

Moshkovska L. M.

National Transport University

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH COMPARATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN INTERNET TRANSPORT TEXTS: TRANSLATION ASPECTS

The article is aimed at investigating structural and semantic features of English comparative constructions in internet transport texts to faithfully convey them into Ukrainian. In the process of research, the method of theoretical sources analysis, the contextual method of studying original internet texts, the componential method, the method of translation interpretation of the results were employed.

As a result of the research, the most common comparative constructions of inequality (25% of the total number of cases) with qualitative adjectives in the comparative degree were classified into four types according to structural and semantic criteria with the identification of five components: comparee – marker – parameter – index – standard. It was found that comparatives of equality with adjectives – parameters in the positive degree account for 15%, in the superlative degree – 20%. The comparatives of inequality with numerals (25%) that function as parameters describe decreasing or increasing figures in percent and in compound cardinal numerals. Implicit comparatives (15%) were described in lexico-semantic oppositions in the context of simple sentences and a passage. It was noted that comparees and standards are mostly expressed by terminological noun clusters while parameters are represented by adjectives and numerals, thus undergoing transformations in translation, with markers and indexes mainly rendered through equivalent translation. The most common translation ways turned out to be permutation and transposition for five types of comparatives. It was substantiated that translation models of combined transformations faithfully convey English comparative constructions into Ukrainian.

To sum up, comparative constructions are complex syntactic units of evaluative semantics that were classified into two types based on equality and inequality of features of a comparee and a standard. The most applicable ways and models were identified to faithfully render English comparatives into the target language in compliance with structural and semantic features of their components.

Key words: comparison, comparative construction, comparee, standard, permutation, combined transformation.

Problem Statement. Nowadays internet texts, their hybrid forms, created by means of integrated technologies, represent a single content space through a variety of components' application: verbal, visual, audio-visual. Being stipulated by the advantages of uninterrupted communication, they are often considered network units which pertain hypertextuality, interactivity, narrative strategies of material exposition, time economy and space compression, eliminating physical distance barriers. Moreover, there is a great public demand for internet articles as they highlight the latest developments in different spheres, including transport technologies. Transport sector plays a paramount role in sustainable economic development and has become a driving force of national economies prosperity in the XXI century. At present, the scope of scientific and technical progress can only be measured by intensive implementation of innovative technologies in already existing transport

manufacturing processes. The comparative analysis of qualitative and quantitative figures in the transport sector and their faithful linguistic interpretation to the target audience contribute a lot in the overall picture of the latest economic data processing in the context of European integration. So, it is necessary to elaborate the appropriate translation ways for the most common comparative models denoting transport production capabilities to be adapted in the linguistic environment of internet target texts that are the most dynamic component of internet media communication all over the world.

The latest Researches and Publications Review. Comparison is regarded as a major factor of reality process depiction. It is one of the means and keys to the world cognition. In academic disciplines, comparison is often expressed by a tri-partite construction with the subject being compared, another subject to be compared against and the basis of comparison.

However, comparative models can vary in the number of components. Scientist N. P. Shapovalova accounts for the linguistic model of comparison as the combinability of four main constituents: the subject of comparison (comparant), the object of comparison (comparator), the basis of comparison, the indicator of comparative relations [14].

In the process of investigating foreign linguists' contributions, Yv. Treis describes comparison as a mental act of examining similarities and differences of two or more objects and one-dimensional as well as gradable properties within the object. Such evaluation process finds its linguistic representation in comparative constructions with five constituents: comparee, standard, parameter, degree marker and parameter marker. His classification was elaborated on fixed-case and derived-case comparatives which are structured on the basis of adverbial phrases of place, negative, disjunctive or similitive coordinators [16, p. 2–6]. R. M. W. Dixon's classification of comparative constructions covers three important features: mono-/bi-clausibility of the construction, morphological characteristics of components and the degree of their classification. The comparative components in his study are determined as follows: comparee (the phenomenon with one or more features being compared), index (a means of linguistic representation of comparative semantics), parameter (a feature that allows to perform a comparative act), marker (a morphological indicator of comparison), standard (the phenomenon with clearly expressed and well known features to be compared against a newly emerged thing [11, p. 5–7].

