

SECTION 4. TRANSLATION STUDIES

4.1 The realization of the concept “the world” in English phraseological units and ways of translation into Ukrainian

The concept is one of the basic notions of modern linguistics. It serves as a centre of a culture in the mental world of a man. Concepts carry important cultural information, i.e. they provide information about the structure of the world, since different nations perceive this world differently. The role of the concept is important and conceals the mechanisms that encompass the human intelligence, soul, consciousness, sensory space, thinking and perception of reality.

It is the most sensible to study a certain concept with the help of phraseological units or phrasemes, as they serve as a key to understanding the mentality of the nation. That's why we have taken into account English phrasemes and their translation into Ukrainian. Therefore, the study of the concept “the world” and how it is realised in English phrasemes is a main task in this paper. In short, the purpose of this work is to characterize the conceptual sphere of the concept “the world” through the conceptual sphere of the outside (external) and inner (internal) world.

To achieve these goals, the following tasks will be solved: to provide a theoretical understanding of the concept “the world”; to highlight the views of scientists on the definition of concept; to identify the main approaches to the definition of a phraseological unit and classification; to study the phraseological implementation of the concept “the world” in English on the basis of two sub-concepts: the external and internal world; to establish the main characteristics of this concept in the English-speaking environment; to establish the features of translation of phraseological units denoting the concept “the world”; to investigate the frequency of usage of certain methods of translation of English phraseology into Ukrainian.

The basic materials for this paper are works of domestic and foreign scholars, as well as 1002 phraseological units selected from the English-Ukrainian phraseological dictionary edited by K. Barantsev [185]. We decided to investigate the phraseological

units of English in the most universal printed source: a dictionary. But if we needed to investigate the concept, for example, of the certain period, we could take works of writers this period. Comparing the idioms of Ukrainian and English, we can observe how our main concept “the world” and its small concepts “the inner world” and “the outside world” are represented. As English and Ukrainian are not close languages, we can observe a lot of similarities in the composition and structure of a phraseological unit.

We have applied the methodology, which allowed us to study the actual material: generally scientific (observation, systematization, generalization, induction) and empirically theoretical methods (analysis, synthesis, method of comparison and classification); method of component analysis for the division of the concept “the world” into small concepts; the method of distributive analysis, which is used to select phraseological units to denote this concept; comparative analysis of translations of these units; elements of quantitative analysis, which allowed to identify the frequency of use of methods of translation of phraseological units in the Ukrainian language, the frequency of use of phraseology, denoting a certain small concept.

First of all, let's determine what the notion of concept is. The word “concept” is of Latin origin. It is a “bunch” of culture in the human mind; that enters the culture of the mental world of a human and vice versa: a human also enters the culture, and sometimes human influences on it, these are ideas that come up to people's mind throughout its development [146].

The concept is one of the leading notions of modern linguistics. As a rule, linguists pay attention to the concepts that are most closely connected with the culture of the people and most vividly reflect the specifics of its collective consciousness. Despite the fact that the term “concept” is used by the representatives of various areas of linguistics, there is still no single definition. This indicates the richness of its features and properties rather than the lack of uniformity of views on the nature and functions of the concept [147].

The linguist T. Radziyevska identifies five functional properties of the concept in human speech: to act as a correlate of a certain discursive practice; to be an

accumulator of culturally significant meanings; to function as a means of interpretive reality; to act as a condensed cultural scenario; to act as a determinant of the psycho-mental state [148]. It should be emphasized that it has the following characteristics: the concept is an ideal object; the area of localization of the concept is human consciousness; the concept does not exist in isolation, it is closely related to other concepts; the concept is characterized by national and cultural specifics; the concept is implemented by language; the concept has a rather complex multilevel structure; the type of the concept and the method of its description depends on the phenomenon that compares it with the world. According to everything said above, we consider the definition of S. Vorkachov to be the most successful. He believes that the concept is a unit of collective knowledge and consciousness that has a linguistic expression and a certain ethnocultural specificity [149].

The term “concept” in Eastern European linguistics occurred in the late 80's of the XXth century due to the expansion of semantics and its interaction with other sciences, including logics, psychology, anthropology, sociology. This led to the shift in orientation: from the interpretation of meaning as an abstract entity, the formal representation of which is separated from the author and his/her addressee, to the study of the concept primarily as a mental entity [148].

In our terminology, mastering the term “concept” is accompanied by overcoming a stable association that persists in the linguistic consciousness of a native speaker that usually equals the word “concept” with the term “notion” [150].

The concept is the main centre of culture in the mental world of human. In culturology, the term concept is used when one abstracts from the cultural content, and means only the structure. The full definition of the concept has been proposed by P. Babushkin, who believes that the concept is any discrete meaningful unit of collective consciousness that reflects the object of the real or ideal world and is stored in the national memory of native speakers in the verbal form. The concept is verbalized, denoted by a word or word-combination, otherwise its existence is impossible [151].

The concept is the main centre of culture in the mental world. It has a huge impact on people, it is the subject of emotions, likes and dislikes. The concept has a

multi-layered structure, and different layers are the result, a reflection of the cultural life of different eras. Concepts in different cultures are different imaginations about the world order. The way of conceptualization of reality (worldview) inherent in language is universal, national-specific, as speakers of different languages can see the world in a slightly different way, through the prism of their languages [152].

The main research of modern conceptual analysis can be considered the work of A. Vezhbyt'ska, which allows to penetrate into the culture and into the way of thinking of different people. This approach to language learning is based on anthropocentrism: firstly, a language is anthropocentric since it is designed for human, and the whole linguistic categorization of objects and objects of the external world is focused on human, this is a common feature of all languages. Secondly, each language is nationally specific. Thus, in language not only features of natural conditions or culture, but also originality of national character of its carriers are reflected [152].

Concepts pierce the lexical, word-forming, phraseological and grammatical systems, being like “a brick” between them. Thus, in the process of passing through the systems around the concept, a conceptual field is formed, the conceptual sphere, which is a global invariant image of the world, which underlies the worldview of the bearers of a culture. Conceptual sphere, according to D. Lihachov, is a set of basic elements of culture of this ethnic group, reflected in its language. D. Lihachov believes that the concept is a basic concept of cognitive linguistics (studies the processes of saving and transmission of knowledge through language). One of the main ways to study cognitive linguistics is the analysis of the concept, which makes it possible to trace the course of cognitive processes in language on the example of one object. One of the most important processes of cognitive human activity is conceptualization, which consists in the formation of the conceptual sphere, i.e. concepts and conceptual structures. The information that comes to a person is understood, and this leads to the formation of certain ideas about the world in the form of concepts recorded in the human mind. This is how concepts form their space, called the conceptual sphere. D. Lihachov considers the conceptual sphere to be a set of concepts [153].

