

O. Vasylenko, J. Halkina
Alfred Nobel University, Dnipro, Ukraine

**PHENOMENON OF THE SYNTACTIC SUBORDINACY
IN THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE PUBLICISTIC DISCOURSE
AND ISSUES OF ITS TRANSLATION INTO UKRAINIAN**

Introduction. Nowadays translation of the publicistic texts gains more and more importance. In line with lexical peculiarities typical of publicistic texts, from the syntax point of view these texts are characterized, among others, by the abundance of long composite and complex sentences. It should be noted that sometimes the adequate translation of them presents one of the main difficulties in the publicistic texts translation.

The topicality of the problem is predetermined by the insufficient investigation of subordinate clauses translation peculiarities in the frames of publicistic texts along with the wide use of subordinate clauses in the texts of publicistic discourse. The absence of the common approach to the problem of translation of different subordinate clauses types contributes to the importance of the research as well.

Purpose of the research is to define, analyze and study the problems of translation into Ukrainian of the subordinate clauses from English-language publicistic discourse.

To achieve the purpose of research we need to solve the following **objectives**: (i) to define linguistic peculiarities of the publicistic discourse and features of its syntax; (ii) to analyze scientific literature related to the subject of the research; (iii) to conduct comparative analysis of the subordinate clauses classifications in Ukrainian and English languages; (iv) to conduct linguistic analysis of the subordinate clauses on the basis of the collected lexis material, classified according to the accepted classifications; (v) to study peculiarities of translation of English-language publicistic discourse into Ukrainian.

The research consisted of three parts: theoretical study and two practical ones where linguistic and translation analysis has been conducted.

The theoretical study clarifies the notion of publicistic discourse, defines its linguistic peculiarities and features of its syntax. There has also been made a review of scientific publications devoted to the subject of the research and conducted comparative analysis of the well-known subordinate clauses classifications in Ukrainian and English languages.

According to the most well-known definition presented in literature [3], discourse is a notion, which includes not only the fixed result of the oral activity process (as text does), but also paralinguistic, extralinguistic, pragmatical, socio-cultural and other factors, and is being studied together with typical real-life situations, to which it refers. In the research there has been revealed that publicistic discourse correlates with publicistic style, so it has the same linguistic

features as this style has, such as objectiveness, up-to-date narration, officiality, consistency and persuasion of language. As the major aim of the publicistic discourse is to influence on people, there is typical to use equivalent-lacking lexis, clichés, stylistic figures, means for conveying expression, etc. In respect to the syntax of publicistic discourse, there are often used detachments, conjunctive constructions, noun word-combinations, homogeneous parts of sentence, rhetorical questions, vocatives and composite sentences with simple structure.

The review of scientific publications has revealed that many linguists have been studying the various aspects of the problem for several decades. Many of them (for example, J. Birenbaum, N. Matveeva, N. Pospelov and others) take a great interest to the phenomenon of the syntactic subordinacy [5, 9, 10], some linguists (T. Stanishevskaya, S. Fedorenko) study publicistic discourse and different issues of its translation [11], others (L. Azarova, S. Aleksandrova, L. Barkhudarov and also J. Birenbaum) study peculiarities of translation of the definite types of complex sentences [1, 2, 4, 5]. But, despite the great number of scientific publications devoted to the different aspects of the problem, there are no works aimed to study the problem of subordinate clauses translation on the material of English-language publicistic discourse as a whole and there are no sufficient recommendations on the peculiarities of translation in this case.

In the presented article we have analyzed a range of well-known subordinate clauses classifications existed in English and Ukrainian linguistics. It has been defined that the most often used classifications in Ukrainian and Russian linguistics are: (i) classification of complex clauses according to the peculiarities of their syntactical structure and semantic-syntactical relations between them (I. Vykhovanets, [7]); (ii) classification based on structural-semantic or semantic-structural principles (O. Zahnitko, V. Beloshapkova, I. Kruchinina, M. Pospelov, O. Ponomariv, [8]); (iii) classification based on logical-grammatical principle (F. Buslaev, O. Rudnev, [10, p. 323]); (iv) classification based on formal-grammatical principle (M. Peterson, O. Peshkovskii, P. Fortunatov, L. Bulakhovkii, [10, p. 325]).

The linguists studying Subordinate Clauses in English are more unanimous as for the classifications. There has been defined that Y. Birenbaum, L. Verba, I. Verkhovska, N. Kobrina, E. Khomenko use so-called functional classification [12] (according to the function which the Subordinate Clause performs regarding to the Principle one). What is remarkable, this classification matches with logical-grammatical classification [10] used in Ukrainian linguistics.

Unlike others M. Bloch [6] proposes to divide Subordinate Clauses into three categorial-semantic groups: (i) "qualificative" nominal subordinate clauses; (ii) "main" nominal subordinate clauses; (iii) "circumstances" subordinate clauses.