Comparative constructions belong to the syntactic peculiarity of internet transport texts since they carry stylistic coloring, make the dryish style of the technical idea exposition more descriptive while representing qualitative and quantitative outcomes of transport developments by contrasting two or more objects, features, processes. The issue of translating comparative units has been covered in many scientific researches. Linguist V. I. Karaban singles out the main types of English comparative and pseudocomparative complexes on the basis of their componential analysis in scientific and technical texts, suggesting the most adequate translation models [2, p. 199–200]. Scientists T. O. Tsepeniuk, Iu. B. Golovatska, V. V. Konkulovskyy highlight procedures, techniques, methods, strategies and tactics to faithfully reproduce English amplifying comparative constructions in Ukrainian translations of modern English fiction according to their structural and semantic aspects as well as their functional purposes in a particular context. Scholar

A. A. Ryzhenkova concentrates on the functional peculiarities of comparative constructions to distinguish the means of the target language to retain these functions in translation [15].

The issue of English comparatives' functioning mainly arouses scientific interest in fiction. Meanwhile, the structural and semantic characteristics of comparative constructions in internet transport texts have not been described so far. The relevance of research is stipulated by certain common and distinctive properties of syntactic comparative units in both source and target languages, so their detailed analysis allows a translator to identify the appropriate ways of their adequate rendering into Ukrainian.

The aim of research is based on structural and semantic features of English comparatives for their faithful conveying in English internet transport texts into Ukrainian. It is realized through the following tasks fulfilment:

- to conduct a structural and semantic analysis of English comparative constructions in internet transport texts;
- to describe the most applicable translation ways and translation models to adequately convey English comparative units into Ukrainian.

In the process of research, there were some general scientific and specific methods employed. The method of theoretical sources analysis was used to clarify the notion “comparative construction” and to investigate its structural and semantic nature. The contextual method of studying original internet texts was designed to distinguish the comparative constructions and to determine their functional potential. The componential method was applied to construct the most common comparative models in internet transport texts. The method of translation interpretation of results enabled to identify the most common ways and models of conveying them into Ukrainian.

Research Outcomes. As the research shows, comparative constructions usually have four- or five-component structure. The comparative models of both classifications are highlighted in the research. Parameters with comparative markers that form comparative and superlative degrees of comparison of adjectives perform a great functional loading in forming comparative constructions in English internet transport texts. It is worth noting that comparatives with adjectives account for 60% of the total number of cases (100 structures). The first – positive – degree of comparison of adjectives expresses some quality of objects and corresponds to the dictionary form [1, p. 197–199]. The most frequent application of the positive degree of adjectives can be singled out

in the comparative structures of equality introduced by the comparative index “as...as”. “*Most applications are only as good as the data they can possess...*” [8]. The common model with adjectives-parameters (comparee – index – parameter – standard) is extended by the fifth component in this example – a marker which is an adverbial amplifier “only”. It emphasizes the only condition an innovative transport technology should satisfy to function effectively. The final comparative model can be illustrated as follows: comparee (noun phrase) – marker (adverbial modifier of degree) – parameter (adjective in the positive degree) – index (double conjunction) – standard (noun).

In many cases the comparee, the parameter and the standard in internet transport texts are connected by the following comparative indexes: like, as, as though, as if, the same... as, similar to, such as. “*Gartner Hype Cycle Special Manufacturers now treat interstate highways as if they are part of the assembly line...*” In this case the comparative model “comparee (transport term) – index (conjunctive phrase) – standard (adverbial clause of comparison)” gives positive characteristics of biometrics that is compared to a novel technology. So, the comparatives of equality in simple and complex sentences constitute 15% of the examples considered.

It was revealed that comparative constructions of inequality with qualitative adjectives in the comparative degree prevail in internet transport texts and amount to 25% of all the cases. The comparative degree of adjectives denotes a higher or lower level of quality over the quality of another object and is formed by means of adding the suffix -er to the stems of monosyllabic or disyllabic adjectives or “more” to some disyllabic or trisyllabic adjectives [1].

