

**TYOLOGICAL FEATURE OF THE COGNITIVE-HEURISTIC MODEL OF ENGLISH VERB-CASUATIVE PATTERNS TRANSLATION INTO UKRAINIAN.**

***I. Y. Golovash, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Foreign Languages, Ivan Kozhedub Kharkiv University of Air Force (Kharkiv, Ukraine)***

e-mail: grafart28@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4849-3321>

***S. V. Kobiakov, Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages, Ivan Kozhedub Kharkiv University of Air Force (Kharkiv, Ukraine)***

e-mail: skobyakov70@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4597-4277>

***M. Y. Pogodina, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Foreign Languages, Ivan Kozhedub Kharkiv University of Air Force (Kharkiv, Ukraine)***

e-mail: mariapogodina2902@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4629-561X>

*The article explores the possibilities of translating English causative constructions into Ukrainian within the framework of the cognitive-heuristic approach to translation. The authors analyze the concepts of causality, causal situation, the term “causative construction” and the structure thereof. The concept of the causative verb is discussed and different kinds of causative verbs are identified. The paper presents a critical analysis of the traditional approach to the problem of translating causative constructions within the framework of the linguistic theory of translation and identifies the limitations of the approach. At the next stage, the cognitive-heuristic model of translation is described and its three main component parts explored, including the cognitive search, concept recombination and the search for the translation language means of verbalizing meaning with auto-correction. Using the psycholinguistic method of introspection and examples from English texts containing various causative constructions, the author vividly demonstrates the possibilities of using the three kinds of mental operations discussed above in the solution of translation problems at different stages of the translation process. Special attention is paid to the role of the cognitive context. The paper identifies the most interesting regularities observed in the translation of English causative constructions into Ukrainian, among them the change of the causal image scheme into an action-consequence scheme and the possibility of verbalizing causal action and its consequence by means of one lexical unit. The general conclusion is made that by using all the three mental operations along with a monolingual dictionary of the English language and drawing on various kinds of knowledge including first of all background knowledge and the knowledge of context one can successfully translate causative constructions of different kinds in the cognitive context.*

**Key words:** causative verb-pattern, English verb construction, cognitive context, heuristic search, action-consequence scheme, psycholinguistic method of introspection, causality concepts, cognitive-heuristic model.

**The relevance of research.** The presence of a large number of various causative constructions, primarily with impersonal forms of the verb, and the ability of a number of verbs to express the meaning of causation in context are an important typological feature of the English language. Translation of English causative constructions into Ukrainian is often a significant problem due to differences in the ways of structuring meaning and its expression by means of two languages and the impossibility or undesirability of structural parallelism in translation.

**Analysis of recent research and publications** shows that this problem was usually solved in line with linguistic theories of translation based on traditional semantics, using concepts such

as equivalence, transformation, omission and addition, which, as we see it, significantly narrowed the range of possibilities. Currently, cognitive linguistics has received rapid development, demonstrating a new stage in the study of the complex relationship between language and thinking. Cognitive linguistics is one of the branches of cognitive science, which aims to study the processes associated with obtaining, processing, storing and using, organizing and understanding the structures of knowledge, as well as the formation of these structures in the human brain. Thanks to the emergence of cognitive science, it became clear that language activity takes place in the human brain, that different types of language activity are associated with different parts of the brain. «Cognitive science is interdisciplinary, it unites under the “umbrella” of specialists in different fields of knowledge: psychologists, linguists, philosophers, logicians, but from the very beginning of its inception, a special role was assigned to psychology and linguistics» [11]. Cognitivism is characterized by the desire to see more general categories behind the categories of linguistic semantics, which are the result of the assimilation of the world by human cognition. The researcher’s gaze moves from the object of knowledge to the subject, the person in the language and the language in the person is analyzed. “Heuristics – the science of creative thinking – has much in common with cognitive science, since both emerged as interdisciplinary sciences at the crossroads of psychology, logic, philosophy, philology. For heuristics, as well as for cognitive science, the common foundation is psychology and linguistics, which in turn forms the intercultural language of heuristics” [11].

