



Volume 7 - 2019 · ISSN 2534-952X

# STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS, CULTURE AND FLT



Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen  
Department of English Studies



# STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS, CULTURE AND FLT

Volume 7 - 2019  
„Viewpoints and Perspectives  
in Linguistics & Translation“



Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen  
Department of English Studies



This seventh issue of *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT* is the end result of a project *Viewpoints and Perspectives in English Studies* (KP-06-NP/35 dated 12.12.2018) of the Department of English Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen financed by The Bulgarian National Science Fund (BNSF) at the Ministry of Education.

Този седми брой на списанието *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT* е резултат от проекта „Гледни точки и перспективи в англицистиката” (КП-06-НП/35 от 12.12.2018), Катедра „Английска филология”, Факултет по хуманитарни науки, Шуменски университет „Епископ Константин Преславски” финансиран от Фонд научни изследвания към МОН.

Editorial Board\*:

Editor-in-chief: Prof. Roumyana Todorova, PhD (Bulgaria)

Editors:

Prof. Dr. Habil. Anna Bączkowska (Poland), Prof. Berrin Aksoy, PhD (Turkey), Assoc. Prof. Desislava Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, PhD (Bulgaria), Assoc. Prof. Irina Ivanova, PhD (Bulgaria), Dr. Antonia Navarro Tejero (Spain), Prof. Dr. Birsen Tütünlü (Turkey), Prof. Dr. Habil Berrin Aksoy (Turkey), Prof. D. Litt. Maya Pencheva (Bulgaria), Joanna Mikosz, PhD (Poland), David Mossop, PhD, Mary Sinéad Fallon (Spain)

\* The Editorial Board bear no responsibility for the content or accuracy of the articles.

© Individual contributions: respective authors

© *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT*

© Asenevtsi Publishing, Sofia

Impact Factor: 3.363 (SJIF 2016), 4.163 (SJIF 2017), 4.685 (SIF 2018), 5.017 (SJIF 2018), 5.452 (SJIF 2019).

ISSN 2534-952X за печатно издание

ISSN 2534-9538 за онлайн издание

# Contents

PREFACE.....	5
HOW SEEING IS DIFFERENT FROM LOOKING A COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE ON VERB-PARTICLE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH LOOK AND SEE <i>Svetlana Nedelcheva</i> .....	7
THE SEMANTIC NETWORK OF “SEE” (A CORPUS-BASED STUDY) <i>Tsvetalina Aneva</i> .....	22
MEANS OF EXPRESSING GRATITUDE IN ENGLISH AND BULGARIAN – PRAGMATIC DIMENSIONS <i>Deyana Peneva</i> .....	36
THE ROLE OF ELECTRONIC CORPORA IN TRANSLATION TRAINING <i>Silvana Neshkovska</i> .....	48
STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES IN THE TRANSLATION OF MOVIE TITLES (AN ENGLISH-RUSSIAN COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY) <i>Radostina Iglíkova, Olga Usataya</i> .....	59



## PREFACE

The seventh issue of SILC “Viewpoints and perspectives in Linguistics & Translation” is comprised of five papers, which reflect on a variety of issues in the fields of linguistics and translation.

The opening paper of the issue by Svetlana Nedelcheva is titled “How seeing is different from looking: A cognitive perspective on verb-particle constructions with look and see”, and compares the various verb-particle constructions with look and see with the goal to analyse the “nuances of meaning of two synonymous verbs that combine with spatial particles and examine[...] the image schemas associated with them” (Nedelcheva, 2019, p. 7).

The second paper, “The semantic network of ‘see’ (a corpus-based study)” by Tsvetalina Aneva, presents a corpus study of eight of the most frequent patterns with see as presented in COCA. The main aim is to examine the ways “the meanings of the verb change according to the relationship between human vision and cognition” (Aneva, 2019, p. 22).

The last paper in this issue is within the field of pragmatics. In “Means of expressing gratitude in English and Bulgarian – pragmatic dimensions” Deyana Peneva analyses “thanking situations, strategies and expressions with respect to use, politeness orientation and specificities” (Peneva, 2019, p. 36) paying close attention to the context-dependent situations where these speech acts are generally used, and the possible difficulties learners of English can experience when exposed to such linguistic occurrences.

In the paper “The role of electronic corpora in translation training” Silvana Neshkovska looks into different electronic corpora and the way they can be used in order to assist translators in the process of their training so that those working in the field of translation are better prepared for the challenges imposed by the changing world.

Radostina Iglíkova and Olga Usataya round off this issue by a paper which deals with the techniques and strategies applied in the translation from source (English) to target language (Russian) of 10 movie titles excerpted from a general corpus of randomly selected 200 movie titles and their translated versions. As the authors state, “the results and observations are not intended to be representative or conclusive, but rather to provide a glance into the process of translation within a specific context, through the prism of a systematic classification of strategies and techniques” (Iglíkova & Usataya, 2019, p. 59).



# HOW SEEING IS DIFFERENT FROM LOOKING A COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE ON VERB-PARTICLE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH LOOK AND SEE

Svetlana Nedelcheva<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** In Cognitive linguistics verb-particle (VP) constructions are treated as compositional and analyzable. The particles when combined with the verbs contribute to the overall meaning in the form of image schemas. This article compares the verb-particle constructions with look and see. It aims at analyzing the nuances of meaning of two synonymous verbs that combine with spatial particles and examines the image schemas associated with them.

When the corresponding image schemas are activated they influence the VP constructions, thus they bring forth new evidence for the embodied nature of language and thought. This study also uses the theoretical framework of Construction Grammar to focus on the different ways of processing spatial and non-spatial VP constructions.

**Key words:** cognitive approach, verb-particle constructions, image schemas, see, look

## 1. Introduction

Achievements in the field of cognitive linguistics over the last 35 years have revealed that the meanings of verb-particle (VP) constructions<sup>2</sup> are conceptually related to each other, and various studies have shown that foreign learners can benefit from utilizing these approaches. However, the insights in research have not reached ELT classrooms and the way idiomatic meanings of phrasal verbs are taught. Although the Internet abounds in available resources, there is a striking disconnection to the most relevant theories that have become leading in this field of study and foreign-language textbooks are predominantly based on outdated teaching theories.