According to structural and semantic criteria comparative units with parameters – adjectives in the comparative degree were classified into four models:

a. Comparee (syndetic terminological cluster) – marker I (adverb of degree) – parameter (adjective) – marker II (morpheme -er) – index (conjunction) – standard (syndetic terminological cluster). “*From optical point of view, when the size of materials is comparatively smaller than the wave length of visible light...*” This model represents a comparee with one parameter being contrasted against a standard to express a lower level of the quantitative feature (size) over another quantitative property (length) in nanomaterials technology development.

b. Comparee (asyndetic terminological cluster) – parameter I (adjectival word-group) – index I (copulative conjunction) – parameter II (adjectival word-

group) – index II (conjunction) – standard (asyndetic terminological cluster). “*On the other hand, plastic type scratch has smoother surface and less ability to light scattering than the fracture type scratch...*” In this construction a comparee with two parameters is opposed to one standard.

c. Comparee (noun phrase) – parameter I (adjective) – marker I (morpheme -er) – parameter II (adjective) – marker II (morpheme -er) – implicit standard. “*Modern trends that nanotechnology enables for the automobile are lighter and stronger materials...*” The comparative complex includes a comparee with two parameters in contrast with an implicit standard to show a better quality of nanomaterials over the existing ones that are implicitly expressed in the context of the sentence.

d. Parameter marker I (adverb of degree) – parameter I (adjective) – comparee I (asyndetic terminological cluster) – implicit standard I – index (copulative conjunction) – parameter II (adjective) – comparee II (noun) – implicit standard II. “*If they invested in more affordable public transport options and a better infrastructure, the incidence of congestion would decrease in major cities*” [9]. The comparative construction emphasizes a higher degree of quality of two comparees with two parameters over the existing properties of two implicit standards in the the adverbial clause of unreal condition.

Thus, it can be inferred that such basic components as comparees and explicit standards in four types of comparatives with adjectives-parameters in the comparative degree are mostly expressed by noun clusters, asyndetic or syndetic terminological noun clusters while markers as adverbs of degree function as amplifiers.

It is worth pointing out that adjectives in the superlative degree function as the components of comparative constructions of inequality, often emphasizing the superior feature of the comparee. For example, “*the lowest weathering performance*”; “*the largest station*”; “*the most reliable road surface finish*”; “*the greatest part of a ship owner’s outlay*”; “*...the most common sizes are one TEU, two TEU...*”. The comparative structures of inequality with parameters (the superlative degree of adjectives) and comparees, mainly expressed by the terminological noun clusters, denote the lowest or the highest level of qualitative and quantitative characteristics concerning technical specifications of transport mechanisms, threshold values and temporal factors. Thus, they encompass comparees, parameters, parameter markers and implicit standards, functioning in 20% of the cases considered.

It is worth identifying the numeral as a quantitative component of comparative constructions of inequality that is often applied in internet transport texts. The numeral (cardinal, ordinal, fractional) has a categorial meaning of number and forms compound numerals, numerical substantives. It can be included in subject, object, predicative or adverbial groups in its numerical attributive function [1, p. 38]. “*Per capita private cars generate three times more greenhouse gas emissions than public transport systems like buses*” [13]. The comparative model can be represented as follows: comparee (grammatical structure) – parameter (numerical phrase) – marker II (the comparative degree) – standard I marker (than) – standard I (noun phrase) – index (conjunction) – standard II (noun). The quantitative component “three” expressed by the cardinal numeral shows an increasing amount of harmful substance in comparison with that of conventional transport systems. The sentence extended by the comparative structure has negative semantics as it describes a disastrous effect of rapid global urbanization in quantitative evaluation. Hence, parameters with the appropriate markers in the comparatives of quantitative inequality (25% of cases) describe decreasing or increasing figures in percentage ratio (*by between 36.1% and 38% by 2030*), by cardinal numerals (*more than 6 million cars*), by decimal fractions (*by 31.4 million tons*) or implicitly (*transport emissions may even triple by 2050*).

It is to be emphasized that there is a significant layer of parameters in comparatives (15% of all the examples) that realize quantitative and qualitative differences between the comparee and the standard implicitly in the context of the complex sentence, several sentences or a passage through the following lexico-semantic oppositions:

1) verbs of evaluative semantics: *fall – rise, decrease – increase, worsen, deteriorate – improve*;

2) noun phrases with the numerical component: *two-stroke cycle – three-stroke cycle, two-layer system of road pavement – three-layer pavement system*;

3) temporal components: *nowadays – in the past, updated – obsolete*;

4) superior or inferior semantics of adjectives, participles: *dominant, prevailing – rare, major – minor*.