The formation of the English system of cognitive heuristics includes various regions of the international community. This process represents the multi-temporal contribution of different countries to the development of this system, since a direct connection between perception and mental states and processes is recorded in the language [5].

**The purpose of this article** is to show how the problem of translation of causative constructions can be solved in line with “the cognitive-heuristic translation model which is based on the key principles of cognitive semantics” [9]. To this end, the article discusses the concepts of causation and causative construction, provides a critical analysis of traditional approaches to solving the problem of translating causative constructions, describes the main relevant components of the cognitive heuristic model of translation and, on the basis of the latter, identifies ways and some patterns of solving this problem. As the research material, examples are used, mostly taken from texts of an academic style, “for which the use of causative constructions is most typical” [4].

**Materials and research methods.** The paper mainly used the methods of empirical research, psycholinguistic method of introspection and examples from English texts. The comparison was the main cognitive operation revealing the similarity or difference of objects (or stages of development of the same object), i. e. their identity and differences. Comparison is the basis of such a logical method as analogy, and serves as the starting point of the comparative-historical method. General sociological methods and research methods were also used: Analysis, Generalization, Analogy.

In modern Linguistics causal connections are understood as those that have inherent nonrandom relation of events in nature, society and social life. Causation is realized with the help of integrated system of verbal and non-verbal markers in modern English discourse. The basic terms in the category of causativity research are concepts “situation of causativity” and “causative construction”. Situation of causativity is realized by constructions of causative relationships which occur between person and things, phenomena, actions, events, processes and states [14].

The structures that verbalize the causal situation are traditionally designated in linguistics and translation theory as causative constructions. In English, these are, as a rule, three-term constructions, the first component of which is a verb in a personal form, the second is a noun or pronoun, and the third component can be an infinitive, first or second participle or gerund [8].

The greatest interest for researchers at this stage is the first verbal component of the construction, which is often referred to as a causative verb. Different scholars distinguish

different types of causative verbs. In Longman's English grammar, causative verbs belong to one of the seven main semantic groups of verbs, which include, for example, cause, enable, force, help, let, require, permit [4], and at the same time distinguish a group of prepositional causative verbs, such as lead to, result in, allow for, contribute to [4].

A causative construction is a language model of reference to the situation of causativity – macro-situation which consists of not less than two micro-situations connected by the causation relationships. There are three essential elements in causative construction: antecedent, consequent and causation relationship [14].

English causative constructions have great research interest. This phenomena is usually studied from the point of relationships of cause and effect.

The causative construction is a construction that has stimulating meaning, i. e. subject does not perform an action by himself / herself but stimulates somebody else to do it [14]. Typical causative construction from the point of syntax may consist of three components: verb-predicate, object (noun or pronoun), predicative complement, or four (verb, object, preposition, infinitive or gerund). The main role in these constructions belongs to verb. The feature of a number of verbs traditionally referred to as causative, namely the fact that their categorization occurs only “at the moment of the formation of the meaning of the statement” [6], as well as the fact that the content of any utterance is the result of the action of “the principle of integration of lexical and grammatical meanings of all elements of the utterance and its structural meaning” [6], was actually not taken into account when solving the problem of translating causative constructions within the framework of the linguistic approach to translation. The authors often focused on the search in the Ukrainian language for correspondences to individual causative verbs. As a result, we find lists of possible matches in works. For example, as noted, the verb cause can be translated in Ukrainian as *спричиняти, зумовлювати, викликати, завдавати* [13].

The following are examples to show how it can be used to translate specific sentences containing cause. However, it remains unclear whether in all contexts this verb can be translated by one of these expressions, on what it is based the choice of one instead of the other, whether there may be other options for translating these sentences. Sometimes the authors themselves admit that this approach is problematic: it is noted, in particular, that when focusing on interlingual correspondences, including those fixed in dictionaries, it is impossible to reflect in the translation the differences in meaning between different causative verbs. Five different verbs (*force, compel, impel, cause, make*) are translated in the dictionary in about the same way [13].

English linguist John Lyons investigates the concept of causative through the system of verb. Verbs that indicate the situation if causatively, i. e. macro-situation where one simple situation is cause and other is effect, are called causative verbs. To the category of causative verbs belong every verb that has semantic feature to “cause” independently whether there is the only semantic feature or the word has extra ones that characterize action-cause and action-effect [8].