Teachers are generally left with two ways of phrasal verb organization – semantic and syntactic. When organized semantically phrasal verbs are grouped thematically in vocabulary sections entitled e.g. “Clothes”, “Eating”, “Drinking”, “Driving”, “Love & friendship”, etc. Although used in similar contexts not all of them are related to each other; thus students receive long lists

---

1. Associate Professor, PhD at Shumen University, Department of English Studies, Shumen, Bulgaria, e-mail: s.nedelcheva@shu.bg

2. The term verb-particle constructions is used interchangeably with phrasal verbs.

of VP constructions to memorize. The syntactic organization chooses between syntactic elements and categorizes the constructions either by the verbs or by the particle. This method is closer to the cognitive approach but it does not point out the motivation of meaning. Therefore, both the semantic and the syntactic approach are unable to identify the actual motivation of meaning extension provided by the conceptual metaphor.

Applying the cognitive approach, this article attempts to exhibit the similarities and differences between verb-particle constructions of two synonymous verbs such as *see* and *look*. It aims at analyzing the nuances of meaning of the two verbs when combined with spatial particles and examines the image schemas associated with them.

## 2. Theoretical background

Verb-particle contractions, such as *look after*, *look away*, *see around*, *see off*, etc., also referred to as phrasal verbs or multi-word verbs, are a characteristic feature of the English language, particularly of spoken communication. Traditionally, English prepositions and particles have been considered largely as having arbitrary semantics. Dictionaries enlist numerous possible uses in different contexts without any apparent relation to one another. Learning them posits a problem for students who study English as a foreign language, who mostly see English VP constructions as idiomatic expressions which are random and unpredictable and must be learnt by heart without any systematic explanation of their uses. Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999) define phrasal verbs as “ubiquitous”, while Walkova (2012) and White (2012) distinguish between literal (transparent) meanings (e.g., *look around*), completive meanings (e.g., *see out*) and idiomatic meanings (e.g., *see off*), which cannot be easily derived from the meanings of the verb and particle in the particular phrasal construction. In addition to their seemingly arbitrary nature VP constructions are also highly polysemous. This significantly increases their complexity and the number of meanings that learners should memorize.

A lot of research in Cognitive Linguistics has been dedicated to polysemy in general and more specifically to prepositions. Since Brugman’s study (1981) on the meaning of *over*, much work has been done on prepositions from a cognitive perspective (Cuyckens & Radden, 2002; Dirven, 1993; Lakoff, 1987; Radden, 1989; Taylor, 1993; Tyler & Evans, 2003; Vandeloise, 1994). Their view that it is possible to find interrelations among the different senses of a preposition can be transferred to the various meanings of phrasal verbs and show them as motivated ones, and therefore opposes the idea that they are arbitrary (cf. Tyler & Evans, 2003, 2004). The different meanings of a polysemous word can be organized in a semantic network of related senses, some of them more central, others more peripheral. The basic meaning of a preposition is the spatial one, whereas the

abstract senses originate from concrete senses “by means of generalization or specialization of meaning or by metonymic or metaphoric transfer” (Cuyckens & Radden, 2002, p. xiii). More specifically English prepositions, or spatial particles as they are also called, encode an abstract conceptualization of a spatial configuration, based on a more specific spatial scene, what Tyler and Evans (2003, 2004) call the proto-scene.

Image schemas are highly schematic representations of force-dynamic and spatial relations and generally regarded in cognitive linguistics as central elements on the level of “preconception” (cf. Johnson, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson 2002). Based on Lakoff’s (1987, p. 459-461) and Johnson’s (1987, p. 19-21) image-schema criteria, Hampe (2005, p. 1-2) extracts the following concise categorization of image schemas:

- Image schemas are directly meaningful (“experiential”/ “embodied”), preconceptual structures, which arise from, or are grounded in, human recurrent bodily movements through space, perceptual interactions, and ways of manipulating objects.
- Image schemas are highly schematic gestalts which capture the structural contours of sensory-motor experience, integrating information from multiple modalities.
- Image schemas exist as continuous and analogue patterns beneath conscious awareness, prior to and independently of other concepts.
- As gestalts, image schemas are both internally structured, i.e., made up of very few related parts, and highly flexible. This flexibility becomes manifested in the numerous transformations they undergo in various experiential contexts, all of which are closely related to perceptual (gestalt) principles.

Image-schema identification was initially achieved via cross-linguistic analyses of spatial relations and motion concepts. The ensuing list is not exhaustive as it has never been a closed set:

- (1) a. BALANCE, CENTER-PERIPHERY, CONTAINMENT, PART-WHOLE, SOURCE-PATH-GOAL  
b. FORCE-DYNAMICS: ATTRACTION, BLOCKAGE, COUNTERFORCE, ENABLEMENT, REMOVAL, RESTRAINT (cf. Cienki, 1997, p. 3, 12; Johnson, 1987, p. 126; Lakoff, 1987, p. 267; Lakoff, Turner, 1989, p. 97-98)
- (2) a. CONTACT, SCALE, NEAR-FAR, SURFACE, FULL-EMPTY, PROCESS, CYCLE,

---

3. Grady (1999) notes that a consequence of the nature of interaction between humans and their environment is that certain kinds of experiences are frequently correlated. This correlation he calls “experiential correlation”.

ITERATION, MERGING, MATCHING, SPLITTING, OBJECT, COLLECTION (Johnson, 1987)

b. UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK (Lakoff, 1987)

(3) a. INANIMATE MOTION, ANIMATE MOTION, SELF MOTION, CAUSED MOTION (Mandler, 1992, p. 593-596).

b. EXPANSION (Turner, 1991, p. 171), STRAIGHT (Cienki, p. 1998), RESISTANCE (Gibbs et al., 1994, p. 235), LEFT-RIGHT (Clausner, Croft, 1999, p. 15)

This study focuses on the image schemas applied to the phrasal verbs associated with two synonymous perceptual verbs, namely *look* and *see*. In Collins English Dictionary<sup>4</sup>, *look* is defined as follows: “If you *look* in a particular direction, you direct your eyes in that direction, especially so that you can see what is there or see what something is like.” On the other hand, “When you *see* something, you notice it using your eyes” (ibid.). Therefore, when you look at something you can usually see it but you can see something without purposefully looking at it. The two verbs differ in their semantic component from the point of view of activity and experience. Activity is correlated with a process that is under the control of an *actor/ perceiver* (as in *look at*), experience is identified with a state that is not controlled (as in *see*<sup>5</sup>), and consequently the subject is an *experiencer*<sup>6</sup>. From the image schema perspective the opposition may be associated with SELF MOTION VS. CAUSED MOTION. In this occasion, motion is conceptualized in a very broad sense and it does not necessarily involve movement as it is the case with vision.