To sum up, the comparative constructions of equality and inequality with adjectives in positive, comparative and superlative degrees (60%), with numerals (25%) and implicit comparatives (15%) are frequently employed in the linguistic environment of internet transport texts. As a result of the research

conducted, it was revealed that word-for-word translation at the level of word-groups and equivalent translation at the lexemic level are not always relevant to adequately convey English comparatives into Ukrainian. The importance of applying transformational approach can be substantiated by distinctive features of the source and target language systems: different ways of information transmission, predominantly verbal style of expression in English, semantic and syntactic relations between words by positioning in English rather than prepositions or case forms in Ukrainian [5, p. 127]. Translation process of syntactic units (particularly comparatives) can go through two main stages – analytical and synthetic. The former one provides adequate rendering of their individual components. The synthetic stage allows to arrange the components according to their semantic and functional properties [4].

It was found that grammatical transformations (permutation, omission, addition) are the ways for linguistic realization of comparison in translation. They were extensively investigated by researchers L. I. Chernovaty, A. M. Fitterman, T. R. Levytska, V. N. Komisarov. Since comparison is regarded as a modal category of evaluating quantitative and qualitative characteristics, it is realized in the linguistic plane by such lexical units as: terminological noun clusters, adjectives, adjectival word-groups, adverbs, numerals, verbs, conjunctions, participles, forming the structural and semantic basis of comparison. They undergo a number of lexical (transliteration, transcribing, concretization, generalization), lexico-grammatical (compensation, antonymic translation, descriptive translation) and complex transformations in translation [3]. Linguists L. P. Naumenko and A. Y. Hordyeyeva distinguish lexico-semantic (contextual substitution, word-for-word translation, descriptive translation, omission of words, permutation, transposition (nominalization, verbalization)) and grammatical transformations (replacement, partitioning, integration) that will also be applied in our translation research [6].

As was proven, comparative constructions with adjectives as parameters constitute the largest group in internet transport texts. “...modern, low-manning, low-tech ships are as safe as conventional vessels.” – “...сучасні, малокомплектвані, високотехнологічні кораблі є такими ж безпечними, як і судна класичного зразка.” The comparative construction of equality was conveyed into Ukrainian by word-for-word translation with the modulation of the standard. So, word-for-word translation consists in the replacement of all units

by the full equivalents in the target language [6]. In another case the comparative construction of equality was rendered into Ukrainian by word-for-word translation with omission of one component and transposition of another one (starting – початкова вартість) while rendering the parenthetical phrase as a part of the standard. “*In the very near future your dashboard may soon become as versatile as your laptop Ford’s Sync, an option starting at \$ 395...*” – “У найближчому майбутньому ваша панель приладів може стати такою ж універсальною, як і ноутбук Ford’s Sync з початковою вартістю від 395 доларів.” In another comparative construction of equality, the comparee and the standard emphasize common positive activities undertaken by the attorney and the plaintiff. “*Reviewing your claim with an attorney is as good as identifying who if anyone was negligent...*” – “Розгляд вашого позову у присутності адвоката є таким же важливим кроком, як і визначення особи з недбалим ставленням...” The components of the comparative construction were rendered by using equivalent translation with the transposition of gerundial forms (*reviewing, identifying*) by the corresponding Ukrainian verbal nouns. The parameter “good” was translated by the word-group through modulation. Hence, the combined transformation was resorted to: equivalent translation + transposition + modulation.

In the internet descriptive text on transport issues intended to highlight technical specifications of container parts, the comparative construction with the comparative index I “*the same... as*” expresses availability of the autopart for both types of containers but underlines the inferior state of the property marked by the negative particle “*not*” and by the adverb of manner “*enough*” with index II (adversative conjunction) “*but*”. “*Swap body units have the same bottom corners as intermodal containers but are not strong enough to be stacked*” [12]. – “Контейнери зі з’ємним кузовом мають однакові нижні кути, що і міжмодальні контейнери, але вони недостатньо міцні для укладання”. The comparee (*swap body units*) was rendered into Ukrainian by the syndetic terminological noun cluster through contextual substitution (*units* – *контейнери*) and permutation of the components while parameter II (*strong*) was conveyed by means of synonymous substitution with the comparative markers (*not, enough*) having been translated by means of the permutation of components.

