

**DATA REPRESENTATION FOR DRAMATIC AND LYRICAL IDIOMS:
THE CASE OF W. SHAKESPEARE**

Дослідницькі прийоми семантичних мереж уможливають розкриття особливостей ідіоматичних зворотів у сполученнях ситуативних частикових синонімів та в омонімічній дисоціації двозначностей. Драматичні та ліричні ідіоми виявляють відмінності через розкриття їх причетності, відповідно, до дії або ж до прихованої проблеми.

Ключові слова: конотація, компіляція, індексація, найменування, синонім, омонім, перифрастичний опис.

Исследовательские приемы семантических сетей создают возможность раскрытия особенностей идиоматических оборотов через сочетания ситуативных синонимов и омонимическую диссоциацию двусмысленностей. Драматические и лирические идиомы проявляют различия через их причастность, соответственно, к действию или к скрытой проблеме.

Ключевые слова: коннотация, компиляция, индексация, обозначение, синоним, омоним, перифрастическое описание.

The explorative methods of semantic nets enable disclosing idiomatic locutions' peculiarities within partitive synonymous situational combinations and homonymous dissociation of ambiguities. Dramatic and lyrical idioms differ in revealing their attachment towards action or inner latent problem respectively.

Key words: connotation, compilation, indexation, intitulation, synonym, homonym, periphrastic circumscription.

The problem of compressing and summarizing texts with the aim of comprehending and exploring their contents has been recently taken anew due to the advancement of artificial intelligence researches. A few decades ago this problem used to be regarded as something trivial. In particular it was the Shakespearean legacy that once happened to be esteemed by A.A. Anikst as plain for depiction in opposite to that of decadent epoch: "One can select separate places from the plays of Shakespeare and represent the verbal depiction of the whole plot with allocating them in a certain order ... the real sense of the speeches spoken by the dramatis personae at Ibsen or Chekhov can be disclosed only under shrewd and penetrating attitude" [1: 235]. It is noteworthy in this respect that the first attempts to compile digests had been undertaken already at the beginning of the XIX c. and that it was Shakespeare which became their object. It goes about Ch. and M. Lamb's "Tales from Shakespeare" with some plays' contents briefly

retold. Meanwhile one has always to take into account the scientific tasks to which textual compressions serve and the respective horizon of scientific experience that determines the way of textual comprehension at all.

The devices of compressing a text and of expanding the compression to produce a derivative text are known for ages and were used especially in the improvisations: let only A. S. Pushkin's "Egyptian Nights" be reminded. As to the use of the devices of the kind for the tasks of exploring the generative textual opportunities and narrative strategies it remains still unsolved problem. In particular there had been invented the so called "verbal plot study" («глагольное сюжетоведение», [4: 107]) where the sequence of predicative locutions served to describe a plot in a brief manner. Similar devices have given ground for the rise of frame analysis with the so called predicative frames as "the structures of future sentences" [2: 166, 171]. It was supposed that a text can be described with the aid of questionnaire in replying to the ready set of questions – the so called slots. At the same time the deficiency of frame approach has become evident in particular in the circumstance that "frame-system theories ... do not tell us how we are constrained in ordinary conversation to assess just the correct background knowledge" [11: 244]. As to the artistic work it is evident that latent and implicit (what is called background) information plays primordial role, and subsequently the devices of the frame analysis can't be accepted as satisfactory. To overcome it the semantic nets' methods have been developed: in particular it has been stressed that "one uses the nets in the cases when slots can't acquire the meanings that would satisfy the conditions ascribed to these slots" [7: 74].

The respective procedure of building semantic net consists in the standard data representation of text without preliminary premises of frame questionnaire: the represented text is transformed in a listing (enumerative) structure that is in an index of locutions that disclose their semantic connections (both contact and distant) instead of purely syntactic scheme retained in frames. Thus it is with producing a compilation of phrases that the indexation of text (as its enumerative transformation) initiates the semantic net's building. In its turn indexation presupposes also the intitution of the represented textual passage. It is to be taken into account that title is identical with the ultimate limit of each textual compression. Then the whole compilation can become the disclosure and interpretation of a title's folded contents. Title is selected from the idioms as the designation of the textual passage's key detail in preliminary scanning and skimming the text. Respectively the choice of title depends upon and reveals the interpretation of the passage: one would imagine replacing "Othello" with "Iago". Thus indexation and intitution become the initial procedures of compilation (with the succeeding compression) as the make of textual interpretation. For each passage (paragraph) of a text a separate indexed compilation can be built in the manner of "prosaic strophes" (I. R. Galperin) where initial "title" is succeeded with its disclosure.

