Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет

ГУРИН Лев Сергеевич

Выпускная квалификационная работа

Transfer of emotive lexis in Russian translations of Jack London's "White Fang": a diachronic perspective /
Передача эмотивной лексики в разновременных переводах произведения Дж. Лондона «Белый клык»

Уровень образования: магистратура
Направление 45.04.02 «Лингвистика»
Основная образовательная программа ВМ.5791 «Литературный перевод»

Научный руководитель:
доцент, Кафедра английской филологии и перевода,
Лекомцева Ирина Алексеевна
Рецензент:
доцент, Кафедра иностранных языков,
ФГБОУ ВО «Санкт-Петербургский горный университет императрицы Екатерины II»,
Кольцова Елена Александровна

Санкт-Петербург
2024

Saint Petersburg State University

Gurin Lev Sergeevich

Qualification Research Paper

Transfer of emotive lexis in Russian translations of Jack London's "White Fang": a diachronic perspective

Level of education: Master's degree programme

Field 45.04.02 «Linguistics»

Educational programme BM.5791 «Literary translation»

Research supervisor:

Associate professor, Department of English

Philology and Translation,

Irina Alekseevna Lekomtseva

Reviewer:

Associate professor,

Department of Foreign Languages,

Saint Petersburg Mining University

Elena Alexandrovna Koltsova

Saint-Petersburg

2024

Contents

Introduction

As stated in the title, **the topic** of my graduation project is the "Transfer of emotive lexis in Russian translations of Jack London's "White Fang": a diachronic perspective". Thus, my research will combine the methodology of Translation Studies and Comparative Lexicology to give an interdisciplinary perspective.

In my research, I will focus on **the subject** of emotive lexis transfer, in particular, how it is performed in the three chosen translations and what degrees of equivalence to the original text can be achieved during this process. Regarding the **object of the research**, it will include various lexical items that represent emotions either by directly referring to them or carrying additional emotional meaning as connotations.

Choosing **the material** for my project, I opted for Jack London's novel *White fang* [see *References: Source materials*, M1] as the source text (further, ST), against which the translations will be analysed. The choice of material is motivated by the fact that the author's unique style of writing can be challenging for translators, especially in terms of preserving the emotional content of the original. Being one of the most popular London's texts, *White fang* is also interesting because it has been translated into Russian multiple times in different historical periods. As such, I hope that the comparison of the three chosen translations will also allow us to obtain a diachronic perspective on the subject.

To perform comparative translation analysis, I have chosen the following translations:

1. Published in 1913 as a "free addition to the journal *Novaya zhizn'*" with no further reissues, arguably the first full translation of *White fang* into Russian, made by M.A. Andreeva [M2].

2. One of the two most popular (according to both the number of reissues and readers' opinion) translations of the novel, made by N.S. Kaufman and published in

1926 [M3] with numerous reeditions and reissues (I am using the 2011 edition [M4] due to its better digital quality).

3. The most popular (often labelled as "classical") translation by N.S. Volzhina (representing I.A. Kashkin's Moscow school of literary translation), first published in 1961 with numerous further reissues [M5].

In terms of **methodology**, the material will be analysed in the comparative aspect: either comparing the ST and one of the target texts (TT), or comparing one of the translations with others. As a result, my **research will be text-based**, deriving all conclusions from the textual analysis without referencing translators' notes or letters (as it would significantly change the subject of the work and tremendously extend its scope).

In order to establish and maintain rigorous scientific approach, which answers the basic science criteria (especially such as the usage of clearly defined terminology, quantifiability and evidentiality), I have set the following **objectives**:

1. Establish theoretical foundation for the study of emotive lexis through the analysis of existing approaches to lexical meaning and lexical semantic fields.

2. Develop exact methodology of:
a) finding relevant lexical items, that either directly refer to emotions or have emotional connotations;
b) analysing such items with the use of dictionaries and language corpora, where dictionary data is used to precisely establish the contents of the word meaning, its semantics, and corpora data – to see how a given emotive word collocates with other words, i.e. whether such collocation is frequent and systematic or individual, idiosyncratic.
c) determining the level of equivalence of emotive lexis within the framework of linguistic model of translation.

3. Perform statistical analysis of the obtained data and link it to the diachronic perspective, outlining the changes in translators' strategies in relation to emotive lexis.

Together, the objectives will bring us closer to the **ultimate goal** of the research – to analyse in what ways and to what degree emotive lexis can be transferred in translation, based on the examples from the chosen material.

The **scientific relevance** of my research is supported by its interdisciplinary character, that encourages further collaboration between the Translation Studies scholars and specialists in other spheres of linguistics. I believe that modern Translation Studies can provide linguistics with a unique perspective on the relationship between languages, which is derived from practical translation experience and theoretical analysis of previous translations. At the same time, Translation Studies can benefit significantly from using other linguistic disciplines' methodology to explore new dimensions of translation analysis.

Apart from that, I believe that the **problem of emotions and emotionality is still controversial in linguistics**, even though it has been explored by a diverse group of scholars, such as V.I Shakhovskiy, V.N. Teliya, I.V. Arnold, E.M. Volf, Ch. Stevenson, M. Halliday, A. Wierzbicka, E. Tabakowska, M. Bednarek and many others. Even though modern linguistics is more aware of the subject of emotions than earlier, there is still no common point of view on status of emotions in the language and, in particular, the role and place of the emotional component in the structure of the lexical meaning. Even less explored is the question how emotions get transferred among different languages in the process of translation, which is why it is central in my research.

My graduation project will be **structured** in the following way: the first chapter will be dedicated to the overview of different theoretical approaches to the following problems (grouped in 4 sections):

1. What is word meaning, how it can be structured and what elements does it include?

2. What is the place of the emotional component inside the structure of word meaning and what are the main groups of emotive lexis?

3. What are lexical semantic fields, how words can be grouped into them and how do such fields correspond to different emotions?

4. What is translation equivalence and how equivalence-based approach may be applied to the problem of emotive lexis transfer in the process of translation.

Next, **the second chapter** will present the practical results achieved in my graduation project:

1. The first section will present the methodology that was used to select relevant lexical items and analyse them with the help of monolingual dictionaries, language corpora and advanced Internet search.

2. The second section will include the analysis of the examples, distributed into 4 groups, according to the level of equivalence between the emotive units in the source text and the target texts:

2.1) Full equivalence;

2.2) Partial equivalence;

2.3) Lack of equivalence;

2.4) Translator's omission/addition.

Finally, section 3 will summarise the results of the statistical analysis of translations in comparison between each other, representing the unique features of each of the translations in terms of their approach to the transfer of emotive lexis. As the final result, we will get a diachronic perspective, showing how translations of *White fang* changed with time in their approach to the emotive lexis. At that point, the goal and all the objectives of the research will be completed, calling for the final conclusion. Having discussed all preliminary notes, let us move forward to the theoretical chapter of our research.

Chapter 1. Theoretical basis of research of emotive lexis and problems of its transfer in translation

1.1 Word meaning, its structure and main theoretical approaches

To begin with, almost every linguistics student is familiar with the dichotomy between *langue* (language) and *parole* (speech), that was proposed by Ferdinand de Saussure in his *Cours de linguistique générale* (*Course in General Linguistics [De Saussure, 1995]).* According to Saussure's theory, language is a relatively stable system with a concrete structure and set of rules that exist in our mind independently of speech acts, while speech is represented by a potentially infinite number of separate speech acts that are not governed by any unified rule and represent unique instances of language use in real life. With that said, I would like to draw an analogy between this dichotomy and the relationship between *lexis* and *grammar*.

In this regard, *grammar* is akin to *langue*, as it represents a set of rules that structure the language and restrict its usage, establishing common ground for communication. Furthermore, *grammar* of modern languages is quite stable, being more resistant to changes than *lexis*. Contrary to that, *lexis,* or vocabulary, includes all potential lexical items of the language, which makes it a potentially infinite field of research. *Lexis* also shows more flexibility, constantly adapting to the changing reality surrounding the speakers of the language. Therefore, new lexical items appear, while familiar words gain and lose meanings, shift between different styles and registers of speech, become more rarely or frequently used and so on.

Although it is probably impossible to grasp the lexis in its entirety, there is a special field of linguistics that studies it – lexicology. In Soviet-Russian linguistics, it was explored by G. Shchur, V. Teliya, V. Gak, I. Arnold, I. Sternin and many others, while in the Western linguistics this tradition is represented by a significant number of scholars including D. Alonso, R. Barthes, G. Zuckermann, P.Roget, M. Halliday and many more.

As such, word meaning is the first essential concept that we should cover in preparation for the practical part of our research. First of all, it is worth noting that there is no complete agreement between scholars on what is included in the notion of the *word meaning*. The most important part of it is usually called *lexical meaning* (also, *denotate*), and it describes the relationship between the word and the object or concept represented by that word (denotate). Even though the words that refer to real objects (object (concrete) words) and to abstract things (indicative (abstract) words) have different qualities [Арутюнова, 1980], all of them have a denotate they refer to. Such approach allows us to describe the meaning of a particular word as a list of such reference objects or concepts:

Bear – 1. **A large, generally omnivorous mammal** (a few species are purely carnivorous or herbivorous), related to the dog and raccoon, having shaggy hair, a very small tail, and flat feet; a member of the family Ursidae; 2. (figuratively) **A rough, unmannerly, uncouth person**. 3. (finance) An investor who sells commodities, securities, futures or other things in anticipation of a fall in prices. 4. (CB radio, slang, US) A state policeman (short for Smokey Bear). [1970s] (etc)

Each of the definitions above can be broken down into smallest units of meaning, *semes*, which can be considered as "building bricks" of the lexical meaning. For example, as we can see from the second definition of the word *bear* given above, it can be used to describe a person with a certain set of qualities (*rough, unmannerly, uncouth*), all of which describe that person *in a negative way*. Therefore, we can conclude that *bear* can be used to express *negative evaluation* and some *negative emotion* (*annoyance, dislike, contempt*), making it a part of the *emotive lexis* of the English language (we will look closer at the place of emotional component of the word meaning in the next section).

Equally important is the fact that most words have several different meanings, but those meanings are not used with the same frequency. If we come back to the

word *bear*, its first meaning (a specific animal) will definitely be the most common one (if we take an average of a large corpus of English texts (e.g. British National Corpus or Corpus of Historical American English)). As a result, this meaning is considered to be part of the *nucleus* of the word meaning, while most others lie at its *periphery*.

Furthermore, *semes* can also be divided into *nuclear* and *peripheral* semes: the first ones are most often actualised in speech, while *peripheral* ones are only optional (or *potential*, as V.G. Gak puts it [Гак, 2010]). If we compare semes *human, female, adult* for the word *woman* and semes *tender, obedient, quiet*, we will find that the first three semes refer to the most fundamental qualities of a *woman* as a denotate, while the last three can only be potentially actualised in some unique speech situations.

Another way to look at the relationship between *nucleus* and *periphery* is to say that nuclear semes represent the so-called *intentional* meaning (*интенсионал*) that unites the class of denotates the word belongs to. Contrary to that, peripheral semes are part of the *implicational* meaning (*импликационал*) (the dichotomy is suggested by M.V. Nikitin [Никитин, 1983]). Based on the frequency of semes actualisation, we can distinguish between different degrees of *implicational meaning* (e.g. *mandatory, frequent, free, negative),* making their distinction more of a continuum, than a strict dichotomy.

While *denotate* of the word (the referred object or concept) and its *connotate* (speaker's attitude and emotion) represent the basis of the word meaning, some scholars also include in either one or both of the following components:

1. *Functional* component (also *functional-stylistic*) including
speech register (formal, informal) – in which registers of speech the word is used;
social component (younger generation's slang, professional jargon) – which social groups use the word (probably, in some particular meaning);
temporal component (dated, archaism) – when the word was used and if it is

considered modern or, instead, outdated in contemporary language.

territorial component (dialectal, colonial) – where the word or some particular meaning is used.

frequential component (common, rare, neologism, nonce word (occasionalism)) – how often the word is used.

2. *Grammatical component* – describes how the word interacts with other words (part of speech, gender or number agreement, frequently used prepositions and so on).

For example, such complex approach is used by V.I. Shakhovskiy who distinguishes between three main components of word meaning [Шаховский, 1987], such as *logical-objective component* (what is described by the word?), *emotional (emotive) component* (which emotion can be expressed with the word?) and *functional-stylistic* (in which speech situations and registers the word is usually used). Another classification, suggested by O. Zagorovskaya, lists three components [Загоровская, 2009:24-32]: denotation (the reference object), connotation (speaker's attitude and impression), imagery (originally, *образный компонент*) (which images does it produce in speaker's or recipient's imagination).

In our research, we decided to use I.A. Sternin's multi-level approach [Стернин, 1979] to the *word meaning* (*sememe* in Sternin's terminology). Firstly, *sememe* is divided into two "*mega-level components*": *lexical meaning* and *language-structural meaning*. Then, both of them are divided into two "*macro-level components*":

lexical meaning is divided into *denotative component* and *connotative component;*

language-structural meaning into *grammatical component* and *functional component* (*further divided into stylistic, social, temporal, territorial and frequential components*).

As a result, Sternin's methodology allows us to preserve the focus on the *denotate* and *connotate* (as *lexical meaning* is still the most fundamental component of the sememe). At the same time, it provides us with tools to analyse additional components, that may open new comparison dimensions for our translation analysis. I believe that my research will benefit the most from using such comprehensive approach suggested: for example, we will be able to explore the topic of word usage (including idiomaticity and the concept of unique items).

In order to fully utilise Sternin's framework, we will use, on the one hand, *dictionary data* (to precisely describe the lexical meaning of the English word and then compare it with its translation in Russian) and, on the other hand, corpora data and advanced Internet search (to define the functional components of the word meaning (how often it is encountered in texts, in what registers of speech it is used, etc)).

