



BIBLIOTEKARZ PODLASKI  
2/2020 (XLVII)  
<https://doi.org/10.36770/bp.482>  
ISSN 1640-7806 (druk) ISSN 2544-8900 (online)  
<http://bibliotekarzpodlaski.pl>



Nadiya Balandina\*

Odessa National Polytechnic University, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6933-838X>

## The Common and the Specific in the Translation of Pragmatic Clichés

**Abstract:** The object of the analysis is pragmatic clichés. Their linguistic behavioral nature serves as an example to demonstrate subtleties of Czech-Ukrainian translation and is based on the differentiation of the common and the specific, systemizing the specific which causes most translation difficulties. Among the common features we can specify are: the presence of explicit or implicit performatives in the structure of clichés; speech act specificity; the connection with stereotypical communicative situations and culturally defined standards of behavior; perception of communicative success in different spheres and at different stages; retranslation of ethical and cultural meanings; the obligatory nature of the recipient's reaction, at least, in the form of 'received'. The specific is presented as a set of attributes different from the attributes of an analogous unit of the target language; it should demonstrate quantitative and qualitative definiteness. The study shows the way the specific can cause interest, occasionally cognitive dissonance, and cases when it can hinder full-fledged communication. The specific has been described in the context of issues of translation equivalence and adequacy. It has been proved that the vocabulary si-

\* Doctor of Philology, full professor Nadiya Balandina – works at the department of information activity and media communications of Odessa National Polytechnic University (Ukraine).

Nadiya Balandina, *The Common and the Specific in the Translation of Pragmatic Clichés*

gnificative equivalent is only one possibility among the abundance of reference variants connected with specific contexts. Taking verbs as an example, the paper offers possible approaches to rendering grammatical meanings which are abstract by their nature and require taking into consideration different nuances and subtleties, including frequency of usage. Zero equivalence is presented as the highest degree of expressing the specific. This idea is proved using the translations of wishes which include the lexemes *рушник* (lit. 'towel/ cloth') and *доля* (lit. 'fate') in the Ukrainian language. The common and the specific are characteristic for both the linguistic model and the communicative model of translating pragmatic clichés. But it is the specific which offers most resistance in the process of rendering linguistic units.

**Key words:** pragmatic clichés, translation, common and specific, equivalence and adequacy, non-equivalence.

### Introduction

The transition to translation as an international communicative process has highlighted considerable gaps in translation studies as the phenomena of language and speech frequently fail to be differentiated in the search for analogies. As a result, vocabulary significant correspondences become irrelevant at the reference level. This also applies to the object of our study, pragmatic clichés belonging to a wider category – language stereotypes. Leaving aside the differentiation of stereotypes and clichés as a separate terminological issue<sup>1</sup>, we assume that these groups typically enter genus-species relations where stereotypes belong to the genus field. Pragmatic clichés possess pronounced conventional behavioral features and are different from other stereotypes as the usage of the former is equal to action. Hence, there is a clear reason for using the

<sup>1</sup> N. Romanyuk, *Dyferencijni ta klasyfikacijni oznaky movnoyi klishovanoyi odynyci*, „Visnyk Zaporizkogo nacionalnogo universytetu. Seriya „Filologichni nauky”, Zaporizhzhya 2017, no. 1, pp. 177-182; F. Baider, *Cultural Stereotypes and Linguistic Clichés: Their Usefulness*, „Intercultural Competency. International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education” 2013, Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp. 1166-1171.

attributive feature of this notion ‘*clichés*’ – ‘*pragmatic*’ deriving from Greek *pragma* ‘action’. By saying *Thank you*, the speaker performs an act of expressing gratitude. The maxim *Word is Action* used referring to pragmatic clichés ceases to be a mere metaphor. The same applies to greetings, partings, wishes, requests, permissions, prohibitions, etc., i.e. for a standard set of formulae used in stereotypical situations and characteristic for different communicative cultures. There is a simplistic perception of such formulae as ‘trite coins’, as routine interactions can become a stumbling-block for international communication and translation processes. In modern translation studies, the role of stereotypes and the peculiarities of their translation remain poorly explored as a possible result of insufficient studies of communication issues in general and, more specifically, of standardized communication. In the context of the general Theory of translation, they were occasionally considered by specialists in Germanic and Romance languages (A. R. Garipova, A. I. Kazantsev, V. I. Karaban, J. K. Catford, L. L. Nelyubin, L. M. Chernovaty), there are separate works on the Slavic linguistic basis (L. I. Danylenko, S. Leshchak, O. L. Palamarchuk). At the same time, it is the standardization of all spheres of human activity in the age of globalization that requires scholars to study these linguistic units in-depth, the necessity of which has been repeatedly stated by different professionals<sup>2</sup>. It is also worth noting the applied aspect of the issue: clichéd units. First and foremost, etiquette formulae are acquired during initial stages of study of any foreign language, and that is why the results will be useful for the analysis of interlingual communicative and culturally specific features.