Data representation (textual description, compression) is always to be regarded as the interpretative problem. In particular all textual transformations necessary for its exploration are also the acts of interpretation, as well as interpretability is the immanent property of each text as the built-in program of its decoding. A very particular interpretative task consists in disclosing the meaning of idioms peculiar for the single artistic work. It has already been demonstrated that the traditional criterion of reproducibility can't withstand the criticism, as far as "the so called free collocations can be regarded as reproducible as well" [3: 11]. There has been elaborated another approach where the complication of connotative meanings is regarded so that the

complicated connotation coexisting with the literal meaning (that simultaneously exclude each other) becomes the principal idiomatic criterion [8: 71]. It entails in its turn the necessity of dealing with the homonymous and synonymous interaction.

It goes about the phenomenon that due to textual integration the lexical units used within the borders of a separate passage make up semantic “isotope” or the row of situational occasional synonyms that disclose “partitive” similarity and mutuality of the meanings of otherwise distanced lexical units [6: 88]. It is the “theme” of textual passage (possibly represented in its title) that becomes the axis to unite the differentiated and diversified lexical units involved there. The attachment to this theme discloses semantic mutuality of the words thus making them situational synonyms. Such attachment becomes especially evident in dramatic dialogues where it reveals itself in the necessity of action that demands respective lexical selection. Then reciprocally each lexical unit may be esteemed as lesser or greater deviation from the axial theme of the passage. In its turn homonymous dissociation of meaning represents ambiguity as the immanent dramatic quality. It is interesting that the split of homonymous meaning of ambiguous designations becomes specific device for the disclosure of hypocrisy of Iago in Shakespeare’s “Othello”. It is with the game with homonyms that Iago tries to justify himself in the final scene: “*Demand me nothing: what you know –you know*” (line 304). Moreover, Iago actually betrays his genuine intentions in the very beginning as he comments the recent events (Othello’s plans for marriage): “... *though that his joy be joy / Yet throw such changes of vexation on*?” (I.1. line 72-73; the figures here and further will designate act, scene and line). Such intentional ambiguity of speech is acknowledged by him in the very scene in the words uttered apart: “*I must show a flag and sign of love / Which is indeed but sign*” (lines 158-159). The cases of the equivocal interpretations of the same “signs” becoming fatal in “Othello”, the very device in lesser or greater degree belongs to the ubiquitous properties of dramatic text. Each poetic work is in a way a homonym in comparison to colloquial speech.

These synonymous and homonymous interactions turn out to become very productive in disclosing idiomatic meanings in dramatic play. For example, the famous scene in the orchard from “Romeo and Juliet” with the rapid development of love used to be regarded as the example of the mutability of characters where the heroes enrich their own experience in the decision-making process. In particular this scene served as the argument against Hegel’s statement on the gradual unfolding of hero’s properties in dramatic action because “it is the heroes themselves that are here making up the dramatic situation due to their passion’s gusts, decisions and actions” [5: 151]. Actually “changes in the relationship are here tied with the changes of persons” that “don’t only reveal their characters. Here the formation of the very characters takes place” [5: 152].

