanings under the differences in their morphologic structure. The paper proves that the ethnolinguistic specificity might cause certain implications during literary translation. During translation derived substantives differ in word-formation models, hence one should

distinguish between employing a paraphrase (group of lexemes) and substituting a word-combination by a word.

**Keywords:** correlate; comparison; derivational category; literary translation; motivation; non-equivalence; lacuna; source language; target language.

## Introduction

Occupying a specific niche within nonverbal semiotics, translation studies and modern linguistics, nowadays, lacunae are often viewed as gaps between the compared languages, basic elements of the linguistic and cultural community which complicate translation and make a non-native speaker fail to understand the target text notions due to the lack of corresponding concepts, categories, associative reactions, and nonverbal resources [1. P. 369].

The issue of selecting an adequate equivalent for a distantly related language when translating language units has been hotly debated in numerous linguistic discussions, particularly in the fields of translation studies (Catford, 1965, Nida, 1969, Kirkwood, 1989, Krzeszowski, 1990, Pym, 1993, Komissarov, 2002), contrastive linguistics (Makhonina, 2002, Sternina, 2002, Bykova, 2003, Korunets, 2004, Sternin, 2004, Kocherhan, 2006, Panasiuk, 2007), lexicography (Szerszunowicz, 2015), cognitive linguistics (Bykova, 1999, Anokhina, 2013), ethnolinguistics (Sorokin, Markowina, 2010), and glotodidactics (Turunen, 2006). The notion of lacuna as a linguistic phenomenon was introduced by J.P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet (1958) in terms of stylistics and translation studies which basically referred to the gaps or the lack of equivalents (one L1 word with no word L2 correspondence). A wide range of terms is used to describe non-translatable units: *untranslatable lexis* (L. Barkhudarov); *realias* (Y. Vereshchagin, V. Kostomarov); *sememes without lexemes* (G. Bykova); *ethnodeims* (N. Varych, L. Sheiman); *antiwords* (Y. Stepanov); *black spaces* (R. Budagov); *intercultural communication gaps* (G. Gachev); *gap* (K. Hale); *random holes in patterns* (Ch. Hockett).

The article aims at analyzing non-equivalent TL nouns in the contrasted English and Ukrainian languages, the material consisting in derivatives and their word-building properties in the lexical-semantic system of the language. Therefore, we assume that the peculiarity of word-formation gaps can be determined by a structural motivation and identified through comparison between languages. In the research, we apply the methodology of contrastive analysis, viewing equivalence as a useful category for describing formal correspondences. The paper proves that both linguistic and cultural incompatibilities might cause certain implications during literary translation.

The theoretical framework employed is based on J.P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet's equivalence theory [2], which allows for conducting compari-

son, since non-equivalent lexis and lacunae are usually handled in pairs: a lacuna in the SL presupposes the availability of non-equivalent lexis in TL. Applying this translation mode to the subject matter of the present work means a constructive discussion of non-equivalent language units through a deliberate selection of lexical correspondences and translation examples (the English- Ukrainian language pair) at the word level where the asymmetry appears the most obvious. The suggested study examines structural differences between non-equivalent units in the contrasted language and ways of their meaning elimination which fully account for translation as a particular form of interpersonal communication where translators associate words and ideas [3].

In the article, we hypothesize that lacunae constitute a special domain in any language, which involves lexical units whose structural and content properties can be revealed by implementing a comparative analysis. Since comparative studies clearly testify to the possible variations between meanings in the domain of transposition, word-formation and semantics structures [4. P. 122], in the word-formation domain there seem to be mismatches caused and even complicated by the insufficient level of elaboration in the contrasted English and Ukrainian languages. This points to the important considerations that, in respect to a interlanguage, the morphological properties of SL are to be prime for investigating lacunarity as a purely linguistic phenomenon, the specificity of at the lexical level originates from its word-formation potential.

The lacunarity study is primarily focused on reviewing its derivational potential, the entities' ability to formulate and express certain derivational categories using the morphological motivation criterion. From a theoretical standpoint, comparative linguistic studies interpret lacunae as linguistic units that do not necessarily carry explicit information about real phenomena. This is mainly due to the ability of one language to linguistically formalize certain aspects of this reality, while the other distinguishes other features [4. P. 61; 5; 6. P. 37; 7. P. 95], which enables the study of lacunary units at various language levels. Compounding, which has a syntactic character, is considered more productive in English, whereas the suffixation closely related to morphology, is more intrinsic to Ukrainian.