In the next section, we will define the place of emotional-evaluative component in the structure of word meaning and also discuss different approaches to the relationship between *emotion* and *evaluation* in lexicology.

1.2 Specific features of emotion words: emotional-evaluative component in the structure of word meaning

Now, as we have defined our approach to the word meaning and its structure, we will have a closer look at the notion of *emotion* and *evaluation*. While these two elements are generally included into lexical meaning under its *connotative* (emotive or other names) component, the relationship between them is still debated among scholars. One question is that whether *emotion* or *evaluation* can exist separately: in other words, can a word bear emotional meaning without giving evaluation (either positive or negative) or vice versa.

The problem is that these two concepts are closely tied to each other, which is logical given the definition of *emotion* as a person's *attitude* towards something, that can always be classified either as a *positive or negative* experience [Шаховский, 2008:276]. At the same time, *evaluation* also implies the dichotomy between *positive* and *negative*, which is impossible without some emotional reasoning. This brings us to another question: what is the place of *emotion* and *evaluation* in the lexical meaning? Is there any kind of hierarchy between those two concepts?

Regarding our second question, scholar's opinion is not univocal. Roughly speaking, there are three different positions:

1. *Emotion* and *evaluation* "do not represent two different components of the word meaning, as they are united (according to N.A. Lukyanova [Лукьянова, 1986:36]).

2. *Emotions* are part of the whole that is represented by *evaluation* (V.I. Shakhovskiy [Шаховский, там же]).

3. Both concepts imply each other, but "differ in their character" [Квасюк, 1983:29]. The difference, for example, is that "different subclasses of emotional phenomena are not equally evaluative in their character" [Вилюнас, 1976:48].

Navigating between these approaches, we should remember that we are interested only in the way how emotions are represented in the language. This is why Vilunas's claim that emotional phenomena are not equally evaluative (referring to emotional phenomena in general) is not enough to support the hypothesis that emotion and evaluation represent two different components in the sphere of language.

In my opinion, it is possible to solve this problem by introducing two different classes of emotive lexis: *emotion words* and *emotional words* (the terms suggested by M. Bednarek [Bednarek, 2008:10], see Bednarek's work for the comparison of similar terms by other scholars). First class includes all words that directly *denote* emotions (anger, fear, love, hatred, etc.). Thus, emotion words have emotions at the centre of their denotative component and can be neutral in terms of evaluation (as they actually lack emotional-evaluative component, presenting emotions as their denotes). To support this claim, we should remember that by saying *anger* or *sadness* we do not express either *positive or negative attitude (evaluation)* towards the emotion of anger itself (even though anger may be considered a negative (destructive) emotion, opposite to positive emotions like love, sympathy, etc.). In this situation, *emotional meaning* becomes more fundamental in the hierarchy, as it now represents a part of the denotative meaning.

However, even emotion words can express at least some degree of evaluation. Let us compare dictionary definitions of the two English set verbal phrases *to lose one's nerve* and *to chicken out*.

To lose one's nerve – To stop doing or fail to do something **because one lacks courage**.

To chicken out – (idiomatic, informal) To shy away from a daring task; to decline, refuse or avoid something **due to fear or uncertainty**.

Based on dictionary data, we can see that both phrases refer to a situation when a person doesn't do something (or stops some action) because they feel the

emotion of *fear*. Now, let us use corpora data to see if there is any difference in the speech register.

The query *chicken out* gives 19 hits in the British National Corpus (BNC) [See *References: Digital resources,* R1], out of which 2 hits are not relevant in our case – for example, featuring a noun *chicken* as an object of a phrasal verb *hold out* (*When I approached and held a piece of chicken out to him, he opened his eyes in surprise and at first refused to take it*). Similarly, the query *chickened out* has given us 22 hits, all of which were relevant. Analysis of relevant matches shows that this set phrase is most often listed in the category *Fiction and verse*, being used by younger generations of authors (from 25 to 45).

At the same time, queries *lost his nerve* and *lost her nerve* have given us 16 and 10 hits, respectively. Most of the hits also belong to the category *Fiction and verse*, though the usage frequency is more equally around different age categories of authors.

As a result, both dictionary data and corpora data suggest that *chicken out* is more often used in informal speech, while *lose one's nerve* seems to be its more neutral equivalent. Now, let us look at two examples taken from the social-political sphere:

1. "*I dismiss Reporters Without Borders. Completely nonsensical. We invited them in for a select committee hearing, and in the true heritage of free speech, they chickened out*" (BBC, quotation from BNCweb [R1]).

2. "*Zelensky was adaptable, trained not to **lose his nerve** under pressure*". (The Time magazine, quotation from COCA [R3])

In the first example, featuring the phrase *chicken out*, the context shows speaker's annoyance with a particular non-governmental organisation: evidently from *dismiss, completely nonsensical*). Thus, *chickened out* may have been chosen instead of *lose one's nerve* or other alternatives in order to express negative attitude towards the said organisation. That shows that *chicken out* at least has a potential to

15

express negative evaluation in suitable context and is probably more intense in doing so by changing the register of speech from neutral to informal.

The second example, on the contrary, is taken from a positive characteristic given by The Times to the Ukrainian President V. Zelensky. Here, *trained not to lose his nerve under pressure* is implied to express positive evaluation of this political figure. Given the neutral and more formal character of this set phrase, it suits this positive formal context more than *chicken out,* even though both phrases bear the same emotional meaning. To sum up these two examples, *emotion words*, directly referring to emotions, can express evaluation, even though it will be always less prominent and more context-based than their emotional meaning. It is especially true when we compare informal emotion words that have more potential of expressing negative evaluation due to their stylistic features and more formal, literary emotion words, having more potential of positive evaluation.

Now, let us look at the second class of emotive lexis, *emotional words*. It is represented by lexical items that contain emotional-evaluative meaning only as the part of their connotative meaning. For example, as we saw before, the word *bear* in one of its meanings (*(figuratively) A rough, unmannerly, uncouth person*) expresses *negative evaluation* and *implies* at least some degree of speaker's *dislike* towards the person they are calling *a bear*. With such words, the 1st approach by Lukyanova seems to be the best, as *emotion* and *evaluation* are united in that class of emotive lexis: most of the time, negative emotion comes along with negative evaluation and, similarly, positive emotion implies positive (or neutral) evaluation.

The idea that there are different types of emotive words has been present both in Russian linguistics (see E.M. Volf [Вольф, 1985:29], L.G. Babenko [Бабенко, 1989:10]) and foreign linguistics (e.g. M. Péter [Péter, 1984:246-7], L. Abu-Lughod and C.A. Lutz [Lutz, 1990:10], A. Athanasiadou and E. Tabakowska [Athanasiadou, 1998:xi]). Also worth noting is the idea that emotions are mostly universal across different cultures and languages, even though each language has its own set of emotion-related vocabulary (see for details the monography by A. Wierzbicka

[Wierzbicka, 1999]). Statistical data shows that emotional words with negative evaluation are more numerous in most languages (for example, data from L. Babenko's research of emotive lexis in the Russian language [Бабенко, там же]).

To sum up this section, emotions and evaluation are represented differently: emotion words (e.g. *love, hatred*) refer to emotions as their denotate and only occasionally express evaluation (which is less prominent than their emotional meaning), while emotional words (*bastard, sweety*) express both evaluation (positive or negative) and emotion (contempt, sympathy, etc.), where positive/negative emotions imply positive/negative evaluation, and vice versa. In the next subchapter we will explore the notion of lexical semantic field and how it can be used in the analysis of emotive lexis.

1.3 Semantic field, its structure and different approaches to it

The term *lexical field* (or *word field*) was coined by the German linguist Jost Trier [Trier, 1931], who believed that words inside such field influence one another. Thus, inside the lexical field words share the same continuum: as a result, when one word gets its meaning extended, other words' meanings narrow to free some space. In its original form, lexical field theory did not account for cases, when it is not easy to define a set of close words or when the meanings overlap each other or there are gaps between them.

Later, the term *semantic field* (sometimes also *lexical semantic field*) was introduced to refer to a set of words that are grouped by their meaning (semantically) and refer to a specific subject [Jackson, 2007:132]. As such, *semantic field* may be considered a logical abstraction, a result of cognitive analysis of a group of words. For example, verbs like *run, go, jump, crouch* all describe some kind of movement, which makes them a part of the semantic field *movement.* However, similarly to logical categories, semantic fields exist at different levels: there are more abstract and general semantic fields and there are fields that are more concrete and less *populated* (with words).

For example, the semantic field *emotion* will include all words that describe human emotions in any way: *love, hatred, fear, melancholy etc.* Next, we can highlight several subfields that will be dedicated to one particular general emotion: such are the subfields of *sadness, annoyance, love, hope* and many more. Of course, any of such fields can be broken down into even smaller subfields, which may describe a more or less intense degrees of an emotion (*displeasure* (low intensity) vs *annoyance* (normal intensity) vs *hate* (high intensity)), may be subject or object oriented (*to get afraid* (referring to oneself) vs *scare* (someone)).

Similarly, words inside one semantic field, for example, *verbs of speech* can express different connotative meaning:

Babble – 2. (intransitive) To talk **incoherently**; to utter **meaningless** words. 3. (intransitive) To talk **too much**; to chatter; to prattle. (**negative evaluation**)

Bemouth – (transitive) To mouth the praises of (a person); talk grandiloquently; declaim. (**potentially negative**, referring to being *too pompous*).

Declaim – To recite, e.g., poetry, in a theatrical way; to speak for rhetorical display; to speak pompously, noisily, or theatrically; bemouth; to make an empty speech; to rehearse trite arguments in debate; to rant. (potential for all options: neutral, negative, positive, depending on the context).

Mutter – To utter words, **especially complaints or angry expressions**, indistinctly or with a low voice and lips partly closed; to say under one's breath. (**often related to negative emotions like anger or annoyance**)

In order to construct a semantic field, we can use two different approaches: *onomasiological and semasiological*. The onomasiological approach requires us to start from an abstract concept (an object, an idea, a quality etc.) and then find different ways to refer to it (hence, its etymological Greek root ὀνομάζο *onomadzo* (to address by name, to give names [Liddell, 1996:1232]).

Therefore, if we ask ourselves how do we call the mental state when we feel irritated by something or someone, we will probably get the following set of words: *annoyance, anger, wrath, rage, ire, fury, displeasure, resentment, grudge, vexation, red mist* (idiomatic). Conversely, with semasiological approach (from Greek σημασία *sēmasia* "significance, meaning" [Liddell, Ibid:1592]*)* we would start with one given word (for example, *anger*) and then find out its meanings and its connection to other words. Similarly, we would end with a set of words that belong to the same semantic field.

Construction of a semantic field can also be interpreted as making a *thesaurus* [Halliday, 2004], similar to *Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases* [Roget,

1995]. For example, in Roget's Thesaurus noun *anger* is listed under the entering *resentment*, which includes not only nouns (such as *resentment, displeasure, anger, wrath, indignation etc.*), but also adjectives (*angry, wrath, irate, wrathful etc.*), verbs and verbal expressions (*resent, take offence, fly into a rage etc.*), and several other categories.

Speaking about the structure of semantic field, it can be viewed in two *perspectives*: the *horizontal* one (with the distinction between nucleus and periphery) and the *vertical* one (listing hierarchy of subfields). Starting with the horizontal perspective, nucleus contains words that are as close as possible to the key word, which underlies the entire field, while the periphery consists of words that only partly correspond to the meaning expressed by the key word. In our example with the semantic field *anger*, the nucleus would include such words as *anger, wrath, rage, fury* and some others, because the meaning of these words is ultimately close to the word *anger*. At the same time, on the periphery there will be such words as *annoyance, frustration, displeasure* (depicting less intense expression of *anger*) or *resentment, grudge, bitterness* (representing *anger* in curbed and hidden form).

Regarding the vertical perspective, as we discussed before, the semantic fields that describe more abstract concepts will have inside of them numerous subfields with a more concrete meaning. Thus, the semantic field *desire* in the English language will contain words such as *desire, dream, ambition, want, idea, aspiration, lust (*archaic*), longing, yearning* that can be grouped into smaller subfields:

General **desire, dream**;

More rational **inclination, intention, idea**;

Very strong desire (often sexual) **craving, lust**;

Mandatory **need, necessity**

Melancholic **longing, yearning**

More emotional and momentary **whim, caprice, impulse**.

For our research, semantic fields are important as they allow us to generalise the results obtained during the material analysis and get a wider perspective on the

distribution of emotive lexis among different lexical fields. Because translation by its nature cannot be fully equivalent to the original, we may expect some shifts in the distribution of emotions in the text. The next section of our research will be dedicated to the concept of equivalence and its application in the analysis of semantic losses and gains that happen with emotive lexis in the process of its transfer.

1.4 Concept of equivalence and its usage in translation analysis

Equivalence has been one of the central concepts in Translation studies, especially in works that use linguistic model of translation. As our research is based only on the relations between the original text and the three target texts, it also belongs to that linguistic paradigm in Translation studies. Equivalence, in general, can be defined as the degree (level) of similarity between the source text and target text that can be established by a meticulous comparison of the textual information.