So we have come to a conclusion that there is no common and general accepted approach to the subordinate clauses typological classification. The cause for such diversification is complexity and variety of the phenomenon of subordinacy, which has a number of important features and, as a consequence,

subordinate clauses can be treated from the different points of view.

In the second part of the research linguistic analysis of the selected linguistic material have been performed. To perform the linguistic analysis two classifications have been used. The first is well-known functional classification [13], according to which there have been allocated the following types of subordinate clauses: Subject Clause, Predicative Clause, Object Clause, Attributive Clause, Adverbial Clause (and its subdivisions: Clause of Time, Clause of Place, Clause of Purpose, Clause of Comparison, Clause of Cause, Clause of Result, Clause of Condition and Clause of Concession). The second classification used in the second and third parts of the research, was proposed by the authors. It based on the syntactical structure of the complex sentences. According to this classification there are such types of sentences as: (i) sentences with one subordinate clause, (ii) sentences with two subordinate clauses, (iii) sentences with three or more subordinate clauses and (iv) sentences with mixed type of connection between principal and subordinate clauses.

The research has been conducted on the material of 200 subordinate clauses selected from the social and political articles from such news web-sites as: <http://bbc.com>, <http://theguardian.com>, <http://forbes.com>, <http://nytimes.com>, <http://rferl.org>, <http://heraldtribune.com>, <http://uatoday.tv>, <http://post-gazette.com>, <http://kyivpost.com>, and <http://telegraph.co.uk>.

In the course of linguistic analysis there have been indicated number of subordinate parts in the sentence, defined type and structure of subordinate clause (-es), defined parts of the sentence and provided some reasons for chosen type of clause, for example:

1. *When she attends conferences with her husband, people assume she is his secretary* is a complex syntactic structure with two Subordinate Clauses.

Part *When she attends conferences with her husband* – is Adverbial Clauses of Time, because it defines the time of action expressed by the verbal predicate of the main sentence *assume*. The Subordinate Clause is located before the Principal Clause. The Principal and Subordinate parts are linked via conjunctive word *when*, which has the semantics of the circumstances of time. The Subordinate Clause is expanded and includes the basis and two Objects. The basis *she attends*, where subject *she* is expressed by personal pronoun and predicate *attends* which is expressed by verb. The Objects: *conferences*, expressed by noun; the Object *with her husband*, consists of conjunctive word *with*, personal pronoun *her* and noun *husband*.

2. *The point of democracy is that it is the ultimate political tool* is a complex syntactic structure with one Subordinate Clause.

Part *that it is the ultimate political tool* - is Predicative Clauses, because it refers to the Predicate *is* of the Principal Clause, located immediately after the predicate, but has some formal attributes of Object Clause, because of conjunctive word *that*, which has an Object semantics. The Subordinate Clause is not extended, so it consists of a basis only, where the Subject *it* is

expressed with a Personal Pronoun, and Complex Noun Predicate *is the ultimate political tool* is expressed with a verb *to be* in Present Simple and a Noun *tool* with two Adjectives *ultimate, political*.

Thus, the linguistic analysis conducted in the second part of the research helped to draw some conclusions about prevailing types of subordinate clauses and sentences structure in the English-language publicistic discourse.

It has been revealed that in English-language publicistic texts:

1) The most commonly used types of Subordinate Clauses are Object Clauses (46% of all the sentences analyzed), Adverbial Clauses (28%), and Attributive Clauses (13%). Such distribution can be explained by the purpose of these types of subordinate clauses aimed at providing reader with more details, that fully corresponds with the main aim of the publicistic discourse in general.

2) The most rarely used types of Subordinate Clauses are Subject Clauses (only 4% of all the sentences analyzed) and Predicate Clauses (9%). This clauses type has untypical structure and can easily be confused with other types of subordinate clauses, mainly with Object and Attributive Clauses due to conjunctive words semantics.

3) According to the structure there are prevailed Complex Sentences with one or two subordinates, that fully corresponds with publicistic discourse syntax peculiarities.

In the third part of the work translational analysis has been conducted. The aim of this part is to define and study peculiarities of English-language publicistic discourse translation into Ukrainian and give some general recommendations to the problem researches and translators.

For example:

1. *What bothers me about this narrative is that it implies that only oppressive experiences are legitimate.*

Translation: *Що дратує мене в цій розповіді так це її натяки, що лише гнітючий досвід є справжнім.*

During the translation the following transformations occurred:

- Subordinate Clause «*What bothers me about this narrative*», which was Subject Clause in the source language, has been transformed into Attributive Clause;
- A preposition «about» has been transferred (with an addition of demonstrative pronoun) to «в цій», with a purpose of sentence part coordination;
- There is also a Replacement has been made: a number of a noun «experiences» (in plural) has been transferred into a noun «досвід» (singular).