### **Method and Materials**

Primarily, the application impact of contrastive analysis in regard to investigating linguistic peculiarities of lacunary units in translations [8. P. 46] is still questioned. Moreover, we assume that some overlaps are related to specific difficulties in identifying a common ground for English and Ukrainian correspondences. Firstly, the study material bases on reviewing the English structurally motivated nouns' lexicographical and textual

representation in the Ukrainian language. We apply a text corpora as data for conducting a comparison in order to tackle mutual comparability in translation [9. P. 20]. Secondly, derivational categories are taken as a *tertium comparationis*; the contrastive analysis involves formal correspondence and textual equivalence that can be abundantly illustrated from a wide range of English-Ukrainian noun correlates.

Meanwhile, the consistent specificity of the languages under consideration can be traced through the prism of their word-formation techniques, determined by structural differences in the contrasted languages since translation procedures can be systematically described from a linguistic point of view [10. P. 24].

The derivation potential of the English language is described within the framework of the general dynamic model based on the concept of derivation introduced by A. Levitskyi [11. P. 42], who takes it as a process of transforming the function of the basic model, which causes a change of both the outer form and its value, the derivational relations being applied both to one-level and multi-level units.

M. Halliday approaches meanings realized through wordings [12. P. 17], the contrastive-typological aspect involves the identification among possible regular and occasional correlates of lacunary units within the lexical-semantic paradigm, as well as the description of semantic transformations determining the emergence of linguistic specifications [13. P. 175; 14. P. 42] which can be explained through derivational processes. Once the need appears for a corresponding token in the contrasted language, its communicative necessity can be eliminated at the syntactic level. The meaning of a compactly expressed SL notion is conveyed by means of a paraphrase in TL. According to Olena Snitko [15. P. 45], the presence of inner form (hereafter-IF) is considered a word's natural property, reflecting those structural relations through which a word can enter a language system. The most important thing is the interlanguage comparison via IF, which aims to establish similarities and differences at the interlanguage level regarding lexico-grammatical manifestations of nouns.

The process of identifying the IF of lacunary units consists of a number of successive procedures, among which we distinguish the following: a) the stage of determining the correlation word combination; b) analysis of the reference situation with further determination of the correlation value for the lacunary unit; c) setting a ratio for the lacunary unit value and the corresponding word combination or paraphrase in the contrasted Ukrainian language. Without denying the influence of extralingual factors on the misunderstandings and discrepancies which occur in communication between representatives of different cultures, we purposely narrow the scope of our research and focus on lexical lacunae which constitute the derived noun nominations.

## **Findings and Discussion**

The types of interlanguage lexical correlates under investigation are morphologically motivated derivatives that are established when conducting a bilingual comparative alignment whose meaning is conveyed using a descriptive phrase that usually «involves a generic term, focusing on the aspect of the surface form, or of function, of the concept which appears the most relevant in the context» [16. P. 80]. The suggested research focuses on the comparative study of interlanguage equivalence of derived nouns, considering their formal correspondence in the bilingual dictionary. According to J. Szerszunowicz [17], lexicographic analysis discusses types of equivalents such as borrowing and an explanation, translation equivalent, an explanatory definition, a substitution with a hyperonym, followed by additional information, and a functional equivalent.

Lacunary derivatives are identified in the study as «motivated non-equivalents» which are interpreted in terms of SL as lexical units those without one-word objectivation due to their different word-formation potential. Accordingly, we can account for apparent irregularities in the data in terms of lexicalization [18. P. 95]. Primarily, absolute one-word equivalents are not considered in the study, therefore, two main types of approximate correlations are distinguished: 1) those which share common components; 2) those which are semantically close.

In the research, the inner form is defined as universal [19. P. 76] being treated as the semantic and structural correlation of the morphemes which make up the word together with other morphemes. According to V. Rusanivskyi [20], motivation consists in establishing the interrelation / interlink between the meaning and inner form. The latter enables identification of typological properties and prioritizing in selecting the ways of nomination in the contrasted languages. It also provides answers to narrow research questions on structural and systemic language description, which goes considerably beyond mere linguistic analysis and supplies us with diverse data. In the proposed study, the IF of substantive gaps is considered as a dynamic component of the derivatives' value (both according to the morphological composition and the meaning) of the comparable linguistic units.

### **Lexicographical representation of morphologically motivated lacunae**

In the study, we adhere to Olena Kubriakova's approach, according to which derivation is defined as the process and result of the formation in language of any secondary sign that can be interpreted using the adopted form of the SL, or derived from it by the application of certain TL rules [21. P. 64;

22]. Created by a particular model, the value of lacunae seems relatively easily decoded. Among regular type correlates of this linguistic stratum are word forms that undergo a syntactic objectification in the contrasted language. Applying a comparative analysis of derivatives enables a linguistic description of lacunae that belong to various morphological derivational categories. When it comes to the systemic relations, the noun paradigm is represented by various types of referentially transparent language units. Compare: Eng. *afterlife* – Ukr. *життя після смерті*; Eng. *afterglow* – Ukr. *приємне відчуття після пережитої події*; Eng. *camper* – Ukr. *особа, яка зупинилася чи тимчасово перебуває в наметі*; Eng. *counterattraction* – Ukr. *місце чи тип розваг, який змагається з іншим з метою привернути увагу відвідувачів та збільшити їх кількість*; Eng. *northerly* – Ukr. *вітер, що дме з півночі*; Eng. *forethought* – Ukr. *слушна думка, яку слід врахувати на майбутнє зараз, плануючи перед тим, як щось зробити*; Eng. *foregone (conclusion)* – Ukr. *результат, очевидний для всіх до його офіційного оголошення*; Eng. *foreknowledge* – Ukr. *передчуття того, що має відбутися* etc.