The object of our study is Czech-Ukrainian translation clichéd analogies, the unique linguistic behavioral natures of which can serve as an optimal example for a demonstration of translation subtleties. This research aims to differentiate the common and the specific in pragmatic clichés of the Czech and the Ukrainian languages, to systemize the specific features hindering the translation process.

Theoretical-methodological basis of the work are achievements in the field of Theory and practice of translation (S. Vlahov, S. Florin, V. I. Karaban,

<sup>2</sup> L. L. Nelyubin, *Vvedenie v tekhniku perevoda*, Moskva 2007, p. 133; Ya. I. Retsker, *Teoriya perevoda i perevodcheskaya praktika. Ocherki lingvisticheskoi teorii perevoda, dopolneniya i komentarii D. I. Ermolovicha*, Moskva 2007, pp. 163-165.

Nadiya Balandina, *The Common and the Specific in the Translation of Pragmatic Clichés*

I. V. Korunets, V. N. Krupnov, Y. J. Retsker, J. Levý), Communicative linguistics and the Theory of speech acts (F. S. Batsevich, V. I. Karasik, J. R. Searle, J. Hoffmannová, O. Müllerová) and Intercultural communication (J. Bartmiński, A. Wierzbicka, V. M. Manakin, K. I. Mizin).

The paper utilizes a complex methodology including a structural-semantic method used to locate structural elements of pragmatic clichés and their inherent meanings; a comparative method is used to describe the national cultural specificities and their assimilation through a different language; a method of speech act analysis is used to select translation equivalents creating an adequate communicative effect.

### **The Unity of the Common and the Specific in the Process of Studies of Pragmatic Clichés**

Pragmatic clichés are problematic for our cognition as they require taking into consideration a whole range of indicative features – linguistic categorial, cognitive, communicative, national specific, occasionally motivational affective<sup>3</sup>. They work at all stages of communication, contribute to the implementation of the principles of successful communication in various fields: domestic, official-business, scientific, socio-political, cultural-artistic, represent the standard of conventional behavior established by cultural tradition. Pragmatic clichés, on the one hand, are linguistic units belonging to the language system, and on the other hand, they are verbal reactions to stereotypical situations, and that is why the translation should conform to the requirements: 1) linguistic systemic equivalence; 2) communicative pragmatic and cultural adequacy.

Having set the aim to ascertain the role of the common and the specific in the process of pragmatic cliché translation, we need to make a small remark about the essence of the dual philosophical category *common / specific* in the context of our study: the common is the complex of features uniting the pragmatic clichés of both languages; the specific, on the contrary, showcases clichés of one language on the background of the other one as different, singular. Understanding the unity of the common and the specific leads to the conclu-

<sup>3</sup> N. F. Balandina, *Funktsiyyi i znachennyya ches'kykh prahmatychnykh klishe v komunikatyvnomu konteksti: monohrafiya*, Kyiv 2002; G. R. Safiullina, *Sposoby perevoda pragmaticheskikh klishe s tatarskogo yazyka na russkij yazik*, „Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki” 2018, no. 9(87), vol. 1, pp. 166-169. Available at: [www.gramota.net/materials/2/2018/9-1/37.html](http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2018/9-1/37.html).

sion about the necessity to analyze any translation unit as the one having both common and specific features.

Among the common, general features of pragmatic clichés from both languages we can specify the following:

- ▶ the structure of pragmatic clichés – explicitly or implicitly – includes performatives (from Latin *performo* – ‘act’) – verbs in the first person singular or plural of the Present Tense of indicative mood: *прошу / просимо, проголошю / проголошуємо, застерігаю / застерігаємо* etc. The term *performative* was introduced by a British logician, John Austin<sup>4</sup>, who laid the groundwork for the classification which was later developed by an American philosopher, John Searle<sup>5</sup>. This classification has been modified and extended on the basis of specific languages. For instance, Yu. D. Апресян specified fifteen groups of words in the Russian language: 1) messages, declarations; 2) confession; 3) promises, 4) requests, 5) offers and advice; 6) warnings, prophecies, 7) requirements, orders, 8) prohibitions, permissions; 9) agreements, objections; 10) approval; 11) condemnation; 12) pardon; 13) language rituals; 14) social acts of transference, alienation, cancellation, refusal; 15) nomination, designation<sup>6</sup>, generally characteristic for both the Czech and the Ukrainian languages.
- ▶ valency potential of performative verbs in the structure of clichés asks for the positions of the speaker and the recipient, and there appears a three-component speech act: *speaker – verbal action – recipient*, for example: *I (we) ask you*. Naturally, it is an ideal pattern. In real-life speech, one can observe various transformations and modifications, e.g. verbs can be nominalized, but the deeper meaning remains virtually unchanged if one refrains from delving into pragmatic and situational subtleties.
- ▶ pragmatic clichés are marks of stereotypical actions, have a socially essential and determined quality, and represent a standard of conventional behavior set by the cultural tradition;

