

Mykhalenko V. V.,

Doctor of Philology, Professor, Department of Foreign Philology and Translation, Institute of International Relations and Social Studies

CROSS-LINGUISTIC GRAMMATICALIZATION IN TRANSLATION

Summary. The present paper discusses the semantic changes inherent in the internal grammaticalization that have led to the systemic grammatical transformations in the translation process. The paper addresses translation as a transfer of meanings from one language to another, but rather as an arena in which different language paradigms and cultural models meet in the person of the translator. This perspective provides a complete contrast to Western translation studies – characterize za or non-translatibility and focuses on the ways of rendering the English category of perfect verb form into the Ukrainian category of the indefinite verb form. The article reveals a distinct tradition grappling with the most important topics in language development and translation studies.

Key words: desemantization, grammaticalization, neutralization, translation/interpretation, perfect form, indefinite form.

Introduction. The meaning of a linguistic sign is generalized by a reduction of its intension and a corresponding widening of its extension. The meaning of a linguistic sign consists of a set of propositions, in the logical sense of the term [16, p. 43, p. 401; 13]. There are two mainstream explanations of grammaticalisation processes: Generative (formalist) accounts regard them as reflections of structural reanalysis through parametric change during language acquisition, resulting in recategorisation of lexical elements as functional heads in syntactic structure. Functionalist approaches focus on performance, arguing that speakers tend to either improve expressiveness or economise speech production by varying the application of the rules of grammar, which may result in grammaticalization and finally even change the rules of grammar or create new functional elements. This paper is intended to integrate the advantages of both approaches. Basically, it is argued that performance based grammaticalization plays a central role for grammaticalisation [15, p. 201] by providing the linguistic preconditions for recategorisation of lexical elements as functional ones, or semi-functional elements as fully functional ones. The desemantization (or desemantization) of a sign is an extreme generalization of its meaning, to the extent that only very generic predicates remain in its intension. The other engine of the language development is lexicalization as opposition to grammaticalization Bauer makes it quite clear that “lexicalization ... is essentially a diachronic process, but the traces it leaves in the form of lexicalized lexemes have to be dealt with in a synchronic grammar” [3, p. 50]. He distinguishes five types which will be considered in the following, namely: phonological, morphological, semantic, syntactic, and mixed lexicalization.

Discussion. A century ago Antoine Meillet, in his work *L'évolution des Formes Grammaticales*, coined the term grammaticalization to describe the process through which linguistic forms evolve from a lexical to a grammatical status. It was Meillet's term that would come to characterize what is now a whole field of study in historical language change. For now, many linguists will probably agree that one of the most prominent developments is found in the expansion of Meillet's definition by Kurylowicz [13] grammaticalization is that

subset of linguistic changes whereby lexical material in highly constrained pragmatic and morphosyntactic contexts becomes grammatical, and grammatical material becomes more grammatical [5, p. 17] (Traugott, 1996: 183). Over the last ten years, studies on grammaticalization inspired by the usage-based and construction grammar insights, became increasingly interested in the notion of language change which currently occurs (De Smet 2012, Fischer 2007).

Grammaticalization is a process in which grammar elements that appear in the process of desemantization obtain new grammatical functions. According to this, it is possible to say that due to desemantization, the functional (grammatical) meaning emerges instead of the diminished lexical one. Grammaticalization is a historical process in which grammar elements that appear in the process of desemantization obtain new grammatical functions. According to this, it is possible to say that due to desemantization, the functional (grammatical) meaning emerges instead of the diminished lexical one [17, p. 35].

The desemantization of a sign of an extreme generalization of its meaning, to the extent that only very generic predicates remain in its intension. Assuming an ontology in the form of a taxonomy, extremely general and abstract concepts such as ‘entity’, ‘action’, ‘relation’ etc. are at its top. These are, at the same time, typical grammatical meanings. Here are some simplified examples: When the Anglo-Saxon demonstrative *that(x)* evolves into the definite article *the(x)*, the semantic component of distal deixis is lost. Desemantization as a gradual loss of lexical meaning refers to the main types of changes in the lexical meaning of a word, leading to grammaticalization [1, p. 32]. But then one can understand a dialectical relationship of desemantization → grammaticalization. Desemantization is suggested to be an aspect of grammaticalization. Hopper and Traugott defined the grammaticalization as a process during which the lexical units start to perform morphological function.

Gradually they change into morphological formants and gain the ability to perform new additional morphological functions. In this case grammaticalization is a part of the process of meaning change and it is considered as a factor of morphological and lexical systems development. One of the main tendencies which lays the foundation of the grammaticalization is the meaning change. Traugott stresses that there is a change from the meaning which depends on the described situation to the meaning which depends on context or metalinguistic situation [2, p. 76].