The *instrumental derivational category* is represented by noun, adjectival and verbal bases having concrete meaning with a transparent IF. Compare: Eng. *unlike* – Ukr. *предмет, який не нагадує інший*; Eng. *allowable* – Ukr. *те, що дозволяють робити і яке вважають прийнятним та законним*; Eng. *nutrient* – Ukr. *лікарський засіб, який впливає на процеси травлення*; Eng. *inflow* – Ukr. *дії людей після прибуття в якесь місце*; Eng. *walk-in* – Ukr. *місце, куди можна прийти без попередньої домовленості*; Eng. *walkout* – Ukr. *вихід з офіційної зустрічі людини з метою висловити свою незгоду або залишити роботу для початку страйку*; Eng. *influx* – Ukr. *прибуття великої кількості людей чи речей в один період* etc.

Equally motivated substantives differ in both nominal attachment and significance, although they are characterized by a common concept and united by morphological motivation whose encoded meaning can easily be deduced from its constituents, e.g. Eng. *amputee* – Ukr. *людина з ампутованими кінцівками*; Eng. *appraiser* – Ukr. *людина, яка хвалить когось чи щось*; Eng. *achiever* – Ukr. *переможець; той, що досяг успіху*; Eng. *underwork* – Ukr. *праця менш кваліфікована чи гіршої якості*; Eng. *byrpath* – Ukr. *бокова стежка (дорога)*; Eng. *rounder* – Ukr. *предмет вагою один фунт*; Eng. *half-rounder* – Ukr. *щось вагою півфунта* etc.

The selected data of derivatives within the *attributive derivational category* represent specific state or condition nouns which embrace affixals: Eng. *nuttiness* – Ukr. *приємний присмак горіхів*; Eng. *standout* – Ukr. *щось, надзвичайне за якістю*; Eng. *septuagenarian* – Ukr. *людина у віці між 70 та 90 роками*; Eng. *torporific* – Ukr. *те, що спричиняє апатію*;

Eng. *downer* – Ukr. *те, що гнітить та спричиняє депресію*; Eng. *after-taste* – Ukr. *присмак, що залишається у роті (після їжі, куріння тощо)*; and compounds Eng. *backtalk* – Ukr. *зухвала відповідь*; Eng. *intangible* – Ukr. *дещо незрозуміле, невловиме*; Eng. *spender* – Ukr. *щось неекономне, яке потребує великих затрат*; Eng. *six-footer* – Ukr. *щось довжиною в шість футів*. Primarily, the quality denoted by the base is frequently used in a figurative sense and clearly derived from the meaning shown in the root morpheme.

The *agentive derivational category* takes up the biggest share of the lacunicon, being diverse in the range of word-building formants and shifts in morphological status. Despite its formal modification, the lacunae of this categorical meaning retain their inner form, inherent in the original unit, thus indicating the same denotate: Eng. *alarmist* – Ukr. *панікер; поширювач чуток*; Eng. *remonstrant* – Ukr. *той, хто протестує (заперечує)*; Eng. *allottee* – Ukr. *той, хто одержує земельну ділянку*; Eng. *appointee* – Ukr. *призначувана особа*; Eng. *adulterer* – Ukr. *той, хто порушує подружню вірність*; Eng. *backer* – Ukr. *той, хто допомагає комусь (стоїть за, підтримує, субсидує когось)*; Eng. *haggler* – Ukr. *той, хто постійно торгується, сперечається з приводу цін, умов*; Eng. *hazer* – Ukr. *той, хто насміхається з новеньких* etc.

Meanwhile, the compounds usually constitute interesting examples of cross-linguistic gaps whose motivation is not explicitly represented in the contrasted language: Eng. *barnstormer* – Ukr. *мандрівний (посередній) актор*; Eng. *one-aloner* – Ukr. *цілком самотня людина, одинак*; Eng. *president-maker* – Ukr. *впливова політична особа, представник ділових чи фінансових кіл, який у змозі впливати на результати президентських виборів*. Thus, in finding a translational equivalent, a metaphorical meaning is added. Furthermore, derivatives with human denotata are often characterised by ethnospecific nomination: Eng. *coroner* – Ukr. *судовий слідчий в Англії і США, який проводить розслідування у випадках насильницької смерті*; Eng. *alderman* – Ukr. *олдермен, член муніципалітету*; Eng. *back-bencher* – Ukr. *рядовий член партії (в парламенті)* etc. Still, definite shortcomings of lexicographic descriptions are observed due to the cultural reference impact, which determines the lacuna's representation by applying a descriptive phrase or a definition to interpret the meaning.