Even bigger questions are raised by remarks such as “sometimes it is recommended to omit the verb cause when translating” or “the verb make is often not translated” encountered in works written in the mainstream of the linguistic theory of translation or “there are cases when the English causative verb does not require transmission in translation” [12]. Such recommendations clearly indicate the orientation of their authors towards formal equivalence at the level of the word with its meaning in the language system and create a wrong idea of what is happening in the translation process. What does it mean, for example, to omit the lexical unit of one language when translating into another?

Where does it go down? Is it in the source text or in the translation text? The first is self-sufficient and regardless of whether we translate it or not, it can no longer be changed. As for the second, it is difficult to imagine, rather, the inverse, namely, that the English verb will be mechanically transferred into a foreign language text. Focusing on words with their meanings, and not on the meanings created in the context of the utterance, sometimes leads to such recommendations as “in translation it is necessary to remove causation” [1]. The author,

commenting on the impossibility of translating the English verb *make* by the Ukrainian verb *to force*, does not notice how his own Ukrainian version of the translation of an English sentence with a causative construction, which follows, in fact, as we see it, expresses a causative attitude, although not as a separate word [1].

In other cases, the authors, considering the causative construction, offer their own version of the translation of the entire sentence with this construction [1]. It is assumed that this option is equivalent to the original proposal, and in many cases it seems to us that it is indeed successful. However, as in the case of the translation of individual causative verbs, the reader remains unclear why this particular version is equivalent, how it arose and how it reflects the meanings that the original English sentence expresses. Generally speaking, approaches to the translation of sentences with causative constructions, aimed at a static comparison of texts and their units on the basis of their linguistic meaning and the use of transformations, are able to offer solutions to the problem only for certain specific cases (translation of individual words, phrases and sentences). In addition, the proposed translation solution is usually not objectified in any way, and the reader must often just believe that the proposed version is equivalent. It seems to be the limitation of such approaches.

The cognitive-heuristic approach to the translation of causative constructions that we are developing suggests that the focus of the researcher is on the actual translation process as a type of speech-thinking activity. One of the main research methods is the psycholinguistic method of introspection or self-observation, about the expediency and possibility of using which W. Chaf was one of the first to write [2].

Observing what processes occur in the mind when translating constructions of interest to us, how different types of knowledge interact and how decisions are made should ultimately allow us to develop a translation technique that makes it possible to successfully translate causative constructions in different contexts, using available sources of information with a lack of certain knowledge or to objectify their own translation decisions.

Solving the problem of translating causative constructions requires considering all three main components of the cognitive-heuristic translation model developed earlier, namely: cognitive search, recombination of meanings and search for a means of expression that includes auto-correction [9].

Cognitive search is used at the first stage of the translation process in those frequent cases when understanding of any elements of the source text is difficult for one reason or another. The cognitive search process is a movement from the original text to the structure of meanings in the mind of the translator. Its ultimate goal is the formation of a coherent structure of meanings. In the process of cognitive search in the mind of the translator, various types of knowledge interact, in particular, knowledge of the prototypical meanings of the units included in the text, background knowledge and knowledge of the context [9]. Cognitive search is carried out by the abduction method [10], that is, by putting forward hypotheses that are accepted when and as long as the facts allow, or rejected when facts are found that contradict them, and then new ones are put forward.

Let us consider a number of examples of how cognitive search can be applied in the translation of causative constructions. Particular attention, as it seems, should be paid to sentences containing the verbs *have*, *get* and *make*, expressing the relation of causation only as part of the causative construction. It is precisely the refinement of the causation method in the context that often requires a cognitive search. Let's start with the verb *have*.

The explanatory dictionary of the English language gives a fairly general definition of the verb *have* as part of a causative construction with an infinitive or participle:

- If you have someone do something, you persuade, cause, or order them to do it (with infinitive or participle I);
- If you have something done, someone does it for you or you arrange for it to be done (participle II) (Collins Co-build).