<sup>4</sup> Dzh. L. Ostin, *Slovo kak deystviye*, [in] *Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike*, vol. 17: *Teoriya rechevykh aktov, obshch*, ed. B. Yu. Gorodetskogo, Moskva 1986, pp. 22-130.

<sup>5</sup> R. Serl' Dzh., *Chto takoye rechevoy akt?*, [in] *ibid.*, pp. 151-169.

<sup>6</sup> Yu. D. Апресян, *Izbrannyye trudy: v 2 t.*, vol. 2: *Integral'noye opisaniye yazyka i sistemnaya leksikografiya*, Moskva 1995, pp. 200-202.

Nadiya Balandina, *The Common and the Specific in the Translation of Pragmatic Clichés*

- ▶ unlike other language stereotypes, they are used at any stage of communication, and ensure its success from the point of view of the maxim of cooperation (according to H. P. Grice) and the politeness maxim (Geoffrey Leech) in different spheres: domestic, business, scientific, social, political, artistic;
- ▶ are indicators of ethical and cultural meanings, and optimize the speech process;
- ▶ using pragmatic clichés calls for a reaction (at least, in the form of ‘Received’), while the main importance is given to the communicative effect, and not the content adequacy.

### The Specific as Individuality of Speech Practices

The specific in the pragmatic cliché is a set of properties that set it aside from the properties of an analogue in the target language and demonstrate quantitative and qualitative distinctness.

The specific always causes interest and occasionally cognitive dissonance, and sometimes becomes a barrier to full-fledged communication. At the same time, the specific should not be perceived as an obstacle to be removed. On the contrary, it is an organic and essential component of different language communities that aims not to divide, but to regulate their cooperation. The main aim of the specific is to show the distinctiveness of language practices, and also to stimulate interest in a different cultural society and its cultural code.

In such a way, the Central European words of gratitude are marked by the specificity, and the lexeme with the meaning ‘good’ acts as their intensifier: *Krásně děkuji* (Czech), *Danke schön* (German), *Köszönöm szépen* (Hungarian), *Chvala lepo* (Serbian). That stresses the courtesy of the behavior and even its aesthetic aspect. Against this background, the intensifiers of qualitative semantics are more common in the Ukrainian, Russian, Byelorussian, and Polish linguistic areas: *Дуже дякую* (Ukrainian), *Очень благодарю* (Russian), *Вельмі дякую* (Byelorussian), *Bardzo dziękuję* (Polish). Still, this pattern is not completely consistent: in the Central European and the Eastern European linguistic areas it is possible to find words of gratitude such as *děkuji mnohokrát* (Czech), *много вам хвала* (Serbian), and *премногу благодарен* (Russian). Speakers often try to highlight not only the formal aspect of gratitude, but also its ethical moment, stressing their sincerity: *щиро* (Ukrainian), *искренне* (Russian), *upřímně* (Czech), *szczerze* (Polish).

An average Ukrainian entering the Czech linguistic area feels cultural dissonance hearing the warning *Pozor!* (*Увага!*, ‘Attention!’), which is associated with the Russian *Позор!* (*Ганьба!*, ‘Shame!’). Both lexemes present an example of interlingual homonymy that originated as a result of the initial development and later dissolution of polysemy. According to the etymological dictionary, the word had the original meaning ‘attention’, ‘sensation’<sup>7</sup>. With time, the primary meaning acquired new shades: in the Czech language the meaning ‘visual perception of something’ remained, with an additional seme, ‘attention’, as concentration on something or somebody. In the Russian language the concentration is aimed at an object (a person, a phenomenon) causing condemnation, disrespect.

An invitation to enter *Dále!* (Ukr.: *Прощу!*, *Будь ласка, Заходьте!*), due to its formal semantic similarity to the Ukrainian *Далі!*, is also able to deceive the Ukrainian speaker and to cause a case of stylistic disagreement. Though Czech *Dále!* and Ukrainian *Далі!* express declaration of intent – permission to enter, they still belong to different tonal registers: for the former language it is neutral, and for the latter it is low, which can negatively affect both the success of communication and translation.