Transposition of lexico-grammatical properties is observed in the structurally and semantically specific nouns, preserving similar inner form but different outer. Their morphological motivation is primarily transparent, which makes it possible to establish regular correlates in the Ukrainian language (compare: Eng. *catcher* – Ukr. *бейсболіст, в обов'язки якого входить ввіймати м'яч, який не вдалося пробити нападнику*) as well as non-transparent ones (compare: Eng. *finery* – Ukr. *красивий одяг чи ювелірни*

вироби, які одягають з нагоди особливого свята; Eng. *claimer* – Ukr. кінь, якого можна придбати після перегонів; Eng. *underkill* – Ukr. засіб, який чинить меншу шкоду, ніж передбачалось; Eng. *offprint* – Ukr. окремий відбиток (статті тощо); Eng. *throwaway* – Ukr. рекламне оголошення, проспект (безкоштовний); Eng. *walkabout* – Ukr. спілкування високої посадової особи з громадськістю etc.

The study revealed an intralingual lexicographic predominance of motivated derivational meanings, with the application of previously implemented elements of both form and content, compare: Eng. *angler* – Ukr. людина, хобі якої є рибалка; Eng. *batsman* – Ukr. гравець крикету, завдання якого регулярно вдаряти по м'ячу; Eng. *bylaw* – Ukr. закон, прийнятий місцевим урядом, який стосується лише цього регіону; Eng. *detainee* – Ukr. особа, яка перебуває під вартою, особливо з політичних причин; Eng. *jugful* – Ukr. кількість чогось, що міститься в глечику etc.

When dealing with the word-building properties of the contrasted languages, it is worth mentioning that Ukrainian differs from English in its more flexible organization of the affixation techniques which make it possible to express particular shades of meaning. Characteristic features are traced among other types of word formation, in particular, different range of distribution in the nominating space. This also applies to different amounts of semantic value and the difference in syntactic properties of expressing meanings, compare: Eng. *give-up* – Ukr. той, хто відмовився і не хоче продовжувати ← *to give up* здаватися; Eng. *do-gooder* – Ukr. той, хто робить добро ← *to do good* робити добро); Eng. *babe-in-arms* – Ukr. дуже мала дитина; Eng. *wallflower* – Ukr. сором'язлива людина, здебільшого дівчина чи жінка, яка уникає участі в соціальних заходах і не викликає особливого інтересу чи уваги; Eng. *he-man* (coll.) – Ukr. сильний чоловік, який любить демонструвати усім свою силу; Eng. *work-to-rule* – Ukr. ситуація, в якій люди чітко дотримуються правил та інструкцій, які дають щодо їхньої роботи з метою оптимізації кількості виконуваної ними роботи; Eng. *queue-jumping* – Ukr. самовільно просуватися поза чергою з метою якнайшвидшого обслуговування; Eng. *standstill* – Ukr. стан, у якому всі дії і рухи зупиняються; Eng. *whistle-stop* (tour) – Ukr. низка короткотривалих візитів відомого політичного діяча до різних місць etc.

It is worth noting that in terms of lacunary units, the idiomatically-oriented derivatives also manifest their potential, compare: Eng. *booty* – Ukr. гроші та цінні речі, викрадені армією чи злодіями під час війни; Eng. *burn-out* – Ukr. сильна втома, спричинена надмірною працею; Eng. *firebrand* – Ukr. особа, яка спричинює соціальні та політичні суперечки, виступаючи проти влади, підбурюючи інших чинити те саме; Eng. *whiteout* – Ukr. погодні умови, за яких сніг та хмари змінюють заломлення світла так, що можна побачити лише темні предмети etc. Fol-



lowing the productive word-formation processes, the lacunary units acquired additional emotional colouring, thus signaling the specificity of the language under a contrastive analysis. Constituents of this type are predominantly characterized by the IF commonality of multi-language correlates that are accompanied by the value adequacy with a transparent motivation. Still, a comparative analysis of definitions reveals the nontransparent character of derived lacunary units which might be determined by a considerable influence of semantic derivation.