Although the given definition of equivalence is mostly universal, the classification of different degrees of equivalence varies significantly among scholars of translation. That is why we would like to give a review of different approaches to equivalence and find the one that will be most useful in our research. Let us compare two major conceptual approaches to the problem of equivalence:

1. The first approach is represented by E. Nida (formal and dynamic equivalence [Nida, 1969]), P. Newmark (semantic and communicative equivalence [Newmark, 1988]), A. Pym (natural and directional equivalence [Pym, 2014]) and others. These two-part systems of equivalence classifications are based on the principal distinction between two types of equivalence:

The first one (formal, semantic, natural) can be achieved automatically ("cruise mode" by A. Pym) in the most straightforward way (being really close to *word-for-word translation* (*literal translation*);

The second type of equivalence (dynamic, communicative, directional) requires additional transformations and is used when translator encounters a problem that cannot be solved straightforwardly (such problem is called "a bump" by A. Pym) (also see Ryabtseva on *translation problems and solutions* [Рябцева, 2009]). This approach to equivalence does not distinguish different degrees of equivalence and, therefore, is not sufficient for the purposes of our research.

2. Another way to approach equivalence is to define the language levels where it is taking place. This method is used by W. Koller (denotative, connotative, text-

normative, pragmatic, formal equivalence [Koller, 1992]) and several Russian translation scholars (e.g. Shveitser distinguishes between three levels of equivalence [Швейцер, 1973], V. Komissarov – five levels (target of communication, situation description, statement, message, language signs) [Комиссаров, 1990:52-91]). That approach allows to distinguish between equivalence taking place on various levels (separate words, phrases, text, message etc), but it still doesn't provide us with tools to evaluate the degree of equivalence achieved at any of those levels.

I believe that for my research it would be better to not use any of the already existing approaches to equivalence, but develop a new system that will correspond to the following requirements. First of all, as we will be working with lexical meanings and semantic fields, we will be performing our analysis at two levels (the level of words and the level of phrases). At the word level, we will be comparing the sets of semes that are included in the words used in the source text and in the target texts, while at the level of phrases we will be interested in how the words are connected to each other (and how common in the language a particular combination of words is encountered).

Secondly, we are interested in a system that will allow us to evaluate the degree of equivalence between the ST and TT (i.e. in some examples we will have "full equivalence" because the sets of semes almost completely correspond to each other, while in some examples there will be "lack of equivalence" because emotive lexis in the ST and TT have no correspondence. Thus, we would like our system of equivalence to highlight the *losses* and *gains* that happen during the transfer of emotive lexis in the process of translation.

Thirdly, as we're mostly interested in correspondence of emotional-evaluative content of the texts, our system of equivalence should not be all encompassing. To the contrary, it should be centred around emotional-evaluative component of the word meaning and corresponding lexical-semantic fields that denote different fundamental emotions. This way, it will be possible to keep the scope of our research focused without shifting it to other elements of the text.

Therefore, in this section we analysed some of the most popular approaches to different levels of equivalence and decided on the set of requirements for the new special theory of equivalence that we will develop for that project. Using these speculative requirements, we will open the practical chapter of our research with the overview of our methodology and the presentation of the final system of equivalence that we will be using in the classification of examples.

In the next subsection, we will summarise the results of the theoretical chapter of our final graduation project.

Conclusions of the Chapter 1

1. In the first subchapter we have analysed different approaches to word meaning and decided on using the one suggested by I.A. Sternin as it is the most comprehensive approach, highlighting and structuring different components of the word meaning such as the denotative component, connotative component, grammatical component and functional component.

2. After that, we have reviewed several approaches regarding the place of emotion and evaluation in the structure of lexical meaning. We have highlighted that scholars disagree on the hierarchy of relations between emotion and evaluation (are they equal or is one of them more fundamental than the other one?). To solve this problem, we have established two classes of emotive lexis that differ in the distribution of emotional-evaluative meaning between their denotative and connotative component: 1) *emotion words* that directly refer to emotions, are part of the emotive lexis due to the nature of their denotative component and, most commonly, do not express any evaluation (with some exceptions discussed before); 2) *emotional words* that have emotional-evaluative meaning in the connotative component and, thus, always combine positive/negative emotional meaning with either positive or negative evaluation.

3. In the third section, we have discussed the concept of the lexical semantic field, which can offer us additional options in the analysis of examples. As semantic fields are more abstract and speculative than separate words with their meanings, they allow to establish a profound system of classification with a hierarchy of subfields to show how different emotions are distributed among our textual material.

4. In the final section, we have looked at different approaches to the concept of equivalence and decided that they are not fully suitable for the purposes of our research. As a result, we have prepared a set of requirements that we will need to satisfy while designing our own system of classification that will be focused on the emotional meaning and will distinguish between several degrees of its equivalence.

As such, we have prepared the theoretical foundation for the analysis of the material which we will perform in the next chapter.

Chapter 2. Practical analysis of emotive lexis transfer in translations of Jack London's *White fang*

2.1 Methodology of research and classification of examples

At the beginning of the practical part, we would like to introduce the reader to the material we will use. For an English source text, we have chosen the novel *White fang* written by Jack London (real name John Griffith Chaney, 1876-1916) and published in 1906 by Macmillan Inc. Choosing the material, we followed several requirements:

1) it should be a text that was created in the relatively distant past (but not too deep in the history, as it complicates the analysis and the work of translators too) – ideally, the end of the 18th century or the beginning of the 19th century;

2) there should be available several translations of it in Russian that were created in different time periods (in order to add a diachronic perspective to our project by comparing the chosen translations);

3) the text should be familiar to the Russian readers and have the status of a "classical" text of its period (in order to focus on the subject of research, instead of introducing a little-known text from the periphery of the literature process);

4) it should represent author's original style of writing and creative use of language (which is pretty common for Jack London's texts, especially for *White fang*).

In order to fully represent diachronic perspective in our analysis, we have chosen three translations that were created in 1913 (by M.A. Andreeva), 1926 (N.S. Kaufman) and 1961 (N.A. Volzhina). The translation by Andreeva is the first ever translation of the novel into Russian language that we managed to find, and it uses the pre-reform Russian orthography. The translation by Kaufman is relatively popular (as can be seen on the Internet forums where readers share their thoughts on

different translations), though it is Volzhina's translation that is believed to be the ultimate standard.

Next, we would like to introduce the algorithm we used to work with material:

1) The first step is the search for examples. This process involves careful reading of all four texts one by one highlighting all lexical items that may carry emotional-evaluative meaning. While the main focus it on the source text as the basis of comparison, it is also important to pay attention to the cases when the translations have emotive lexis that is not present in the ST (making those items a product of translator's addition).

2) Next, we should check our hypotheses regarding the presence of emotional meaning with the use of monolingual dictionaries. For Russian words and phrases, we most commonly used "Словарь русского языка в 4-х томах" (ed. by А.П. Евгеньева [70, 1999]), also occasionally using "Фразеологический словарь русского литературного языка" (ed. by А.И. Фёдоров [77, 2008]). For English we used Cambridge Online Dictionary [R7], Wiktionary.org [R6] and the online version of the Oxford English Dictionary [R8].

3) The following step is to check how *natural* (idiomatic) in the language is the used word or phrase. In order to assess the degree of idiomaticity, it is necessary to check how often it is encountered in the non-translated texts. For that purpose, we have used the following language corpora:

The Russian National Corpus [R11] – for all examples in Russian language (see the article on the corpus [Савчук С.О. и др., 2024];

Corpus of Historical American English (COHA) [R2]). – providing comparative diachronic perspective for most of the English examples;

British National Corpus (BNC) [R1] – additional checks and British English data;

Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) [R3] – additional comparisons with the Contemporary state of the English language.

Apart from these, we have also utilised advanced Internet search via Google [R4] and Bing Search [R5] in cases when the corpora didn't have enough usage data.

4) Following that, we distributed the examples into four groups according to the system of equivalence that will be described after that algorithm.

5) The final step included the statistical analysis (the number of examples in each group and their distribution among semantic fields of emotions in different translations) and the diachronic analysis (the changes in the results of emotive lexis transfer in all three translations compared between each other).

Having established the algorithm, let us have a closer look at the classification of examples. It is based on the notion of equivalence, though we have restricted it to the sphere of emotional and evaluative meaning. Furthermore, we will be using the concept of semantic fields in order to establish the degree of equivalence that was achieved in the translation. The four degrees go as follows:

1) Full emotional equivalence – the translation and the source text use lexical items that belong to parallel semantic fields in both languages (for example, the semantic field *anger* corresponds to the field *гнев* in Russian, making the translation *разозлиться* fully equivalent to the original *to get angry*, as both of them depict the same emotional concept and have the seme of *acquiring such emotional state* (i.e. *start feeling angry*)). In this situation the set of semes represented by the translated word will have almost complete correspondence to the set represented by the word from the original text.

2) Partial emotional equivalence – the lexical items used in both texts can be seen as a part of two parallel general semantic fields representing one basic emotion, but at the same time they belong to different subfields (e.g. the original text has the phrase *became depressed* (that is related to the field *sadness* and has the additional seme of *higher intensity* (+intensity)) while the translation uses *взгрустнул* (that

29

belongs to the field *грусть*, but expresses the seme of *lower intensity* (-intensity)). In the example above, both words belong to corresponding semantic fields in both languages (*sadness* and *грусть*), but belong to different subfields due to the opposite semes of intensity.

3) Lack of equivalence – in this case, compared lexical items belong to completely different semantic fields and represent different emotions that cannot be seen as two relatively close variants of one basic emotion. As an example, the translation uses *струхнул* (*got afraid*, semantic field *страх*) for *is almighty blue* (*is extremely sad, melancholic*, part of the field *sadness* (*melancholy*)). In this case, there is no emotional equivalence between the translation and the original.

4) Omission or Addition – this extra group includes all cases when the emotive lexis is not present either in the target text (thus, being *omitted* by the translator for some reason) or in the source text (making it a translator's *addition*). Such additions or omissions change the overall emotional balance of the text by introducing new emotional meanings and omitting the ones present in the original.

2.2 Transfer of emotive lexis and translation equivalence

2.2.1 Full emotional equivalence and its degrees

Let us start from the highest degree of equivalence that is seen in the examples and then proceed to the lower degrees step by step. The examples in this section will have numbers starting with 1. (e.g. 1.1, 1.2) to keep them separated from the later examples.

Example 1.1. The first example will show us how full equivalence can be achieved in translation of remarks about character's speech. In this case, we will use all three translations to show the different ways of achieving such degree of emotional equivalence.

ST: "They've half got you a'ready a-talkin' like that," Henry **retorted sharply**.

T1 (M. Andreeva, 1913): «Да послушать вас, так они уже наполовину вас съели!» – **с раздражением ответил** Хенри.

T2 (N. Kaufman, 1926): «Тебя, дурака, они уже наполовину съели», -- **резко возразил Генри.**

T3 (N. Volzhina, 1961): «Ты, можно считать, уже попался, если столько говоришь об этом», -- **отрезал** его товарищ.

Let us start with the analysis of the original:

to retort – to provide a sharp or witty reply, or one which turns an argument against its originator.

sharply – 5. of speech, delivered in a stern or harsh tone.

As we can see from the dictionary data, the original has the verb *retort* which has the seme of *sharpness, annoyance* in the denotative component of its meaning. This makes *retort* an *emotion word*, that belongs to the semantic subfield *sharp (rude) reply* (alongside *comeback, rejoinder* or *back answer*) and may be related to the

emotion of *annoyance*. The intensifier *sharply* further amplifies the emotional intensity, while it may also be considered a sign of speech redundance (as *retort* already has the seme of *sharpness, harshness* by itself).

According to the data from the COHA [R2], the verb *retort* is encountered 306 times in texts from 1820 to 2010, being most commonly used in the 1920s (33 matches) and 1910s (27 matches), which makes it a completely natural choice for London. In its turn, the adverb *sharply* has 14 292 matches in the same period, being most commonly used in the period from 1900 to 1960 (more than 1000 matches in each decade of the period). At the same time, the whole phrase *retorted sharply* has only 16 matches (most commonly in the texts from the 1880s and 1960s (3 matches each)). Even though, most of the matches belong to the category of fiction, thus making it a natural part of the literary language.

Now let us turn our attention to the translations. starting with Kaufman's T2, which uses the same grammatical structure as the original (Adv. of intensity + Verb).

возразил – Выразить несогласие с кем-, чем-либо, высказать довод против чего-либо.

резко – нар. к резкий – 5. Лишённый мягкости, учтивости; дерзкий, грубый.

In this case, the verb *возразить* only carries the meaning of *disagreement* and doesn't have the seme of *sharpness* or *rudeness,* which, in turn, is preserved in the adverb *резко.* As a result, the grammatical structure is the same as in the original text, while the distribution of emotional meaning is somewhat different. Even though, it can be considered fully equivalent to the original, as the whole phrase *резко возразить* can also be attributed to the semantic subfield *резкий ответ* (parallel to *sharp reply*), expressing the same emotion of *annoyance* (*раздражение*).

The verb of speech *возразить* has 17 916 matches in the RNC [R12], while the adverb *резко* – 30 383 matches. The whole verbal phrase *резко возразить* is listed 70 times, being found in texts from 1863 to the present day. As a result, we

can conclude that both the source text and the target text (T2) use lexical items that are equally common in the source language and the target language respectively.

Next, we will look at the translation by M. Andreeva (T1). It is different in terms of its grammatical structure, as it employs a prepositional phrase with a noun in Instrumental case to modify the meaning of the main verb.

ответить – 1. *перех., с союзом* «что» и *без доп.* Дать ответ (в 1 знач.) на заданный вопрос, обращение.

раздражение – 3. Чувство острого недовольства, досады, злости.

Thus, the neutral verb of speech *ответил* that doesn't characterise the emotion of the reply here is expanded with the prepositional phrase *с раздражением*, that directly refers to the emotion *раздражение* (*annoyance*). We may note that there is a significant number of examples both in the source text and the translations, where either the construction *Adv. + Verb of speech* or *Prep. phrase + Verb of speech* is used to introduce characters' emotions into author's remarks about their speech. Most of the time, these examples show the highest degree of equivalence, also being relatively similar in all translations. In this case, T1 is also fully equivalent to the original (with the note that the grammatical structure is different and the emotional meaning is absent from the verb of speech itself).