Based on the dictionary data and the above description of the causal situation with its semantic components, let us analyze the following example:

1. *In his autobiography he has one young man at Oxford saying to him 'Spiritually, John, I was at Eton'* (Byrne).

The initial analysis of the sentence allows us to say that in the situation there is an agent-causator - the author of the autobiography, the object - a certain young man and the consequence - the young man being described says something. Further search, which includes the analysis of the context simultaneously with the involvement of background knowledge about what constitutes an autobiography, allows us to conclude that the way of causation in this case is the portrayal of the hero in a literary work. The general conclusion about the events described boils down to the following: the author of his autobiography depicts a scene in which a young man utters a certain phrase.

In the next example with the same verb, the causation method is completely different:

2. *John Knox ... was a clever controversialist whose eloquence had so impressed the Duke of Northumberland that the Protector had him appointed a chaplain to King Edward VI* (Wilson 1).

Cognitive search, drawing on knowledge of history and context, leads us, first, to the conclusion that *the Protector* and *the Duke of Northumberland* are one and the same person, and that the causator in this case is the Duke of Northumberland. Knowledge of the structure of the causative situation allows us to conclude that as a result of the latter's actions, John Knox was appointed to the post of chaplain under King Edward VI. Finally, knowledge of the historical context and general knowledge of the world allows us to conclude that the duke used his influence on the young king and that is how he achieved his appointment.

Let us now consider how cognitive search allows us to comprehend causative structures with the verb *get*.

3. *Kurt will get me to sign a cheque for the whole lot when I'm tight.*' (Waugh).

In example (3) the components of the causative situation are clear enough, and the main problem is to understand the way of causation. This requires the involvement of knowledge of the context, in particular, knowledge of the relationship between the characters and their typical behavior patterns. Based on this, a search for the contextual meaning of the word *tight* is carried out, as a result of which it is concluded that it describes a state of intoxication. Finally, drawing on knowledge about the world allows us to make a general conclusion that one hero can persuade another, taking advantage of the fact that he does not fully control his actions when under the influence of alcohol.

4. *Everyone has Inspiration. It is simply a question of getting it to function.* (Huxley).

In the case of example (4) cognitive search is necessary, first, to determine the semantic components of the causative situation, which requires an analysis of the context. The analysis allows us to connect the pronoun *it* in the causative construction with the *Inspiration* in the previous sentence and conclude that the object in this situation is the human imagination, and the agent-causator is any person. So, at least, thinks the hero to whom these words belong. Additional analysis of the context and our knowledge of the world, in particular the realm of experience associated with imagination, makes it possible to understand that it is about making your imagination work.

The hero does this by connecting to certain channels of communication with the Universe, entering a state of trance. So he advises others to do as well.

The second important component of the cognitive-heuristic model - the re-combination of meanings - turns out to be necessary when the coherent meaning-word structure has already been formed, but the translator cannot verbalize the meanings in the target language in the form or in the configuration in which they are present in the given semantic structure in his mind. This happens either because in the target language there are no units at all capable of verbalizing one or another meaning or configuration of meanings in a given context, or when the translator can, in principle, choose a means of verbalization, but believes that it violates the norms of the target

language in this context or sounds unnatural. The term “recombination of concepts” (or meanings) was introduced by us within the framework of the model [9] and implies mental operations with meanings within a certain semantic structure in order to obtain such a configuration that could be verbalized by the units of the target language that sound naturally in this context. Several different types of recombination have been identified – from simpler (splitting and merging of meanings) to complex (rebuilding the entire event frame) [9].

Translation of causative constructions is exactly the case when the recombination of meanings is most often necessary. A causative verb and any verb not only conveys knowledge about a specific event, but also implies its structure, types and character of its participants, as well as possible ways of its syntactic representation" [5]. By means of a figurative-schematic model (R. Lanecker's term [7]) of a causal situation, an English sentence with a causative construction structures the translator's mental space in a certain way. However, this method of structuring the described situation is not at all predetermined by this situation itself, but “imposed on it” [7], due to which the subject, and in our case the translator, has the ability to “format the cognitive content in different ways” [7]. When translating causative constructions, he often finds himself forced to do this, since, as will be shown below, a number of English causal figurative schemes are not characteristic of the Russian-language picture of the world. Usually, in this case, a type of recombination is used, such as restructuring or changing the figurative-schematic model (figurative scheme). Let's look at some examples:

5. *Light cannot escape from a black hole, making it appear black* (Focus).