Meanwhile the idiomatic analysis of the scene discloses some very important particulars concerning the rapidity of the engendered love and the decision to marry. Of a special importance is here the passage from Juliet’s monologue (2.1.75 ff.) that could be entitled as DOFFING THE NAME (with the rare verb ‘doff’ used in the monologue as the abbreviation for do off). Its representation can include the series <*refuse the name – deny the father – newly baptizing – call love – name being enemy – hateful name – man’s part being no name – <hand – foot – arm – face> – rose smelling sweet with other name – retaining perfection without title – being the self*> + <*stumbling on the counsel – tearing the word – drinking words*>. Juliet’s objections against the prohibition to love are those of the stream of scholasticism (known as nominalism)

but of a special importance is the very mentioning of NEW BAPTIZING: no need to remind that it belonged to one of the principal heresies in the Roman Catholicism. Thus it was an overt challenge to the morals of the time that made the heroes understand their personal independence from society as THE SELVES and entailed the rapidity of decision-making. There arise more general problems of personal responsibility that stand behind the cited idioms of RENAMING taken together with NEW BAPTIZING as situational synonyms. It is remarkable that Ch. & M. Lamb in their digest mention only that Romeo “bade her call him Love” and omit phrase of new baptizing as well as of tearing the words, though they add their comments of Juliet “chiding Romeo for being Romeo” [10: 247] though such comment would imply Juliet’s irritation not witnessed with the text.

As another example Macbeth’s “monologue of hesitation” with the succeeding discussion with the Lady (1.7.1 ff.) may serve that doesn’t concern the murder’s case of the drama only. It demonstrates general problems on motivation promoting or impeding the action of murder generally. According to Lamb here Macbeth’s “resolution had begun to stagger” the objection against the planned murder as regards Duncan consisting in that “such kings are the peculiar care of Heaven” [10: 147]. Meantime the idiomatic analysis gives grounds neither for the mentioning of staggering nor of Heaven: the hero says of “heaven’s cherubin” that would designate messenger diffusing the news of the foreseen murder. The passage could be entitled JUMPING THE LIFE TO COME (in the meaning of putting the life to risk). It goes there about the confrontation of the reasons of PITY vs. QUICKNESS. Among the most important idioms the following series can be built up: <well done quickly – trammel up the consequence – returning bloody instructions – commending [back] poisoned chalice – no spur pricking intent – virtues pleading against the damnation of taking-off – pity blowing in every eye>. W. Wagner has commented that here the word trammel is used that belongs to fishermen’s terminology (literally denoting the net with three meshes, from Fr. *travail* of Lat. *tremaculum*) [12: 26]. It gives already grounds to refer to the imagination of a hunter without scruples. It goes only about the deliberated effectiveness of action, of its promptness identified with quickness that is also implied in the locution of spurs pricking the sides of intent. The idioms do merely enumerate the elements of jeopardy accompanying action as partitive synonyms.

There’s why there are no reasons to blame the Lady of persuading her husband to commit the crime. According to the generally accepted opinion, “It is only the Lady who has managed to make him keep on the plan further with her reckless derision” [9: 274]. Meanwhile one of her chief arguments consists in referring innocently to the proverb “*the cat would eat fish and would not wet her feet*” (cited in W. Wagner’s comments [12: 29]). The Lady’s speech (with Macbeth’s insertions) could be entitled BRAIN & DRUNKENNESS. The idioms used in this speech encircle the theme of mastering the will with potion: <*drunken hope – afraid desire – coward in esteem – dashing the babe’s brains out – brain [becoming] a limbeck – memory being fume*> + <*convincing wine & wassail – drenched chamberlains’ natures / spongy officers*>. It is remarkable that here the exclusively specific term (*limbeck* from Arab. [12: 30]) of the alchemists is used for designating brain as the receptacle of reason. Besides, the Lady actually refers to the hints of Medes having killed her own children. Thus the convincing arguments of her speech concern somatic images. The Lady can be said to appeal to her husband’s body’s scheme and to exert impact upon his subconscious images. Together with the axial line of idioms attached to the argument COWARDICE there is the lateral line in

Lady's speech attached to somatic images, and it is this laterality that exerts fatal impact upon her husband.