Similarly, the literal translation of the address to young women *mladá paní* by the phrase *young lady* is correct in relation with linguistic equivalence, but in Ukrainian it is not a cliché that is reproduced in the text as a completed unit, so in terms of communicative adequacy it requires consideration of contextual factors and communication goals. The closest equivalent is the address *панна*, *панянка*, but they are practically not used in current practices.

Addressing a young woman as *mladá paní* may seem impolite to a Ukrainian as from the psychological perspective it refers to the subconscious antonymy ‘young – old’ and the subsequent impolite ageism aimed at women. Actually, the Czech form of address *mladá paní* can serve as a sort of flattery, a manipulative technique when a speaker is interested in successful communication with a woman who might not be so young after all. The nomination *mladá paní* owes its frequency to the wide circle of people it can signify: it can be an unmarried girl (*slečna*) and an actual young woman (*mladá pani*), and even a woman already addressed as *paní* who is past a certain age. This can be

<sup>7</sup> M. Fasmer, *Etimologicheskij slovar' russkogo yazyka: v 4 t.*, vol. 3, Moskva 1987, p. 303

Nadiya Balandina, *The Common and the Specific in the Translation of Pragmatic Clichés*

further proved by a typical newspaper advertisement: «*Mladá paní (52) hledá zaměstnání*».

A Czech marriage proposal is also likely to cause a certain cognitive dissonance. *Vezmeš si mne? (lit. \*Чи візьмеш мене (собі)? – (Чи) Вийдеш за мене (заміж)? Прошу твоєї руки)* can be perceived as somewhat humiliating for a man. A similar configuration of positions is communicated in the constative *Vzala si hodného muže (lit. Взяла собі хорошого чоловіка)*. Meanwhile, in the Ukrainian translation, it is only possible to use *Вийшла за хорошого чоловіка* (and not *взяла собі*). The literal translation *Vzala si hodného muže* as *\*Взяла собі хорошого чоловіка* is incorrect. However, Czech also uses the synonym *Vdala se za hodného muže*, fully equivalent to the Ukrainian *Вийшла за хорошого чоловіка*. The cultural specificity of the Ukrainian cliché presents the male position as higher. The Czech proposal, in its turn, raises the female position.

A jocular wish of luck, in particular, to students taking an exam, *Zlom vaz!* (Lit. *Скрути собі в'язи*) – *Hi nuxu ni nera!* can be perceived as black humor by Ukrainians lacking the cultural context. But the Czechs are not completely original in this aspect as the British use the expression *Break a leg!* (lit. *Зламай ногу*), and the German wish is to break not only legs but also a neck: *Hals und Beinbruch*. The Czech cliché is likely to have German origins where it is used among sportsmen, actors or acrobats. The Ukrainian equivalent *Hi nuxu ni nera!* has an Eastern-European background and used to be a wish for lucky hunting, a ward against the evil eye. The wish for fishermen *Hi xvosta ni lusk!* has a similar intention.

The provided examples testify that an essential condition for a successful translation is a knowledge of specificities, subtleties, and the ability to interpret language signs bearing different connotations<sup>8</sup>. Under such circumstances, the translator must maneuver between the proverbial Scylla and Charybdis: keep the national specific worldview, ethical behavioral models, and simultaneously make them accessible for another linguistic space.

<sup>8</sup> See: K. I. Mizin, O. O. Petrov, *Zistavna linhvokul'turolohiya: metodolohichni problemy ta perspektyvni metodyky: monohrafiya, Pereyaslav-Khmel'nyts'kyi*, Kremenchuk: Vinnytsya, 2018.

### Equivalence and Adequacy of Translation in the Context of the Specific

The behavioral nature of clichés requires both adhering to the linguistic systemic equivalence and the communicative pragmatic adequacy. That mostly corresponds to Yu. Naida's idea about two levels of equivalence: formal and dynamic. With the orientation for the formal equivalency, the attention is focused on the message's form and content; meanwhile, the dynamic level calls for correlations recreating the dynamic connection between the message and the recipient existing in the source language<sup>9</sup>. So, from the point of view of linguistic equivalence, the greeting *Přeji hezký podvečer!* should be rendered as *Бажаю гарного підвечір'я!*, but the dynamic model offers the equivalent *Доброго вечора!* Actually, translation studies have many more translation models<sup>10</sup>. In our case, we focus on the barriers characteristic for the lingual and communicative-pragmatic models.