When translating the sentence in example (5), as a result of the cognitive search in the mind, the following figurative scheme is built. A physical phenomenon acts in the role of an agent, namely, that light cannot get out of the black hole. The causative agent affects the object - a black hole, changing its state – it is perceived by us as black. In other words, in the English text, an event is categorized as a causal situation in which an inanimate phenomenon acts as a causator, which causes a change in the state of an inanimate object. The given figurative-schematic model turns out to be atypical for the Ukrainian language, and for this reason we cannot verbalize the formed structure of meanings without violating the norms of the Ukrainian language. However, as noted above, the method of categorizing the described event was not predetermined by him, but was chosen by the author, a native speaker of English. This event can be categorized differently by changing the original figurative scheme to the “Phenomenon – Consequence” scheme, in which the method of categorizing the phenomenon will remain unchanged, and the consequence will be categorized in the form “Agent – Action” (black hole – it seems black).

6. *«Fast radio bursts have the whole radio astronomy community scratching their heads at the moment»* (Focus).

In example (6), as before in example (5), the event is categorized as a causal situation. In this case, a mysterious phenomenon, designated in the Ukrainian language as fast radio bursts, acts as a causator. This phenomenon affects the active subject – the world astrophysical community, forcing him to perform the specified action. Difficulties in verbalizing a given scheme by means of the Ukrainian language are explained, as in example (5), by the inanimate nature of the causator. These difficulties can be overcome by changing the given model to the “Agent – Action – Object” or “Agent – Action – Reason” scheme, where the world astrophysical community will act as an agent.

The third important component of the cognitive-heuristic translation model is auto-correction. In the course of auto-correction, the subject, in our case, the translator, makes changes to his own version of the verbalization of one sense or another. Carrying out auto-correction is associated with the need to comply with the norms of the target language and the natural sounding of the target text. The concept of natural sounding used by us is broader than the often used concept of *usage*, since it involves taking into account, including how this or that unit we use will be perceived in a specific context [9]. To illustrate how auto-correction can be performed when translating a causative construct, consider the following example:

7. *In our world, the emission of photons allows energy to be exchanged* (Scientific American).

When translating this example, cognitive search makes it possible to form in consciousness a model of a causal situation, in which the emission of photons acts as a causator, and an exchange of energy acts as the causative event. In principle, the Ukrainian language allows verbalizing this causal situation without changing the figurative scheme in the form of a preliminary version:

“У нашому світі емісія фотонів дозволяє енергії обмінюватися”.

The proposed option is the first hypothesis in the abductive process verbalization of the semantic structure given by the English text. It does not suit us, because it sounds unnatural, primarily due to the use of a reflexive verb after an inanimate subject. In this case, a second hypothesis is put forward, in which the causated event is verbalized without a predicate, in the form of a combination of two nouns. In addition, a not very natural-sounding verb *дозволяє* being replaced by *уможлиблює*: «У нашому світі емісія фотонів *уможлиблює* обмін енергією».

This second version of verbalization in general seems to be quite satisfactory, however, in this case, the auto-correction can be continued, and, given the area of knowledge in which the text is written, the combination of *обмін енергією* can be replaced by *енергообмін*. So we come to the variant, which becomes the final version of the specified sentence translation: *У нашому світі емісія фотонів уможлиблює енергообмін*.

Let us now describe some of the most interesting regularities observed in the translation of causative constructions. The study shows that very often when translating into Ukrainian the English image-schematic model of the causal situation with the causative agent and the object can be replaced by a model in which the causative event is categorized as a consequence of the first event and the former object becomes an agent, as shown in the example (5). In the Ukrainian sentence, the meaning of the consequence is often marked by conjunctions: *так що*, *внаслідок чого* and others:

8. “*The famine had now been afflicting Ireland for two years, killing hundreds of thousands of people and forcing others to emigrate*” (Wilson 2) – укр.: *На той час голод лютував в Ірландії вже два роки, внаслідок чого сотні тисяч людей померли, а інші змушені були емігрувати*.