Within the conceptual sphere, super-concepts, macro-concepts, basic concepts and micro-concepts are distinguished. For example, the integrating super-concept is the concept of “man”. The macro-concepts underlying the conceptual sphere of the “inner world of man” are the concepts “soul” and “spirit”. They themselves unite the sphere of the inner world (the concept of “feeling”), the mental (the concept “mind”), the imperative (the concept of “will”), the moral spheres (the concepts of “good” and “evil”) into a single entity. Macro-concepts have the longest semantic connections within the conceptual sphere formed by them [154].

Currently, the term “concept” is actively used in two main areas of modern linguistics: cognitive linguistics and linguo-culturology. In both areas, the term receives its own interpretation, so in recent years there has been a tendency to distinguish between cognitive and linguistic and cultural concepts. Such differentiation is present, in particular, in the works of V. Karasyk. In the cognitive approach, the concept is considered within the concepts of “knowledge” and “consciousness”, understood as mental formation, a cognitive structure that includes units of consciousness. In interpretations of this kind there is a problem of correlation between language and consciousness. In the linguo-cultural approach, the concept is considered within the concepts “language - culture”. Here the concept also acts as a localized object in the mind, but the focus is on its national and cultural identity [155]

The concept, according to O. Selivanova, is a fragment of knowledge, personal experience, which includes both linguistic and extralinguistic information. Therefore, it is understood as a mental prototype (indivisible idea of the object), the idea of the concept and even the concept itself. It has a dual essence - mental and linguistic. On the one hand, it is an ideal image, or even a prototype that embodies the culturally conditioned ideas of the speaker about the world, on the other hand, it has a certain name in the language [156].

Yu. Stepanov considers culture as a set of interconnected concepts. It follows that the concept is the main element of culture in the mental world of human, so the content of the concept, which is of great importance for culture, is called a concept. In modern works, the definition of the concept suggested by Yu. Stepanov is often used.

According to this scholar, the concept is a semantic bunch, in which it converges with the terms of the general semantics of “significance”, “intentional”, “meaning”. Thus, the concept is understood as a certain mental formation, a common denominator between units close to the lexical meaning of one or different languages [146].

One of the first linguistic content of the concept has been defined by A. Vezhbytska, who claims that it is an object from the world of “ideal”, which has a name and reflects certain culturally conditioned ideas of human about the world of “reality”. However, currently in linguistics the term concept is associated with quite different theoretical constructions, which greatly complicates the mutual understanding between the authors of certain publications [157].

Analyzing the concept from the point of view of cognitive linguistics, A. Kubriakova defines it as a means of explaining the “mental resources” of human consciousness; she draws attention to the nature and functionality of the concept, emphasizing its key role in shaping the “conceptual system and language of the brain”, and hence the linguistic picture of the human world [158].

A similar view is held by V. Maslova, who considers concepts as “mental entities”. In this regard, in her opinion, at the turn of the millennium, the concept of mentality comes to the fore. The researcher is convinced that the explication of the content of the concept is available only to the linguist, who is a native speaker of this language. V. Maslova considers the action of the following factors necessary for the concept: the selection of certain features, objective actions with objects, their ultimate goals and evaluation of such actions. However, she admits that even recognizing the role of all these factors, cognitologists cannot yet explain the origin of concepts, they only generalize the process of meaning formation [159].

V. Maslova identifies three approaches to the interpretation of the concept in modern linguistics. The first approach in considering the concept focuses on the culturological aspect, when the whole culture is understood as a set of concepts and relationships between them. With this understanding of the term “concept”, the role of language is secondary, it is only an auxiliary means, i.e. giving language form to the culture of the concept (Yu. Stepanov, V. Teliya). The second approach considers the

semantics of the language sign as the only means of forming the content of the concept (N. Arutiunova). Proponents of the third approach believe that the concept does not arise directly from the meaning of the word, but is the result of the collision of the meaning of the word with personal experience, popular experience and general human experience, i.e. the concept is a mediator between words and reality [159].

Z. Popova develops a cognitive approach to understanding the concept, defining the concept as a discrete mental formation, which is the basic unit of human mental code, has a relatively orderly internal structure, is the result of cognitive activities of the individual and society and carries comprehensive, encyclopedic information about the displayed object or phenomenon, about the interpretation of this information by public consciousness and the attitude of public consciousness to this phenomenon or object [160].

The representative of linguo-culturology V. Karasyk considers the cultural concept to be the basic unit of this branch of linguistics, namely multidimensional semantic formation in which value, figurative and conceptual sides are allocated. He believes that it is possible to speak about the existence of the names of concepts only if the conceptualized sphere is understood in the linguistic consciousness and receives a one-word definition. Conceptualization of reality is realized as designation, identification and description. Designation is the selection of what is relevant for a given linguistic culture, and assigning to this fragment of reality a special sign. Concept discovery is the whole set of linguistic and non-linguistic means that directly or indirectly illustrate, clarify and develop its content. The researcher emphasizes that the concept can have a detection, even without a special verbal designation. The description of the concept is special research procedures of interpretation of the meaning of its name and the nearest meanings [161]. V. Karasyk defines the concept as a cultural formation, the expression of the objective meaning of words, which makes sense and therefore is translated into various spheres of human life, in particular in the sphere of mostly conceptual (science), mostly figurative (art) and mostly active (domestic life) mastering the world [161].

I. Shtern looks at the concept from the standpoint of psycholinguistics, calling it a mental prototype. The researcher considers it one of the key concepts of several disciplines including sociolinguistic analysis of changes in value of approaches to the perception of concepts in various historical contexts. Considering the concept as a “dual” mental entity, we can say it has two sides: mental and linguistic. I. Stern notes that mental and linguistic aspects branch out as follows: in the psyche it is an object of ideal nature, an image that embodies certain culturally conditioned ideas of the native speaker about the world and at the same time is a prototype, “idea” of a group of derived concepts; in language the concept has a certain name, because reality is reflected in consciousness not directly, but through language. According to the researcher, the concept as an ideal object that exists only in the human psyche, may correspond to completely different mental formations. Therefore, the scholar believes: not only different languages “conceptualize” the world in different ways, but behind the same word of this language it can be completely different concepts [150].

From the point of view of the psycholinguistic approach, a concept is something that cannot be directly observed. We look at the same object from different positions, and therefore each of us sees only a part of the picture, but not a picture as a whole. Concept and meaning are equally a reflection of reality. Both phenomena, meaning and concept, are of cognitive nature, both are the result of reflection and cognition of reality by human consciousness. Distinguishing between concept and meaning, scientists contrast them as mental units that stand out, respectively, in cognitive and linguistic cognition of human and form the very content of this type of knowledge. The concept is a product of human cognitive ability, the meaning is a product of language cognition [161].

O. Yefimenko understands the concept as “localized mental formation that reflects the objective world” and also believes that the concept does not coincide with notion and meaning of the word, but has a broader meaning, covering the various connections of the phenomenon in pictures of the world and words in the language system [162].