Interestingly enough, the verbal phrase *с раздражением ответил* is 10 times more common than its reverse equivalent with the prepositional phrase in post position (22 vs 2 matches in the RNC). Even though it is relatively less commonly used than the option from Kaufman's translation, it also seems to be natural for the Russian language.

Finally, the third translation by Volzhina is the most concise one, using only the verb of speech *отрезал*.

отрезал – *также без доп. Разг.* Резко ответить, желая прекратить разговор.

As we can see, the definition of this Russian verb does remind us of the definition of *retort*, and we can see that both of them belong to the subfield SHARP REPLY. In this case, the translation does not employ any adverb (probably redundant with the given verb) and combines both the emotion and the notion of reply in one word (similar to *retort* in the original).

The verb отрезать has more than 10 thousand matches in the corpus, but it is important to differentiate between its basic meaning (to cut) and the one we see in T3. To do so, we will refine our search query the following way:

We will do two queries, one for the combination of the verb *отрезать* with a personal pronoun in the Nominative case ((SPRO) & (nom) & (1p | 2p| 3p)) and another for its combination with a personal noun (S & (famn | persn | patrn) in the RNC syntax). Apart from that, both queries will be limited to include only those cases when the verb is intransitive, thus filtering out most of the nonrelevant meanings (which require this verb to be transitive).

As a result, we have received 134 and 412 matches for each combination, respectively. Most of the times (approximately 90% of the cases), the noun or pronoun is in postposition to the verb, as it is in Volzhina's translation. Based on this data, we can conclude that T3 also uses a perfectly idiomatic Russian equivalent for the similarly natural English expression from the source text, even surpassing the two other translations in terms of its idiomaticity by using a *unique item* of the Russian language (see [Tirkkonen-Condit, 2004] for more details).

Thus, in all three translations a full degree of equivalence is achieved, even though it is done in a different way each time. This is why we believe it is important to compare both the meaning of the words and phrases in our example and the way the meaning is transferred: especially since the frequency distribution of such ways of expression is not equal in the language, which we have seen from the corpora data.

In the next example, we will look at the situation when the author uses a unique metaphor to see how its emotional content can be transferred in translation.

Example 1.2. ST: "If that pack ever starts to jump you, them three cartridges 'd **be wuth (*sic, =worth*) no more'n three whoops in hell".**

T1: Если стая набросится на вас, то **ваши три заряда вам не помогут** [*Omission*].

T2: Если вся эта стая нападёт на тебя, то твои три заряда будут всё равно, **что три ведра воды в аду**.

T3: Если они на тебя всей стаей набросятся, три патрона тебе **помогут, как мёртвому припарки**.

In order to justify our claim that the original uses a unique metaphor, we will consult both the dictionary and the language corpora (alongside Internet search).

whoop – 1. A loud, eager cry, usually of joy.

three whoops in hell – There is no entry in the dictionary for that phrase, nor it is listed in COCA or BNC. Despite that, there is one entry for that expression in the COHA. According to it, this phrase is used in the play *The Return of Peter Grimm,* written by David Belasco (1853-1931) and published in 1911 (six years after the publication of London's *White Fang*).

The context is as follows: "As I look at it, he wished to give you something he had used – something personal. Perhaps the miniature and the fob **ain't worth three whoops in Hell**, – it's the sentiment of the thing that counts". The phrase structure is similar to our source text and the supposed meaning is similar too (worth **nothing at all**). Assumably, the logic is that *three whoops in hell* where every soul is supposed to be screaming with pain will not change anything, being equal to nothing (similar to the meaning and the imagery of *три капли в море* in Russian).

Furthermore, Internet search shows that most of the time this phrase is associated with London's text (either in its reproductions on the sites or on the readers' forums). Other entries include the beforementioned play by Belasco and some random personal blogs and sites ([R9](), [R10](), [R11]()). Given that, London's usage

of the phrase remains the earliest, which makes it possible that he was the first to coin it. Regardless of that, the phrase may be considered a unique item in translation due to its high rarity, which makes its transfer especially difficult. Our assumption is that *three whoops in hell* belong to the category of *emotional words*, combining the notion of *nothing* with the emotion of *contempt*, similar to **petty**, **trivial**, **trifling**, *insignificant*.

petty – (often derogatory) Having little or no importance.

trivial – Ignorable; of little significance or value.

Now that we have established the meaning of the original phrase, let us look at the Kaufman's translation (T2) – *всё равно, что три ведра воды в аду*. As we can see, the notion of *hell* is also present here, while instead of *three whoops* we have the metaphor of *three buckets of water*. This phrase is not listed in the Russian National Corpus, and most of its matches obtained with the Internet search refer back to Kaufman's translation. The only example [R13] we found is from an original story by an independent Russian author – *А если так, то все мази, прописанные милым врачом, как **три ведра воды в аду***. Based on the context, we can assume that in both examples the phrase has the meaning similar to the original and is used to express character's *contempt (пренебрежение)* of something that is *insignificant* or just *not enough*. Thus, in this case we are dealing with fully equivalent (in terms of emotional content) translation that also preserves relative linguistic uniqueness of the original by introducing a new word combination that is unnatural for the Russian language.

Contrary to that, Volzhina's translation (T3) has *помогут, **как мёртвому припарки***, which is a fixed phrase naturally used in Russian.

как мёртвому припарки – Разг. Пренебр. Ничуть, нисколько (не поможет). О том, что совершенно бесполезно. — *Не помог что ли, перец-то? — Как мёртвому припарки.* (Б. Полевой. Дефицитная бабушка). [Фразеологический словарь, 2008].

This expression is listed 12 times in the Russian National Corpus, also having a significant number of matches in the Internet (45 600 results via Google). Analysis of its definition shows its relation to the emotion of *contempt* (thus, the note *Пренебр.* in the dictionary) and is similar to the original notion of *nothingness*. Based on this data, we can infer that this fixed expression is a *natural idiomatic* equivalent to the unique metaphor used in the London's novel.

Lastly, in the Andreeva's translation (T1) the unique metaphor is omitted with any sign of its emotional content, which puts this case to the last degree of equivalence that we established – Omission of emotive lexis. Anticipating the final results, we express the observation that *omissions of emotive lexis* are quite frequent in T1, especially in cases with author's unique expressions.

Example 1.3. This example will be featured both in this section and the section on additions and omissions (Example 4.1). Here, we will introduce only two of the translations (T1 and T3), as we believe them to be fully equivalent to the original, although they employ completely different means to achieve such equivalence.

The context is as follows: One of the characters, Henry, is worried about his friend's (Bill) condition. Both characters are chased by the wolves, and they have lost some of their sled dogs, so their lives are at risk. Even though they are not close friends, Henry is worried for Bill's mental health and decides to cheer him up.

ST: "There's no mistaking it**,** Bill's **almighty blue**. I'll have to cheer him up tomorrow.

T1: Билл в самом деле **находится в очень мрачном настроении**. Завтра надо будет его подбодрить.

T3: «**Хандрит** Билл. Надо будет растормошить его завтра».

In the original text Henry describes the situation in an informal way: *Bill is almighty blue*.

blue – 2. (informal) Depressed, melancholic, sad.

almighty – (slang) Great; extreme; terrible.

As such, *blue* is related to the semantic field of *sadness* (*melancholy* etc.) and is an *informal* expression. The emotion is further intensified by the modifier *almighty* (a more formal equivalent would be *absolutely, greatly* and so on). The grammatical construction is as follows: *blue* is the part of the compound nominal predicate with the auxiliary verb *to be*, while *almighty* is an adverb of degree, that modifies the meaning of *blue*.

The combination used in the source text (*almighty blue*) seems to be rather unique in the English language, having no exact matches in either the BNC or COHA. Furthermore, even though the collocation *almighty blue* can be found via Internet search, there are no relevant examples of this phrase used as a part of a nominal predicative phrase (e.g. "is almighty blue"), with the only exception being London's original text. Furthermore, the adverb *almighty* seems to have no natural collocates among English adjectives or even pronominal adjectives, according to the BNC data. As a result, it is a completely unique expression, encountered only in our source text and representing author's creative use of language.

Compared to the original, T1 employs a rather large grammatical construction: the verb *находиться* governs the prepositional phrase *в очень мрачном настроении,* where the emotional state is included as an attributive adjective *мрачном* and further intensified by the adverb of degree *очень.*

настроение – **1.** *обычно с определением.* Душевное состояние.

мрачный – Погружённый в тяжёлое раздумье, испытывающий чувство безотрадности, безнадёжности; угрюмый.

очень – *нареч.* Весьма, чрезвычайно, в сильной степени.

As is indicated by the dictionary, the word *настроение* (in its first, most basic, meaning) is most commonly used with an attribute, which makes it neutral by itself.

It makes it similar to the English word *mood,* that has to be modified by other words in order to reflect a person's emotional state (*bad mood, good mood* and so on).

Using the RNC, we have obtained 215 matches for that construction, limiting our query with two lemmas (*находиться, настроение)* where the second word should be in the Prepositional case (to filter out nonrelevant constructions). In the diachronic perspective, this construction was used most commonly around the year 1900 (two times more often than in the 1870s and three times more so than in the 2nd half of 20th century), making it a natural choice for Andreeva's translation. As a result, the uniqueness of London's expression is neutralised, even though its emotional meaning is fully preserved. In terms of grammatical structure and frequency of usage, it is similar to the English phrase [to be] *in a (adjective) mood*.

mood – 1. A mental or emotional state, composure**.**

Compared to London's unique expression, the aforementioned construction is exceptionally common in English, for example, having more than 3100 matches in the BNC.

The last translation, T3, in this case is once more (as in Example 1.1) the most concise.

хандрить – Быть в мрачном настроении, испытывать чувство тоски, уныния.

хандра – Мрачное, тоскливое настроение, тоска, уныние.

By utilising only one verb *хандрить,* Volzhina manages to achieve full equivalence to the original, as this verb both introduces the topic of one's emotional state and also immediately states its connection to the emotion of *грусть*. Apart from that, dictionary data shows that it represents *мрачное, тоскливое настроение,* which makes it even more intense than the basic emotion *грусть* (which is described as *чувство лёгкого уныния):*

грусть – Чувство печали, легкого уныния.

тоска – 1. Тяжелое гнетущее чувство, душевная тревога.

печаль – 1. Чувство грусти и скорби, душевной горечи.

уныние – Мрачное, подавленное состояние духа.

Given the definitions we have, we could imply that *грусть* and *тоска* in the Russian language describe less intense degrees of *sadness* or *melancholy* in comparison with *тоска, уныние (*that are closer to *depression* or *extreme sadness*).

According to the corpus, the verb *хандрить* is encountered from as early as the 1830s to the present day, having 339 entries in the RNC. Thus, it is idiomatic in Russian.

Based on all the data, we conclude that both T1 and T3 are fully equivalent to the original in this case. At the same time, it is interesting to note that one of the translations achieves this degree of equivalence with the use of a large and complex grammatical construction, while the other utilises only one word, which meaning seems to cover most of the meaning expressed in the original text. Even though the unique character of London's vocabulary is not preserved in either of the translations, both of them are fully equivalent to the source text in terms of emotional-evaluative meaning.

Additionally, this example shows two different ways to introduce a situation when one character assesses an emotional state of another character in their speech. As we could see, both Russian and English have several different constructions to use in this case, which include a compound nominal predicate where the nominal part expresses the emotion, a prepositional phrase with a verb of state or just a standalone verb.

2.2.2 Partial emotional equivalence

In this subsection, we will analyse examples where the overall emotional meaning is preserved in the translation, even though some details of it do not correspond to the original.

Example 2.1. ST: "There, that'll **fix you fool critters**," Bill said with satisfaction that night, standing erect at completion of his task.

T1: Вот так, теперь вы не убежите, **глупыя животныя**! – сказал в тот вечер Билл, когда, наконец, окончил свою работу

T2: Вот что вас удержит, **глупые твари, --** сказал в тот же вечер Билл, самодовольно оглядывая свою работу.

T3: Ну, **безмозглые твари**, теперь уж никуда не денетесь, -- с довольным видом сказал Билл на очередной стоянке.

Here we are interested in the noun phrase *fool critters* and its translations. In this scene, Bill, one of the characters, is referring to the sled dogs that had been running away one by one before he decided to tie them. Given that he is not talking about wolves, but his dogs, we can make an assumption that he wouldn't use the rudest words in his lexicon.

critter – (usually endearing) A creature, an animal.

fool – (informal) Foolish – (of a person, an action, etc.) Lacking good sense or judgement; unwise.

Dictionary data shows that *critter* is a modified (presumably dialectal) version of the word *creature* and, at least in the Contemporary English, is most often used *endearingly,* conveying the emotion of *endearment*. Next, *fool* belongs to the semantic field *unwise*, while being less emotionally intense than such words as *stupid, idiotic* or *absurd*, but close to informal *silly* or neutral *unwise*.

The noun *critter* has 866 matches in COHA, most commonly encountered in the texts from the 1840s (86 matches) and 1910 (86). Despite that, the whole phrase

fool critter(s) is not listed in either COHA or BNC, while most matches obtained via Internet search refer back to the London's White Fang. Even though the word *critter* can be used with an adjective (*smart critter, little critter* (collocations from BNC)), we can conclude that this exact combination is a unique item created by London.

Let us look at the translations now, we will start with T3 by Volzhina.

тварь – 1. Устар. и прост. Живое существо. Твари земные. Бессловесные твари (животные).

2. прост. О подлом, мерзком человеке. ‖ Употребляется как бранное слово.