One can easily discern in Shakespeare's dramas a special type of the so called final salvation scenes where the mystery is disclosed and the recognition takes place that rescues the dramatis personae. Such are the final acts of "Measure for Measure" or "All's Well that Ends Well" where the motif of the substituted concubine arises. Similar type is to be found in "The Winter's Tale", "Cymbeline" and "Much Ado about Nothing" with the motifs of the resurrection or the return of the pretended dead person. The act of recognition becomes here tied with the removal of the ambiguity of periphrastic designations and with the dissociation of homonyms' "heaps". In particular such is the case with the ambiguity of RING in "All's Well that Ends Well". Diana pretended to sleep with Bertram, and in reality she was replaced with his genuine wife Helena (pretended also to be dead) with the aim of helping her to return the husband: they have changed their rings, and now Helena's ring has been disclosed on Bertram's finger. The passage before the return of Helena comes to the riddle announced by Diana and addressed to Bertram: "*He knows himself my bed he has defiled; / And at that time he got his wife with child: / Dead though she be, she feels her young one kick: / So there's my riddle, - One that's dead is quick*" (5.3.298-301). This is preceded with Diana's soliloquy (interrupted with King's questions, 5.3.267 ff.) where the ambiguities of the drama are condensed. The passage could be entitled BAIL and the attributes are enumerated here that concern the origin of the ring <not given – not bought – not found – not lent> and experience of Bertram <guilty vs. not guilty – him knowing & swearing no maid vs. me swearing a maid & him knowing not>. But besides these objects Diana mentions trice specific idioms <(fetching / putting in) bail – [being] surety> with the decisive final words about <the jeweler owing the ring> where Helena is meant. They refer to scene 4.4 where Helena calls the King "SURETY". Here her own definition returns to herself and her appearance from the pretended death becomes the salvation for Diana's dangerous hazardous play. Words' ambiguities turn out to be removed with the action so that A RING becomes THE RING with the elucidated fate witnessing the deeds. Meanwhile this decisive passage of perilous lexical game is fully omitted in Lamb's digest: the only detail is there mentioned that "her accounts of the ring differing from Bertram's, the king's suspicions were confirmed" [10: 168].

In "Measure for Measure" the motif of the substituted concubine is still subordinated to the motif of broken promise of provisional ruler (together with the disguised ruler's motif), the pretended death concerning the unjust provisional ruler's victim. It is worth discussing here the accounts of Mariana (5.1.169 ff.) before the Duke's court that have evident correspondence with the quoted Diana's passage. She played here the same role as Helena in the previous case in replacing the pretended concubine Isabella for Angelo and demonstrates almost the same set of idioms that Diana does as the ambiguity <never married vs. not maid – not knowing the husband vs. the husband knowing to know his wife> (5.1.185-188). Such are the properties of dramatic idioms attached to the necessity of action. Quite different peculiarities are to be seen in lyrical idioms that serve chiefly the circumscription of the latent problem.

As the sample of homonymous ambiguity's removal with the disclosure of exact meaning let be the 52-th sonnet chosen. For the intitulation here can be the idiom TIME KEEPING selected as it goes about the evaluation of the temporal intervals dividing the rendezvous with the sweetheart. This motif is developed in the series of images attaching to the theme of TREAS-

URY: <surveying the up-locked treasure seldom ← blunting of pleasure> + <rare & solemn feasts ← stones of worth / jewels of carcanet – chest / wardrobe hiding – unfolding the imprisoned pride – special instant special blest – hope & triumph>. In giving the explication of time's positive evaluation it is here to pay attention to a rare name carcanet designating necklace and implying thus the comparison of the row of meetings' moments with precious stones. Not to blend the meant meaning of the idiom of time-keeper with homonymous possible treatments (as of a prisoner) here the image of unfolding pride is used. Besides, one would refer to specific for the sonnet synonymous relation of RARITY & SOLEMNITY that belong to the coupled synonyms of bifurcating type (the so called *hendiadys*).

The hidden idea of *PROGRESS can become the intitulation for the 32-th sonnet that can be regarded as a kind of the circumscription though the very name has been coined (in its modern meaning) just in the epoch by Fr. Rabelais. The circumscription of the idea consists in combining and confronting its antonymous qualities: <growing age – bettering the time – churl Death covering bones with dust – reserving poor rude lines for love – outstripped lines>. The enumerated idiomatic series gives grounds for the statement that it goes here more about the bitter irony of “bettering” and “growing” where “bones” and “lines” become victims of the TIME that stands behind the supposed progress/