Grammaticalization is traditionally contrasted to lexicalization. The concept of “lexicalization” refers to the encoding of conceptual components in a lexical unit, whether a word or a morpheme, and the term “lexicalization pattern” refers to regularities in the way such components are encoded in lexical items and hence distributed across the constituents of the clause in particular languages. However, on the linear axis of the language development each can be treated either causative, or consequential, which depends on the researcher's objective of investigation

Corpus analysis. The whole process of grammaticalization may include several steps of alternate performance based and parametric changes.

English may be said to use distinct “grammaticalization and lexicalization patterns”. Lexicalization often opposed to Grammaticalization (a): Lexical items and constructions in certain contexts become grammatical items, not vice versa; [9, p. 17-18; see also Haspelmath 1999, Heine and Kuteva 2002]; (b) Grammaticalization involves bonding, coalescence, bleaching = (loss of content meaning, addition of grammatical meaning). But Lexicalization is characterized in contradictory ways: (a) Lexicalization = degrammaticalization (Ramat 1992, 2001; van der Auwera 2002: 111); (b) Lexicalization involves splitting up of fused elements; increase in content meaning, loss of grammatical meaning.

Öhl admits that the term grammaticalization is understood not as the acquisition of grammatical function by contentful lexemes that by undergoing delexicalization and desemantization change into grammatical morphemes [16, p. 43]. The process of grammaticalization is understood broadly as pertaining not to individual lexemes or phrases but to whole notional categories [11, p. 91].

Hopper distinguished 5 principles of grammaticalization, which help to identify it: (1) layering; (2) divergence; (3) specification; (4) persistence; (5) de-categorization [9, p. 17ff.]. The first one means that in a language there are several constructions with analogical or identical function. These constructions are used with different lexical units, in various contexts, in diverse sociolinguistic situations. The main idea of divergence principle is the initial form of the lexical unit may function in a language system independently, despite of the fact that simultaneously its grammaticalized variant is used. In such a case grammaticalization is a source of homonymy in a language. The third principle of specification leads to the contraction of form distribution. The persistence principle works when the link between the initial construction content and its grammaticalized version is preserved. De-categorization means a shift in a functional and semantic sphere which occurs with the grammaticalized unit. In the process a language unit loses morphological markers and syntactical characteristics of the lexical parts of speech and gains the features of the subordinate parts of speech [2, p. 77].

The gradual shift of grammatical chain is from concrete to abstract, and from content to function words. The driving force of grammaticalization is metaphorically motivated in human cognition. A common phenomenon in language change is the process whereby an independent part of speech, like pronoun gradually undergoes semantic bleaching to become a marker of some morphological feature.

In the process of investigating two parallel texts of the novel *Theatre* by W. Somerset Maugham (English and Russian) in the framework of Translation Studies the way of rendering perfect verb forms by Russian past indefinite forms attracted our attention. First, the translator must correlate two different language systems – analytical and synthetic and, second, s/he must elaborate a set of triggers to transform compound terms into simple ones, third, to desemantize “secondary” markers of the perfect form (adverbs) and turn them into the intensifiers of completed action in Russian. Definitely, it is a simplified algorithm of translator’s activity – the rendering of the concept of “completed action” is his/her major objective. We retrieved the first 30 fragments from the texts, in case of vague cases the context can make the interpretation much easier.

MODEL #1: Present Perfect (ADV) → Present Indefinite + (PARTICLE)

1. *I’ve had a good deal of experience.* “У меня такой богатый опыт”.

The regular way of translating the present perfect *be* verb forms into Russian is employing its omission or explicating with the help of the *be*-past form and the adverb *NEVER* is substituted by the particle *НИ – НЕ*:

2. *I’ve never been to a rehearsal in my life.* “Я еще ни разу в жизни не был на репетиции”.

MODEL #2: Present Perfect + Adv → Past Indefinite + Adv

3. *I’ve seen it three times already.* “Я видел спектакль уже три раза”.

The adverb retained is used as an intensifier of the past action

MODEL #3: Present Perfect → (Present Indefinite) + Adv (УЖЕ)

4. *He’s been here three days.* “Он здесь уже три дня”/

The speaker does not use the secondary marker of Perfect action “already” which is implicit in the context. But the translator underlines the duration of action till the moment of speaking.

MODEL #4: PAST PERFECT + ADV → PAST INDEFINITE + ADV.

5. *(Julia, however, had insisted that she must have her bedroom as she liked, and having had exactly the bedroom that pleased her in the old house in Regent’s Park) which they had occupied since the end of the war she brought it over bodily.*

“Однако Джулия настояла на том, чтобы спальня была такой, как она хочет, и, поскольку ее абсолютно устраивала спальня в их старом доме в Ридженс-парк, где они жили с конца войны, перевезла ее сюда всю целиком”.