In comparative constructions of inequality numerous advantages of implementing advanced transport technologies are emphasized. “*The project*

of enclosed pods has become more realistic than that advanced by R. Schmidt.” – “Проект закритих капсул став доступнішим ніж той, що розробив Р. Шмідт.” The parameter “*realistic*” was conveyed by the adjective through the lexical transformation of concretization. and the standard expressed by the elliptical clause was translated by the attributive clause through transposition. The combined transformation has the following model: equivalent translation + concretization + transposition.

There were some cases of six-component comparative constructions of inequality with two pairs of comparees and implicit standards and with appropriate comparative markers in internet informational texts on transport technologies. “*On top of that, with a large chunk of the working population operating from home, there has been greater demand for faster and more efficient broadband connections...*” – “До того ж, зріс попит на швидкісні та ефективніші широкосмугові сполучення через те, що велика частина активного населення працює дистанційно...” Parameter I “*greater*” was conveyed by the Ukrainian verb “зріс” through transposition and the permutation of components was applied to some sentence parts to emphasize the rheme in the target sentence and place the attending fact in the second position. The model of the combined transformation takes on the following form: equivalent translation + permutation+ transposition.

Internet transport advertising texts encompass comparative constructions with the superlative degree of adjectives as parameters of comparees and implicit standards. “*The advanced Propulsion Center plays a vital role in bringing together the brightest minds in industry and research institutes...*” – “Передовий центр силових установок відіграє важливу роль у пошуку найкращих фахівців промисловості та дослідних інститутів...” The comparee and the parameter constituting the metaphoric expression were translated non-metaphorically through situational substitution. It should be noted that most of the examples with the superlative degree of adjectives as parameters to explicit comparees and implicit standards show the superior position of the latest developments over conventional devices, processes or obsolete technologies. “*Compared with the electronic wizardry found in our homes and offices, even the most advanced cars built today seem stuck in the Stone Age*” [8]. – “Навіть надсучасні автомобілі сьогодення, здається, застрягли у Кам’яному віці порівняно зі смартелектронікою у наших домівках та офісних приміщеннях.” In the process of rendering the comparative construction of inequality, the sentence part

with the comparee, the parameter, the comparative index and the marker (*even*) were put in the initial position of the target language sentence for emphatic purposes through such translation transformation as permutation while the standard expressed by the metaphor (*electronic wizardry*) was conveyed non-metaphorically, applying concretization. So, the combined transformation has the following model: equivalent translation + permutation + concretization.

It is worth considering the ways of rendering comparative constructions of inequality with numerals. In some internet informational texts, the superior position of the comparee is often substantiated by statistic figures expressed by percentage ratio, cardinal compounds or ordinal numerals. “*Electric cars remain a niche product, with less than 2% of the market, due to higher prices and worries about a lack of places to charge*” [10]. – “Електромобілі залишаються продукцією незайнятого ринку товарів з асортиментом менше ніж 2%. Це відбувається через вищі ціни та занепокоєння про нестачу зарядних станцій.” The structural and semantic analysis of comparative constituents enabled to single out 5-component comparative construction, where the standard (*a niche product*) was translated in a descriptive way. Quantitative parameter I (*less*), comparative index (*than*), numerical marker (2%), the standard (*market*) were translated by means of concretization and permutation. The comparee (*electric cars*) was rendered into Ukrainian by the compound noun through transposition. Outer partitioning allowed to divide the original simple sentence extended by two comparative constructions into two simple ones to emphasize causal relations. The translation model with the combined transformation has the following representation: equivalent translation + descriptive way + concretization + transposition + outer partitioning.

Apart from explicit expression of comparison in constructions of equality, inequality, implicit comparisons perform their semantic peculiarities in the context of complex sentences or several copular sentences or within the passage. “*While engine design methods are well established, the increasing thermal loads are causing significant mechanical stresses in components... .*” – “В той час, як методи розробки двигунів загально визнані, зростаючі температурні навантаження спричиняють значні механічні напруги у підсистемах двигуна... .” The adverbial clause of attending circumstances with the conjunction “*while*” was rendered into Ukrainian by the equivalent clause. Implicit comparison emphasizes the contradiction between the well-established

methods and the deteriorating state of some engine subsystems. The elements of the standard expressed by the terminological noun cluster (*engine design methods*) were rendered into Ukrainian by means of permutation while the element of the extended comparee (*component*) was conveyed by modulation. The translation model is expressed as follows: equivalent translation + permutation + modulation