So we can observe grammatical (syntax) Replacement and Addition.

2. *The point of democracy is that it is the ultimate political tool.*

Translation: *Сутність демократії в тому, що це найбільш авторитетний інструмент політики.*

During the translation the following transformations occurred:

- Definite Articles *the* and a Preposition *of* have been omitted due to their purely grammatical function;
- An Adverb *найбільш* has been added due to sentence decompression;
- An Adjective *political* which was an Attribute has been replaced onto Noun *політики*, which is an Object.

So we can observe grammatical (syntax) Replacement, Omission and Addition.

Translational analysis conducted for 200 Subordinate Clauses, allows us to draw the following conclusions:

1). Grammatical or / and lexical transformations are always happened in the process of translation. They connected with the necessity of translated text adaptation to the target language norms;

2). The most frequent transformation is a replacement, which occurs almost in each sentence, in 42% cases of all the transformations;

3). Sentence Integration happens in 1% of all transformations and, as a result, the subordinate clause turns to a part of the principal one. The opposite transformation - Sentence Fragmentation occurs in 2% cases, and as a result one subordinate clause divides into two clauses;

4). In 5% cases change of a Subordinate Clause type has been occurred as a result of sentence members syntactic function changing in the translated text.

Conclusion. In the research there has been revealed that all the factors which determine the necessity of making translational transformations and lead to the changes in the sentence structure can be divided into several categories. These categories are: lexical, grammatical, logical, artistic factors and general factors of text perception. What is more, all these groups of factors have different degree of translational transformations necessity. So, for example, artistic factors have low level of necessity to make transformations, lexical factors and factors of general text perception have middle level of necessity, and grammatical transformations always have the highest level of necessity to perform translational transformations.

Based on the results of the translation analysis conducted in the work, we could recommend to the translators to use synonymic constructions and transformations only when there is no possibility to preserve expression structure. While translating the long sentences, translator should take into consideration a reader's perception and to avoid using too massive and overloaded with information sentences. In this case we can recommend using other lexical means for conveying author's intention or split long sentence into smaller ones.

As a general recommendation it should be stressed that only distortion of original text sense is unacceptable, that is why the translator should be extremely careful while carrying out any transformations.

Literature

1. Азарова Л. В. Трансформация сложно–подчиненного предложения с придаточным дополнительным в современном английском языке: автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук: 10.01.08 / Азарова Любовь Васильевна. – М., 1968. – 22 с.
2. Александрова С. Я. Сложноподчиненные предложения с придаточными ирреального сравнения в тексте / С. Я. Александрова // Грамматика и перевод: Сб. науч. тр. –М.: МГИИЯ им. М. Тореца, 1988. – Вып. 308. – С. 87 – 91
3. Арутюнова Н. Д. Дискурс / Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / [авт.-состав. Арутюнова Н. Д.]. – М.: 1990. – 136 с.
4. Бархударов Л. С. Язык и перевод (Вопросы общей и частной теории перевода)/ Л. С. Бархударов. – М.: Междунар. отношения, 1975. – 240с.
5. Биренбаум Я. Г. Сложноподчиненное предложение в современном английском языке: Учебное пособие / Я. Г. Биренбаум. – Челябинск: Челябинский гос. пед. институт, 1981. – 131 с.
6. Блох М. Я. : Учебник. Для студентов филол. фак. ун-тов и фак. англ. яз. педвузов / М. Я.. Блох. – М.: Высш. школа, 1983. – 383 с.
7. Вихованець І. Р. Граматика української мови. Синтаксис: Підручник / І. Р. Вихованець. – К.: Либідь, 1993. – 368 с.
8. Загнітко А. П. Теоретична граматики української мови: Синтаксис: Монографія / А. П. Загнітко. – Донецьк: ДонНУ, 2001. – 662 с.
9. Матвеева Н. Н. Проблемы парадигматики сложноподчиненного предложения (на материале английского языка) / Н. Н. Матвеева. – Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1984. – 135 с.
10. Пospelов Н. С. О грамматической природе сложного предложения / Н. С. Пospelов // Вопросы синтаксиса современного русского языка / Под ред. В.В. Виноградова. – М.: Просвещение, 1950. – С. 321 – 337.
11. Федоренко С. В. Англomовний публіцистичний дискурс як соціокультурологічний лінгвістичний феномен сучасного комунікативного простору в перекладацькому аспекті / С. В. Федоренко, Т. І. Станішевська // «Молодий вчений». – № 1 (16)., 2015. – с. 194 – 196.
12. Хоменко Е. Г. Граматика англійської мови: Навч. посіб. / Е. Г. Хоменко. – 2-ге вид., випр. – К.: Знання-Прес, 2007. – 606 с.

Scientific supervision by J. Halkina, Associate Professor, PhD in Phylology