

The creation of phraseological-semantic fields can serve as a method of description of certain national and cultural specifics. That is, such a description can give us some insight into how phraseological units display a special, nation-specific perception of the world. The fact that a certain phraseological unit appears in the language and remains current in it indicates that the unit contains a generally comprehensible, typical metaphor (or symbol).

To make a conclusion, it's possible to say that phraseological units present quite a large part of vocabulary and to make a good translation from English into Russian it is important to know both about English and Russian idioms and their sense peculiarities because it is important to transfer the emotional, stylistic and functional information of the original idiom. Of course, the translator must try and render idiom by idiom, however, it's not always possible as not always there is an equivalent in the target language or there is an equivalent but it is not suitable according to its stylistic features.

#### REFERENCES

1. Baker, M. In *The Other Words* / M. Baker. – London: Routledge, 2010. – P. 43.
2. Chang, N. *Understanding Idioms* / N. Chang. – Available at: <http://kzdocs.docdat.com/docs/index – 16797.html> (04.11.2013)
3. Keysar, B., Bly, B. Intuitions of the Transparency of Idioms: Can One Keep a Secret by Spilling the Beans / B. Keysar, B. Bly // *Journal of Memory and Language*. 34. Elsevir Inc., 1995. P. 89-109.
4. Glucksberg, S., McGlone, M.S. *Understanding Figurative Language : From Metaphors to Idioms* / S. Glucksberg, M.S. McGlone // *Oxford Psychology Series*. Number 36. – Oxford University Press, 2001. – 134 p.
5. Vinogradov, V.S. *Translation: General and Lexical Issues* / V.S. Vinogradov // *Perevod: Obschie i leksicheskie voprosi*. – Moscow, 2004. – P. 86.
6. Wehmeier, S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* / S. Wehmeier. – Oxford, 2000. – P. 108, 744.

#### **THE ANALISYS OF TRANSLATION DECISIONS IN EXPRESSING THE METAPHORICAL MEANINGS IN «THE HEARTBREAK HOUSE» BY B.SHAW**

*Natalya L. Nevskaya, Master's Degree Student  
Department of Translation Studies  
Belgorod State National Research University*

The transferring of high-quality imagery of the original text is still argued by such outstanding national philologist and linguists as V. Vinogradov, I. Galperin, N. Arutyanova, etc., as well as foreign linguists, among whom we can identify Paul Ricoeur, George Miller, Max Black continue to study the theory of figurative language which was put forward by Aristotle. The grows of theoretical interest to the

metaphor was stimulated by increasing its presence in different types of texts, beginning from the poetic speech and journalism, and ending with the languages of different branches of science.

The usage of different words as a base metaphor, such as abstract, poetic and terms are the main specificity of the language style of Bernard Shaw. The translation of M. Bogoslovskaya and S. Bobrova is based mainly on the use of the full word equivalents. Shaw gave his work an extensive remark, and immediately deceptive the reader into a strange atmosphere of the house- ship. Sea terminology fills the entire stage direction up to the end. The same applies to the play itself and its main character - Captain Shotover, the owner of the house-ship. His speech was full of sea terms which can be considered as a linguistic figures with a figurative meaning.

...young and attractive female waiting in the poop. [Shaw 2010: 40].

The literal translation of the word “poop” is «корма». However, the old captain gives such name to the hall in the house.

...as a child she thought the figure – head of my ship...the most beautiful thing on earth. [Shaw 2010: 32].

The literal translation of the selected phrase is «фигура на носу моего корабля». His house was called the ship by Captain Shotover.

...you will not marry the pirate’s child. [Shaw 2010: 53].

The marked phrase translated into Russian as “a child, a pirate's kid” is used by Captain Shotover to describe Ellie, a simple young girl, the daughter of a romantic loser Mazzini Dunn.

At the end of Act One Captain Shotover asks Hector, who is in many respects very much like him: "What then is to be done? Are we to be kept forever in the mud by these hogs to whom the universe is nothing but a machine for greasing their bristles and filling their snouts?" [Shaw 2010: 54]. The translation in Russian of these words is: «А что же делать? Так, значит, нам вечно и барахтаться в грязи из-за этих свиней, для которых вселенная это что-то вроде кормушки, в которую они тычутся своими щетинистыми рылами, чтобы набить себе брюхо?» [Shaw 1982: 195].

The metaphor used as an example contains several focuses and interconnected frames, which as a whole enables to achieve an intensity and unity of expression of the metaphor components.

In the Russian translation the word “hog” used in the latter example in plural form is replaced by the Russian equivalent of “swine” (“свиньи”). It shows that the metaphor in the source text and the one in the target text is different, first of all, in motivation, and, secondly, in the degree of expression. In the English text the motivation is embodied in the grammar structures, while in Russian the vocabulary is used for this purpose, which results in abundance of synonyms. In this case we can speak of neutralized or emphasized speech variants in the source and the target text. However, taking into account this particular metaphoric context, we can speak about the emphatization of the speech variant of the metaphor in the target text.