безмозглый – Разг. презр. Очень глупый, бестолковый.

Dictionary data suggests that the adjective *безмозглый* is higher in its intensity than *fool* (because it is **очень** *(+Intensity adverb)* + *глупый (foolish)*), also having a shade of *contempt (презр.)*. Furthermore, although *тварь* can be a neutral (and dated) word in literary language (as in *твари божии*), here it most certainly carries *negative evaluative meaning* and describes character's *contempt* towards the dogs. All in all, Volzhina's translation here carries significantly more emotional intensity, though in general the emotion of *annoyance* is preserved, allowing the translation to stay partially equivalent to the original.

In terms of frequency of usage, the phrase *безмозглая тварь* (including all grammatical variations) has only 4 correspondences in the Russian National Corpus, all of which belong to the period from 1989 to 2001. As such, it may be considered relatively rare. However, the noun *тварь* is often used with other adjectives (most commonly, *живой, божий (*both in pre- and postposition*), новый, подлый, разумный)*. Based on that, we can say that such a combination is possible and is rather natural, even though it may be considered too intense and less literary.

Now, let us look at the other two translations. Both of them use the adjective *глупые* instead of *безмозглые*, which can be considered more common and more neutral (positioned right at the nucleus of the semantic field *глупый*)

Compared to T3, the adjective *глупый* is more often used in combination with the given noun, having 10 matches instead of 4 (2.5 times more often).

глупый – Умственно ограниченный, неумный.

The difference between T1 and T2 in this example lies in the choice between *животные* or *твари*. The former is the most neutral and basic designation for *any living being (usually not including plants and opposed to human),* while the latter has already been discussed above.

животное – Всякое живое существо, исключая растения. Живое существо в противоположность человеку.

Interestingly enough, the phrase *глупое животное* is more commonly encountered in the Russian National Corpus (20 times, mostly in the 1840s and 1880-1920s). Thus, all three variants of translation are idiomatic in the Russian language, in contrast with the uniqueness of London's expression for English.

As a result, T1 may be considered fully equivalent to the original in this case, preserving both the notion of *slight annoyance* and *tenderness* towards the dogs. Contrary to that, T2 and T3 have a different emotional balance that is leaning towards *contempt*.

Example 2.2. In the next example, we will look at a situation similar to the example 1.1, where the original text uses a combination of verb of speech plus an adverb of manner. The dialogue features Bill's displeasure with the fact that Henry made coffee only for himself (the day before Bill had sworn to not drink his coffee in case any of the dogs would disappear, which did happen overnight).

ST: "Say, Henry," he **chided gently**, "ain't you forgot something?"

Т1: Послушайте, Хенри, -- **с упрёком** проговорил он, -- не забыли ли вы чего?

Т2: Скажи-ка, Генри, -- проговорил он **добродушно**, -- ты ничего не забыл?

Т3: Слушай, Генри, -- сказал он **с мягким упрёком**, -- ты ничего не забыл?

As in example 1.1 with the verb *retort*, the English text has the verb *chide* that introduces both characters speech (acting as any other verb of speech) and additionally the emotion of the character.

chide – (transitive) To admonish in blame; to reproach angrily. (intransitive, obsolete) To utter words of disapprobation and displeasure; to find fault; to contend angrily.

Evident from the dictionary definition, *chide* usually implies a high degree of *annoyance* (*angrily, words of disapprobation and displeasure)*. However, the author uses it with the adverb *gently* as a negative *intensity* (-intensity) modifier.

gently – in a gentle manner

gentle – soft and mild rather than hard or severe

This allows the original text to combine the emotion of *annoyance* with the fact that Bill has only awoken from sleep and is in a relatively good mood (hence, the *softness* of his speech).

The verb *chide* is present in 440 examples from the COHA, being most common for the texts from the 1st half of the 19th century (around 150 examples or 35% of all), relatively common in the 2nd half of the same century (100 examples) and considerably rare in texts from the 20th century (about 10-15 matches each decade). The whole phrase *chided gently* is listed in COHA only 5 times (1 in the 1910, and other 4 in the 1980-2010s), also being included one time in BNC (*He*

*glanced back at the dead girl and smiled, as if to **chide her gently** for her folly*). Thus, it is relatively rare, but not unique to London's texts.

In comparison to the original, the balance of emotional content is different in all Russian translations. All translations in this case use neutral verbs of speech that do not carry any emotional meaning by themselves (compare with *chide* in the ST).

проговорить – 1. (*несов.* проговаривать) *перех.* Сказать какие-л. слова, фразы; произнести.

сказать – 1. *перех.* и *без доп.* Выразить словесно (в устной речи) какую-л. мысль, мнение, сообщить что-л.; произнести.

Instead, the emotional meaning is transferred via the use of either of two constructions (familiar to us from the example 1.1):

Verb of speech + Prepositional phrase;

Verb of speech + Adverb of manner.

The T1 employs the prepositional construction in its simplest form (Preposition + Noun in Instrumental case).

упрёк – Укоризна, обвинение, высказанные кому-л. или по отношению к кому-л.

Consequently, the noun *упрёк* allows the translator to preserve the emotional meaning of *chide* (an *angry reproach*). At the same, the meaning of *gently* is not transferred in T1, making character's words harsher and more intense. Corpora data shows that *с упрёком проговорить* is present in 11 texts from different time periods (from 1875 to 2013), which makes it relatively rare, as the phrase from the source text. It is also interesting to note that it can be modified with an adjective *лёгкий* to soften the emotional intensity: «*Вы прежде были со мной откровенны, — **с лёгким упрёком** произнесла Елена*». *(Тургенев, Накануне) [НКРЯ]*.

Compared to that, T3 uses the same grammatical construction, but with an adjective *мягкий*, that is mostly equivalent to *gentle* and is used here to *lower* the emotional intensity and *soften* character's speech.

мягкий – 6. Лишенный резкости, грубости.

In its turn, T2 uses the adverbial construction to modify the verb *проговорить* with an adverb *добродушно*.

добродушно – нареч. к добродушный – Мягкий и добрый, расположенный к людям, ко всему окружающему.

The corpus shows only 3 examples of such usage, making it even more rare than the previously discussed options.

Although the emotional meaning of *добродушно* seems to correspond fully to *gently,* it does not convey the notion of *reproach* (*упрёк*). As a result, both are T1 and T2 are only partially equivalent to the original text, as each of them loses one part of the emotional content of the original (either the notion of *reproach* or *its softness*), while T3 may be considered fully equivalent (with a note that it uses a different grammatical construction to transfer the original meaning).

Example 2.3. In this example we will look at the situation when the original uses a neutral word, but the surrounding context brings some emotional meaning to it. Thus, we will see that 2 of our translations have a less neutral equivalents for this word.

ST: "Hello, you **husky**!" he called. "Come here, you whatever-your-name-is."

T1: Эй, ты, **растрёпа**! – крикнул он. – Поди сюда!

T2: Эй, ты, **лохматый**, -- воскликнул он. – Пойди сюда! Как тебя зовут?

T3: Эй ты, **лайка!** – крикнул он. – Подойди-ка сюда… Как там тебя зовут!

The original uses a neutral common word *husky*:

husky (2) – Any of several breeds of dogs used as sled dogs.

sled-dog – Any dog, such as a husky, that pulls a sled as part of a team.

In this situation, the character is talking to a she-wolf that, as he and his friend had agreed before, looks like a husky dog. He is hoping to kill the wolf with a precise shot, but it is too far away. As a result, he mocks it by calling it a husky, trying to provoke the wolf. Thus, even though that in a standard context husky is just a neutral term for a specific breed of dogs, here it acquires the emotion of *annoyance (dislike)*, that is seen in whole phrase.

When it comes to the corpora data, *husky* seems to be a pretty common word with 2158 matches in COHA, around a half of which (987) belong to the first half of the 20ᵗʰ century. However, if we pay closer attention, we will see that almost all of those matches actually refer to the adjective *husky* (depicting a *hoarse and rough-sounding voice* in its most basic meaning), and not the dog breed. Likewise, BNC data shows only 19 matches for the query {husky/N}, some of which are proper nouns. Given that, we can conclude that this word is relatively rare in the English original texts, especially in fiction.

The translation by Volzhina (T3) uses a Russian equivalent for the word *husky*, which is *лайка*.

лайка – Порода охотничьих промысловых собак.

An interesting detail is that the word *лайка* seems to be pretty common in Russian texts, as the RNC has 313 matches for it (the earliest text that has it is from 1769, but it often refers to a type of fabric, while the earliest relevant matches is from the 1880s). In terms of frequency, it has several peaks (1890s, 1920s), and then a visible plateau from the 1950s and up to the present time, when the word finally established itself in the language. Volzhina's translation belongs right to the starting period of this plateau, compared to the other two texts in our analysis.

In their turn, those translations opt for words that have additional emotional meaning – both of them may be said to express some kind of *antipathy* and *contempt* to the person (or an animal), being called this way.

Т1. **растрёпа** – 1. Небрежно и неряшливо одетый или непричёсанный, лохматый человек.

 2. То же, что разиня (разг. Очень рассеянный, невнимательный человек).

Т2. **лохматый** – 1. С длинной, густой шерстью; косматый.

2. С длинными и густыми всклокоченными волосами.

While *лохматый* can be used, when talking both about an animal or a person, *растрёпа* in Russian is usually encountered in references to people. Such a change of denotative meaning from a reference to a particular dog breed to a general descriptive word does bring some changes in emotional meaning too. First of all, *растрёпa* may imply that the speaker does not approve of how the person looks, which makes it a part of the subfield *disapproval* (*неодобрение*) and shows the emotion of *annoyance* (*недовольство, раздражение*). Now, using *лохматый*, addressing a person, may also be considered rude and negative in its emotional content. Even though in this situation the character is referring to a wolf, using this as a way to address the animal can be considered as more emotionally intense. It is further amplified by the fact that both T1 and T2 use a more informal and intense verb forms in the surrounding text (compare *поди сюда* и *пойди сюда* to *подойди-ка сюда* in T3).

The word *растрёпa* has 39 matches in the RNC, out of which 4 are not relevant to our situation (*e.g. он, в страшном растрёпе, подъезжает*). Our hypothesis on its potential negative evaluation seems to be supported by some of the examples: *Мачеху же Катерина Петровна" не приняла ",* **запрезирала***, называя* **подергушкой, растрепой***,* **кляла** *за то, что та долго любит спать,* **срамила** *за алябушник* (В. Астафьев. Последний поклон (1968-1991) [НКРЯ].

Презирать – Относиться с презрением к кому-, чему-л.

Презрение – Чувство полного пренебрежения, крайнего неуважения к кому-, чему-л.

In this example, the character's attitude is directly described as *contempt* (презрение), and *растрёпа* is one of the means to express such attitude, that is employed by the said character. This, in our opinion, shows its potential negativity in terms of emotional-evaluative meaning, that is also taking place in T1.

Now, *лохматый* seems to be more neutral, even though it also has some of the similar negative potential (especially if it is used to address a person). Still, the choice to use a more common word instead of the one referring to a particular dog breed is interesting and can probably be explained by the fact that neither *лайка (see the analysis above)* nor *хаски* (13 relevant matches, all starting from 1999) were commonly used in the 1920s, when Kaufman and Andreeva created their translations.

As a result, we believe that in this case both T1 and T2 are only partially equivalent to the original, as the intonation of character speech changes due to the word usage, making the emotional balance different by further intensifying the character's hatred for the she-wolf.

2.2.3 Lack of emotional equivalence

In this section we will look at relatively rare cases when the translation lacks any equivalence to the original text when it comes to the transfer of emotional meaning. Based on the statistical data, the conclusion is that such lack of equivalence is even rarer than occasional translator's omissions or additions (which may be seen as lack of equivalence too, but we decided to group them separately, as they do not allow normal comparison between the ST and TT).

Example 3.1 This fragment of the ST was already mentioned in the example 1.3, because T1 and T3 in this case may be considered fully equivalent. Now, we are interested in the Kaufman's translation, that, in our opinion, lacks any degree of equivalence with the original. The example is taken from the direct speech of one of the characters (Henry) who is concerned with his friend's mental state.

ST: [Henry] "There's no mistaking it, Bill is **almighty blue**. I'll have to **cheer him up** tomorrow".

T2: [Henry] «А **бедняга** Билл **порядком струхнул**! Надо будет как следует **взяться за него** завтра!»

In the original Bill's mood is described with the words *Bill is almighty blue*.

blue – 2. (informal) Depressed, melancholic, sad.

almighty – (slang) Great; extreme; terrible.

As such, *blue* is related to the semantic field of *sadness* (*melancholy* etc.) and is an *informal* expression. The emotion is further intensified by the modifier *almighty* (a more formal equivalent would be *absolutely, greatly* and so on). Moreover, our analysis before (see the example 1.3 for more details) has shown that this phrase *almighty blue* is not typical for the English language and is a part of London's unique writing style.

Compared to the ST, Kaufman's translation also uses an *adverb of degree* (*almighty* vs *порядком*), but the overall grammatical construction is different

(original has a nominal compound predicate where the verb *to be* is used to introduce a predicative *adjective (is blue),* while the translation uses a simple verbal predicate *струхнул*).

струхнуть – разг. Струсить, испугаться.

порядком – **1.** В значительной степени, довольно сильно, изрядно.

Analysis of the dictionary data shows that the Russian verb *струхнуть* is related to the semantic field *испугаться (*parallel to *get afraid)*, which is related to the general emotion of *страх* (*fear*). As such, there is no correspondence between emotions expressed in the original and in the translation (*sadness* vs. *fear*), even though the usage of intensifiers is similar. The word choice here seems to be idiomatic for Russian, as the verb *струхнуть* has 324 matches in the RNC, being relatively common at the time when Kaufman's translation was created.