Here is a regular practice of rendering the preposition *since* by its Russian equivalent prefix *с-*. Cf. The same case with the preposition *for* which is rendered by *в течение*:

6. Reduced to picture-postcard size it had sold in the provinces for years.

“Уменьшенная до размеров художественной открытки, она в течение многих лет продавалась в провинции”.

MODEL #5: PAST PERFECT + (FOR) ADV → PAST INDEFINITE + (X)ADV.

7. *She had been with Michael for five years.* “Она проработала с Майклом пять лет.

In this case the speaker underlines the duration of an action till the present moment with the help of the temporal preposition *for*, in the translation the preposition is eliminated and the limit of duration of action is lost either. But the completion of action is rendered with the prefix *про-*. The prefixes of such type are a frequent means of rendering a perfect action in Russian and Ukrainian, for instance, работал: про-работал, пере-работал, об-работал, за-работал, с-работал, etc.

Cf. The adverb *ever* is rendered by the preposition *в* illustrating the phenomenon of cross-language grammaticalization [19, p. 50].

8. *It was the only Shakespearean part she had ever played* “Единственная шекспировская роль в ее жизни”.

In the following case the adverb *never* is rendered by the negative particle

9. *It was a pity she had never had a chance of playing Rosalind, she would have looked all right in boy’s clothes.*

“Жаль, что ей не выпало случая сыграть Розалинду, ей бы очень пошел мужской костюм”.

Note: The completion of action the translator expresses with the help of the prefix *c-*, i.e. grammaticalization: Adv NEVER → Particle HE [18, p. 27].

MODEL #6: Past Perfect Active → Past Indefinite Active

10. *All the illustrated papers had given it a full page and they had used it on the programmes.* “Все иллюстрированные газеты отдали ей по целой странице; ее печатали на программах”.

11. *He had played Romeo at Cambridge, and when he came down, after a year at a dramatic school, Benson had engaged him.* “Он играл Ромео в Кембридже, и после того как, окончив университет, провел год в драматической школе, его ангажировал Бенсон”.

MODEL #7: Past Perfect Passive → Past Indefinite Passive

12. *The walls had been panelled (at cost price) by a good decorator and on them hung engravings of theatrical pictures by Zoffany and de Wilde.* “Стены были обшиты панелями (по себестоимости) хорошим декоратором, на них висели гравюры на театральные сюжеты, выполненные Зоффани и де Уайльдом”.

The given models illustrate the regular cross-language (morphological) de-grammaticalization: the compound verb form → simple form. However, the translator employs sets of various triggers to render the ST content into the TT [5, p. 77; 7, p. 39].

Additionally, models 6 and 7 reflect regularities in rendering the perfect verb form by the past simple verb form.

MODEL #8: Past Perfect Active → Participial phrase

13. *A bunch of yellow tulips in a silver bowl, which he had got through winning the theatrical golf tournament three times running, showed Margery's care.* “Желтые тюльпаны в серебряной вазе, выигранной Майклом на состязаниях по гольфу среди актеров, свидетельствовали о заботливости Марджори”.

This is the rarest case in our corpus when the translator de-grammaticalized a clause into a participial phrase.

FINDINGS & PERSPECTIVES. In conclusion, there are striking cross-linguistic patterns in the constructions used to represent the completed action in the ST and their transformation (lexicalization, grammaticalization and neutralization). In the TT. An important insight that underlies these patterns is that in some English and Russian there are different language structures. Consequently, the translator has to elaborate the typological triggers as well as specific ones to correspond to the author his/her discourse and its various registers [20].

In closing, we would like to stress again that both lexicalization and institutionalization are global notational terms, which may be further subcategorized, e.g. de-grammatization, pre-grammatization, or post-grammatization [4, p. 43] in translation and LSP tracing [6, p. 5]. The research in grammaticalization theory focuses mainly on the ‘triggering’ role of the context (Diewald 2006; Traugott 2003). However, in translation studies we speak of the translator’s triggering. Then our case-study extends the importance of the context to the grammaticalization stage in the ST and de-grammaticalization in the TT.