### Textual correlates during literary translation

During literary translation one cannot expect a complete correlation between the form and content of the English and Ukrainian word-formation systems. Based on J. Catford's theory of meaning at a word level [23], we employ the linguistic approach to descriptive translation study. Moreover, we fully support M. Hoey and D. Houghton who view the contrastive analysis as an effective assistant for interpreting structurally different units [24]. Comparing the inner form of distantly-related linguistic cultures, we can conclude that every nomination sign encodes the specific features most relevant for the community's consciousness, being individual and representing specific word perception by representatives of different ethnolinguistic communities. Primarily, correlative lexemes constitute the lexicographic correspondence, the comparison of which assisted in establishing full and partial equivalence of the inner form in the contrasted lacunary units under various word-formation models.

Mona Baker advocates for the absence of one-to-one correspondence between orphographic words and elements of meaning across languages, supporting her argument by the linguistic system's non-obligatory function to provide for a suitable equivalent, but also the way both the writer of the ST and the TT producer who sometimes «choose to manipulate the linguistic systems in question» [25. P. 18]. Let us compare the textual correlates for the agentive derivational category and its exponents in the contrasted languages and pay attention to the difference in the use of word-formation potential within the two language worldviews. The agentive derivative with verbal base *confider* (Eng. *to confide* «довіряти, виливати душу») does not receive one-word representation in Ukrainian, for conveying its content the TL employs a paraphrase, a descriptive analytic construction, e.g.:

<...> «Oh, yes, he told me all about it last night,» Bill said. «He's a great little **confider**. He said he had a date with Brett at San Sebastian»<sup>1</sup>;

<...> Знаю, знаю, він уже все розповів мені вчора ввечері, – сказав Білл. – Він **мастак виливати душу**. Признався, що мав зустріти Бретта Сан-Себастьян<sup>1</sup>;

---

<sup>1</sup> Hemingway E. For Whom the Bell Tolls. London : Arrow Books, 1994.

Decoding this explicit derivative reveals the transparency of its inner form. We can assume that the equivalence is achieved through syntactic modifications of the form. In English, this word class is represented mainly by the verbal and noun-type systemic derivational nouns, e.g.:

<...> *His father was a **disciplinarian**. Jody obeyed him in everything without questions of any kind*<sup>2</sup>;

<...> *Батько був **суворий чоловік**, і Джонні йому покорився*<sup>3</sup>.

The concept of inner form as a way of representing content is at the basis of the distinction between denotative meaning and the interpretative component of meaning in functional grammar [26]. If the denotative meaning transmits a cognitive content that has a universal nature, then the interpretive component of the value is associated with a specific form, or with a specific language construct, reflecting the specifics of the speech presentation of the content [27]. The equivalence of the IF among the derivatives with a different structural configuration set. It should be noted that abstract vocabulary of this type is characterized by both morphological and semantic-morphological functional reorientation of derivatives, resulting in their semantic status shift.

Within the derived words of the substantive paradigmatic class of abstract notions, properties and states, one can distinguish nouns, the content of which is specified through noun, adjectival, verbal semantic bases of root morphemes.

Within the derived words of the substantive paradigmatic class of abstract notions, properties and states, one can distinguish nouns, the content of which is specified through noun, adjectival, verbal semantic bases of root morphemes. Systemic lacunae represented by a monolexeme Eng. *soldiering* – Ukr. *період служби в армії* refers to the action and preserves its integral seme, realizing both processual and time meanings, compare:

<...> *«I have been in seven wars and four revolutions,» the count said. «**Soldiering?**» Brett asked*<sup>4</sup>;

<...> *Я брав участь у семи війнах і чотирьох революціях, – сказав граф. – **Ви воювали?** – Доводилося, люба*<sup>5</sup>.

Through the prism of interlingual lacunarity, complex relationships can be traced between the method of nominalization and meaning with its axiological component in the stylistic opposition. From a theoretical stand-

<sup>1</sup> Hemingway E. *Fiesta. For Whom the Bell Tolls: Novels*. Translated from the English into Ukrainian by M. Pinchevskyi. Kyiv : Vyshcha Shkola, 1984.

<sup>2</sup> Steinbeck J. *The Red Pony*. New York : Bantam Books, 1955.

<sup>3</sup> Steinbeck J. *The Red Pony*. Translated from the English into Ukrainian by P. Sharandak, Kyiv : Dnipro, 1964.

<sup>4</sup> Hemingway E. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. London : Arrow Books, 1994.

<sup>5</sup> Hemingway E. *Fiesta. For Whom the Bell Tolls: Novels*. Translated from the English into Ukrainian by M. Pinchevskyi. Kyiv : Vyshcha Shkola, 1984.

point, the semantic structure of the word is determined by its structure and morphological properties, which denote either the connection of the sound and meaning, or connotations associated with a certain style. As a rule, such lexemes correlate with the word-combinations on the formal criterion basis, whereas semantically their components constitute a single cognitive-nominative complex [28. P. 276]. This word class is characterized by a functional shift which involves a gradual reorientation of language units towards nouns with a different level of concrete semantics.