9. *Alarm clocks had gone off – with a vigour that could hardly have been surpassed and which had sent Ronny leaping out of bed with a confused idea that the day of judgement had come* (Christie) – укр.: *Будильники задзвонили голосніше нікуди, так що Ронні схопився з ліжка, подумавши спростання, що настав кінець світу*.

However, explicit marking of the cause-and-effect relationship is not always possible, and the translator, in any case, focuses on the natural sounding of the Ukrainian version:

10. *Pluto’s largest moon, Charon, is far more varied than the team expected, and hosts a mountain that has researchers baffled* (New Scientist).

Translation of this sentence presents significant difficulties due to the scheme of the causal situation, which is unusual for the Ukrainian language, in which the role of agent-causator is played by the mountain, and the causable state is the bewilderment of scientists. Obviously, in reality, the mountain cannot make intentional actions in relation to people. In this case, in addition to cognitive search, it is necessary to change the figurative scheme: as a consequence of the presence of a mountain on the moon, scientists are at a loss. However, the problems do not end there either, we are faced with the fact that when verbalizing meanings in this case, options similar to those used earlier in examples (8) and (9) are not suitable. In this case, referring to an explanatory dictionary helps, which gives the following definition of the verb *baffle*: *If something baffles you, you cannot understand it or explain it* (Collins Cobuild) [3]. This definition suggests the possibility of the following Ukrainian variant: *Рельєф Харона, найбільшого місяця Платона, набагато різноманітніший, ніж припускали дослідники, у ньому є гора, існування якої вчені не можуть пояснити*.

Another interesting regularity, which is worth mentioning, is related to the fact that sometimes the Ukrainian language allows verbalizing a causative action and a causative effect in one lexical unit, which ensures a successful solution to a translation problem. Consider the following example:

11. “*If you could try and get her to talk*” (Fowles).

As we wrote above, the meaning of desemantized verbs like *get* is usually specified by the context, so in this case, at the first stage of translation, an analysis of the cognitive context is required in order to understand the relationships of the characters. This analysis leads us to the conclusion that the hero being addressed is a guest and cannot, for example, force or force the heroine to speak. He can only somehow try to make her start talking. When verbalizing the formed meaning, it becomes clear that verbs such as *переконати*, *попросити* or *вмовити*, which, in principle, are possible when translating the causative *get* in other contexts, are not suitable in this context. Continuing to put forward hypotheses, we stop at the Ukrainian prefix verb to talk, expressing both a causative action (prefix) and a consequence, allowing a direct animated addition (to talk to whom?) and appropriate in style. A translation of the entire sentence might sound like this: *Якби Ви спробували розговорити її*.

**Conclusions and perspectives.** The description of all the regularities in the translation of various causative constructions is beyond the scope of this article. Its main goal is to demonstrate the possibilities that the cognitive-heuristic approach provides. As has been shown, conducting an intensive cognitive search using the English explanatory dictionary, if necessary, and attracting various kinds of knowledge, the skill of using mental operations with meanings, as well as the mandatory implementation of auto-correction – all this allows you to quite successfully translate various kinds of causative constructions in context.