Even though it can be logically inferred that Bill is melancholic because he is afraid of death (as the characters are chased by a pack of wolves), the gap between the two emotions is too significant to overlook it. Because of that, we believe that Kaufman's translation here lacks emotional equivalence to the original.

Example 3.2. The second example will also feature another example from Kaufman's translation, which seems to alter character's emotion.

ST: I'm thinkin' you're **down in the mouth some**.

T2: А мне всё-таки кажется, что ты немного того… **сбрендил**.

In the original text, the phrase *to be down in the mouth* is used:

To be down in the mouth – (idiom, informal) to be sad, to feel depressed.

To further establish the meaning of this idiom, we will look at an example from the Corpus of Historical American English: *You know, Peg, I got a confession to ake. I was in the dumps myself when I met you. **A man is down in the mouth** and his teeth drag on him somesines. I was feelin' just that way when I met you tonight*

51

(James T. Farrell *No star is lost, 1938).* Overall, it has 89 matches in the COHA, that show a significant drop in usage frequency since 1970 (2 matches for each decade, which is three times less often than before). Evidently, this expression was much more common in London's time, so it is not a part of his own style.

As we can see, the original text here uses an idiom that belongs to the semantic field *sadness (feel sad)*, also representing character's informal way of speaking.

The translation by Kaufman, in its turn, uses the verb *сбрендить*:

сбрендить – **1.** Потерять мужество, самообладание; струсить. Упасть духом, отчаяться.

2. *перех. и без доп.* Сказать что-либо глупое, несуразное или солгать.

Сбрендить с ума – (просторечное) то же, что *сойти с ума.*

Сойти с ума – 1. Потерять рассудок, стать помешанным, сумасшедшим.

Above we listed all definitions from the Russian monolingual dictionary that are connected to the word *сбрендить.* Our assumption is that in Kaufman's translation it is used in the first meaning from that list (*Потерять мужество, струсить).* If our assumption is right, then this is the second case (alongside Example 3.1), when Kaufman's translation refers to the emotion of *fear* instead of the emotion of *sadness* that is conveyed by the original.

If we look at the corpora data, we will see that *сбрендить* has a rather significant number of matches (204 for 150 texts), but with an interesting detail: more than half of those matches actually belong to the period starting from 1960 and onwards (being especially common in the texts written in the last 30 years). There are no matches for this word in 1934-1958 period (which may or may not be a sign of strict censorship), even though it does encounter in the texts from the earlier periods, including the 1920s. This data shows that *сбрендить* can be considered idiomatic for Kaufman's time period, though being not as common (and overused) as in our time.

In my opinion, even though the context supports the idea that characters are scared of the wolves and, ultimately, of death; *fear* and *sadness* still represent different basic emotions, which imply different reaction. While *fear* can be seen as an active emotion, that makes adrenalin rush in one's blood, *deep depression* is a passive emotion, when a person has no mental force to change the circumstances. Given that, the semantic fields that correspond to both emotions in both Russian and English are different (compare *испугаться, струсить, to get afraid, to chicken out, to lose one's nerve* and *взгрустнуть, отчаяться, to be in despair, to become sad, to grieve*). As a result, this example from the Kaufman's translation cannot be deemed equivalent even to the least degree.

Example 3.3. The next example will continue the discussion, started by the two previous examples.

ST: …and the dogs grew excited and frightened, and were guilty of panics that tangled the traces and **further depressed** the two men.

T2: …собаки волновались, вздрагивали и несколько раз в припадке панического ужаса путали постромки, **заражая своим страхом** и людей.

As before, the translation and the original do not agree in their emotional content:

depress – To make depressed, sad or bored.

depressed – Unhappy; despondent (in low spirits from loss of hope or courage).

заражать – несов. к *заразить* – **2.** *перен.* Передать, внушить кому-л. свое чувство, склонность к чему-л. ‖ Передаваясь, распространяясь, охватить кого-л., увлечь.

страх – 1. Состояние сильной тревоги, беспокойства, душевного смятения перед какой-л. опасностью, бедой и т. п.; боязнь.

Based on the corpus data, the combination of the verb *depress* with an object noun (referring to the person *getting depressed* by the subject of the verb) seems to be natural and common in the English language (stably showing around 20 matches for each decade from the 1830s and up to now).

Compared to that, the expression *заражая страхом* seems to be much less used (at least in the literature covered by the RNC), having only 2 matches (texts from 1857 and 2012). Having said that, Google Search shows around 20 matches for that exact phrase, most of which belong to the modern fiction. As a result, Kaufman's translation seems to be using a relatively unnatural phrase, in contrast with the idiomatic expression from the ST.

Even though this example is relatively similar to the previous two, it is worth noting that the adjective *depressed* (connected with the verb *depress* used by the author) can be associated not only with the emotion of *sadness (unhappy),* but also with the emotion of *despair* or *fear* (see *despondent* and its definition right next to it). In my opinion, Kaufman's translation is not equivalent to the original in this case too, but it can be said to be pretty close to one of the peripheral meanings, included in the original. With that note in mind, it can be said to belong right at the border between the *partial equivalence* and *lack of equivalence*.

2.2.4 Translator's omissions and additions of emotive lexis

Another possibility that is pretty close to the lack of equivalence is the omission or addition of some emotional meaning. This category includes all examples where there is absolutely no correspondence between the source text and the translation, because one of them is simply lacking lexical items that could correspond to their counterparts.

Example 4.1. The first example will show the case where the omission happens on the sentence level, resulting in significant alteration of the text.

ST: We've got three cartridges. **But it's a dead shot**. Couldn't miss it.

T1 (Andreeva): У нас всего три заряда. [Omission]. Промахнуться нельзя.

The sentence in **bold** was omitted completely, even though it conveys the emotion of *certainty* (the character is sure he will successfully shoot the wolf that is chasing him).

The emotional meaning is represented by the phrase *dead shot*, where:

dead – 21. (not comparable) Exact; on the dot (precise).

shot – 1. The result of launching a projectile or bullet.

The phrase *dead shot* has 78 matches in the COHA, which are spread relatively equally among different time periods (the highest number of matches is 12 for the 1920s). However, around a half of them have a slightly different meaning: instead of referring to an opportunity to get a good shot, they refer to a person (*an unerring marksman*). Even though, London's way of using these words seem to be unmarked.

Another sign that the character is sure of getting a good shot is the following sentence "Couldn't miss it", which features a modal verb "could" that expresses speaker's mental assessment of action's possibility. The sentence used in the translation («Промахнуться нельзя») can be read in two different ways: in one case, it expresses the same meaning as the original "couldn't miss it" ("there is almost no

way I will miss it"), on the other hand, it may be understood as "It is better to not miss; I should not miss (or it will be bad)".

The absence of the in-between sentence, which introduced the emotion of *certainty* by the phrase *dead shot*, makes Andreeva's translation ambiguous, as it can be read in two different ways, one of which is not equivalent to the original. For example, out of the 3 matches for the phrase *промахнуться нельзя* from the Russian National Corpus one introduces the meaning *there is no way to miss the target* («*та мишень, в которую он обязан стрелять и в которую промахнуться нельзя*» *(Б.В. Савинков (В.Ропшин). То, чего не было (1918) [НКРЯ]),* while another one – *it is better to not miss* («*Стоит обер-лейтенант, любуется. Долго я целился, тут промахнуться нельзя*». *(Ю. Герман. Дорогой мой человек (1961) [НКРЯ])*

This example shows the role that emotive lexis plays in the literary text, shaping and channelling character's emotions to the reader. Even though mistranslation of emotive lexis can distort the original meaning significantly, omission of it can also lead to ambiguity.

Examples 4.2 and 4.3. The next two examples will show one of the common situations in which additions take place (especially in Kaufman's translation (T2)).

4.2 ST: "They've **half got you** a'ready, a- talkin' like that," Henry retorted sharply**.**

T2: Тебя**, дурака**, они уже наполовину съели, -- резко возразил Генри.

4.3 ST: "There's no mistaking it**, Bill** is almighty blue. I'll have to cheer him up tomorrow.

T2: «А **бедняга** Билл порядком струхнул! Надо будет как следует взяться за него завтра!»

In both cases the additions are inserted in the character's speech, addressing his dialogue partner. Both additions are represented by nouns, that have additional emotional meaning:

дурак – 1. Разг. Глупый, тупой человек.

бедняга – Разг. Несчастный, вызывающий сожаление и сочувствие человек.

In the second case, the word *бедняга* seems to be inferred by the context (the speaker is sympathetic towards his friend who looks depressed), making the implicit emotion of *sympathy* explicit by that addition. The first case can also be analysed in this way, where the *derogatory* character of the word *дурак* is inferred by the situation (*Henry retorted **sharply*** (in a rude, harsh way), showing that Henry is annoyed with his friend and can call him a bad word). Both *бедняга* and *дурак* are common in similar speech situations in the Russian language (having thousands of matches in the RNC).

Thus, both examples of additions may be considered equivalent to the implicit context of the source text, but not to its explicit expression. As a result, both examples still belong to the least degree of equivalence, as there are significant alterations of the emotional balance of the text, highlighting the emotions that were implicit (therefore, put by the author in the background) and omitting those emotions that were explicitly expressed by Jack London. Considering how important individual author's decisions in fiction literature, the ideal option would be to preserve them as much as possible in the translation.

Example 4.4. In the next example, we will look at an interesting situation, when omission and addition happen simultaneously. In particular, a sentence from the source text gets completely replaced by a new sentence in the target text.

ST: An'd I wisht I'd never started on this trip, Henry. I don't like the looks of it. I d**on't feel right, somehow**.

T2: Эх, лучше бы не затевать этого путешествия, Генри. Не нравятся мне что-то наши дела. **Скорее бы уже всё кончилось**.

In the original text we see the sentence *I don't feel right, somehow*, which conveys character's *concern* about the current situation. It is supported by the context (*regret* "I wish I had never started on this rip" and another *anxiety marker* "I don't like the looks of it").

Contrary to that, the translation features the following sentence *Скорее бы уже всё кончилось*, which signifies character's *hope* that the trip will end soon. That feeling is represented by the conditional mood of the verb (*бы кончилось*).

From the corpora data, we can see that the phrase *feel right* is common in English texts, having 544 matches in the COHA. However, it was significantly less common in the 1st quarter of the 20th century (only 34 matches (6% of total) for the 1900-1930 period), compared to the period from the 1930s and up to present (from 27 matches to 83 matches a decade, accounting for more than 70% of the total number). Interestingly enough, there is no exact matches for the phrase *скорее бы уже всё кончилось (закончилось)* in the RNC, though advanced Google search shows around 30 matches for it, mostly from the modern texts (and Kaufman's translation itself). As a result, the target text here seems to offer a less natural expression than the original (not mentioning the meaning change).

While the original repeatedly refers to the same emotion of *anxiety* twice, the final translation result is probably derived from a logical conclusion (IF the character doesn't like the situation as it is right now, THEN they probably would like to get out of it as soon as possible). If it is so, then this case also shows the movement of emotional meaning from the implicit plane of the text to the explicit space. While translator's motivation cannot be determined in this case, it is an interesting case when omission and addition of emotional meaning coexist together.

Example 4.5. In the last example in this subsection, we will look at the situation, when the omission of emotive lexis actually neutralises the imagery of the text. As we are dealing with the literary text, such omissions should be considered

undesirable as they alter the unique style of the author. For the sake of comparison, we will include another translation where this meaning is fully preserved.

ST: Dark spruce forest **frowned** on either side of the frozen waterway.

T2: Тёмный хвойный лес **высился** по обеим сторонам скованного льдом водного пути.

T3: Тёмный еловый лес **стоял, нахмурившись**, по обоим берегам скованной льдом реки.

This example is also relatively unique, as the emotive lexis here does not refer to the emotions of human characters (or even animals). Instead, it is used as one of the common means of literary expression: personification of the natural world.

frown – 1. (intransitive) To have a **frown on one's face**.

2. (intransitive, figurative) To **manifest displeasure or disapprobation**; to look with disfavour or threateningly.

As the verb *frown* directly refers to the way how the emotion of *displeasure* manifests on people's faces, it is exclusively used referring to people and their emotions. Based on that, *dark spruce forest frowned* may be considered as a personification of the forest, which is imbued with human-like emotions, thanks to the emotional meaning of *frown*.

To support our claim, let us look at the corpora data: BNC has no entries for the query *forest {frown/V}* (including all forms of the verb), while COHA has only 1 match for *forest FROWN_v*, belonging to the 1837 text *Zinzendorff* by L.H. Sigourney (1791-1865): *And cities arose where the forest frowned.* Furthermore, Google Search only shows references to the London's text, so this personification may be considered a rather unique literary device, showing the author's individual use of language.

If we look at the translations, we will notice that in T2 (Kaufman) any emotional meaning is neutralised: instead, there is only a reference to the forest's location in the world of the book (its literary *topos*), expressed by the verb *выситься*.

выситься – Возвышаться над окружающими предметами, высоко подниматься.

Compared to the unique metaphor from the ST, the translation here shows a more typical use of language, as there are 13 examples for *лес выситься* (including all noun and verb forms) in the RNC. However, only 2 of the examples predate Kaufman's translation (one from 1915 and one from 1923), which makes it more unique for the time when T2 was created. Still, it does not completely recreate the author's unique style.

In its turn, Volzhina's translation (T3) uses a combination of the verb *стоял* (introducing the existence of the forest) and the adverbial participle *нахмурившись*, derived from the verb *нахмуриться,* close in its meaning to the English *frown*.

стоять – 9. Быть, находиться, располагаться где-л.