The concept is a holistic entity capable of evolving, changing and reflecting people's experiences. The concept has a complex logically organized dynamic structure consisting of a basic element and related derivative elements due to the prototypical value. The structure of a concept can be revealed through the means of its representation in language. The basis of the concept is the primary prototypical model of the basic meaning of the word [163].

Thus, the concept is a category that is broader than the concept and meaning, because it combines elements of both of the above categories and has additional characteristics of subjectivity (associative and emotional content). Despite the variety of definitions and approaches to the notion of “concept”, most researchers agree that the concept is an operational unit of consciousness, mental formation that has figurative and emotional potential, ethnocultural specificity, and is the basic unit of universal subject code. Therefore, the concept should be understood as a set and configuration of meanings behind the linguistic unit, i.e. the unity of the plan of expression and the plan of content as a series of meanings covering different meanings. The role of the concept in language activities is quite diverse and hides such mechanisms that cover the various incarnations of human intellect, soul, consciousness, sensory space, thinking and perception of reality [162].

In this paper, we will consider the concept on the basis of phraseological units, so we will learn more about the basic definitions of the concept of phraseological unit. So, it would be sensible to analyse the notion of the phraseological unit and then turn to idioms that denote the certain concept.

The notion of concept in our understanding is both an idea and a concept, and the image as an inseparable whole. It is impossible to separate from each other; so, everything is intertwined and interdependent. It is known that language stereotypes, which reflect certain ideas of society, are not only words, but also, above all, phraseology. Phraseological material (we mean all kinds of stable verbal complexes from idioms to paremias) creates ample opportunities due to the specificity of phraseological meaning, contained in phraseology, content related to the concept or inference as an emotional (expressive-emotional-evaluative, imprint of objects)

situations of reality. It is quite natural that in the nominative inventory of language systems vocabulary and phraseology take a prominent place [163].

According to R. Zorivchak, phraseological units are special formations of language. They are most often used in fiction and nonfiction, in oral language. They make the language figurative, intelligible, convincing, that is, give emotionality. The ability to distinguish in the text and adequately translate the phraseological unit is one of the most important tasks of the translator. Phraseology is one of the universals of language. In them we find a reflection of the history of the people, the uniqueness of its culture and way of life. The human factor plays a huge role in phrase formation, because the vast majority of phraseology is associated with man, various areas of his activity. R. Zorivchak emphasizes that the phraseology of each language, for all its grammatical and semantic originality, does not exist in isolation from the whole system of language. Since phraseology is a part of a language, one of its subsystems, it cannot but be associated with the system as a whole, cannot but retain all its basic features and characteristics. Actually, the phraseological subsystem is the area of language where all its specifics are concentrated. The history of the people, customs, culture, civilization, literature, even the weather and food intake – everything is reflected in the phraseology [164].

This opinion is shared by O. Kunin, who argues that phraseology is an extremely complex phenomenon, the study of which requires its own method of research, as well as the use of data from other sciences such as lexicology, grammar, stylistics, phonetics, history, language, philosophy, logic and country studies. Therefore, when translating phraseologies and idioms into the native language, it is necessary to select expressions and language clichés that correspond to the mentality and culture of the language of translation. After all, the phraseology concentrates and consolidates people's ideas about myths, customs, rituals, habits, morals, behaviour, as well as stereotypes and socio-historical facts [165].

V. Teliya calls the phraseological structure of language a mirror in which the linguistic and cultural community identifies its national self-consciousness [166].

In turn, J. Retsker notes that phraseology has not only cultural and national specificity and colour, they are also characterized by cultural and national connotations. Even stylistically-neutral phraseologies differ in national originality and can acquire expressive meaning in the context [167].

The term “phraseological unit” introduced by V. Vynogradov had to be used to denote those compounds that are not formed in the process of speech, but are reproduced by tradition. It is reproducibility, according to V. Vynogradov, that is the main feature of phraseology [168].

In linguistics, there are many definitions of a phraseological unit. According to M. Shansky 's definition, a phraseological unit is a reproducible unit of language from two or more stressed components of a verbal character, fixed (constant) in its meaning, composition and structure [169].

I. Halperin emphasized that, like many other linguistic phenomena, some phraseological units cannot be clearly distinguished from free phrases. Boundaries are mobile to such an extent that in some cases the combination of words can also be attributed to the usual free words and phraseology [170].

A similar definition is given by R. Zorivchak, who argues that phraseology is a semantically related combination of words, which, unlike similar in form syntactic structures (expressions or sentences), does not arise in the process of speech in accordance with the general grammatical and semantic regularities of the combination of lexemes, and is reproduced in the form of an established, indivisible, integral structure [164].

V. Arkhangelsky gives a slightly different definition. He defines phraseology as a constant combination of verbal signs: boundary and integral. It is reproduced in the speech of its speakers and is based on the internal dependence of the members, consisting of at least two strictly defined units of the lexical level, which are in a known sequence; grammatically organized according to existing models of phrases or sentences; having a single meaning, to varying degrees combinatorial in relation to the meanings of conjugated elements, but more stable in relation to the denoted or expressive elements [171].

Unlike V. Arkhangel'sky, O. Kunin formulates the definition concisely: a phraseological unit is a stable combination of words with completely or partially figurative meaning [165].

The main problem was the theory of equivalence at the level of “phraseology-word”. Based on it, researchers were divided into two camps: supporters of “narrow” and “broad” understanding of the scope of phraseology. Representatives of the “narrow” understanding of phraseological unit consider the object of study only those phraseological units that perform a nominative function, which is semantically equal to the function of the word. They do not include stable phrases in the phraseological fund that perform the function of communication, such as proverbs and sayings. In particular, N. Amosova says that these are autonomous independent both in structure and content of the sentence, which are not part of the language system. She notes that such units as periphrasis inversions, descriptive names and fixed phrases with a fixed nomination should be analyzed separately and be the subject of context and, in part, stylistics [154].

However, most researchers, in particular O. Reformat'sky, insist that phraseology should study proverbs, sayings, winged expressions and aphorisms. Some of them even include quotations from works of art, slogans and metaphorical words used in the phraseological fund [172].

Having analysed the definitions of the phraseological unit, we can say that it is a complex unit of language, which has a certain set of features that distinguish it from free phrases. The use of phraseology in speech is a feature of thinking and consciousness, in which a person uses an already prepared form of thought expression precisely because he/she cannot find the necessary equivalent at the word level. R. Zorivchak notes that each phraseological unit as a poly-lexical construction consists of a combination of lexemes of a certain structure and grammar. From the meaning of each of these lexemes, separate semas appear, which become components of the image with a certain denotative meaning, on the basis of which a connotative meaning appears, which coincides with the subject-logical meaning of the whole phraseological unit [164].