It is noteworthy that semantic oppositions are realized in the context of two sentences, thus forming situational comparatives. “*So far, electrics are most popular in wealthier countries with per capita incomes over 40 000 euros a year... . In poorer countries, electrics are nowhere to be seen.*” – “До сих пір, електронне обладнання є найпопулярнішим явищем у більш розвинутих країнах з прибутком понад 40 тисяч євро щорічно на душу населення, а в країнах, що розвиваються, воно відсутнє.” In order to faithfully convey the semantic oppositions (*wealthier countries – poorer countries; availability of electronics – nowhere to be seen*), it’s necessary to follow some lexico-semantic and grammatical transformations. Descriptive way was employed to convey two noun clusters (the first semantic opposition). The noun “*electrics*”(comparee) was translated by the noun cluster through modulation. To emphasize the contrast, it’s relevant to integrate two original sentences into the composite one with the adversative coordination by using the comparative index “*a*” in translation. The combined transformation model is as follows: equivalent translation + descriptive translation + modulation + integration.

Thus, situational comparatives express superiority or inferiority of one object over another in terms of several quantitative or qualitative properties in the context of a passage. “*The Cass Freight Index returned a 27.6% year-over-year increase in shipments with the expenditures component of the index jumping 45.1%. The comparisons to the prior year reflect widespread quarantine mandates that brought the economy to a temporary halt*” [7]. – “Вантажний індекс Кас знову на позначці 27.6% від річного збільшення товарних партій, причому показник витрат сягнув 45.1%. Порівняння з минулим роком відображають поширені карантинні вимоги, які спричинили тимчасове уповільнення економічної активності.” Comparee I (*The Cass Freight Index*) was translated by permutation of the components, standard I (*shipments*) was rendered by modulation while comparative marker I (*a 27.6% year-over-year*) was conveyed into Ukrainian through partial explication and transposition of the second component (*річного*). Comparee II (*the expenditures component of the index*) was translated

into Ukrainian by the two-component noun phrase (*показник витрат*) through omission, permutation and synonymous substitution.

Conclusions. Qualitative and quantitative characteristics of innovative transport technologies, their divergencies with the conventional ones are effectively realized in the linguistic plane of internet transport texts through comparative constructions of equality and inequality with the following components: comparee – marker – parameter – index – standard or implicit standard. The componential analysis enabled to single out the main components of comparatives: the comparee and the standard mainly expressed by terminological noun clusters as well as the parameter expressed by adjectives in positive, comparative and superlative degrees and by numerals. Implicit comparison is realized through lexico-semantic oppositions in the context of a complex sentence, two sentences or a passage. Structural and semantic characteristics of comparative constructions and the transformational approach to rendering their components

into Ukrainian allowed to build the most common translation models of comparative constructions with the adjectives – parameters in the positive degree (equivalent translation + transposition + modulation, word-for-word translation + omission + transposition; contextual substitution + synonymous substitution + permutation), in the comparative degree (equivalent translation + concretization + transposition; equivalent translation + permutation + transposition), in the superlative degree (equivalent translation + permutation + concretization), with numerals (equivalent translation + descriptive translation + concretization + transposition + outer partitioning), of implicit comparison (equivalent translation + permutation + modulation; equivalent translation + descriptive translation + modulation + integration). In the perspective, it is worth focusing on the main translation strategies, tactics and means of conveying English comparative constructions into Ukrainian that will enable to work out the translation algorithm for different comparative models in English internet transport texts .

References:

1. Блох М. Я. Курс теоретической грамматики английского языка. М., 2000. 380 с.
2. Карабан В. І. Переклад англійської наукової і технічної літератури. Граматичні труднощі, лексичні, термінологічні та жанрово-стилістичні проблеми. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2004. 576 с.
3. Комиссаров В. Н. Современное переводоведение. М. : ЭТС, 2001. 424 с.
4. Корунець І. В. Теорія і практика перекладу (аспектний переклад): Підручник. Вінниця. «Нова Книга», 2003. 448 с.
5. Мірам Г. Е. Основы перекладу (курс лекцій з теорії перекладу англійською мовою) (співавтори: О. Гон, М. Грищенко, В. Дайнеко, Л. Тарануха). К. : Ельга Ніка-Центр, 2005. С. 127.
6. Науменко Л. П., Гордєєва А. Й. Практичний курс перекладу з англійської мови на українську. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2011. 136 с.
7. April Freight Trends Jump, 2021 To Be 'Extraordinarily Strong Year'. URL: <https://www.benzinga.com/news/earnings/21/05/21088150/april-freight-trends-jump-2021-to-be-extraordinarily-strong-year>
8. Car and driver. URL: <https://www.caranddriver.com/features/a15128721/the-future-of-in-car-technology/>
9. Cause & Effect Essay: Traffic Problems of a Big City. URL: <https://www.scholaradvisor.com/essay-examples/effect-essay-traffic-problems-of-big-city/>
10. David Mchugh. Volkswagen bets big on electric. Will consumers buy in? URL: <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/business/autos/foreign/2019/09/09/vw-unveil-new-logo-affordable-cars-show-new-era/40101945/>
11. Dixon Robert M. W. Comparative Constructions in English. Melbourne. 2005. 27 p.
12. Intermodal freight transport. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intermodal_freight_transport
13. Lindau T. Transport Plays a Key Role in Urban Air Quality. URL: <https://www.wri.org/insights/transport-plays-key-role-urban-air-quality>
14. Shapovalova N.P. The functional-semantic status of comparative constructions in Modern Ukrainian Language. Manuscript. The thesis for the scientific degree of the philological sciences of the speciality 10.02.01 – Ukrainian language. Donetsk University. Donetsk, 1998. 180 p.
15. Translation of amplifying comparative constructions in modern fiction / Tsepeniuk T. et al. // Analele Universitii din Craiova / Seria Tiinte Filologice Lingvistice. Craiova, 2020. № 42. P. 224–237.
16. Treis Yv. Comparative Constructions: An Introduction. Linguistic Discovery, Dartmouth College Library, 2018, On the expression of comparison: Contributions to the typology of comparative constructions from lesser-known languages (guest editors: Yvonne Treis & Katarzyna I. Wojtylak), 16 (1), pp. I–XXVI. ff10.1349/PS1.1537-0852.A.492ff. fhal-02005012v2

Мошковська Л. М. СТРУКТУРНО-СЕМАНТИЧНІ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ КОМПАРАТИВНИХ КОНСТРУКЦІЙ В ІНТЕРНЕТ-ТЕКСТАХ ТРАНСПОРТНОЇ ТЕМАТИКИ: ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКІ АСПЕКТИ

Стаття спрямована на дослідження структурно-семантичних властивостей англійських компаративних конструкцій в інтернет-текстах транспортної тематики для їх точної передачі українською мовою. Під час дослідження застосовано метод аналізу теоретичних джерел, контекстуальний метод вивчення оригінальних інтернет-текстів, компонентний метод та метод перекладацького тлумачення отриманих результатів.

В результаті дослідження, на основі структурно-семантичних критеріїв найпоширеніші компаративні конструкції нерівності (25% від загальної кількості випадків) з якісними прикметниками у порівняльному ступені розкласифіковано на чотири основні типи та виокремлено п'ять базових компонентів: об'єкт порівняння, маркер, параметр-властивість, вказівник, стандарт. Виявлено, що компаративи рівності з прикметниками-параметрами у позитивному ступені налічують 15%, у вищому ступені порівняння – 20%. Компаративи нерівності з числівниками (25%), що виступають параметрами, описують спадні та зростаючі показники у відсотках та складними кількісними числівниками. Імплицитні компаративи (15%) описано в лексико-семантичних опозиціях в контексті простих речень або абзацу. Зазначено, що об'єкти порівняння та стандарти переважно виражаються термінологічними іменними словосполученнями, параметри – прикметниками, числівниками, підлягаючи трансформаціям при перекладі, а маркери та вказівники – еквівалентному перекладу. Найпоширенішими перекладацькими способами виявились пермутація та транспозиція для п'яти типів компаративів. Доведено, що перекладацькі моделі комбінованих трансформацій найточніше передають зміст англійських компаративних конструкцій на українську мову.

Підсумовуючи, компаративні конструкції є складними синтаксичними одиницями оцінної семантики, які розкласифіковано на два типи з урахуванням рівності та нерівності якостей об'єкта порівняння та стандарту. Виокремлено найпоширеніші способи та моделі точної передачі англійських компаративів на цільову мову у відповідності до структурно-семантичних характеристик їх компонентів.

Ключові слова: порівняння, компаративна конструкція, об'єкт порівняння, стандарт, пермутація, комбінована трансформація.