According to Earl McCormac, “as the basis of a metaphor is built up by similarities and differences in the properties of the references, any metaphor contain elements both of epiphora and of diaphora. The metaphor which is mainly connected

with the similarities in the properties of its references, can be identified as an epiphora, while the metaphor which is mainly connected with differences, can be considered a diaphora” [McCormac 1990: 363]. This quote confirms our idea that we are dealing with epiphora, that is, it rather appeals to the reader's imagination, unlike a diaphora which appeals to the intuition. The references, or the frames, of the metaphor, include the verbal context of the two concepts: “hog” and “machine”. The first concept denotes well-to-do people, the latter one is compared with the Universe. Their frames are interconnected.

The above metaphors using the word “hog”, as well as a number of others listed below, can be identified as zoomorphic metaphors.

Think of this garden in which you are not a dog barking to keep the truth out! [Shaw 2010: 74].

Вспоминайте про наш сад, где вам не приходилось быть сторожевым псом, который лает, дабы преградить дорогу правде. [Shaw 1982: 205].

...but it's a god's life; and I don't own anything. [Shaw 2010: 80].

... но это собачья жизнь. А собственности никакой у меня нет [Shaw 1982: 176].

The attribute forming the zoomorphic metaphor “...you are not a dog barking to keep the truth out”, far from being significant for the original concept, contradicts the traditional associations with the word “dog”. A dog has always been known as a symbol of devotion, self-denying friendship and loyalty. However, these well-known characteristics have not been expressed in the language, and in metaphoric meanings quite opposite associations are used – those describing an evil person. We can suggest that the translators, guided by the negative associations with the metaphorical meaning “dog”, chose the Russian word “пес» (a male dog), which much more corresponds to the meanings of “evil” and is more expressive, that is, it plays the respective expressional function.

The following metaphor can be identified as a colour metaphor. Hector pronounces it speaking to Captain Shotover. The translation of the word “spark” evidently has a metaphoric meaning in the text. The character speaks about a divine spark - “I must believe that my spark ... is divine”. The meaning of the word “divine” in Russian is “given by god, a prophecy”. The focus of the metaphor is the word “spark” used in its indirect meaning: “something that inspires to act”. The metaphoric analysis of the word “spark” builds an image in our brain which corresponds to its direct meaning. In case of an indirect meaning, in the interpretation of the image created by the word “spark”, only colour associations emerge in our memory - for instance, “the spark in a man's soul” - the image that emerges is as follows: something sparks within a man inspiring him / her to act. The example of the metaphor under study is built with the help of the similar association, using the direct meaning of the word “spark” in respect to objects and phenomena which can only be compared in their semantic properties.

Further on, Bernard Shaw continues to employ his colour palette: “the red light over their door is hell fire” – he directly includes the adjective “red”, denoting a colour, into his vocabulary. The anadiplosis enables the reader to build a solid

colourful image in his brain confirmed with a “dual” colour metaphor. Bernard Shaw, speaking of the inhabitants of the “House”, gives them a light colour image, while Hector's phrase about “dealers” has an unpleasant, hot, dark, “bloody red” association. Adding the implicit meaning to the play, the author persuades the reader to share his views.

Further in the play, Bernard Shaw makes frequent use of metaphors, confirmed with similes or identities, with the help of anadiplosis. It is employed for the readers to focus their attention on the words, consciously creating an image consisting partially of the reader's personal experience and partially of the images which emerge after reading the text of the play, which itself builds an image completing it with some facts: "I took your father's measure. I saw that he had a sound idea, and that he would work himself silly for it if he got the chance. I saw that he was a child in business, and was dead certain to outrun his expenses and be in too great hurry to wait for his market." [Shaw 2010: 98]. "Я сразу раскусил вашего отца. Я видел, что идея у него хорошая и что он будет из кожи вон лезть, если ему дать возможность претворить ее в жизнь. И я видел, что в делах он суший младенец и не сумеет уложиться в бюджет и выждать время, чтобы завоевать рынок." [Shaw 1982: 219].

In conclusion, it should be noted that in the source text and in the target text there is a slight fluctuation of metaphoric information. The borders of the fluctuation fall within the limits set by the semantic properties of the language images, as well as by the tonality of the whole play.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Arutyunova, N.D. *Metaphor and Discourse // Theory of Metaphor / N.D. Arutyunova, M.A. Zhurinskaya // Perevod: Metafora i Diskurs. – M.: Progress, 1990. – 512 p.*
2. Black Max. *Metaphor, Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society / M. Black. – Oxford University Press, 1954. – Pp. 273–294.*
3. Mac Cormac, Earl R. *A Cognitive Theory of Metaphor / E. R. Mac Cormac. – MIT Press. –1958, – Pp.164-252.*
4. Ricoeur, P. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies in the Creation of Meaning in Language. – Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1975. – 157 p.*
5. Shaw, B. *Heartbreak House / B. Shaw. – Moscow, 2010.*
6. Shaw, B. *Plays / B. Shaw // Perevod: P'esy. – M.: "Pravda", 1982. – P. 164 – 252.*