There are many classifications of phraseological units. We relied on V Vinogradov's classification as it is considered to be one of the most successful. His work had a great influence on the further study of phraseological units, especially in English. The researcher identifies three main groups of phraseology:

1. Phraseological conjunctions – absolutely indivisible phrases, the meaning of which does not depend on their lexical composition and meanings of components. They have certain features: they may include necroticisms and archaisms; they are syntactically indivisible; in most cases, rearrangement of components is impossible; adding new words to them is also impossible.

2. Phraseological unities – phrases in which the principle of semantic separateness of components is preserved, there is a hint of motivation of general significance. Characteristic features of such phraseology are: possibility of coincidence with existing phrases; saving the values of individual components; impossibility to replace one component with another; emotionally expressive colouring; the presence of synonyms among other phraseologies or individual words.

3. Phraseological combinations – phraseological units formed due to the realization of phraseologically related meanings of words. They have a certain independence between their components and have the following features: variance of one of the components is allowed; possible synonymous replacement of the core word; possible addition of definitions; permutation of components is allowed; one of the components can be freely used independently of the other [168].

Professor M. Shansky tried to supplement this classification by adding a fourth type - phraseological expressions. They do not contain components with phraseologically related meaning, but the words in these expressions cannot have synonymous substitutions. Thus, they are close to free phrases, but have a constant lexical structure [169].

V. Vinogradov's classification is quite criticized by scientists. The researcher is accused of not naming the criteria by which a distinction could be made, and O. Kunin even says that Vinogradov's too broad understanding of the scope of phraseology does not allow to establish its boundaries and separate phraseological units from related

formations [168]. However, this division is one of the main ones in modern phraseology, so in the following part of our work we will rely on it.

In our study we will consider phraseological units that present the concept “the world” in the “broad” sense of the phraseological unit, namely we will explore the phraseological realization of this concept, considering not only idioms but also proverbs and sayings, winged expressions and stereotypes.

Let's move on to analysing how phraseological units denoting various concepts are translated into Ukrainian and what methods and means are used. To begin with, let's analyse what translation is.

Translation is a great art. In order to achieve an adequate translation, in our case the translation of phraseological units, several conditions are necessary. To adequately reproduce the meaning of phraseology, one must have not only a perfect command of the original language and the language of translation, but also the idea about the country's ethnolinguistic factors, the level of cultural development of native speakers, their thesaurus, geographical and living conditions, their material culture. Phraseology is not only a metaphorical expression of thoughts, but also a reflection of the consciousness of the whole nation, its spiritual achievement and heritage, habits and traditions, priorities and preferences. That is why the ability to reproduce phraseological units indicates a high level of qualification of the translator, his/her comprehensive development and ability to use language as a tool [164].

Of course, there are cases when a translator transmits English phraseology with the help of a similar structure of Ukrainian phraseology, and sometimes simply uses a lexical unit that conveys the meaning of phraseology. Therefore, it is appropriate to give the point of view of V. Komissarov, who distinguishes 5 levels (types) of equivalence between the translation and the original, since translating phraseology different types of equivalence can be observed: 1) the purpose of communication; 2) description of the situation; 3) statements; 4) notification; 5) language signs [173].

According to scientists S. Vlahov and S. Florin, the basic skills and knowledge required for a translator are: knowledge in the field of phraseology; ability to recognize

phraseology in the text; the ability to translate phraseology, saving not only the semantics but also the stylistic and expressive function.

The ability to recognize phraseology in the text is quite important. If the translator is unable to recognize phraseology, he/she will translate it as a free phrase, define it as a literary feature of the author's style or give to a free phrase metaphorical meaning and translate it at the level of phraseology [174].

According to J. Retsker, the context that can be both an invaluable helper and a major obstacle for a translator has a great influence on the translation of a phraseological unit. J. Retsker notes that no dictionary is able to predict all the possibilities of phraseology in the context [167]. Therefore, contextual analysis is an integral part of translation. In general, there are two main ways to translate fixed phrases or idioms: phraseological and non-phraseological ones.

The phraseological method of translation includes translation by equivalent and translation by analogue. The best way to translate figurative phraseology is to use the appropriate phraseology in the native language. The use of this method of translation provides not only the transfer of content, but also the reproduction of imagery and expressiveness of the English expression. Translation by equivalent is possible when there is a full-fledged, context-independent equivalent in the language of translation. E. Soloduhov defines the equivalent as a unit of language capable of performing the same function as a unit of another language. That is, figurative phraseological units in the native language, which fully correspond to any English phraseology and which are based on the same image, are translated by equivalents (international expressions of biblical-mythological or literary nature) [175].

The full equivalents include the material content and functional commonality of the compared units. If in intralingual relations this is the result of linguistic affinity, then at the interlingual level it indicates the presence of cultural and historical contacts. The full equivalent is the similarity of the structural organization of the form of language units, as well as the commonality of their meanings and functions. As for partial equivalents, they are often used in translation. The meaning of phraseology is conveyed through an expression similar in structure and lexical set. If the equivalent in

the language of translation has other connotations, the translation of the phraseological unit is carried out using an analogue. The number of figurative phraseological units that coincide semantically and figuratively in English and Ukrainian is relatively small. More often the translator needs to use Ukrainian phraseology, similar in content to English, but based on a different image [166].

The phraseological method of translation also includes the case when the translator, not finding a match, creates his own, “artificial” equivalent, which reflects both the semantic-stylistic and functional meaning of the unit and differs from true phraseology in that it does not have such feature as reproducibility, so it is “one-time” and is used only in a specific text of the translation. Among the non-phraseological methods of translation, the most common are lexical translation, calquing (loan translation) and descriptive translation. Lexical translation occurs when the phraseological unit of the original language is replaced by a word in the language of translation. This way of translation may be adequate, but the result is a loss of stylistic and emotional colour, national specificity, connotations, etc. [176].

Calquing is used in cases where it is impossible to find a counterpart in the language of translation. Sometimes a translator, trying to save the imagery of the original in the translation of phraseology, which has no equivalent or analogue in the native language, turns to the literal transfer of the image in foreign phraseology. This technique can be used if after calquing we get an expression whose imagery is easily perceived by the Ukrainian reader and does not give the impression of inconsistency with the generally accepted norms of the Ukrainian language. Sometimes in the literal translation of English phraseology inserted words can be used, e.g. “as they say”. Literal translation is not a phraseological translation, because it does not use ready-made phraseological units that are in the language of translation, and each time a translator creates a new figurative phrase, foreign to the native language, yet understandable [177].

To make calquing possible, a certain motivation of the meaning of phraseology is required. Then the recipient will be able to establish a connection between imagery and context and understand the meaning of the unit.

Although, on the one hand, calquing doesn't indicate a high level of translation, R. Zorivchak notes that this technique is quite important because it preserves all the national specifics of phraseology, illustrating the way of thinking of another ethnic group, because a reader must constantly feel that he/she reads a work written in another language, associated with another culture, with the realities of another life [164].