This article focuses on the similarities and differences in the meanings of verb-particle constructions with *see* and *look*. We hypothesize that there are correspondences in the utilized image schemas and we aim at analyzing the nuances of meaning of the two verbs when combined with the same spatial particle. We mostly concentrate on the metaphorical meanings of the studied phrasal verbs and how they are systematically motivated in relation to the spatial ones.

All VP constructions with *look* and *see* were extracted from Longman Phrasal Verbs Dictionary (2000). In order to investigate the different uses of the phrasal verbs in naturally occurring data we used the Corpus of contemporary American

4 [www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english](http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english)

5. For a detailed analysis of ‘see’ cf. Aneva, Ts. (2019). The semantic network of “see” (a corpus-based study).

6. According to Viberg (1984), there is a third group, source-based, which refers to constructions where the perceiver is not mentioned (e.g., Mary looks young). The last category, however, remains outside the scope of this study as it is not associated with spatial particles and does not form verb-particle constructions.

English (COCA)<sup>7</sup>. The corpus is suitable for this kind of studies due to the variety of genres it contains: academic journals, fiction, media texts including spoken language from TV and radio programs. The second step of the analysis after excerpting all the phrasal verbs, involved identifying the central meanings of the VP constructions. We began by finding their etymological roots in the Online Etymology Dictionary<sup>8</sup>. If the original meaning was preserved and was currently in use we regarded it as the central meaning. Then we consulted Collins COBUILD Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs (2012) and Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary<sup>9</sup> for potential extended meanings. Next all distinct meanings were analysed applying relevant image schemas. Finally, the conceptualizations of *look* and *see* VP constructions were compared revealing their motivation by the specific contributions of the verb meanings and the particle meanings.

### 3. Data analysis

After we extracted all the phrasal verbs with *look* and *see* from Longman Phrasal Verbs Dictionary (2000), we organized them in two parallel columns to show the correspondences of verb + particle constructions (see Table 1).

Particle	LOOK + particle	SEE + particle
after	Look after (1834)	-
ahead	Look ahead (780)	-
around	Look around (3733)	See around (270)
at	Look at (119530)	-
away	Look away (1211)	-
back	Look back (6776)	-
down	Look down (2456)	-
for	Look for (18508)	-
forward to	Look forward to (4232)	-
in/ into	Look in (3153), into (3736)	See in (7282), into (516)
off	-	See off (33)
on	Look on (4015)	-
out	Look out (4049)	See out (493)
over	Look over (1629)	See over (436)
through	Look through (1100)	See through (1426)
to	Look to (5060)	See to (1554)
up	Look up (13091)	-
up to	Look up to (1008)	-

Table 1. Verb-particle constructions with *look* and *see*

7. <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>

8. [www.etymonline.com](http://www.etymonline.com)

9. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>

Table 1 shows that *look* is much more productive in forming phrasal verbs. Seventeen *look*-VP constructions were attested, which are opposed to only seven *see*-VP constructions. The numbers in the brackets reveal their frequency based on more than 560 million words. The outlined tendency is that *look*-VP constructions outnumber those with *see* (except for *see in* and *see through*). The two parallel columns display that there are six instances of particle repetition, i.e. the same particle combines with both *look* and *see*. The most illustrative and memorable way of representing the meanings of the phrasal verbs is to compare and contrast them.

The most readily acquired are those referring to spatial configurations. The GOAL image schema is applied to *look at* vs. *look away*.

*Look at* vs. *look away*

*Look at* is associated with two main meanings:

1. = to examine/ study/ consider something carefully (e.g., One needs to continue to **look at** other empirical research before making a decision).
2. = to read something quickly and not in detail (e.g., We might be able to **look at** a film from 1932 and recognize at a glance that it was the product...).

The use of *at* began in 14c. and replaced *on* in the spatial contexts. *At* introduces the focus of the look without taking into consideration the relative sizes of the Trajector (TR) and Landmark (LM)<sup>10</sup>. When *at* took over the general spatial meaning, the uses of *on* in combination with *look* became more specialized. In the late 1500s the meaning “watch as a spectator without getting involved” was introduced, e.g., Throngs of passersby **looked on** or stopped... A century later this use was extended to denote, besides “watch”, also “regard in a certain way” (possible with *upon*, too), e.g., Women were sacred, **looked on** with great honor. The image schema of *on* shifted from the spatial SURFACE to the more abstract GOAL.

*Look at* finds its antonym in *look away* because it denotes that the previous focus of attention is avoided (see 3.1.2).

*look away* = to turn your eyes away from someone or something that you were looking at.

Similarly to *look at*, *look away* is neutral to the characteristics of the reference object. The LM may be explicitly pointed out in the sentence, as *from the hands* in e.g. She couldn't **look away** from the hands, or it may be implicit if it has been mentioned previously in the context, e.g. Kendra finally forced herself

---

10. We use the term trajector (TR) for the more prominent, mobile participant in a (spatial) event, and landmark (LM) for the secondary, usually immobile and less salient participant.

to **look away**. Both *at* and *away* refer to the GOAL schema but they may also be associated with the NEAR-FAR image schema due to additional elements in the contexts such as the adverbial *from the hands* above. If the LM of *at* is conceptualized as being NEAR, what is away is interpreted as FAR. *Look* when combined with either *at* or *away* is used unidiomatically.

*Look ahead vs. look back*

*look ahead* = to think about future events (e.g., And in that sense it's interesting to **look ahead** to this possible meeting in July between President Trump and President Putin).

*look back* = to think about something that happened in past (e.g. I always **look back** at the original iPod ads that started in 2004).

*Looking ahead* has a literal meaning of looking in front of oneself. The corresponding image schema is that of a GOAL. Both *look ahead* and *look back* developed metaphorical meanings based on the cultural belief that future is in front of us, while past is behind. Many languages, English among them, express this conceptualization making use of spatial particles.

*Look around vs. see around*

*look around* = to go to a place and look at what is there (e.g., I come to an abrupt halt and **look around** in disbelief).