нахмурившись – деепр. к ***нахмуриться*** – 1. Нахмурить лоб, брови, лицо, стать хмурым.

Наморщиться, сдвинуться, выражая раздумье, озабоченность или недовольство и т. д. (о бровях, лбе, лице).

Apparently, Volzhina also managed to recreate the unique London's metaphor, as all 12 examples for *стоять нахмуриться (ger)* in the corpus feature a person as the subject of the verb *нахмуриться.* Thus, we can conclude that the combination of a non-human subject with a verb characterising human facial expressions is equally rare in both Russian and English, making it a literary device.

Even though that Volzhina's translation is more explicit than the original (as it introduces the notion of the forest existence and its "emotional state" by two separate words), it manages to preserve the personification, that was intended by the

author. On the contrary, by omitting the reference to the emotion, Kaufman's translation neutralises that personification. This example shows how unusual, unique to the author's style, use of lexical items with emotional meaning can be important for translators, who strive for maintaining the literary features and style of the original text.

Now, we will move from the individual examples to the overall statistical analysis of obtained data in order to get a better understanding of the trends, present in our material.

2.3 Diachronic perspective of emotive lexis transfer in statistical-comparative analysis

To start with, the number of analysed examples is 157. This number is based on the source text (thus, it is universal for all translations) and represents all instances of emotive lexis usage from the ST that we have been able to analyse. As some of them fall into different categories of equivalence in different translations, the one and the same example can appear in different categories at once, making the total count more complicated.

Given that, let us look at the final statistical table, showing distribution of examples into the different equivalence groups that we have established before (for the purpose of statistical research, omissions and additions are counted separately here).

Translation/ Level of equivalence	T1 M. Andreeva 1913	T2 N. Kaufman 1926	T3 N. Volzhina 1961
Full equivalence	88 (56%)	83 (52.8%)	114 (72.6%)
Partial equivalence	47 (29.9%)	47 (29.9%)	42 (26.7%)
Lack of equivalence	4 (2.5%)	8 (5%)	0 (0%)
Omission	18 (11.4%)	5 (3.1%)	0 (0%)
Addition	0 (0%)	14 (8.9%)	1 (0.6%)

Table 1. The distribution of examples among different levels of equivalence

First of all, let us note that all translations preserved a significant level of equivalence (in terms of preserving the emotional and evaluative meanings of the

62

original). A substantial number of examples with only partial equivalence (around 30% for each of the translations) can be explained by the phenomenon of linguistic asymmetry that prevents perfect transfer of meaning without even slight changes. In general, our research has shown that the more typical and common is a given lexical item or construction in the source language, the higher average degree of equivalence can be achieved in its transfer to the target language. Conversely, author's unique use of language seems to be the most problematic for translation, often resulting in partial or no equivalence at all, or even translator's omissions.

However, we have noticed several important trends, that may be particularly interesting in the diachronic perspective:

1. The first ever translation of *White Fang* done by Andreeva has been shown to have a significant percentage (11.4%) of omissions of emotive lexis. Most often, it seems to happen in situations when the translator struggled with Jack London's creative use of language (see examples 1.2 and 4.1, where T1 completely omits whole sentences with emotive meaning). We can only make assumptions about the reason that motivated translator to make complete omissions (not enough familiarity with the language, strict editorial practices, etc.), but the fact is that those are exceptionally common in Andreeva's translation (especially compared to translations by Kaufman and Volzhina).

2. The next translation, done by N. Kaufman, shows a different approach to the translation of emotive lexis and author's text, in general. Among all three translations, T2 often shows the least degree of *naturalness or idiomaticity* (in other words, it features a relatively non-standard and non-typical use of the Russian language). By doing so, it often manages to recreate the unique character of Jack London's language, but at the same time it often comes at a price of slight or even significant changes in the emotional-evaluative meaning of the text: therefore, it shows the highest percentage of examples *lacking any equivalence* to the source text (5%).

3. Another trend, observed in T2, is a high frequency of translator's additions, which account for about 8.9% of the analysed material. As with the 1st trend, we can only assume that it may be a part of translator's strategy: most of the time, those additions seem to explicitly state information that is already implicitly contained in the original. Probably, translator's motivation was to make the text clearer (by using *explicitation technique*) and bring it closer to the reader.

4. Finally, T3 by Volzhina has surprised us with its accuracy by having almost no examples with a complete lack of equivalence or omission/addition. An important feature of Volzhina's translation is the usage of most natural and *literary* (i.e. resembling literary texts originally written in Russian) language. In a certain sense, this translation may be even considered smoother and less *originally* written than the source text, which features a lot of London's unique imagery and creative language use. At times, it is also more emotionally intense than the source text. While readers' opinion on that may vary, it is fair to say that Volzhina's translation has preserved the emotional content of the original especially well, achieving the two highest degrees of equivalence in almost all of the analysed cases.

Another interesting detail is the distribution of lexical items among semantic fields, referring to different basic emotions. In that aspect, our analysis has shown that most of the times (at least around 80% of cases on average) the translations manage to maintain the same basic emotion with only slight changes (most commonly, in terms of intensity). The overall emotional background of the text is preserved in the translations with its dominating emotions of *depression, melancholy, fear, anger*. However, there are two important exceptions to that:

1. Kaufman's translation (T2) often replaces lexical items referring to the emotion of *sadness or depression* with those that depict the emotion of *fear* (see examples 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 for the details). As we have noted before, *sadness* is usually understood as a *passive emotion*: it is more long-lasting, may not have a direct source and often discourages the person from any activity, draining their mental powers. Contrary to that, *fear* is an *active emotion*, which is usually provoked by a particular

object or circumstances (e.g. if a person is afraid of dogs, this fear is usually shows itself close to its object). Fear also motivates a person to get away from its source as soon as possible, which also brings a physiological adrenaline reaction. As such, the shift between these two distant emotions seems to distort the emotional background of the original text, shifting its emotional accents.

2. Another interesting observation can be done about the translation by M. Andreeva (T1). There, the English pronoun *you*, which unites both a 2nd person singular and 2nd person plural forms, is exclusively translated as *вы* in all speech situations. Given the fact that *вы* in Russian can also act as a *polite* alternative to the 2nd person singular *ты*, it also changes the overall tone of characters' speech, making it more formal and characters – more distanced from each other.

According to the corpora data, the pronoun *вы* was more often used than its alternative in the period from 1830 up to 1900, i.e. in the Golden Age of the Russian literature. For that reason, modern readers may associate its excessive use with classical literature, while London's text belongs to the later realistic tradition, where character's speech is especially varied to represent different social backgrounds and positions. As a result, the overall style of T1 is less straightforward, which also affects the representation of emotions (e.g. relatively rude jokes of London's characters become akin to gentlemen's slightly ironic remarks).

To sum up, looking at the three texts from a diachronic perspective, we can see that transfer of emotive lexis in each translation has been done differently and has yielded different results: even though most of the translations have a relatively high degree of equivalence to the ST, some of them suffer from numerous omissions of emotive lexis (T1) or disputable additions (T2). Another important conclusion is that the two translations (T1 and T2) use a more literal, though less natural for the target language, approach to emotive lexis, while T3 most of the times makes use of the already available resources of the Russian language, putting more accent on preserving the meaning rather than the form of the original. Next, we will move to the conclusions of the practical chapter.

Conclusions of the Chapter 2

In the practical part of our final graduation project, we have done the following:

1. We have developed an original classification system for the selected examples, which is based on the notion of translation equivalence. However, we have limited the scope of such equivalence to the semes that bear emotional or evaluative meaning in order to keep the focus on the equivalence of emotional-evaluative meaning and not equivalence in general. Our classification system describes four degrees of such equivalence from full equivalence to complete lack of it or translator's addition or omission.

2. Apart from that, we have selected the source material for our research, based on the following criteria: the existence of several translations into Russian (preferably, from different time periods), relatively modern English language (ideally, the beginning of the 20th century, recognition and familiarity of the text among both English and Russian readers, unique author's style. As a result, we opted for Jack London's *White Fang* and three of its translations (M. Andreeva (1913), N. Kaufman (1926), N. Volzhina (1961)).

3. Then, we have developed a universal research algorithm, putting accent on the usage of dictionary and corpora data to prove any of the proposed hypotheses. We have settled on using monolingual dictionaries to obtain the information on the exact meaning of analysed lexical items, while language corpora have been used to provide the usage statistics and to determine if a given word or word combination is natural in the language.

4. Next, we have performed the example analysis. We have chosen 3 examples for each of the first three degrees of equivalence and 5 examples for the last degree (to include both the cases of addition and omission). The presented examples reflect both a more typical use of language (see examples 1.1, 2.2, 3.2) and author's creative style (especially examples 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 4.5). When it was possible and relevant, we

have analysed several translations simultaneously to provide the reader with a comparative perspective and highlight the individual traits of each of the translations.

5. As a final result of the second chapter of our research, we have performed statistical analysis of the obtained data and described the main features of each of the translations in their approach to the emotive lexis. With that, we are ready to move on to the general conclusions of the entire research.

Conclusions

In our final graduation project, we have studied the subject of emotive lexis transfer in translation. In order to establish the theoretical foundation for our research, we have looked at several different approaches to the definition of word meaning, its structure and hierarchy. Having chosen I. Sternin's all-encompassing approach, we have also elaborated the distinction between *emotion words,* which contain references to concrete human emotions in the denotative component of their meaning, and *emotional words*, which contain emotional and evaluative meaning in the connotative component of the lexical meaning (making it more optional and situational). As a result, we have been able to better grasp the similarities and differences between *emotional* and *evaluative* components of the meaning.

In order to classify and sort emotive lexis into smaller groups, we have agreed on using the semantic field theory, linking basic emotions (e.g. *love, fear, sadness, annoyance*, *anger*) to their respective general semantic fields, which can be later subdivided into numerous levels of subfields. Such representation allows us to summarise data obtained from separate examples and compare the source text and its translations on a more abstract level.

Finally, we have looked at a number of different approaches to the problem of equivalence in translation and decided to work out our own special classification of equivalence degrees. To do so, we have limited the concept of equivalence to the semes that bear emotional-evaluative meaning and established four levels of such equivalence that have been achieved in analysed translations:

1. Full equivalence – the translation and the source text use lexical items that belong to parallel semantic fields in both languages

2. Partial equivalence – the lexical items used in both texts can be seen as a part of two parallel general semantic fields representing one basic emotion, but at the same time they belong to different subfields (expressing different intensity, being subject- or object-oriented, etc.).

3. Lack of equivalence – lexical items belong to completely different semantic fields and represent different emotions that cannot be seen as two different relatively close variants of one basic emotion.

4. Translator's omission/addition – this extra group includes all cases when the emotive lexis is not present either in the target text (thus, being *omitted* by the translator for some reason) or in the source text (making it a translator's *addition*).

Most importantly, we have based our analysis exclusively on the dictionary and corpora data: as a result, we hope that we have achieved at least a degree of objectivity and impartiality. We have exclusively used monolingual dictionaries to establish the meanings of analysed items, while language corpora allowed us to obtain statistical data on how given lexical items are used in the original (non-translated) texts. All data for the analysis has been taken from resources, available to any other researcher via Internet.

During the analysis, we have looked at both the situations when the author uses typical (for the source language) items (see examples 1.1, 2.2, 3.2 in particular), and when the source text features author's individual use of language (especially interesting are examples 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 4.5). In general, the more typical and common is the given lexical item or construction in the source language, the higher the average degree of equivalence in its transfer to the target language. Conversely, author's unique use of language seems to be the most problematic, often resulting in only partial or no equivalence at all, or even translator's omissions (see subsection 2.3 for the details).

Looking at the texts from the diachronic perspective, we have found that translators' approach to the emotive lexis is indeed different: two translations have been shown to be more prone to omissions (T1) or additions (T2), while the third translation (T3) can be considered the most faithful to the text, despite sometimes being more *literary* than the original.

Overall, we hope that our research will be useful for both translation and lexicology scholars, as it unites the approaches of both disciplines, providing a unique perspective on a familiar subject.

References

Literature

1. A Greek-English lexicon. / Compiled by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. Revised by Sir H.S. Jones. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996 (with a revised supplement).

2. Abu-Lughod L., Lutz C.A. Language and the politics of emotion. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

3. Approaches to semiotics: Cultural anthropology, education, linguistics, psychiatry, psychology. / Ed. by Th.S. Sebeok, A.S. Hayes, M.C. Bateson. – London, Paris, The Hague : Mouton & Co., 1964. – 294 p.

4. Athanasiadou A., Tabakowska E. Speaking of emotions. Conceptualisation and expression. – Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998.

5. Bednarek, M. Emotion talk across corpora. / M. Bednarek.– N.Y., Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. – 242 p. – ISBN 13: 978-0-230-55146-6.

6. Béjoint, H. Modern lexicography : An introduction. / H. Béjoint.– N.Y. : Oxford University Press, 2000 – 276 p. – ISBN 0-19-829951-6.

7. Biber D., Egbert J., Zhang M. Lexis and grammar as complementary discourse systems for expressing stance and evaluation. / The Construction of discourse as verbal interaction. // Ed. by M. de los Ángeles Gómez González, J. Lachlan Mackenzie. – Amsterdam, Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. – P. 201–227.

8. Catford J.C. A linguistic theory of translation. / J.C. Catford. London : Oxford University press, 1965.

9. Contrastive lexical semantics. / Ed. by E. Weigand. – Amsterdam, Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998. – 270 p. – ISBN 90-272-3676-3.

10. De Saussure F. Cours de linguistique générale. / F. De Saussure. – Paris, Éditions Payot & Rivages, 1995. – 520 p.

11. Eco U. A theory of semiotics. / U. Eco. – London: Macmillan, 1977.

12. Gorlée D.L. Semiotics and the problem of translation: With special reference to the semiotics of Charles S. Peirce. / D.L. Gorlée. – Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994. – 255 p. – ISBN 90-5183-642-2.