Descriptive translation, in fact, is an interpretation and explanation of the meaning of a phraseological unit. This is the final loss of imagery and stylistic colour, so this means of translation is used only when no other seems possible. Most often phraseological units are reproduced descriptively, which are the product of the peculiarities of the Ukrainian language and, thus, the absolute lingual gaps on the English phraseological map. Descriptive periphrases reproduce the meaning and sometimes stylistic functions of most phraseological units, which arose due to semantic shift caused by different types of tropization. Phraseological units that have arisen as a result of complete lexicalization are almost always reproduced in a descriptive way, except when they have stylistic and semantic equivalents in the phraseological foundations of the recipient language. When reproducing phraseological units that have arisen due to partial or complete lexical weakening (phraseologized comparisons, proverbs, sayings), descriptive translation is very rarely used [176].

Regarding the imagery of phraseology, J. Retsker defined the following means of its transmission: full saving of the image; partial saving of the image; complete replacement; image removal [167].

Of course, the first tool is the most successful, because the figurative component of the phraseological unit is quite important, and without it it loses much of its pragmatic meaning.

M. Shansky emphasizes that when translating phraseological units, the translator should pay attention to the following factors:

1. Understanding that the translator deals with phraseological unit, because there are phrases that in one context can be free phrases, and in another – phraseological units, and the translator may miss the fact that it is necessary to translate the phraseological unit. Phraseological units that are easily distinguished from the text

include: ones taken from the Bible, myths, legends and historical events; ones that have the wrong grammatical structure; ones that begin with the word like; ones that express information that does not correspond to real conditions. In other words, the harder it is to understand an expression in a given context, and the less meaningful it is in this context as a free phrase, the easier it is for the translator to find out that he/she deals with a phraseological unit. And the more phraseological unit resembles a free phrase in its structure and meaning, the harder it is to identify its correct meaning.

2. Lack of equivalent in the language of translation. In this case, you need to choose one of the non- equivalent translations, and the main task here is to choose the right one;

3. The presence of several equivalents in the language of translation, then you need to decide which one is better to use in the appropriate context;

4. Phraseological units can carry national and cultural aspects, and the most important task in this case is to preserve the national colour and not to replace the phraseology equivalent, which carries completely different cultural realities.

5. Phraseological units may have an equivalent in the language of translation, and the context of its use does not allow to make such a substitution [169].

The use of phraseological combinations is a matter of style. But the translator's task is to maintain this style. Therefore, despite all the difficulties of translating phraseology, in particular phraseological units with the concept “the world”, they must be translated in one way or another.

A translator may also encounter some mistakes that can be made when translating phrases. One such mistake is literalism. Literalism, like calquing, is a literal translation. But literalism is fundamentally different from calquing. Calquing is a justified literal translation, and literalism is an unjustified use of a literal translation that changes the meaning of the translated phrase, copies the grammatical and lexical structures of a foreign language and translates them into the language of translation, and is the kind of violence towards the language of translation [176].

According to our research, we will choose phrasemes that denote the concept “the world”, i.e. “internal and external world”, we will indicate what technique the

translator used to convey the meaning in Ukrainian: phraseological equivalent (full or partial); phraseological analogue; calquing (literal translation); descriptive translation; lexical translation.

The phraseological composition of the language reflects the national-specific ways of conceptualizing the world around. Phraseological units form a picture of the world of native speakers, because they directly focus on the results of cultural experience of the people. The meaning of phraseological units is anthropocentric, because phraseologies are created by man, aimed directly at man, reflecting his nature, characterizing and evaluating him. On the other hand, the meaning of a phraseological unit is ethnocentric, so they are focused on a particular ethnic group. Phraseological units are a kind of key to understanding the ethnocultural mentality, the linguistic mentality of the nation. Thus, the phraseological unit is a vivid figurative expression (idiom, proverb, saying) with rethought semantics of its components, the originality of which is based on various grammatical, lexical, semantic relationships between them, and the specificity of phraseological meaning is due to the properties of phrases, units, and internal phraseological connections [164].

Phraseological units are a means of accumulating and transmitting standards and stereotypes of national culture. They reflect and accumulate all the material and spiritual values produced by mankind over the centuries and are characteristic of the culture of a particular community. Between the external world around man and his internal world lies the third world – language. In the course of contacts with the world a person has a picture of the world, subjective image, interpretation of the world. Representatives of different ethnic groups perceive the world differently. The language of society is an important channel for transmitting the mentality of representatives of a particular ethnic group, a culture [166].

Phraseological units accumulate and carry cultural information about society and the world. They record how a person navigates in the world around him/her, how he/she understands it. Phraseological units, which are called “micro-folklore”, preserve and reproduce the mentality and culture of the people, its creator. Phrasemes reflect traits of character, worldview, way of life of representatives of a particular ethnic group. At

the heart of the imagery of phraseology there is not a single element of reality, but a certain fragment of the world. Idioms are a kind of microtexts, linguistic signs that denote a complex denotation of reality, which is often the whole situation. To understand why a person uses this or that phraseological phrase, it is necessary to identify the language situation, communicative intentions and background knowledge of the speaker [177].

Human in the process of life perceives the world emotionally, information about the relationship to the object, he/she can convey it through the use of a phraseological unit. The language consolidates and “phraseologizes” precisely those aspects of reality that most fully express the peculiarities of the national mentality. Phraseological units, which are passed down from generation to generation, “impose” native speakers national understanding of the world through the prism of their culture. Thus, the phraseological fund of language is a reflection of the culture of the nation, a kind of “code of culture” [166].

In our research, we considered the concept “the world”. We have found that it is a complex concept that encompasses a number of concepts or sub-contexts. Since this concept means all living things, the whole world, humanity, life and time, so we will focus on sub-contexts that are directly related to man, consider phraseological units that reflect the external (outside) and internal (inner) world of man. The external world in our understanding is all that is connected with man in society, his life, way of life, time. The internal world of man is a psychological state and is associated with his soul, mind, heart, mood, character, memory, emotions.

It is traditionally believed that man lives simultaneously in two worlds: external (objective) and internal (subjective): two worlds are united in man and man is the link between these worlds. This view is shared by many psychologists, philosophers, anthropologists. Thus, I. Kant pointed out that there are two realities: One reality - everyday, with its real, material actions people, where each person acts as an external person. Another reality is directly unobservable, higher, purified from material particulars, where the inner man acts mentally [178].

N. Arutyunova's concept of “internal world” includes mental constants, character, inclinations, tastes, ideas, desires, intentions, thoughts, abilities, object and objectless feelings. The inner microworld may narrow. The range of meanings is specified by an additional determinant that indicates the components of the mental structure of man (mind, heart, soul, conscience, etc.). The inner world of man is modelled in language like the outside world. The multifaceted typology, which represents concepts through systemic-taxonomic identities and interpretations of the inner world, reflects the naive classification of this world, one way or another expressed in language [163].