To *look around* 'search about, look round' is from 1883, which makes it a comparatively recent development. The meaning of this phrasal verb is transparent as it is composed of the central meanings of the verb and the particle. It, however, presupposes at least two activities. On the one hand, the doer visits a place and, on the other hand, s/he looks at the things in it. The SELF MOTION image schema is involved in the activity combined with a circular movement.

*see around* = to visit a place and go around looking at it (e.g., Then he whistled and the lights came on, dim but enough to **see around**).

This use of *see around* is very infrequent as mostly the synonymous *look around* is used in this context. The number of examples shown in Table 1 does not correspond to this particular meaning. It encompasses also the literal meaning of *see around*, which is the one exploited predominantly. The difference in the semantics of *look around* and *see around* is found in the variation of actor/ experiencer corresponding respectively to the role of the person *looking* or *seeing*.

*Look up (to) vs. look down (on)*

The spatial, literal meanings of the two VP constructions originate in 13 c. Their metaphorical extensions are attested much later: *look up to* 'regard with respect and veneration' is from 1719. To *look down on* in the figurative sense 'regard as

beneath one' is from 1711; to *look down one's nose* is from 1921. All metaphorical extensions rely on the conceptual metaphor UP IS GOOD, DOWN IS BAD (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980). Those that are *looked up to* are good, honorable and deserve admiration, e.g., Somehow I become the sort of man that other men **look up to**. Those that are *looked down on* are considered of bad quality, disagreeable and inferior, e.g., They're also incredible snobs, so they **look down on** Donald Trump even though he's rich...

The motivation of *looking something up* as information in a reference book (dictionary) or online database is not discussed in the linguistic sources. The meaning was first attested in 1690s and no clear evidence is preserved about the semantic relation of the figurative expression to the literal meaning of *look up*. There are two hypotheses:

- a. According to MED<sup>11</sup>, in ME *loken up* was a synonym for *loken in* = to read/ to consult a text (to look into a book).
- b. The spatial particle *up* emphasizes the process of opening up the book.

Both of them have the potential to give rise to the metaphorical meaning.

*Look after* (someone or something)

1. = to take care of (e.g., She was not expected to **look after** her brother and sister).
2. = to make sure that someone/ something is safe and well (e.g., Doc trusted me to **look after** things while he's gone).

The earliest attested meaning of *look after* is 'to look toward' (c. 1200), which is purely spatially oriented and motivated by the GOAL image schema because when your look is directed after someone or something you show that you think about them. A century later *look after* came to mean 'take care of' which shows how thinking a lot about someone/ something is experientially correlated to caring about them. The second meaning can be interpreted as a metaphorical extension of the first one considering that when you take care of someone/ something you are cautious and try to keep them safe.

*Look for* (someone or something)

In 16 c. *look for* was attested with two conceptually related meanings identified with the GOAL schema:

1. = to search for something or someone, e.g., We had to **look for** a house with a dining room big enough for two tables.
2. = to expect, anticipate, e.g., But don't **look for** a major surge in U.S. nuclear

---

11. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED25944>

power anytime soon.

The ‘search’ meaning of *look for* could be interpreted as literal as it transparently combines the meanings of the two constituents of the VP construction: when a person tries to find an object s/he directs one’s eyes towards it. The ‘expect, anticipate’ meaning is experientially correlated with thinking about a particular event, which is metaphorically associated with looking for it in the future. Further extension of this meaning is expressed by *look forward to*.

*Look forward to* = to wait or hope for, especially with pleasure, e.g. I **look forward to** working together with the SIE team

The meaning of the idiomatic expression is motivated by the spatial senses of *look* and *forward* ‘in the direction being faced’. When one longs for and dreams for something s/he looks at it. The literal meanings of *look ahead* and *look forward* are synonymous as they denote looking in the same direction, the direction one’s face is turned to. They have developed different metaphorical meanings but both are focused on the future, in correspondence to the conceptual metaphor FUTURE IS IN FRONT OF US and the GOAL image schema.

*Look in(to)* vs. *see in(to)*

3.8.1. *Look in(to)*, generally, is a transitive VP construction followed by an inanimate direct object:

1. = to find out more about something in order to improve the situation, e.g., When you get a role, you like to **look in** yourself for what’s there of that character, maybe your friends.

2. = to investigate or examine, e.g., Bendixen and Kennair want to **look into** this in an upcoming study.

The two meanings are closely interrelated in the sense that when you try to find more about something, you actually analyze and explore it. However, when the activity refers to a physical object the spatial meaning of the verb is applied, e.g., “Did you **look in** her room before you came downstairs?” In both spatial and metaphorical cases, though, the image schema of CONTAINMENT is used.

3.8.2. *See in(to)* is also governed by the CONTAINMENT schema, e.g., With the sun at his back he could **see into** Cheryl’s car. When *look in(to)* and *see in(to)* are used intransitively in their literal senses the difference in their meanings lies only in the difference between *look* and *see*. Unlike *look in*, *see in* can be used transitively with animate objects, which extends its spatial meaning:

1. = to show a visitor the way to enter a building, office, etc. by walking there with them, e.g., I’ll **see you in**.

Further on, the spatial schema has been spread in the metaphorical domain, where the landmark is a human body interpreted as a container:

2. = to notice a particular quality in someone or something that makes you like them, e.g., I write your experience, **see into** you all that is cliché: desire, fear, hope.

or an abstract domain conceptualized as three-dimensional, e.g., She read that a shiny surface helped psychics and mediums **see into** the future or the past, hence crystal balls.

In the CONTAINMENT schema *in* and *out* are in opposition. Corresponding oppositions exist between VP constructions, e.g. those with *look* and *see*.

*Look out vs. see out*

The spatial use of *look out*, which is based on the CONTAINMENT schema, e.g., **Look out** your window, is an antonym of *look in*, e.g., Then I happened to **look in** the mirror. Both LMs, *your window* and *the mirror*, are conceptualized as containers. In addition, *look out* is also used as a warning to avoid imminent danger:

*look out* = to be careful, e.g., “**Look out**”, someone shrieked. “He’s gonna hit the board-walk!”

This metaphorical extension may be explained if we conceptualize the focus of attention as a container. The imperative *Look out!* makes the addressees turn their eyes in a direction which is outside their previous field of vision. From this perspective the metaphorical *look out* is semantically correlated to the spatial *look out*.