<...> *He wore **half-glasses** and since he looked at everything through them, he had to tilt his head back to see in the distance*<sup>1</sup>;

<...> *Він носив **окуляри з половинними скельцями**, і тому, що він на все дивився крізь окуляри, йому доводилося закидати голову догори, щоб глянути в далину*<sup>2</sup>.

The illustrations prove that lacunary units represent complex formations undergoing structural and semantic transformations, which results in the transition of units of another word class.

The study revealed that lacunary units with a material value characterized by a transparent IF dominate, with the two-syllable nomination in English corresponding to one-thirds in Ukrainian. The inner form of English derivatives specifies the semantic markers that can be traced among nouns. Using the prefixes *after*, *by*, *fore* – can form nouns with one-type inner form, while in English due to the second component of the compound word acquire a concrete meaning, *compare*: Eng. *afterclap* – Ukr. *несподівана (неприємна) подія*; Eng. *by-election* – Ukr. *додаткові вибори*; Eng. *by-work* – Ukr. *побічна праця; робота, що виконується у вільний час*; Eng. *forefinger* – Ukr. *вказівний палець* etc. The identification of the equivalent IF of the comparable units is complicated by the morpho-semantic peculiarities of the entities with a specific substantive value. Thus, the meaning of class derivatives with the pre-word or post-word in the Ukrainian language is represented in TL lexicalized phrases, e.g.:

<...> *The bull charged and came out into the corral, skidding with his **forefeet** in the straw as he stopped, his head up, the great hump of muscle on his neck swollen tight*<sup>3</sup>;

<...> *Бик вмчав у загін, різко зупинився – аж проїхав **передніми ногами** по соломі – й став, здригаючись усім тілом, задерши голову, напруживши у великий горб могутні м'язи карку*<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Steinbeck J. The Red Pony. New York : Bantam Books, 1955.

<sup>2</sup> Steinbeck J. The Red Pony. Translated from the English into Ukrainian by P. Sharandak, Kyiv : Dnipro, 1964.

<sup>3</sup> Hemingway E. For Whom the Bell Tolls. London : Arrow Books, 1994.

<sup>4</sup> Hemingway E. Fiesta. For Whom the Bell Tolls: Novels. Translated from the English into Ukrainian by M. Pinchevskyi. Kyiv : Vyshcha Shkola, 1984.

Under the equivalence of inner form, a change is observed in the units' semantic status among the contrasted languages determined by functional reorientation. In particular, the Ukrainian-English derivative *wrecker* is entitled to both morphological and semantic qualification, being characterized by the depth of inner form consideration, compare:

<...> *How much do they cost? About a buck if you buy one new – quarter at a wrecker's*<sup>1</sup>;

<...> *А скільки вона коштує? Щось долар за штуку, коли купувати нову, а **стару** можна дістати за чверть монети*<sup>2</sup>.

The analyzed lexemes and their correlates pertain to the following meanings [29]: *wrecker* поломана вантажівка ← *wreck* (1) зруйнований або серйозно пошкоджений наземний транспорт чи водоплавне судно, being characterized by a better developed inner semantic structure with additional metaphoric meaning (2) *coll.* особа, яка має проблеми зі здоров'ям. Thus the conducted componential analysis enables us to assume the homological likelihood of co-motivated derivatives in the contrasted English and Ukrainian languages. The research also revealed differences in producing derivative meanings and application for expressing cultural significance. the majority of derivatives have proved their grammatical specificity in SL. However, parallel notions imply the asymmetry, regular correspondence deviations – characteristic feature of the correlations semantically close but different in the part of speech attribution.

A comparison into the nature of IF mismatches among semantically correlated language units suggests a higher degree of morpho-semantic productivity of English derivatives, which can be determined by the emergence of word-forms with different motivational constituents, represented by notional and functional parts of speech. Regardless of its formal modification properties, nouns with agentive and instrumental meanings cause higher degree of IF mismatches in comparison with the English language.

To sum up, the contrastive study of nouns in the English and Ukrainian languages proves that the relations of partial equivalence embrace the correlates characterized by compositional uniformity of lexical meanings under the differences in their morphologic structure.

Derivational substantives differ in word-formation models, hence one should distinguish between employing a paraphrase (group of lexemes) and substituting a word-combination by a word.

<sup>1</sup> Steinbeck J. *The Cannery Row*. Toronto : William Heinemann LTD, 1945.

<sup>2</sup> Steinbeck J. *The Cannery Row*. Translated from the English into Ukrainian by O. Surits and S. Nikitashenko // *Vsesvit* 1. P. 3–64.