The inner world of man due to its special nature (inability to observe), in the conceptual system of naive linguistic picture of the world appears in the form of a mirror (but not identical) reflection of the physical world. Thus, what is united by the common prototype name “internal man” in English and Ukrainian languages is conceptualized through complimentary, anthropomorphic, divided into emotional, mental and social characteristics [177].

The functional aspect of the linguistic representation of the inner world of man and its components in the linguistic naive picture is the use of such types of metaphorical transfer between the general spheres of extralinguistic reality. When describing the inner world, often the semantic subject of the action (actually acting) in the grammatical design appears as the object of this action in situations of uncontrollability and surprise of its manifestation. For the conceptual system “inner world” such oppositions as “external/internal”, “visible/invisible”, “explicit/implicit”, “mastered/unexplored”, “mastered/unmastered”, “human/inhuman”, “open/closed”, “known/unknown”, “controlled/uncontrolled”, “purposeful (volitional)/spontaneous”, “present/absent”, “actually existing/mythological”, etc. The internalization of the human personality is based primarily on the ability to realize themselves as subjects and objects of knowledge, to separate and distinguish functionally opposite aspects of their “inner world of man” and their self-reflection organs, which arise only in the relevance of one or another assigned, appropriate

function. In the work of M. Pimenova, the comparison of concepts of the inner world of man in languages is considered [178].

The features of the concepts of the inner world are realized according to the model of the outer world (macrocosm): the model “sun and the whole world around it” corresponds to the cognitive model of the microcosm “soul and the whole inner world around it”, in English – “spirit / soul” and the whole inner world around. When describing certain aspects of the inner life of man (in the form of concepts) specific cognitive models, implemented in the relevant language schemes, are also used. In the English language picture of the world, the conceptualization of inner peace and harmony is expressed through a special cognitive model “inner world / peace - money calculation/redemption”. This cognitive model is realized in the accepted language schemes inherent in the concept of conscience. The functions of moral censor are attributed to the concept of the ideal body of self-reflection mind (mind), i.e. conscience in the English language picture of the world is mental, not emotional as in Ukrainian, where this function is attributed to the concept of “heart” and “soul” [177].

The conceptual system related to the sphere of “human inner world” reflects the national and cultural identity of the people. Currently, due to the increased interest in the study of the linguistic picture of the world in different nations, both ancient and modern, the focus of scientists is a range of issues related to the expression of certain concepts in different languages. The concept “the world” is key in any picture of the world. It can consist of several sub-concepts (space, time, the world of the living, the world of the dead) [180].

In English, there are many lexemes that have in their semantics meaning, common or close to the meaning to our lexeme “soul”. The main lexemes in this series are the soul, mind, then synonymous “heart” as well as “spirit”, “will” (freedom), “emotions” and others. [179].

By the concept of external world, we mean first of all life. There are a number of examples of living and inanimate nature in the literature, but the diversity and variety of the concept of “life” is seen when it comes to man, so it is very important subjective interpretation, which is associated with individual human interaction with the world.

This reflects the anthropocentrism of the concept of “life”. Understanding of life by native English speakers is determined by the biological principle, very important for the definition of life, is the place of residence of the language speaker, his/her habitat. Purpose in the life of English speakers also determines a person's life. It is very important what values a person chooses as a dominant (work, love, family and home, personal or social life), which confirms the opinion of V. Karasyk that the linguistic study of cultural concepts should be filled with data from other disciplines such as culturology, history, psychology, geography [161].

The ability to combine “life” with an infinite number of attributes, predicates, etc. shows the depth, multidimensionality and complexity of this concept. “Life has a thousand faces”. Life compatibility is very high. This concept can be used with many synonymous series, such as purpose in life, aim in life, to ruin life, to kill life, to rob life; intimate life, personal life, private life; to come back to life, to spark to life, cough to life, to kick into life, etc. The concept of “life” can be divided into social life, private life, business life, religious life, etc. However, compatibility may include not only an assessment, but also an indication of other additional characteristics, such as social status “orphan's life”; other definitions indicate social status and in the sense of assessment can be both plus and minus, e.g. “married life”. Attributes may include a moral and ethical assessment of life “usless life”, “honest, laborious life”. “Home life”, “family life” express not only the assessment, but also the social status, the attitude to which depends on the living conditions in the house, family, etc. An important role is played by the personal experience of the individual, in one case, “married life” is synonymous with a prosperous life. Marriage as a chance to regulate one's life: “quiet life”, “to regularize her life”. Otherwise, married life has a negative assessment: “married life is a bad habit “. “The good or ill of a good or ill life”. “Natural metaphors” are widely used to describe living conditions: “the wind of life”, “snow and gloom of life”, “roar of life”. Some metaphors are possibly universal: “road of life, river of life”, etc. In the phraseological units of the English language, folk wisdom emphasizes the complexity of life in general: “life is a difficult business” [181].

Also, the concept of “outside world” includes concepts such as “time”. The problem of time arises in the linguistic categories of grammatical time, a type of modality that is directly related to the study of different forms of verbs, because temporal meanings are represented by different parts of speech. The conceptual sphere “time” is represented by different lexical units, in particular: hour, month, year, day, epoch, age, eternity, minute, moment, moment, present, future, present [148].

From the great variety of approaches to the study of the concept of “time”, we chose the approach of Yu. Stepanov, because he pays considerable attention to the culturological side of the concept. The scientist identifies the current, historical layers of the concept and internal form, actual real for all representatives of culture and users of this language. The historical layer deals with some social groups that are associated with the emergence of this concept in culture. Regarding the internal form, it is available only to researchers of this concept [146].

The word “time” comes from the Old English word “tima”, which means a limited space of time, i.e. time was understood as a segment of life on earth or as a segment necessary for a particular activity [146].

An important characteristic of time in English is the presence in the semantic structure of the concept of “time” meaning “rhythm, tact”. The correlation is visible in the following meanings: “in time” and “out of time” (not timely, the one who was late - arrhythmic). Therefore, the expression “beat time” (reflect the rhythm) and “keep time” can be successfully applied to time in the following expressions: “knock sb out of time” [181].

Considering English phraseology and proverbs, we can be sure that existence consists of different times, each of them is suitable for a particular activity. Therefore, a key meaning of the Anglo-Saxon perception of time is the concept of “timeliness” which was formed over many centuries. Time in English culture is seen as a great value and as an object that can be manipulated [182].

Now, let's move on to analyse the phrasemes of English and their translation into Ukrainian. We picked up examples from English-Ukrainian dictionary of idioms by K. Barantsev, separately for inner and outer world subconcepts. We concluded that

the frequency of use of these phraseological units is almost the same, namely from 1002 phraseological units, we selected 525 units denoting the concept of “the inside world” and 477 units to denote “the outside world”.