Unlike *look out*, which is used intransitively, *see out* is a transitive verb with both animate and inanimate objects. Spatially, its meaning is transparent, deriving from the meanings of the constituents, e.g., When you came out of the grocery store, did you **see him out** on the street? Metaphorically, the VP construction has acquired a meaning opposite to the idiomatic meaning of *see s.o. in*:

*see someone out* = to accompany a visitor showing him/her the way out, e.g., We can **see him out**; he brought his own car.

In addition, another metaphorical extension, related to the CONTAINMENT schema, is attested:

*see something out* = to be involved with a task or project until it is completed, e.g., I just want to **see it out** as soon as possible.

This use of *out* corresponds to the Completion Sense, mentioned by Tyler and Evans (2003, p. 204). Its motivation is in the correlation between the TR leaving a bounded LM, and the process of leaving being complete. Through pragmatic strengthening the completion associated with such spatial scenes has been

conventionalized, giving rise to a distinct Completion Sense associated with *out*.

*Look over vs. see over*

Although *look* and *see* are cognate and they are combined with the same spatial particle *over*, the metaphorical extensions of the two VP constructions have developed following different motivation. The meaning of *look over* “scrutinize” dates back to mid-15c. Since then its meaning has been slightly changed so nowadays it denotes:

*look over* = to make a quick examination of something”, e.g., You should ask several peer reviewers to **look over** those documents that you plan on sending to employers.

The Examination sense which is associated with *over* (cf. Tyler, Evans 2003) refers to a spatial scene where the TR and consequently TR’s line of vision is directed at the LM. By experiential correlation, when examining, the viewer is located above the LM and in proximity to the LM. However, if the examined object is a place the SURFACE image schema is also involved, e.g., Customers **look over** suits costing eighteen hundred to twenty-three hundred yuan. Despite that the same spatial configuration applies to the phrasal verb *see over*, an additional image schema is drawn in, that of SELF MOTION:

*see over* = to make a tour and examine (a building or site), e.g., Bridget asked if he’d like to **see over** the house.

The TR moves to the place first and then examines it, so elements of the image schema NEAR-FAR also participate in the scene as the TR changes its position from being distal from the LM initially to being proximal the LM in order to complete the task.

*Look through vs. see through*

No correspondence is found between the meanings of *look through* and *see through* even though they share the same spatial particle.

*look through* = to read something, usually quickly and not very carefully, e.g., I set my cup on the coffee table and **look through** the magazines.

*see through* = not to be deceived by; detect the true nature of, e.g., They would be able to **see through** me.

The literal meaning of *through* ‘in and out again’ is the ground for both VP constructions but their idiomatic meanings have been developed via different metaphors. With *look through*, the TR deals with a physical LM, e.g., a pile of paper. The image schema of PATH is evoked. Although a PATH is usually associated with motion, *looking* presupposes no change of location. A

metaphorical PATH, relates a starting point/ a source with an end point/ a goal, all the contiguous points in between form the path. In 3.11.1., going through the magazines is regarded as following a path, starting with the first one and ending with the last one.

With *see through*, the LM is a human being, more specifically what s/he says, which makes it an abstract notion. Therefore, *seeing through* is not so much related to the ability of beholding but to the conceptual metaphor SEEING IS UNDERSTANDING.

Additionally, unlike *look through* which is used intransitively, *see through* has also built up transitive metaphorical extensions:

1. *see someone through* = to support a person in a difficult time, e.g., We had very little supplies to **see us through**.
2. *see something through* = to persist with a project or task until it is completed, e.g., Like his father, he had the vision and the nerve to undertake the unusual and **see it through**.

The two meanings rely on different conceptual metaphors. When the LM is a human being, the TR refers to a particular period of time that is implicit in the sentence. The conceptualization is based on the metaphor TIME IS SPACE. When the LM is inanimate, the VP construction acquires the Completion sense. It is very often that we speak of situations as being physical places where we can go in, out or around. *Through* entails leaving a place after having entered it, therefore it is experientially related to something being finished. The meaning of completion results from interpreting the physical location of the TR as a process. In this explanation, the Completion sense is not describing a purely spatial relation.

#### *Look to vs. see to*

The two VP constructions have developed quite different metaphorical meanings.

*Look to* has two meanings:

1. = to pay attention to, take care of, e.g., McPherson will **look to** build on his success with Top Tier this summer.
2. = to anticipate or expect, e.g., We are going to **look to** add some players that are talented.

Both of them were developed quite early, 14 c. and 17 c. respectively, and both of them rely on the GOAL image schema. Each one of them expresses a relation in which the TR is oriented towards an accentuated LM. The spatial scenes associated with *to* often prompt the inference of motion of the TR in the direction

to the LM. However, with a verb such as *look* there is no path – in the sense of contiguous locations between a starting point and an end point – explicitly coded by *to*. The two idiomatic meanings seem conceptually related. On the one hand, paying attention to something presupposes a focus of attention, a highlighted LM, a GOAL. On the other hand, when we expect something and wish for it to happen, it is not only our focus of attention, but a GOAL that we try to achieve.

*See to* = to deal with something, make sure it happens, e.g. If you would be so kind, **see to** my bags.

*Look to* in its ‘take care of’ sense is similar in meaning to *see to* but they are not interchangeable due to their structural features. When used idiomatically *see to* is followed by a noun phrase, while *look to* in this particular sense precedes another verb, which designates the activity that should be attended to.

*See off*

1. = to accompany a person who is leaving to their point of departure, e.g. On Friday, she’ll help **see off** President Obama as he flies away from Washington.

2. = to repel an invader or intruder, e.g., I want you personally to **see them off** the mountain and back to their barracks.

The two meanings of *see off* are interrelated as the result of both of them is a person leaving his/ her initial place and going to another one that may not be mentioned in the sentence. As a spatial preposition, *off* denotes ‘not in contact with’, but there are contexts which do not imply a contact but underline the fact of separation. Therefore, the two meanings are governed not by the CONTACT schema but by the opposite SEPARATION image schema. A more detailed analysis shows that apart from the common SEPARATION schema of the two meanings, another pair of schemas differentiates them. Accompanying someone is associated with a SELF MOTION, while repelling a person leads to CAUSED MOTION.