## **Conclusion**

Finally, the notion of derivational categories, performing a connective function between the form and meaning of a linguistic sign, proved a useful tool for comparing systemic derivatives in the English and Ukrainian languages. The conducted study the assumption that regardless of the TL representation form, full and near semantic translation correlates can be considered as equivalents. Consequently, the equivalence relation in the contrasted lacunae of the English and Ukrainian languages encompasses only the lexico-semantic correspondences of languages, characterized by partial coincidence in the composition and content of semantic features that make up the structure of their lexical meanings. Formations with nominal and verbal bases prevail and preserve a number of distinctive features. The material of substantive lacunary units of the English language analysed in the investigation clearly suggests that their form is represented by both univerts and specific words which actualize lacunae's lexico-grammatical properties, the morphological processes remaining productive. Base derivatives in English at the interlanguage level are characterized by intensive abstraction, generalization of motivational traits, whereas Ukrainian nominations are primarily based on specific motivational features, also developing connotative values.

We conclude that the word-formation potential can be applied for investigating non-equivalent units in the English and Ukrainian languages, since it contains vectors of the reality categorization as well as its representation in linguistic consciousness. In the study, lacunarity is approached as a language property which selects different but linguistically relevant traits to achieve the interlanguage equivalence, striving for word economy, whereas, from the contrastive standpoint, the comparative analysis recognizes the language asymmetry. As a phenomenon that demonstrates how languages differ, the findings constitute highly valuable data, validating the national attribution of semantics in the contrasted languages. The linguistic findings can be applied to the descriptive translation procedures, being especially relevant to lexical semantics as it usually interprets not only the lacunae's special status, but both their morphological shape and problematic translatability within the cross-language equivalence, which might create new valuable insights into the way the languages categorize the world.

## **References**

1. Selivanova O. (2006) *Sovremennaya lingvistika: terminologicheskaya encyclopedija* [Modern Linguistics: terminological encyclopedia]. Monograph. Poltava: Dovkillia-K.
2. Vinay J.P. and Darbelnet J. (1995) *Comparative Stylistics of French and English*. Juan C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel (trans. and ed.). John Benjamins.

3. Salm A. (1997) *Vinay, J. P. & J. Darbelnet. Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. DOI: 10.5007/5260
4. Fawcett P. (2001) *Linguistic approaches* // *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 1. – Translating and interpreting. Baker I. Mona (ed.) Oxford: Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 120–125.
5. Bykova G. (1999) *Lakunarnost kak kategoria leksicheskoy sistemologii* [Lacunarity as a category of lexical systemiology] // *Communication culture and its formation*. Voronezh, pp. 60–63.
6. Kocherhan M. (2006) *Osnovy sopostavitelnogo jazykoznanija* [Essentials in Comparative Linguistics]. Kyiv: Akademia Center.
7. Korunets I. (2004) *Poriwnalna typologia anglijskoj i ukrajskoi mowy* [Comparative Typology of the English and Ukrainian Languages]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha.
8. Hoey M. and Houghton D (2001) *Contrastive analysis and translation* // *Routledge encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York, pp. 45–50.
9. Krzeszowski T (1990) *Contrasting languages: The scope of contrastive linguistics* // *Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs* 51. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
10. Catford J. A. (2009) *Linguistic theory of translation: One aspect of applied linguistics*. Moscow, Librokom.
11. Levistkyi A. (1998) *Funkcionalnye podhody k klasifikacyi lingvisticheskikh edinits sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka* [Functional Approaches to the Classification of the Modern English Language Units]. Kyiv: KNLU.
12. Halliday M. (1985) *Spoken and Written Language*. Deakin: Deakin University Press.
13. Kocherhan M. (2006) *Osnovy sopostavitelnogo jazykoznanija* [Essentials in Comparative Linguistics]. Kyiv: Akademia Center.
14. Korunets I. (2004) *Comparative Typology of the English and Ukrainian Languages*. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha.
15. Snitko O. (1990) *Vnutrenniaya Forma Nominativnykh Jedinic* [Inner Form of Nominative Units]. Lviv: Swit.
16. Barnwell K. (1980) *Introduction to Semantics and Translation: With Special Reference to Bible Translation*. High Wycombe: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
17. Szerszunowicz J. (2015) *Lacunarity, lexicography and beyond: integration of the introduction of a linguo-cultural concept and the development of L2 learners' dictionary skills* // *Lexicography ASIALEX*, v. 2, pp. 101–118.
18. Bauer L. (2001) *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Kiyak T. (2004) *Form and meaning of a language unit* // *Annals of Kharkiv National University. Roman-Germanic Philology Series*, no 635, pp. 75–78.
20. Rusanivskyi V. (1988) *Struktura leksicheskoy i gramaticheskoi semantiki* [Structure of Lexical and Grammar Semantics]. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka.
21. Kubriakova E. (1981) *Tipy jazykovykh znachenij. Semantika proizvodnogo slova* [Types of Language Meanings. Semantics of Derived Word]. Moscow: Nauka.
22. Balla M. (2008) *Modern English-Ukrainian Dictionary*. Kyiv: Chumatskiy Shliakh.
23. Catford J. A. (1965) *Linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
24. Hoey M. and Houghton D. (2001) *Contrastive analysis and translation* // *Routledge encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York, pp. 45–50.
25. Baker Monika (2001) *In other words. A coursebook of translation*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
26. Levistkyi A. (1998) *Funkcionalnye podhody k klasifikacyi lingvisticheskikh edinits sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka* [Functional Approaches to the Classification of the Modern English Language Units]. Kyiv: KNLU.
27. Sakal T. (2001) *Kognitivno-onomasialogicheskoye modellirovanije proizvodnogo slova* [Cognitive-onomasialogic modeling of the derived word semantics] // *Romano-Germanic Philology Issues*. Uzhhorod. Mystetska Liniiia, pp. 103–108.