If we analyse groups of phraseological units with each concept separately, we observe the following tendency, the largest number of phraseological units is presented to denote the concept of “time”, related concepts in their meaning. Namely, we have identified 5 groups of such phraseological units, let's give examples for each group:

1. feelings, emotions, soul, spirit, character, heart, will - 175 units: e.g. “be lower than a snake's belly”, “Cool as a cucumber”, “Have a worm in one's tongue”;
2. mood - 217 units: “Be in the blues”, “Be steamed up about sth”, “Cross as a bear”;
3. mind (lack of mind), memory, thought - 133 units: “Dumb Dora”, “Have a slow wit”, “Lad of wax”;
4. time - 267 units: “Autumn of life”, “Bear one's age well”, “Cap and feather days”;
5. life, world - 210 units: “Carry one's life in one's hands”, “Cat-and-dog existence”, “Get on like a house on fire”.

Considering this ratio, it was found that most of the phraseology denotes the concept of the outside world “time” - 267 units (27%). Why is this trend observed? In our language, of course, the word “time” is ambiguous, but the English “time” has greater potential for meaning. Even taking into account the grammatical category of time, it is known that in English the category of time is represented by more tenses than in Ukrainian. In addition, the English-speaking community values time, views it as a value – “Time is money”, which cannot be traced in our society. The English concept of time covers the following system of meanings: time interval, measured in minutes, hours, the possibility of certain actions: a long period of time ; some of the time available: to have all the time in the world (=have plenty of time); epoch, a certain period in history: Golden times; convenient or inconvenient, a good time for something: happy times , hard times . Therefore, in English, the concept of the outside world “time” is represented by a large number of phraseological units.

Now let's analyse the type of translation of selected phraseological units and levels of equivalence. Each of the phraseologies is unique and has its own set of techniques and means of translation, even the type of translation is different. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the classification of translation types according to A. Parshin [183].

According to the form of presentation of the translated text and the original text, our units are written translation, namely written translation of written text. According to the second parameter of the classification, it is difficult to say which translation, because the appendices contain phraseology of artistic, everyday styles, phraseology of military and legal issues.

According to the main pragmatic function, the English-Ukrainian dictionary, from which we chose phraseological units, is a practical translation, as it is intended for practical use in order to search for information, namely published translation (practical or educational translation, translation used to train translators or as one of the methods of learning a foreign language, in our case).

In terms of completeness and type of transmission of semantic content, this translation is incomplete, namely aspectual, because the author translated only parts of the original text, namely an idiom.

It can be argued that the translation of all phraseologies in relation to the types of translation language and the original language is interlingual, because interlingual translation is the transformation of a message expressed by one sign system into a message expressed by another sign system. In turn, interlanguage translation is divided into binary translation, intersemiotic translation and transmutation. Our units are binary translations, i.e. made from one natural language to another, from English to Ukrainian.

By the nature of the correspondence of the translated text to the original text, we are dealing with interpretation. Interpretation is a type of translation that is based on extracurricular activities, i.e. to translate phraseology, you need to know the realities of the language of translation, in order to translate phraseology and convey the main idea to the recipient of information.

By the nature of the subject of translation activity and its relation to the author of the translated text, this translation is a translation made by a translator who is not at the same time the author of the original text.

Taking into account such aspect of classification as the primacy of the original text, it is difficult to say what type of translation our selected units are, because when compiling the English-Ukrainian phraseological dictionary the author used the English-Russian phraseological dictionary, so it is possible that some phraseologies were translated from Russian into Ukrainian, because the dictionary contains a large number of russianisms, so it is appropriate to say that this is a mixture of primary and secondary translation.

According to the type of translation segmentation and the method of processing the translated material, this translation is phrasal, i.e. performed at the level of individual sentences or phrases that are translated sequentially, taking into account semantic, syntactic and stylistic connections between words.

As for the type of adequacy, in our case it is a pragmatically (functionally) adequate translation – a translation that correctly conveys the main (dominant) communicative function of the original [183].

G. Miram notes that the word “adequate” means “identical”. So, the term “adequacy” in general began to be avoided, using instead the term “equivalence”. In both cases it is the same - the degree of conformity of the texts, the original and the translation, which ideally should be identical, but in practice this is almost not achieved. Both the adequacy and equivalence of translation are never complete. The concept of equivalence is one of the main tasks of the translator, which has to fully convey the content of the original, and, as a rule, the actual commonality of the content of the original and the translation is very significant [184].

Equivalence in the theory of translation should be understood as maintaining the relative equality of substantive, semantic, stylistic and functional-communicative information contained in the original and translation. It is worth emphasizing that the equivalence of the original and the translation is primarily a common understanding of the information contained in the text, including that one which affects not only the

mind but also the feelings of the recipient and which is not only explicitly expressed in the text but also implicitly attributed to the subtext. The equivalence of the translation also depends on the situation of creation of the original text and its reproduction in the language of translation [184].

According to V. Komissarov's theory, the equivalence of translation depends on the maximum identity of all levels of content of the original and translated texts. The units of the original and the translation may be equivalent to each other on all five levels or only some of them. In the process of translation, the translator solves the complex problem of processing and proper use of the necessary elements of the system of equivalent units, taking into account what creates communicatively equivalent statements. As it was said earlier, V. Komissarov distinguishes 5 levels (types) of equivalence of translation and original. [173]: the purpose of communication, description of the situation, expression, message and language signs.

For analysis of means of translation we selected 1002 English phraseological units and their Ukrainian equivalents from the dictionary by K. Barantsev [185]. It is known that phraseology can be translated in two ways: phraseological and non-phraseological. Of course, translation by means of a phraseological method is more expedient, but the translator is not always able to find an equivalent or analogue of a certain English phraseology, so he/she uses lexical, descriptive or literal translation (calquing). Therefore, in our work, there are more phraseological units translated into Ukrainian using the non-phraseological method. The ratio of phraseological and non-phraseological methods of translation of phraseological units is the following: 47% - non-phraseological method of translation, 53% - phraseological one.

For example, the idioms that were translated non-phraseologically are the following:

- Beat the schedule – досягти чогось раніше встановленого строку;
- At one's last gasp - що помирає;
- Cheat death – залишитися живим [185].

The idioms that were translated into Ukrainian phraseologically are as follows:

- Life is great if you don't weaken - Життя чудове, якщо людина не занепадає духом;
- Follow the dictates of one's heart – робити щось за покликом серця;
- Unlock one's heart – відкрити свою душу [185].

Let's consider in detail each of the methods of translation of phraseology. Examining the nature of the use of these tools, it was found that when translating phraseological units with the concept of "the world" most often descriptive translation was used, namely in 316 (32%) cases, i.e. the translator explained the semantic and connotative meaning, giving an interpretation of phraseological unit. Descriptively, the following phraseological units were most often transmitted, which do not contain analogues in the Ukrainian language and which would not be understandable in literal translation. The following idioms were translated descriptively:

- Have one's heart in the right place – бути доброзичливою людиною;
- Dirty dog – погана, підла людина;
- Come captain Stiff over one – ставитися високомірно [185].