#### 4. Conclusions

The analysis in this study shows that VP constructions with *look* and *see* are governed by a number of image schemas: SOURCE-PATH-GOAL, SURFACE, NEAR-FAR, UP-DOWN, CONTAINMENT, SEPARATION, SELF MOTION, CAUSED MOTION, etc. The most interesting cases in the research are the phrasal verbs that share the same spatial particle. The present research reveals that they have developed distinct meanings and there is no interchangeability among them, except for *look/ see around*. The difference in the meanings of *look around / see around* lies in the opposition between the semantic roles of the performer of the activity, whether s/he is an actor paired with the verb *to look*, or an experiencer combined with the verb *to see*. The other image schemas are exemplified in Table 2.

PATH-GOAL	CONTAINMENT	SURFACE	COMPLETION
<i>Look around</i> ‘walking around a place and looking’	<i>Look in, into</i> ‘investigate’	<i>Look over</i> ‘examine quickly’	<i>See out</i> ‘complete a task’
<i>See around</i> ‘visiting a place and looking at it’	<i>See in, into</i> ‘show a person in’	<i>See over</i> ‘visit and examine’	<i>See sth through</i> ‘to persist until the task is completed’
<i>Look over</i> ‘examine quickly’	<i>Look out</i> ‘watch out’		
<i>See over</i> ‘visit and examine’	<i>See out</i> ‘accompany a person’		
<i>Look through</i> ‘read quickly’			
<i>See through</i> ‘understand the truth’			
<i>Look to</i> ‘anticipate’			
<i>See to</i> ‘deal with’			

*Table 2. Image schemas of verb-particle constructions with look and see*

The data in Table 2 proves the hypothesis that there are correspondences in the applied image schemas. The analyzed phrasal verbs differ in their meanings due to different conceptual metaphors that took part in their development, e.g., UP IS GOOD, DOWN IS BAD in *look up to* and *look down on*; FUTURE IS IN FRONT OF US in *look ahead* and *look back*; TIME IS SPACE in *see through*, etc.

This research gives additional evidence that cognitive linguistics approach can present the meanings of phrasal verbs as systematically motivated. To implement this approach in learning VP constructions, teachers may choose a couple of frequently used phrasal verbs close in their meanings and ask students to compare and contrast them. By giving the learners the motivation behind these phrasal verbs, teachers will allow them to understand the correlations existing between literal and idiomatic meanings, which will help students in their future encounters with multi-word verbs. Language instructors may also provide corpora examples to illustrate how these phrasal verbs are used in naturally occurring language and help foreign learners master their idiomatic meanings in situational context.

## References:

- Aneva, Ts. (2019). The semantic network of “see” (a corpus-based study). *Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT*. Vol. 7. Sofia: Asenevtsi, 22-35.
- Cienki, A. (1997). Some properties and groupings of image schemas. In M. Verspoor, K. D. Lee, & E. Sweetser (Eds.), *Lexical and syntactical constructions and the construction of meaning* (pp. 3-15). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Clausner, T., & Croft, W. (1999). Domains and image schemas. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 10, 1-31.
- COBUILD Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs*. (2012). Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr., & Berg, E. A. (2002). Mental imagery and embodied activity. *Journal of Mental Imagery*, 26, 1-30.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr., & Colston, H. L. (1995). The cognitive psychological reality of image schemas and their transformations. *Cognitive Linguistics* 6: 347-378.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr., Beitel, D. A., Harrington, M., & Sanders, P. E. (1994). Taking a stand on the meanings of stand: Bodily experience as motivation for polysemy. *Journal of Semantics*, 11, 231-251.
- Grady, J. (1999). Heaviness and difficulty: “Image content” vs. “response content” in conceptual metaphors. Talk at the 6<sup>th</sup> International Cognitive Linguistic Conference (Stockholm, July 1999).
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind. The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh. The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2002). Why cognitive linguistics requires embodied realism. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 13, 245-263.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason. A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Longman Phrasal Verbs Dictionary* (2000). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Mandler, J. M. (1992). How to build a baby: II. Conceptual Primitives. *Psychological Review*, 99, 587-604.
- Turner, M. (1991). *Reading minds. The study of English in the age of cognitive sciences*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, A., & Evans, V. (2003). *The semantics of English prepositions: Spatial scenes, embodied meaning and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tyler, A., & Evans, V. (2004). Rethinking English ‘prepositions of movement’. *Adpositions of Movement*, 247-270. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Viberg, A. (1984). The verbs of perception: a typological study. In B. Butterworth, B. Comrie, & Ö. Dahl (Eds.) *Explanations for language universals*, (pp. 123-162). Berlin: Mouton.

# THE SEMANTIC NETWORK OF “SEE” (A CORPUS-BASED STUDY)

Tsvetalina Aneva<sup>1</sup>

***Abstract:** The research presents a corpus study of the perception verb **see**, which aims at highlighting the complex behaviour of eight of the most frequent patterns drawn from the Corpus of Contemporary American English. The paper examines how the meanings of the verb change according to the relationship between human vision and cognition. The descriptions and analyses in this study are usage-based and organized according to the contexts in which the verb appears.*

***Key words:** perception verbs, shift of meaning, corpus study, see*

## 1. Introduction

The present analysis focuses on the different extensions in the semantic field of the visual perception verb “see” in terms of prototype and metaphor that are central to Cognitive Linguistics.

The main purpose of the research, in more general terms, is to determine, analyse and classify the realization patterns of the verb by considering its various usages. The study reveals that there is a wide range of contexts in which this verb appears and seeks to answer what it means for a person to “see” in different linguistic situations.

## 2. Theoretical background

“See” takes the highest position in the perception verb hierarchy, followed by “hear” and consequently it enjoys a great prominence not only in terms of its frequency of use but also in its ability to express polysemous meanings (Sweetser, 1991; Viberg, 1983; Whitt, 2010). Table 1 (see Appendix) shows the extended (metaphorical) meanings of verbs of visual and auditory perception proposed by Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2002).

Lakoff (1987) states that the basic structure of our conceptual system consists of our ability to form mental images and the kinesthetic image-schematic structure that is comprised of images. These are not specific images which we constantly recall when using a language. They are what may be considered to be

---

1. Lecturer in English at Shumen University, Department of English Studies, Shumen, Bulgaria, e-mail: c.aneva@shu.bg

our subconscious understanding of the world around us based on the experience we have gained.

According to Johnson (1987, p. 172) structures of imagination form our experience. Our less comprehensible experiences become clear on the basis of more directly comprehensible ones. Johnson develops the idea that embodied experience appears to become noticeable through concepts which evolve from sensory and perceptual experience from our interaction with the world.