In related languages, the tendency for word-to-word translation is only natural, but the lexical equivalence is not always sufficient for pragmatic adequacy: the dictionary significative option is only one possibility among the abundance of reference variants. For instance, in the cliché *Upozornění: Průchod zakázán* the dictionary provides the word *upozornění* with the translation *попередження*. This option contradicts the Ukrainian behavioral traditions as such warnings possess a marker *увага* (*Увага: прохід заборонений / заборонено*). In the source language, the focus is the fact of warning (*upozornění*), while the target language highlights attracting attention (*увага*).

There exist certain issues with the translation of separate words in clichés as the set of word meanings differs in different languages. The Czech *prohlášení* and the Ukrainian *заява* show some similarity in the meaning "someone's message, addressing someone combined with providing certain data, statements, thoughts", while the meaning 'a written request made according to a specific template and filed to an official body or an organization' is rendered in the Czech language by the word *žádost*. Meanwhile, the Czech *žádost* and the Ukrainian

<sup>9</sup> Yu. Naida, *K nauke perevodit'*, [in] *Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoy lingvistike*, Moskva 1978, pp. 114-136.

<sup>10</sup> See: V. V. Sdobnikov, O. V. Petrova, *Teoriya perevoda: Uchebnik dlya perevodcheskikh fakul'tetov i fakul'tetov inostrannykh yazykov*, N. Novgorod 2001, pp. 227-257.

клопотання coincide only in the meaning ‘written application, request for something sent to an official body’, while the Czech system of meanings lacks the elements ‘Care, unrest, worrying about someone’ (e. g., ‘клопочуся за нього’), considering something «клопочу собі голову», taking care of business or domestic work’; only the expression *žádost o milost* has a similar meaning.

Some difficulties can appear while translating Czech toasts, the specificity of which lies in the usage of the lexeme *připítek*. To propose a toast is *připít*, ‘*trochu se napít ve společnosti (alkoholického napoje)*’<sup>11</sup> (to drink a little in company (an alcoholic drink)). The determined character of table manners, rules of decorum, are likely to have caused the appearance of the word *připít* in the meaning of proposing a toast. The closest Ukrainian equivalent is *призубити*, ‘to drink symbolically’. The temptation to translate the toast *Připíjím na krásu české země* using the main meaning of *připít* as *призубити*: *Призублюю (цей келих) за красу чеської землі* would lead to a certain loss, as in the Ukrainian tradition people would usually drink for somebody or something. That is why a more accurate translation should be even not *П’ю (Хочу випити)*, but *Виголошую (Хочу виголосити) цей тост / Піднімаю / (Хочу підняти) цей келих за красу чеської землі*. In Czech table etiquette, there is a rarely used synonymic expression *napít se na...* (*Napijete se na...*), but it lacks the sense *trochu* ‘a bit’. It is also worth mentioning the formal aspect of the representation of the grammatical object: the Czech language uses the structure *připít / napít se + na...*; the Ukrainian language has *випити + за...* The latter also has a toast *На щастя, на долю!* whose form is similar to the Czech one.

A slightly different approach is needed to render abstract grammatical meanings that require taking into consideration different subtleties. The requirement for adequacy creates the need for tracing the frequency of usage of some grammatical forms. If one compares the Czech prohibitions for smoking *Zákaz kouření* and *Kouření zakázáno!*, the former is more frequent, which is proved by a review of plaque samples advertised by the producing companies. As for the Ukrainian variants – *Курити заборонено!* and *Курити забороняється!* – the latter option is less frequent. The reason is the active spread of impersonal forms ending with *но-*, *то-*.

<sup>11</sup> *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého*, Za vedení B. Havránka (hlavního redaktora), J. Běliče, M. Helcla and A. Jedličky. Available at: <http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/>.

The grammatical category of aspect is also significant. In the offers to have a seat *Sedněte si, prosím, Posadte se, prosím* one can observe the perfective form which, from the point of view of translation equivalent, motivates to preserve the aspect form: *Сядьте, будь ласка (прошу)*. But in the language usage there is a dominance of the expressions *Сідайте, будь ласка, Сідайте, прошу (просимо)*, in which the imperfective aspect of the verb provides the offer with the meaning of flexibility, repeated action, while the offer *Сядьте, будь ласка (прошу, просимо)* shows a higher degree of imperativeness. The verb aspect in translation practice often becomes a sticking point as translators are inclined to transfer the grammatical status of their native language to the unit of the target language.

### Zero Equivalence as the Highest Degree of the Specific

While translating pragmatic clichés, one can encounter zero-equivalent units metaphorically called *translatorum Cruces* ‘Passion of translators’ by Jiří Levý. We will explain this notion using the example of Ukrainian wishes including realia *рушник* (literally, ‘towel / cloth’): *Рушниками дорога!* (A wish before a long trip), *Швидше станьте на рушник!* (a wish to marry). The groom and the bride step on the towel during the Ukrainian wedding ceremony: *Та ми з тобою на рушнику стояли, та ми з тобою й присягу мали* (A folk song).