The Ukrainian language has a large number of analogues of English phraseological units. After all, both nations have different cultures, background knowledge, so the same concept is transmitted by different combinations of words. Thus, in second place in terms of frequency of use - analogue - in 255 cases (25%). We would like to give the examples of English phrasemes that have analogues in Ukrainian:

- Contended mind is continual feast - Кому легко на серці, до того увесь світ сміється.
- Bring home to one's heart - Зворушити до глибини душі;
- Wear a mask – напускати пиху [185].

In many cases, the translator used full or partial equivalents. Of course, there were very few complete equivalents. And this is due to the difference between two nations, whose culture and worldview are significantly different from each other. Only

in 53 (5%) cases was the full equivalent used to convey the meaning of English phraseology in Ukrainian. Let's give examples of full equivalents:

- Iron will/will of iron – залізна воля;
- Broken heart – розбите серце;
- The eye is the mirror of the soul - Очі – дзеркало душі [185].

In contrast to full equivalents, partial equivalents are more numerous in the Ukrainian language. Therefore, in terms of frequency of use, partial equivalents occupy the third place. In particular, partial equivalents were used in 163 cases (16%). The following examples of translation are partial equivalents:

- Heart bleeds – Серце кров'ю обливається;
- Speak to the heart - Доходить до серця;
- Angry man opens his mouth and shuts his eyes - Розлючена людина втрачає розум і дає волю язика [185].

Lexical translation was used in 140 cases, which is 14% of the total. That is, in most cases, the translator, not being able to find a phraseological equivalent, conveys the meaning of units in one word. Such a translation usually occurs with a loss of stylistic colour and pragmatic potential. Almost every time there is neutralization. These are the idioms that were translated lexically:

- Be on the wobble – вагатися;
- Be out of one's mind – збожеволіти;
- Like a bear with sore head – засмучений [185].

Calquing (literal translation) was used in 75 cases, which is 8%. This is due to the fact that the translator, trying to preserve the imagery of the original in the translation of phraseology, which has no equivalent or analogue in the native language, resorted to the literal transfer of the image in foreign phraseology. As a result of calquing, we get an expression whose imagery is easily perceived by the Ukrainian reader and does not give the impression of inconsistency with the generally accepted norms of the Ukrainian language. Let's give the examples of calquing:

- Black year – чорний рік (нещасливий);

- Had seen better days – бачив кращі дні;
- All men are mortal – Всі люди смертні [185].

Thus, when translating phraseological units, descriptive translation, analogue, partial equivalent or lexical equivalent are used, and less often full equivalents and calquing come to the rescue. However, to translate the phraseology to denote each of the concepts, namely the soul, spirit, character, heart, feelings, emotions, mood, mind (lack of mind), memory, thought, time, life, world, different frequency of use was observed.

All in all, all means of translation have right to exist, and different translators may translate the same phraseme in a different way. For example, one translator will use phraseological unit for conveying the meaning of the phraseme, but the other translator will turn to lexical means of translation. And both means will be appropriate.

In conclusions, we would like to review the main information of this work. So, this work was devoted to the theoretical and practical understanding of the concept “the world” on the basis of works of our and foreign scientists. It was established that there is no universal definition of concept. The concept is a mental entity that can provide information about the perception of the world by a nation, it is a product of cognitive activity. It is the basic unit of the human mental code and carries comprehensive information about the displayed object or phenomenon.

Considering the concept, we turned to the phraseological treasure of language. The phraseological structure of the language provides information about the culture and mentality of the people. Phraseological units are stable combinations of words with completely or partially rethought meaning. Phrasemes concentrate and consolidate the ideas of the people of the world. We also considered the basic techniques of translation of phraseological units.

In our opinion, the concept “the world” covers both the external and internal world of man. It is established that man lives simultaneously in two worlds: external (objective) and internal (subjective), which are united in man. The concept of inner world of man includes mental constants, character, thoughts, abilities, feelings, etc. We

traced the inner world of man through such concepts as “soul”, “mind”, “heart”, “spirit” and others.

As for the concept of outside world, it includes primarily such concept as “human life” and “time”. The phraseology of the English language emphasizes the complexity of life in general. The conceptual sphere of “time” is represented by different lexical units, in particular: hour, month, day, minute, moment, present, future, past. A sign of the English mentality is that it emphasizes the value of time, its correlation with rhythm, pace. The main feature of this concept is timeliness.

The practical part of our study is based on the comparison of English phraseological units to denote the concept “the world”, selected from English-Ukrainian phraseological dictionary of K. Barantsev, with their Ukrainian counterparts. We compared the phraseological units of both languages and determined the methods of their translation. The result of the study was a selection of phraseology, consisting of 1002 units. We considered the concept of world as a combination of external (outer) and internal (inner) world.

In turn, both the inner and outer worlds have their own small concepts. In particular, the external world includes such concepts as life and time, and the internal world – such concepts as soul, spirit, heart, will, mind, emotions, feelings, character, mood, thought.

Based on the processed material, we are convinced that the translation of phraseological units is a rather complex task, which is often performed with great semantic and stylistic losses. Both methods of translation: phraseological and non-phraseological ones were used. Phraseological means equals 53 % of all idioms, and non-phraseological – 47 %. As we know, different methods of translation can be applied. The ratio of translation techniques is as follows: descriptive translation – 316 (32%), analogue – 255 (25%), full equivalent – 53 (5%), partial equivalent – 163 (16%), lexical translation – 140 (14%), calquing (literal translation) – 75 (8%). We have concluded that phraseology is most often conveyed through descriptive translation.

As a result of the study, we concluded that the concept “the world” is represented by a large number of phraseological units, and most of our chosen phraseological units are the concept denoting “time”, which denotes the outside world (267 units or 27%). Such concepts of the inner world as “soul, spirit, character, heart, will” number 175 units or 17%. Among the selected units, 217 units or 22% indicate the concepts of feelings, emotions, mood. Phraseological units to denote the concepts of the inner world “mind (absence of mind), memory, thought” equal 133 units or 13%. As for the concept of the external world “life”, it is expressed in 210 units or 21%.

So, after investigating the concept “the world”, we can point out that this concept is rich and consists of various small concepts. A lot of English phraseological units represent this concept, they are translated with the help of different translation techniques, what helps to understand foreign culture, attitude to certain subjects that relate to the concepts of outside and inner world. Undoubtedly, a translator must have not only an expertise of language, but also a sound knowledge of the cultural aspects, only then a translator is able to transmit the meaning of the phraseological unit. So, for adequate translation of the idiom we shouldn't underestimate the work of translators.