### **3. Research questions**

In this paper, the perception verb “see” is studied with the objective to present its lexical meanings and the types of domains it covers. These domains are considered to be “neither totally free nor totally fixed” (Langacker, 2013, p. 39) and are to be understood according to the context in which they appear. Language affects cognition and perception and reflects the experience stored in the human mind as stated by Evans (2006, p. 497), “the range of linguistic units available to the language user massively undermine the range of situations, events, states, relationships and other interpersonal functions that the language user may potentially seek to use language to express and fulfill”.

Since “see” expresses a range of human activities connected with perception and cognition, the verb is examined first by paying attention to its meaning that refers to physical visual perception, and then to cover the meanings that involve mental processes. It is important to bear in mind, however, that these distinctions are made only for the purpose of the present analysis, as the various meanings of “see” often overlap with one another.

### **4. Methods**

The present research is a corpus-based analysis which puts an emphasis on language in use. For this research, the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) was employed, using the free, online version (<https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>). The sentences taken from the COCA are indicated by the subject word or phrase being highlighted and marked by **underlined boldface** letters followed by a citation of the section, source and its year of publication indicated in parentheses at the end. The research presents a corpus study which aims at highlighting the complex behaviour of 8 of the most frequent patterns drawn from the COCA. The whole corpus of the key word “see” includes 612386 occurrences but that is not the volume of the corpus on which the present research is based for it includes only the most applicable and frequent patterns (see Appendix, Table 2). Since the present research is based on the idea that concepts depend on context, which is of main importance when narrowing

down the meanings they convey, the cognitive linguistic approach is reliable as an instrument to carry out the analysis and to test the hypotheses of the study.

## 5. Data Analysis and Results

### 5.1. Literal meanings

Pattern 1: An animate subject sees a physical object

Meaning: An animate subject perceives or observes a physical object with his/her eyes

The following examples present the meaning of the verb “see” from the point of view of visual perception in the physical sense, i.e, how we identify specific objects in the real world. The action presented may either be completed (1) or not completed (2). Consider the following corpus lines:

1. The witness reported he **saw** the suspect **enter** a burgundy SUV, possibly a Chevrolet Tahoe or GMS Yukon, that was parked on Root and eventually drove away northbound on Root. (NEWS: *Chicago Sun-Times*, 2016)
2. Oliver Spencer, stood when he **saw** us **entering** the room and walked over to greet us. (FIC: *Scholastic Scope*, 2006)
3. “I miss them to this day. Those originals, I’ll never get to **see** them again,” he says, surrounded by the sculptures in his studio: A firefighter, a mountain man, a hard-hat worker, a cowboy.” (NEWS: *Colorado Springs Gazette*, 2017)
4. Every time you **saw** him he had a smile on his face, but when it came time to do his job, he was there (MAG: *Daily Beast*, 2017)
5. Have you **seen him** here before? (FIC: *Midnight crossing: a mystery*, 2017)

The perception verb “see” in the physical sense of vision refers to an event that ranges from “catching sight of” in the third sentence (3), which is an instantaneous event that lasts for only a second, to “recognizing” what or who the object is as in sentence (5). The primary meaning of “spotting” precedes that of duration, conveyed by “recognizing”, since “spotting” is a requirement for the act of “seeing” and “recognizing”. Moreover, “seeing” is unlikely to last for more than a few seconds if it is supposed to be continuous. When there is a time expression of an utterance that lasts for more than a moment (4), “see” presents a series of repetitive occurrences.

Even when “see” is used to actually mean “noticing” something, as in sentence (3), it still requires time, since, perceiving something involves more than just “catching sight of”.

It therefore follows that it is impossible to isolate completely one pattern from the other.

The doer of “seeing” completes the task of “seeing” when one interprets what has been captured with one’s visual organ. It is a cognitive task that has been accomplished.

Pattern 2: An animate subject sees a document or a document part

Meaning: An animate subject refers to a document or document part for further information

Not surprisingly in the search of the COCA, “see” is used in the meaning of “to refer to” in a great number of the corpus examples, often appearing in parentheses and instructing the reader to read another part of the article or another text, etc.

Consider the following examples:

6. Excluding part-time workers affects White women most (see Table A1 of the appendix). (**ACAD**: *American Economist*, 2017)
7. See Telephone Interview with Judge 2 (Mar. 8, 2016); see also Telephone Interview with Judge 1 (Mar. 8, 2016). (**ACAD**: *Stanford Law Review*, 2017)
8. His most recent book is *Tiny Homes on the Move* (see Page 64 to order). Find a list of the tools mentioned here. (**MAG**: *Mother Earth News*, 2015)

Analysing the corpus lines, it becomes clear that the search of “see” seems to have been affected by the high concentration of academic and technical texts in COCA and appears in the meaning of “refer to” mostly in academic texts.

Pattern 3: An animate subject meets someone

Meaning: An animate subject goes to and spends some time with someone, typically for social reasons

9. We hope to see you at the show. (**MAG**: *TechCrunch*, 2017 )
10. Wary of returning to his parents, he goes to see his friend Bassam, who treats him with what hospitality he can. (**NEWS**: *Christian Science Monitor*, 2015)

In (9) and (10) the subject will not only see someone but there is an appointment to meet or visit someone. That means that further cognitive processes follow from the act of seeing.

## 5.2. Metaphorical meanings

Metaphorical meanings of “see” are examined to analyse how the meaning of the verb, describing one’s visual experience, is associated with its conceptual meanings. The analysis shows that the extended meanings of the verb “see” depend on the degree to which it prompts either physical perception or visual mental imagery.

Since the aim of this paper is to examine human cognition from a linguistic point of view, the relationship between vision and cognition is considered by analysing the metaphorical meanings of “see”, which primarily bear meanings different from those that refer to physical visual perception. These meanings can be further divided into two groups: meanings that are connected with physical visual perception and those that are not. The transfer in the meanings of the verb “see” appear towards either those that depend on the literal meaning of the verb or those that are more related to cognition.

## 5.3. Visual Perception-Dependent Meanings

In this part, the uses of the verb “see” are considered by examining the “shift” in its meaning depending on the mental activities that are involved along with physical visual perception. The meaning shifts are classified by the types of additional activities provoked, largely dependent on the characteristics of the object of “seeing”.