The towel in the Ukrainian culture is not only a utilitarian object, but also an ornamental element (to decorate the house) and a ritual symbol. Borys Hrinchenko’s dictionary offers a specific classification of towels (cloths): *рушник-утирач* – for face and hands, *стирок* – a dishcloth, *кілковий* – richly embroidered – to decorate icons, pictures, *божник* – for icons, *плечевий* – richly embroidered for in-laws, *подарунковий* – a cheap one for wedding gifts, etc.<sup>12</sup>. According to experts in Ukrainian ethnography, towels are used to decorate holy icons and crosses; bread is laid on a towel; a child is wrapped in a towel after baptism by water; the groom and the bride step on a towel during the wedding ceremony; matchmakers and important guests are tied with towels during feasts; the coffin is lowered into the grave using towels. Apart from this,

<sup>12</sup> *Slovar’ ukraïyns’koyi movy*, Uporядkuvav Borys Hrinchenko: v 4 t., vol. 4, Kyiv 1997, p. 91.

a towel is a ward against evil. Mothers give towels to their travelling children; and towels serve as reminders of holy and unforgettable things<sup>13</sup>.

The Czech realia *ručník* is only a utilitarian object (a synonym – *utěrák*); it signifies a wiping-cloth and a handkerchief: 1) *pruh látky k utírání těla (zvl. rukou a obličeje) po umytí*: lněný, režný r.; vzít si s sebou mýdlo a r. 2) nář. *šátek*: bílý r. musela přes hlavu uvázat (Něm.); → zdrob. ručníček, -čku m. (6. mn. -čcích, -čkách): dětský r.<sup>14</sup> During translation, the full equivalence of the units *рушник* – *ručník* (*utěrák*) exists only in the meaning ‘A thing for wiping something’. Actually, the Czech *ručník* (*utěrák*) acquires a certain external similarity to the Ukrainian decorative realia only when the former is embroidered (*vyšívaný*). >From the utilitarian point of view, the Ukrainian towel is not used as *хустка*, which is mentioned in the Czech dictionary.

The highest degree of zero equivalence is typical for clichés with the lexeme *рушник* if the latter signifies realia used in rituals. A towel is an integral attribute given to a newly-married couple. During this, the couple is told the words: *На щастя, на долю* (this wish is impossible without a towel: the object and the words are mutually complementary). *Рушниками дорога* is a wish before a long road. The notion that *рушник* for Ukrainians is a symbol of happy fate, harmony, marital fidelity, purity of feelings, and sincerity of wishes is further proved by the abundance of phrasal expressions with this lexeme: *брати рушникі, вернутися з рушниками, готувати рушникі, рушникі дбати, побрати рушникі, подавати (подати) рушникі, посилати (слати, послати) за рушникáми, присилати (прислати) [людéй] за рушниками, рушникі дбати, ставати (стати) на рушникú (на рушникі)*<sup>15</sup>.

While translating such expressions, one should be wary of losing folk poetic connotations, high register, compare: *Рушниками дорога* – *Přeji šťastnou cestu /Ať růže na cestu syrou se ti; Швидше станьте на рушник* – *Přeji brzy se vdát a mít svou rodinu*. Such adaptations can be regarded as simplified.

<sup>13</sup> V. V. Zhayvoronok, *Znaky ukrajins'koyi etnokul'tury: Slovnyk-dovidnyk*, Kyiv 2006, pp. 192-194.

<sup>14</sup> *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého*, op. cit.

<sup>15</sup> *Slovník ukrajins'koyi movy*: v 11 t., vol. 8, Kyiv 1977, p. 919. Available at: <http://sum.in.ua/s/rushnyk>.

A towel is given to wish luck and good fate: *Пошли тобі (Вам), Господи, щастя й долю*. Ukrainian wedding towels are usually embroidered with an inscription «*На щастя, на долю*» ('For luck and fate'). *Доля* (literally, 'fate') in Ukrainian wishes is an embodiment of happiness, success. It is also found in some expressions: *щастя-доля, щастя-доленька, щастя і доля*. *Доля* also serves as a folk poetic way of addressing a beloved person: «*Ти доле моя!*» (a song), in wishes for health and in drinking songs: *Гей, наливайте повнії чари, Щоб через вінця лилося. Щоб наша доля нас не цуралась, Щоб краще в світі жилося*.