This article discusses grammaticalization and lexicalization in the framework of translation, where the retention of the content is of major importance

References:

1. Шимон Н.В. Десемантизации глаголов движения в современном английском языке. Международный научно-исследовательский журнал. 2015. Том 9-5(40). С. 55–56.
2. Baghana Jerome et al. Grammaticalization as one of the main language system evolution consistent patterns (on the material of the set expressions with prepositional-nominal groups in the German language). Journal of Language and Literature. 2014. Vol. 5. № 4. P. 76–78.
3. Bauer Laurie. English word-formation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
4. Bybee J.L., Pagliuca W., Perkins R.D. Back to the future. / Ed. E. C. Traugott & B. Heine. Approaches to grammaticalization. Volume 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991. P. 17–58.
5. Delbecque Nicole, Vervecken Katrien. Conceptually driven analogy in the grammaticalization of Spanish binominal quantifiers. Leuven Working Papers in Linguistics. 2012. P. 77–109.
6. Dodigovic Marina. Interdisciplinary: computer assisted linguistic research and the development of LSP courseware. CALICO Journal. 1992. Vol. 10 Number 4. P. 5–16.
7. Doyle Aidan. Grammaticalization and the Irish passive. SLE 39th Annual Meeting Relativism and Universalism in Linguistics (30 August – 2 September 2006). Bremen: Universität Bremen, 2006. P. 39.
8. Heine Bernd, Narrog Heiko. Grammaticalization and linguistic analysis. / Ed. Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog. The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. P. 401–424.
9. Hopper Paul. J. On Some Principles of Grammaticization / Ed. Elisabeth Closs Traugott, Bernd Heine. Approaches to Grammaticalization. Volume I: Focus on theoretical and methodological issues. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991. P. 17–36.
10. Hopper P. J., Traugott E. C. Grammaticalization (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
11. Kepinska Alina. Grammaticalization of the masculine and non-masculine personal category in the Polish language. Grammaticalisation of the masculine. Hyderabad: Hyderabad College of Science & Technology, Hyderabad, 2011. P. 91–122.
12. Krampen M. Meaning in the Urban Environment. New York: Routledge, 2013. 384 p.
13. Kurylowicz J. The Evolution of Grammatical Categories. Diogenes. 1965. Vol. 13(51). P. 55–71.
14. Lehmann Ch. Thoughts on grammaticalization: a programmatic sketch. Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt (Heft 9). Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität, 2002. P. 43.
15. Mykhalenko Valery. Glossary of linguistics and translation studies. I-F: IFKDGU, 2015. 527 p.
16. Öhl Peter. Formalist and Functionalist Explanations of Grammaticalization: an Integrational Approach. SLE 39th Annual Meeting Relativism and Universalism in Linguistics (30 August-2 September 2006). Bremen: Universität Bremen, 2006. P. 43–44.
17. Shustova Svetlana V., Osheva Elena, Klochko. Konstantin A. desemantization of functional grammatical causatives in the aspect of grammaticalization. XLinguae Journal. 2017. Volume 10. Issue 1. P. 34–42.
18. Unternbäumen Enrique Huelva. Semantic Extension in Grammaticalization as a Double-Scope Integration Process: The Case of the Ditransitive Construction with para in Brazilian Portuguese. Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics. 2012. Vol. 5(1). P. 27–70.
19. Vinogradova E. The Grammaticalization Paths (New Prepositions in Russian Language). Linguistic Studies. 2014. Volume 29. P. 50–56.
20. Zlateva Palma. Translation as social action: Russian and Bulgarian perspectives. London/New York: Routledge Library Editions: Translation, 2018. 136 p.

Михайленко В. В. Міжмовна граматикалізація в перекладі

Анотація. У даній статті обговорюються семантичні зміни, притаманні внутрішній граматикалізації, які призводять до системних граматичних перетворень у процесі перекладу. Переклад трактується не тільки як передача значень з однієї мови в іншу, а скоріше як арена, де різні мовні парадигми та культурні моделі перетинаються в особі перекладача. Запропонована перспектива дослідження протистоїть деяким теоріям перекладності-неперекладності та сконцентрована на засобах передачі англійської досконалої дієслівної форми української категорією невизначеної форми дієслова в паралельних текстах (оригіналу і перекладу). У статті розкриваються як традиційні проблеми перекладу, так і інноваційні, які стосуються важливих тем теоретичного та прикладного мовознавства.

Ключові слова: десемантизація, граматикалізація, нейтралізація, переклад, доконана/недоконана форма дієслова.

Михайленко В. В. Межъязыковая граматикализация в переводе

Аннотация. В настоящей статье обсуждаются семантические изменения, присущие внутренней грамматикализации, которые приводят к системным грамматическим преобразованиям в процессе перевода. Перевод трактуется не только как передача значений из одного языка в другой, а скорее как арена, где различные языковые парадигмы и культурные модели пересекаются в лице переводчика. Предлагаемая перспектива исследования противостоит некоторым теориям переводимости-непереводимости и сконцентрирована на способах передачи английской совершенной глагольной формы украинской категорией неопределенной формы глагола в параллельных текстах (оригинала и перевода). В статье раскрываются как традиционные проблемы перевода, так и инновационные, которые затрагивают важные темы теоретического и прикладного языкознания.

Ключевые слова: десемантизация, грамматикализация, нейтрализация, перевод, перфектная/неопределённая форма глагола.