In the 108-th sonnet the poet's statement, “*I must each day say o'er the very same*” contains its ambiguity in the very repetitions' contradictions: returning to the same presupposes renovation. It is due to the ETERNAL LOVE mentioned among the sonnet's idioms that the cited line is continued with “*counting no old thing old*”. It is noteworthy that the idiomatic couple <*brain & ink*> is here used to designate the temporal provisional things that attest the independence of Love from time. One can see here the disclosure of the very principle of circumscription where the newly discovered details provide the incessant renovation of the mentioned “sameness”. Perhaps not occasionally here the idiom <*conceit of love*> is used referring to the early baroque idea of “concept” (read here as conceit): it goes about the old idea of the Latin proverb “*semper idem sed non eodem modo*” (always the same though not in the same manner) applied to the Love as one of its periphrastic attributive circumscriptions.

One can regard the legacy of W. Shakespeare as a paragon for the generic peculiarities of idioms: dramatic idioms demonstrate their attachment to action and respectively to axial and lateral lines of textual development; lyrical idioms become periphrastic circumscriptions of the problematic core of the work. One can repeat Shakespeare's own words from the 105-th sonnet where the Love is praised: “*Fair, kind and true, is all my argument, - / Fair, kind and true, varying to other words*”. Here the idiomatic law of lyrical genus is exposed overtly: the three words can be varied infinitely with ingenious circumlocutions. Both lyrical and dramatic idioms become then the devices for mental experimentation: it is periphrastic transformation that becomes explorative device for the discovery of the unknown sides of the artistic problem. Meanwhile the borders of such experimentation are in drama strictly delimited with the faculties of solving the presented puzzles, as one could see in the cases of final scenes. In lyrical poems such limitations (associated usually with the poetical conventions) consist in abstraction that opposes to dramatic dependence upon concrete action. Extraneous and intrinsic viewpoints attested with dramatic and lyrical works demonstrate also difference in respective idiomatic means. The interpretative procedures of compilation enable detecting idiomatic meanings with the means of detailed attributive analysis.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Аникст, А.А. Шекспир. Ремесло драматурга. /А.А. Аникст – М.: Сов. писатель, 1974 – 608 С.
2. Зубов, А.В.; Зубова, И.И. Основы искусственного интеллекта для лингвистов. / А.В. Зубов, И.И. Зубова – М.: Логос, 2007 – 320 с.
3. Копыленко, М.М.; Попова, З.Д. Очерки по общей фразеологии. Изд. 2-е. / М.М. Копыленко, З.Д. Попова – Воронеж: Изд. Воронежского университета, 1978 – 144 С.
4. Кожина, М.Н. О специфике художественной и научной речи в аспекте функциональной стилистики. / М.Н. Кожина – Пермь, 1966 – (Пермский гос. университет им. А.М.Горького) – 210 С.
5. Костелянец, Б.О. Лекции по теории драмы. Драма и действие. Под ред. В.А. Сахновского-Панкеева. / Б.О. Костелянец – Л., 1976 – (ЛГИТМиК) – 159 с.
6. Никитин, М.В. Основы лингвистической теории значения. / М.В. Никитин – М.: Высшая школа, 1988 – 168с.
7. Попов, Э.В. Экспертные системы. / Э.В. Попов – М.: Наука, 1987 – 286 с.
8. Савицкий, В.М. Основы общей идиоматики. / В.М. Савицкий – М.: Гнозис, 2006 – 208 с.
9. Franz, R. Der Aufbau der Handlung in den klassischen Dramen. 3-e vermehrte Auflage. / R.Franz – Bielefeld, Leipzig: Veihsagen & Klassing, 1904 – VI, 467 s.
10. Lamb, Ch. & M. Tales from Shakespeare. / Charles & Mary Lamb – London: Penguin, 1995 – 314 p.
11. Sukhorolska, S.M.; Fedorenko, O.I. Methods of linguistics analysis. 2-d edition, revised and updated. / S.M. Sukhorolska, O.I. Fedorenko – Lviv: Intellekt – Zakhid, 2009 – 348 p.
12. Wagner, W. Macbeth von W. Shakespeare. Erklärt von W.Wagner. / Wilhelm Wagner – Leipzig: Teubner, 1872 – L, 116 s.