The wish *На щастя, на долю!*, literally translated as *Na štěstí, na osud*, is an unsuccessful attempt. In Ukrainian wishes, the lexeme *доля* includes the seme 'щасливе життя' ('happy life'), which can be found in dictionaries with the meaning «desirable happy life»<sup>16</sup>. In Czech wishes this meaning can only be rendered analytically using the specifier of positive semantics *šťastný (osud)*.

Comparing concept images of fate in both languages, one should note the commonality of such meanings as *хід подій, збіг обставин, напрям життєвого шляху, що не залежать від бажання, волі людини, як фатум* 'course of events, concatenation of circumstances, life choices independent of the personal will'. Such interpretations of fate are reflected in proverbs: *від долі не втечеш, долі не минути, долі й найбиштришим конем не об'їдеш, перед долею не втечеш*, etc. Similar reflexes can be found in the Czech linguistic space: *rvát se s osudem, osudu neujdeš, hříčky osudu osud vede, nezvratný osud, zajímavý osud*, but this word is used mostly along with extenders connected with negative associations and evaluations: *zkouška osudu, neradostný osud, kurva osud, černý osud, nešťastný osud, pohnutý osud, osud plný běd, smutný osud, klatý osud, neodvratný osud, rany osudu, zásahy osudu, kopí osudu*. In the Ukrainian tradition the word is combined with attributes of both positive and negative evaluation: compare: *добра доля, щаслива доля, гантована доля; нещаслива доля, (нещасна) доля*. Fate in different linguistic views of the world is often depicted adding negative features: *rany osudu, zásahy osudu, kopí osudu, zkouška osudu; зла доля, горбата доля, лиха доля, щербата доля*; Czech expressions are notable for representing *osud* as an

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., vol. 2, Kyiv 1971, s. 360. Available at: <http://sum.in.ua/s/dolja>.

active, masculine phenomenon: fate wounds, strikes, tests, bends (*rany osudu, zásahy osudu, zkouška osudu, pohnutý osud*), uses tools (*kopí osudu*), one can fight fate (*rvát se s osudem*); in the Ukrainian language the gender attribute of fate is not so direct. Fate can chase a person: *від долі не втечеш, долі не минути, долі й найбистрішим конем не об'їдеш*; it cannot be bribed: *долі скаргами не власкаєш, на торгу долі не купиш*; it has negative human traits: *доля зла, горбата, лиха, щербата*.

The Ukrainian understanding of fate has folk cultural connotations. It resides in the poetic discourse, flourishes in the Ukrainian folk oral and written tradition, and has a certain layer of elevation causing difficulties in its translation to the Czech language. We can assume that the existing discrepancy between the meanings of words *osud* and *доля* forced St. Masliak, the translator of Jaroslav Hašek's novel *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka* (literally, 'Fates of the Good Soldier Švejk'), to render the title as *Пригоди бравого вояка Швейка*, as the literal meaning – *доля* – would change the direction of the author's intention to solemnity. Apart from this, the Ukrainian lexeme lacks the plural form: \**Долі бравого вояка Швейка*. In the Ukrainian usage, the plural form is used only referring to two or more persons (*їхні долі, наші долі*).

The mostly positive character of the word *доля* compared to the Czech *osud* stands out against the background of the lexeme *недоля* (*Нехай недоля тебе оминає*); the meaning of the latter can be rendered analytically – *nešťastný osud*. The word *недоля* is practically a contextual antonym of the word *доля* in wishes like *На щастя, на долю!*, *Пошли тобі (Вам), Господи, щастя й долю* and in the continuation of the above-mentioned folk song: *Пиймо, панове, пиймо, братове, Пиймо, поки іще п'ється! Поки недоля нас не спіткала, Поки ще лихо сміється*.

The discrepancies in the scope of meaning of the notions *osud* and *доля* in wishes require compensations using positive evaluation extenders, for instance the wish *Пошли йому, Господи, щастя й долю (дольку, долечку)* can be translated as *Dej ti Bože štěstí a milostivý osud*, toasts *Вип'єм за щастя, вип'єм за долю* as *Přijijete na štěstí a na šťastný osud*. Similarly to the Czech worldview, the Russian world *судьба*, which means 'складывающийся не зависимо от воли человека ход событий, стечение обстоятельств', is specified as destiny, e.g. in the proverb *Наша доля — Божья воля*. This fact may have influenced the translation of the above-mentioned *Song about*

*the Towel*. В. Paliichuk rendered the words *‘I рушник вишиваний на щастя, на долю дала’* with some losses. He excluded the word *доля*: *И расшитый рушник мне на счастье дала*, disregarding the fact that the Russian lexeme *доля* is synonymous with the word *судьба*. In the same way, the Ukrainian colloquialism *судьба* is perceived as a synonym of *доля*. In the Ukrainian language, two words get lexicalized in the word *недоля*, while the Russian language lacks this feature. Compare: *Видать, не судьба нам увидеться*. Language conceptualization of reality, the worldview, is partially common, partially nationally specific. Thus, the speakers of different languages can view the world differently through the prism of their linguistic consciousness.