#### Bibliography

1. Adamenko K. Causative constructions in modern English. Faculty of Linguistics. NTUU “KPI” Science and Technology of the XXI Century. URL : <http://konfist.fl.kpi.ua/ru/node/2084>.
2. Chafe W. L. Meaning and the structure of language. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003. 76 p.
3. Collins Cobuild. Advanced learner’s dictionary / Ed. by J. Sinclair. Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers, 2014. P. 81
4. Douglas Biber. Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 1999. 48 p.
5. Geeraerts Dirk, Cuyckens Hubert. Introducing Cognitive Linguistics. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*: Oxford University Press, 2010. 111 p.
6. Hornby A. S. Verbs and Verbs Patterns: Oxford University Press. 1999. 336 p.
7. Langacker R. Concept, image, and symbol. The cognitive basis of grammar. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001. 395 p.
8. Lyons J. The Theory of Linguistics: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 543 p.
9. Minchenkov A. G. Cognitive-Heuristic Model of Translation. Theoretical Foundations, Verification and Application. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2011. P. 71
10. Peirce C. S. Reasoning and the logic of things: Harvard University Press, 2002. 283 p.
11. Стеванович Р. Когнітивно-лінгвістичний аналіз евристичної наукової термінології, що відображає рівні мисленнєвої діяльності (міжмовний аспект). *Типологія та функції мовних одиниць* : Науковий журнал. Луцьк: Східноєвропейський національний університет імені Лесі Українки, 2016. С. 77
12. Thomson A. J. Practical English Grammar: Oxford University Press, 2005. 382 p.
13. Жлуктенко Ю. О. Українсько-англійський та англо-український словник. Київ : Вища школа, 1997. С. 432
14. Wierzbicka Anna. Causation and Interpersonal Relations: Oxford Scholarship Online. 2006. 43 p.

#### Source Abbreviations

1. *Byrne – Byrne P. Mad World.*
2. *Wilson 1 – Wilson A. N. The Elizabethians.*
3. *Wilson 2 – Wilson A. N. The Victorians.*
4. *Waugh – Waugh E. Brideshead Revisited.*
5. *Huxley – Huxley A. Crome Yellow.*
6. *Fowles – Fowles J. The Ebony Tower.*
7. *Christie – Christie A. The Seven Dials Mystery.*



8. *Focus – BBC Focus, August 2015.*
9. *New Scientist – New Scientist, 25 July 2015.*
10. *Scientific American – Scientific American, July 2015.*

#### References

1. Adamenko, K. (2018). Causative constructions in modern English. Faculty of Linguistics. NTUU “KPI” Science and Technology of the XXI Century. Retrieved from: URL: <http://konfist.fl.kpi.ua/ru/node/2084> (in Engl.).
2. Chafe, W. L. (2003). Meaning and the structure of language. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 360 (in Engl.).
3. Collins, Cobuild. (2006). Advanced learner’s dictionary / Ed. by J. Sinclair. Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers, 1904 (in Engl.).
4. Douglas, Biber. (1999). Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 1204 (in Engl.).
5. Geeraerts, Dirk & Cuyckens, Hubert. (2010). Introducing Cognitive Linguistics: *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199738632.013.0001 (in Engl.).
6. Hornby, A. S. (1999). Verbs and Verbs Patterns: Oxford University Press, 336 (in Engl.).
7. Langacker, R. (2001). Concept, image, and symbol. The cognitive basis of grammar. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 395 (in Engl.).
8. Lyons, J. (1998). The Theory of Linguistics: Cambridge University Press, 543 (in Engl.).
9. Minchenkov, A. G. (2011). Cognitive-Heuristic Model of Translation. Theoretical Foundations, Verification and Application. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 71 (in Engl.).
10. Peirce, C. S. (2002). Reasoning and the logic of things. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 283 (in Engl.).
11. Stevanovich, R. (2016). Kohnityvno-linhvistychnyi analiz evrystychnoi naukovoї terminolohii, shcho vidobrazhaie rivni myslennievoy diialnosti (mizhmovnyi aspekt) [Cognitive-linguistic analysis of heuristic scientific terminology reflecting different levels of mental activity (interlingual aspect)]. *Typology and functions of language units*. Scientific journal. Lutsk: Eastern European National University, p. 367 (in Ukr.).
12. Thomson, A. J. (2005). Practical English Grammar: Oxford University Press, 382 (in Engl.).
13. Zhluktenko, Y. O. (1997). Ukrainsko-anhliiskiy ta anhlo-ukrainskiy slovnyk [Ukrainian-English and English-Ukrainian dictionaries]. Kyiv: Vyshcha Shkola, 432 (in Ukr.).
14. Wierzbicka, Anna. (2006). Causation and Interpersonal Relations. Oxford Scholarship Online. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195174748.003.0006 (in Engl.).

### ТИПОЛОГІЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ КОГНІТИВНО-ЕВРИСТИЧНОЇ МОДЕЛІ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ ДІЄСЛІВНО-КАЗУАТИВНИХ ПАТЕРНІВ УКРАЇНСЬКОЮ МОВОЮ

***I. Ю. Головаш, старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов  
Харківського національного університету Повітряних Сил імені Івана Кожедуба  
(Харків, Україна)  
e-mail: grafart28@gmail.com  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4849-3321>***

***С. В. Кобяков, доцент кафедри іноземних мов  
Харківського національного університету Повітряних Сил імені Івана Кожедуба  
(Харків, Україна)  
e-mail: skobyakov70@gmail.com  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4597-4277>***

***М. Ю. Погодіна, старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов  
Харківського національного університету Повітряних Сил імені Івана Кожедуба  
(Харків, Україна)  
e-mail: mariapogodina2902@gmail.com  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4629-561X>***

**Актуальність.** *Наявність великої кількості різноманітних причинно-наслідкових конструкцій, насамперед із безособовими формами дієслова, а також здатність низки дієслів виражати значення причинного зв'язку в контексті – важлива типологічна ознака англійської мови. Переклад англійських причинно-наслідкових конструкцій українською мовою часто є суттєвою проблемою через відмінності в способах структурування значення і його вираження двома мовами та через неможливість чи небажаність структурного паралелізму в перекладі.*

**Мета статті** – дослідження можливості перекладу англійських каузативних конструкцій українською мовою в межах когнітивно-евристичного підходу до перекладу. Автори аналізують поняття причинності, причиново-наслідкової ситуації, терміна «каузативна конструкція, або дієслівний патерн причинності» та їхню структуру. З'ясовано поняття причинного дієслова та визначено його різновиди. Описано когнітивно-евристичну модель перекладу та досліджено три її основні складники, зокрема когнітивний пошук, рекомбінацію концептів та пошук засобів вербалізації значення з автокорекцією.

**Методи дослідження.** Використовуючи психолінгвістичний метод інтроспекції та приклади з англійських текстів, що містять різноманітні каузативні конструкції, автори демонструють можливості використання трьох різновидів мисленневих операцій задля розв'язання перекладацьких завдань на різних етапах процесу перекладу. Особливу увагу звернено на роль когнітивного контексту. У роботі визначено найцікавіші закономірності, засвідчені в процесі перекладу англійських причиново-наслідкових конструкцій українською мовою, серед них зміна схеми каузального образу на схему дія – наслідок та можливість вербалізації причинної дії та її наслідку за допомогою однієї лексичної одиниці.

**Результати дослідження.** Найчастіше під час перекладу українською мовою англійську образно-схематичну модель причиново-наслідкової ситуації з каузативом та об'єктом можна замінити моделлю, у якій причинна подія класифікована як наслідок першої події, коли об'єкт стає агентом. Переклад речення викликає значні труднощі через незвичну для української мови схему причиново-наслідкової ситуації. Ще одна цікава закономірність пов'язана з тим, що іноді українською мовою можна вербалізувати каузативну дію та каузатив в одній лексичній одиниці, що забезпечує успішне вирішення перекладацької проблеми.

**Новизна.** Новизна полягає в тому, що із залученням різного роду знань, навичка використання розумових операцій зі значеннями, а також обов'язкове виконання автокорекції – все це дозволяє досить вдало перекладати різного роду каузативні конструкції в контексті.

**Висновки та перспективи.** Використання всіх трьох розумових операцій разом з одномовним словником англійської мови та послуговування різними видами знань, передовсім базовими знаннями та знанням контексту, сприяє успішному перекладові каузативних конструкцій різних видів у когнітивний контекст.

Перспективи подальшого дослідження можуть стосуватися вивчення інших значущих чинників під час перекладу англійських причиново-наслідкових конструкцій українською мовою, що надасть дослідникам і перекладачам змогу найбільш точно передавати складні літературні конструкції, використані авторами тексту.

**Ключові слова:** дієслівний патерн причинності, конструкція англійського дієслова, когнітивний контекст, евристичний пошук, схема дії – наслідок, концепції причинності, психолінгвістичний метод інтроспекції, когнітивно-евристична модель.

Надійшла до редакції 11.12.21

Прийнято до друку 28.02.22