13. Greimas A.J. Sémantique structurale : Recherche de méthode. / A.J. Greimas. – Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1986. – 256 p. – ISBN 2-13-039308-x.

14. Halliday M.A.K., Teubert W., Yallop C., Čermáková A. Lexicology and corpus linguistics: An introduction. – Bodmin, Cornwall: Continuum, 2004.

15. Jackson H., E.Z. Amvela. An introduction to English lexicology: Words, meaning and vocabulary. – London, N.Y., Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic, 2007 (3rd edition).

16. Jakobson R. On linguistic aspects of translation / R. Jakobson. // The translation studies reader. – ed. by L. Venuti. – London, N.Y. : Routledge, 2012. – P. 126-131.

17. Koller W. Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft. / W. Koller. – Heidelberg, Wiesbaden: Quelle & Meyer, 1992.

18. Leech, G. Semantics : The study of meaning. / G. Leech. – Suffolk : Pelican Books, 1981. – 2nd ed. – 383 p. – ISBN 0-14-021694-4.

19. Lemke, J.L. Resources for attitudinal meaning : Evaluative orientations in text semantics. / J.L. Lemke. // Functions of Language. – 1998. – Vol. 5:1. – P. 33–56 – ISSN 0929-998X, E-ISSN 1569-9765. – DOI: 10.1075/fol.5.1.03lem.

20. Lyons J. Structural semantics: An analysis of part of the vocabulary of Plate. / J. Lyons. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969. – 237 p. – ISBN 0631079203

21. Newmark P. A textbook of translation. / P. Newmark. – N.Y. : Prentice Hall, 1988.

22. Newmark P. Approaches to translation. / P. Newmark. – Oxford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press, 1981. – xiii, 200 p.

23. Nida E. The theory and practice of translation. / E. Nida. – Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969. – viii, 220 p.

24. Online dictionary of the English language (https://www.dictionary.com/)

25. Péter M. Das Problem des sprachlichen Gefühlsaufsdrucks in besonderem Hinblick auf das Bühlersche Organon-Modell. / M. Péter. – Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984.

26. Pym A. Exploring translation theories. / A. Pym. – 2ⁿᵈ ed. – London, N.Y. : Routledge, 2014. – 178 p. – ISBN 978-0-415-83789-7.

27. Ricœur P. Sur la traduction. / P. Ricœur. – 4-e tirage. – Paris: Bayard, 2004. – 68 p. – ISBN 10:2-227-47367-3.

28. Roget's II. The New thesaurus. / By the editors of the American Heritage Dictionaries. – Boston, N.Y.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1995.

29. S. Halverson Translation studies and representative corpora: Establishing links between translation corpora, theoretical/descriptive categories and a conception of the object of study. / S. Halverson. // Meta, vol. 43, iss. 4. – P. 459-514.

30. Sitchinava D.V. Parallel corpora within the Russian National corpus. // Prace filologiczne, LXIII, 2012. – P. 271—278.

31. Tabakowska E. Emotional valuation: Values and emotions in translation. / Translating values : Evaluative concepts in translation. // Ed. by P. Blumczynski, J. Gillespie. – London : Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. – P. 37–57. – ISBN: 978-1-137-54970-9.

32. The verbal communication of emotions : Interdisciplinary perspectives. / Ed. by S.R. Fussell. – London, New Jersey : Lawrence Erlbaum associates, 2002. – 294 p. – ISBN 0-8058-3689-6.

33. Tirkkonen-Condit S. Unique items: Over- or underrepresented in translated language? / S. Tirkkonen-Condit. // Translation universals: Do they exist? – ed by. A. Mauranen and P. Kujamäki. – Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2004. – P. 177-86.

34. Trier J. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. – Bonn, 1931.

35. Ullmann S. The principles of semantics. / S. Ullmann. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957. – xii, 352 p.

36. Vinay J.-P., Darbelnet J. Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: méthode de traduction. / J.-P. Vinay, J. Darbelnet. – Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée. – Paris: Didier, 1972. – 170 p.

37. Wierzbicka A. Emotions across languages and cultures. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

38. Арнольд И.В. Семантика. Стилистика. Интертекстуальность. / И.В. Арнольд. – М.: Либроком, 2010.

39. Арутюнова Н.Д. К проблеме функциональных типов лексического значения / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – М.: Наука, 1980. – 215 с.

40. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – 2-е изд., испр. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999. – 911 с.

41. Бабенко Л.Г. Лексические средства обозначения эмоций в русском языке / Л.Г. Бабенко. – Свердловск : Из-во Урал. ун-та, 1989. – 184 с. – ISBN 5-7525-0061-3.

42. Бабенко Л.Г. Обозначение эмоций в языке и речи / Л.Г. Бабенко. – Свердловск : УРГУ, 1989.

43. Болотов В.И. Эмоциональность текста в аспектах языковой и неязыковой вариативности. / В.И. Болотов. – Ташкент : ФАН, 1981.

44. Вилюнас В.К. Психология эмоциональных явлений. / В.К. Вилюнас. – М.: Издательство МГУ, 1976.

45. Вольф Е.М. Функциональная семантика оценки. / Е.М. Вольф. – М.: Наука. 1985.

46. Гак В.Г. Семантическая структура слова как компонент семантической структуры высказывания. / В.Г. Гак. // Семантическая структура слова. – М.: Наука, 1977.

47. Гак В.Г. Сопоставительная лексикология. – М.: Либроком, 2010. –

48. Гиндин С.И. Советская лингвистика текста. Некоторые проблемы и результаты. / С.И. Гиндин. – М.: 1974.

49. Гридин В.Н. К вопросу о систематизации эмоциональной лексики. / В.Н. Гридин. – М.: Русский язык, 1979.

50. Гридин В.Н. Семантика эмоционально-экспрессивных средств языка. / В.Н. Гридин. – М., Наука, 1983.

51. Додонов Б.И. Эмоция как ценность. / Б.И. Додонов. – М., Политиздат, 1977.

52. Е. В. Рахилина, Г. И. Кустова, О. Н. Ляшевская, Т. И. Резникова, О. Ю. Шеманаева. Задачи и принципы семантической разметки лексики в НКРЯ // Национальный корпус русского языка: 2006—2008. Новые результаты и перспективы. СПб.: Нестор-История, 2009. С. 215—239.

53. Елисеева В.В. Лексикология английского языка. / В.В. Елисеева. – СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУ, – 2003.

54. Загоровская О.В. Ещё раз о структуре значения словесного знака. – Воронеж: Истоки, 2009.

55. Караулов Ю. Н. Общая и русская идеография. / Ю.Н. Караулов. – М.: Либроком, 2010. – 356 с.

56. Караулов Ю. Н. Семантический гештальт ассоциативного поля и образы сознания / Ю.Н. Караулов. // Языковое сознание: содержание и функционирование. Международный симпозиум по психолингвистике «теория коммуникации». – М.: Совет. писатель, 2000. – С. 107-109.

57. Караулов Ю.Н. Лингвистическое конструирование и тезаурус литературного языка. / Ю.Н. Караулов. – М.:Наука, 1981. – 367 с.

58. Квасюк И.И. Структура и семантика отрицательно-эмотивной лексики лексики (на материале разных частей речи современного английского языка). / И.И. Квасюк. – М.: 1983.

59. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). / В.Н. Комиссаров. – М. : Высшая школа, 1990. – 253 с. – ISBN 5-06-001057-0.

60. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. / Под ред. В. Н. Ярцевой. – М.: Большая Российская энциклопедия, 2002. – 709 с.

61. Лукьянова Н.А. Экспрессивная лексика разговорного употребления: проблемы семантики. – Новосибирск: Наука, Сибирское отделение, 1986.

62. Никитин М.В. Курс лингвистической семантики. / М.В. Никитин. – СПб.: Издательство РГПУ им. А.И. Герцена, 2007.

63. Никитин М.В. Лексическое значение в слове и словосочетании. Спецкурс по общей и английской лексикологии. / М.В. Никитин. – Владимир: ВГПУ, 1974. – 223 с.

64. Никитин М.В. Лексическое значение слова (структура и комбинаторика). / М.В. Никитин. – М.: Высшая школа, 1983.

65. Рецкер. Я.И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. / Я.И. Рецкер. – М. : Международные отношения, 1974. – 215 с.

66. Рябцева Н.К. Переводоведение в России и за рубежом. Часть 2: Анализ эмпирического материала. / Н.К. Рябцева. – М.: 2009 – 67 с.

67. Савчук С.О., Архангельский Т.А., Бонч-Осмоловская А.А., Донина О.В., Кузнецова Ю.Н., Ляшевская О.Н., Орехов Б.В., Подрядчикова М.В. Национальный корпус русского языка 2.0: новые возможности и перспективы развития. // Вопросы языкознания, 2024, 2: 7–34.

68. Сгалл П. Значение, содержание и прагматика. /П. Сгалл // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 25. Лингвистическая прагматика. Под ред. Е.В. Падучевой.

69. Сепир Э. Градуирование. / Э. Сепир // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Лингвистическая прагматика. Вып. 16. Под ред. Е.В. Падучевой. – М.: Прогресс, 1985. – С. 43-78.

70. Словарь русского языка: В 4-х т. / РАН, Ин-т лингвистич. исследований; Под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой. — 4-е изд., стер. — М.: Рус. яз.; Полиграфресурсы, 1999.

71. Стернин И.А. Проблемы анализа структуры значения слова. – Воронеж, 1979.

72. Стивенсон Ч. Некоторые прагматические аспекты значения. / Ч. Стивенсон // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Лингвистическая прагматика. Вып. 16. Под ред. Е.В. Падучевой. – М.: Прогресс, 1985. – С. 129-159.

73. Столнейкер Р.С. Прагматика. / Р.С. Столнейкер // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Лингвистическая прагматика. Вып. 16. Под ред. Е.В. Падучевой. – М.: Прогресс, 1985. – С. 419-438.

74. Телия В.Н. Коннотативный аспект семантики номинативных единиц. / В.Н. Телия. – М.: Наука, 1986. – 160 с.

75. Телия В.Н. Типы языковых значений. / В.Н. Телия. – М.: Наука, 1981. – 269 с.

76. Фёдоров А.В. Основы общей теории перевода (Лингвистический очерк). / А.В. Фёдоров. – Изд. 3-е, переработанное и дополненное. – М.: Высшая школа, 1968. – 395 с.

77. Фразеологический словарь русского литературного языка. / Под ред. А.И. Фёдорова. – М.: Астрель, 2008.

78. Хаэр Р.М. Дескрипция и оценка / Р.М. Хаэр. //Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Лингвистическая прагматика. Вып. 16. Под ред. Е.В. Падучевой. – М.: Прогресс, 1985. – С. 183-195.

79. Шаховский В.И. Категоризация эмоций в лексико-семантической системе языка. / В.И. Шаховский. – Изд. 2-е, испр. и доп. – М.: ЛКИ, 2008. – 208 с.

80. Шаховский В.И. Лингвистическая теория эмоций. /Шаховский В.И. – М.: Гнозис, 2008. – 416 с.

81. Швейцер А.Д. Перевод и лингвистика: О газетно-информационном и военно-публицистическом переводе. / А.Д. Швейцер. – М. : Военное изд-во Министерства обороны СССР, 1973. – 275 с.

82. Щур Г. С. Теории поля в лингвистике. / Г.С. Щур – М.: Наука, 1974. – 256 с.

Source materials

M1. London J. The call of the wild and White Fang. / Introduction by J. Seelye, afterword by M. Meyer // N.Y.: Signet Classics, 2010. – 288 p. – ISBN 978-1-101-44309-5.

М2. Лондон Дж. Полное собрание сочинений, Т.3. – М.: Типография П.П. Рябушинскаго, 1913. – 312 с.

М3. Лондон Дж. Белый Клык: пер. с англ. Н.С. Кауфмана. – М., Л.: Мысль, 1926.

М4. Лондон Дж. Собрание сочинений, Т.5 – Харьков: Клуб семейного досуга, 2011. – 412 с. – ISBN 978-966-14-1769-3 (PDF).

М5. Лондон Дж. Собрание сочинений в 14-ти томах, Т.4. – М.: Правда, 1961. – 478 с.

Digital resources

R1. British National Corpus Web CQP-Edition (BNCweb (CQP-edition)). URL : http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/ (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R2. Corpus of Historical American English. English-corpora.org version. URL : https://www.english-corpora.org/coha (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R3. Corpus of Contemporary American English. English-corpora.org version. URL : https://www.english-corpora.org/coca (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R4. Google Search. URL : https://google.com (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R5. Bing Search. URL : https://bing.com (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R6. Online free dictionary Wiktionary.org (English language version). URL : https://en.wiktionary.org (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R7. Cambridge Online dictionary of the English language. URL : https://dictionary.cambridge.org (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R8. Oxford English Dictionary (Online version). URL : https://www.oed.com/ (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R9. Personal blog post on Coldfury.com URL : https://coldfury.com/2022/04/08/if-it-walks-like-one-and-it-talks-like-one/ (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R10. Personal blog post on Coldfury.com URL : https://coldfury.com/2024/03/09/true-empowerment/ (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R11. Personal blog "Fishing for History". URL : https://fishinghistory.blogspot.com/2011/03/voices-from-past-william-heddon-william.html (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R12. Национальный корпус русского языка (НКРЯ). Официальный сайт. URL : https://ruscorpora.ru (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).

R13. Творческое сообщество Beesona. Проза «Воля небес». URL : https://www.beesona.pro/id6177/literature/51374/ (Дата последнего обращения: 21.05.2024).