### Conclusions

In the process of the translation of pragmatic clichés, a collision happens between two linguistic spaces that demonstrates the mutual and unique nature of linguistic practices, stimulates interest in them, and simultaneously hinders successful interlingual communication. The methodological basis for the search for equivalent and adequate analogies is the perception of pragmatic clichés as the union of the common and the specific. The specific is a set of properties different from the properties of an analogous unit of the target language. The specific causes interest, sometimes cognitive dissonance, and can become a barrier to full-fledged communication. The general vocabulary equivalent or the presence of common grammatical meanings and categories is only one option among the abundance of specific variants dependent on situational, pragmatic, and cultural factors. Zero equivalence is the highest degree of expressing the specific. The common and the specific are topical notions for both the linguistic model and the communicative model of translating pragmatic clichés. But it is the specific which offers most resistance in the process of rendering linguistic units on different levels of the linguistic system and in different contexts.

## References

- Apresyan, Yu. D. (1995). *Izbrannyye trudy: v 2 t., Tom 2, Integral'noye opisaniye yazyka i sistemnaya leksikografiya*, Moskva.
- Baider, F. (2013). Cultural Stereotypes and Linguistic Clichés: Their Usefulness. *Intercultural Competency. International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 4(2), 1166–1171.
- Balandina, N. F. (2002). *Funktsiyi i znachennya ches'kykh prahmatychnykh klishe v komunikatyvnomu konteksti: monohrafiya*. Kyiv.
- Fasmer, M. (1987). *Etimologicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka: v 4 t., Tom 3*, Moskva.
- Havránka B. (hlavního redaktora), Běliče, J., Helcla M., & Jedličky A. (Eds.). (1960–1971, 1989). *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého*. <http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/>
- Mizin, K. I., & Petrov, O. O. (2018). *Zistavna linhvokul'turolohiya: metodolohichni problemy ta perspektyvni metodyky: monohrafiya*, Pereyaslav-Khmel'nyts'kyy, Vinnytsya, Kremenchuk.
- Nayda, Yu. (1978). K nauke perevodit'. In *Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoy lingvistike* (pp. 114–136). Moskva.
- Nelyubin, L. L. (2007). *Vvedenie v tekhniku perevoda*. Moskva.
- Ostin, Dzh. L. (1986). Slovo kak deystviye. In B. Yu. Gorodetskogo (Ed.), *Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike, Vyp.17: Teoriya rechevykh aktov, obshch* (pp. 22–130). Moskva.
- Retsker, Ya. I. (2007). *Teoriya perevoda i perevodcheskaya praktika. Ocherki lingvisticheskoi teorii perevoda*. Moskva.
- Romanyuk, N. (2017). Dyferencijni ta klasyfikacijni oznaky movnoyi klishovanoyi odynyci. *Visnyk Zaporizkogo nacionalnogo universytetu. Seriya 'Filologichni nauky', 1*, 177–182.
- Safiullina, G. R. (2018). Sposoby perevoda pragmaticheskikh klishe s tatarskogo yazyka na russkij yazik. *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, 9(87), ch. 1, 166–169. <http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2018/9-1/37.html>
- Sdobnikov, V. V., & Petrova, O. V. (2001). *Teoriya perevoda: Uchebnik dlya perevodcheskikh fakul'tetov i fakul'tetov inostrannykh yazykov*, N. Novgorod.
- Serl', Dzh. R. (1986). Chto takoye rechevoy akt? In B. Yu. Gorodetskogo (Ed.), *Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike, Vyp. 17: Teoriya rechevykh aktov, obshch* (pp. 151–169). Moskva.

Nadiya Balandina, *The Common and the Specific in the Translation of Pragmatic Clichés*

*Slovar' ukrayins'koyi movy*, Uporyadkuvav Borys Hrinchenko: v 4 t., Tom 4, Kyiv 1997.

*Slovyk ukrayins'koyi movy*: v 11 t., Tom 2 (1971). Kyiv. <http://sum.in.ua/s/dolja>

*Slovyk ukrayins'koyi movy*: v 11 t., Tom 8 (1977). Kyiv. <http://sum.in.ua/s/rushnyk>

Zhayvoronok, V. V. (2006). Znaky ukrayins'koyi etnokul'tury. In *Slovyk-dovidnyk* (pp. 192-194). Kyiv.