28. Levistkyi A. (1998) Funkcionalnyje podhody k klasyfikacyi lingvisticheskikh edynits sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka [Functional Approaches to the Classification of the Modern English Language Units]. Kyiv: KNLU.
29. Balla M. (2008) Modern English-Ukrainian Dictionary. Kyiv: Chumatskiy Shliakh.

**Information about the author:**

**Mariia Onyshchuk**, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of the English Language and Theoretical Linguistics, Institute of English and American Studies, University of Gdańsk (Gdańsk, Poland). E-mail: mariia.onyshchuk@ug.edu.pl

**СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНАЯ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА МОРФОЛОГИЧЕСКИ МОТИВИРОВАННЫХ ЛАКУН (НА ПРИМЕРЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО И УКРАИНСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ)**

**Онишук Мария**, доцент, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры английского языка и теоретического языкознания, Институт англистики и американистики, Гданьский университет (Гданьск, Польша). E-mail: mariia.onyshchuk@ug.edu.pl

DOI: 10.17223/19996195/50/2

**Аннотация.** Рассмотрена проблема непереводимости языковых единиц на уровне слова в дистанционно родственных языках. Исследованы лакунарные единицы, для которых в сравниваемом языке отсутствует однословный коррелят из-за морфологических особенностей языка, проанализированы и классифицированы лакуны сквозь призму их деривационных категорий (агентивной, атрибутивной, инструментальной) на материале английского и украинского языков. Выдвинута гипотеза о том, что лакуны представляют собой специфическую область лексики, структурные и содержательные характеристики которых можно выявить путем проведения сравнительного анализа. Рассматриваются безэквивалентные существительные с разным морфологическим составом, анализируются способы передачи их значения на украинский язык, также обсуждается текстовая реализация значения и формы лакунарных единиц в процессе литературного перевода. Имплементируя концепцию эквивалентности Жана-Поля Вине и Жана Дарбельне, предложен сопоставительный анализ референтно прозрачных и непрозрачных лакунарных единиц в рамках деривационных категорий, что сигнализирует о возможных сдвигах в их морфологическом статусе, поскольку лакуны обычно представляют собой сложные языковые единицы, подвергающиеся структурным и семантическим преобразованиям во время перевода. Методология исследования предполагает комплексный анализ, сочетающий сравнительный, структурный и интерпретационный методы. Рассматриваются подходы к изучению лакунарности, описываются межъязыковые корреляты к исходному языку относительно их лексико-морфологических характеристик. Применяется лексикографический анализ для поиска и определения лакун, которые являются частичными или полными коррелятами в целевом языке. Признавая асимметрию традиционно лексикографической репрезентации, выявлено преобладание мотивированных деривационных значений лакун. Материал рассматриваемых субстантивных лакунарных единиц английского языка, проанализированных в ходе исследования, ясно указывает на факт его репрезентации как универсальными, так и конкретными словами, которые актуализируют лексико-грамматические свойства лакун, при этом морфологические процессы остаются продуктивными. Составляя в основном полные и частичные эквиваленты с различными структурными свойствами, базовые производные в английском языке на межъязыковом уровне характеризуются интенсивной абстракцией и обобщением мотивационных черт. Сравнительное изучение существительных в английском языке и их корреля-

тов на украинском доказывает, что отношения частичной эквивалентности охватывают корреляты, характеризуемые композиционной неоднородностью лексических значений при различиях в их морфологической структуре. Подтверждается гипотеза об особенностях художественного перевода, в котором этноязыковая специфика единиц часто вызывает трудности, потому производные субстантивы отличаются словообразовательными моделями, в связи с чем следует различать использование перефразирования (группы лексем) и замены словосочетания словом.

**Ключевые слова:** коррелят; сравнение; деривационная категория; литературный перевод; мотивация; безэквивалентность; лакуна; исходный язык, целевой язык.

*Received 29 March 2020*