### 5.3.1. To Appreciate/Read/Interpret

The meaning of visual perception in a physical sense is implied in the use of the verb “see”. The object of seeing is physically perceived through vision. Additional cognitive processes, apart from physical perception, are necessary for accomplishing the act of “seeing” the object. Consider the following pattern and examples in an extended context:

Pattern 4 : An animate subject sees a movie/ a play, a book or information

Meaning: An animate subject watches a movie/ reads a book for entertainment

11. the same television. And business is consistently strong. #“Everyone comes to **see movies**,” she says. “Young people, old people.” (NEWS: *Christian Science Monitor*, 2009)
12. When you **see** the **book**, you’ll know what I mean. (SPOK: PBS\_Tavis, 2006)
13. as we will **see below**, each mode of numerical sameness is introduced in precisely the same manner, and each is subsequently described in the material mode. (ACAD: *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 2016)

The use of “see” in the examples above naturally bears the meaning of actual visual perception. Still, all of the meanings of the verb are different from “see” as a physical process, as they refer not only to visual perception, but also to further cognitive processes that follow it. However, there is not a clear distinction between physical visual perception and visual perception implicating additional cognitive activities.

In (11) ~ (13), the visual perception is a means for completing a task. In other words, “see” in sentence (11) means to watch the film and understand the story, and enjoy it or not. Thus, the meaning of “see” in the sentences above is closely related to some kind of emotional or mental reaction and is profiled when the object is a movie, a play, or some kind of performance. The act of seeing does not only refer to obtaining visual information from the object, but it also evokes a reaction to what has been seen, either consciously or subconsciously. The same meaning of “see” is observed in the sentences:

14. We will be there. I’d love to get together, have a meal, and **see** the **play**.  
(MAG: *Town and Country*, 2010 (Dec 2010))

15. I did **see** the **program** that had your sister on it, on Frontline. (SPOK: CNN\_King, 1990)

On the other hand, a person who is told to “see the book” (12) would, in most cases, come to the conclusion that the utterer expects him/ her not only to visually perceive the book, but also, to read it.

The use of “see” in sentence (13) is basically the same as that in sentence (12), as it also requires as a precondition the existence of some text to be read. The activity presented in sentence (13) requires reading the information and not just “seeing” it in the literal sense as is the case with the meaning of “see”, for instance, a building as in the following sentence:

16. I couldn’t **see** the **building** at first. It looked like a gap in the skyline and one more empty lot. (FIC: *Snowblind*, 2014)

The meaning of “reading” which the verb “see” bears in sentences (12) and (13) can also include the meaning which not only involves understanding of the written texts but also “interpreting” what one has seen/ read. The following two examples present the use of “see” in similar contexts:

17. So we need to help people **see** the **data** in a way they can process. (MAG: News-Medical.net, 2017)

18. I would love to **see** any **information** that proves that otherwise. (SPOK: THE FIVE, 2017)

In (17) and (18), the aim of “seeing” the data is predetermined, with an implication of the necessity for an in-depth understanding of what is presented, as can be inferred from the phrase “in a way they can process” or “that proves”. It can be concluded that “see” has a stronger implication of “understanding” by internalizing and processing what has been captured by sight. “See” indicates the activity of “interpreting” what is being physically perceived through the visual sense organ.

Therefore, whenever the verb “see” is used in this kind of context in all of the corpus lines above, it also implies one’s reaction to the experience of “seeing”. It can be concluded that the distinction assumed at the beginning of this research between the physical and the figurative sense of the verb is not something definite, but is a matter of degree. In some cases, the verb “see” expresses more physical aspects, in others, more figurative ones. Consequently, such shifts in the meaning are not explicitly evident in the linguistic system. They are strongly dependent on the context in which they appear.

### 5.3.2. To Check/ Confirm

Pattern 5: An animate subject sees an object or a situation

Meaning: An animate object sees an object or a situation in order to check or confirm to verify an object.

The meaning of “check” and “confirm” is to validate the object through what has been observed or seen. The examples given in this section describing the use of “see” are based on the assumption that in these cases the meaning of physical perception of “see” has changed more towards confirmation than interpretation. This change, however, does not exclude the meaning of “appreciating,” “reading” and “interpreting” described in the previous part, as the process of checking includes these activities. It is clear that one has to “read” or “interpret” what has been seen in order to “check” or “confirm” the text. The following corpus lines present the use of “see” in this meaning:

19. I didn’t ask who was driving. I asked to see his ID. (SPOK: *Fresh Air*, 2017)
20. The guard with the dog whistled and his partner went to see what he’d found. (FIC: *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, 2016)
21. His wife calls to see how he’s doing. (FIC: *Fantasy & Science Fiction*, 2016)

In the case of (19), when one is asked to show one’s passport, or any other official document for verification, one does not expect the other person to be satisfied by only “seeing” its existence. One would know that their passport will be opened and read, and probably examined in detail. Similarly, “see” in sentence (20) also implies not only the meaning of just visually perceiving

something but also carefully checking what is happening and performing other activities that are necessary.

In both (20) and (21), “seeing” does not refer only to visual perception, although it is likely that such will be included as a part of the whole process. The meaning of “see” here also expresses some of the expected activities that follow.

“See,” in the meaning of “check” or “confirm,” is also present in the construction [“see” + that] or [“see” + to it that]. The corpus lines with a longer context demonstrate this more clearly:

22. And we would want to inspect and **see that** they were safe. We go into their room. We’d want to know more about anybody who was sequestered in a room for more than 12 hours. That would be -- that would be something that would -- our people have been trained too look out for. (FIC: *Fantasy & Science Fiction*, 2016)

23. By the same token, in the State Department, you’ve got people stationed all over the world. So a big part of your job is **to see to** it that that organization works. And it’s not that difficult, but you can do it. You know how to do that. (SPOK: CBS, 2017)

While “checking” and “confirming” are activities included in the process of “seeing” in (22) and (23), there is an association that the subject will be involved in further activities that are necessary to become aware of the condition reported in the that-clause. The subject is expected to take care of the expected result<sup>2</sup>.

Thus, as demonstrated in this section, the meaning of “see” connected with the concepts of “checking” or “confirming” depends not only on linguistic contexts but also to a great extent on our real knowledge of the world.

### 5.3.3. To Find Out

Pattern 6: See + that-clause or wh-clause

Meaning: An animate subject achieves an understanding of a proposition or a concept presented in a that-clause or a wh-clause

Another usage of “see,” which covers the meaning “check” or “confirm,” but shifts to that of “find out”, is to be found in the construction [“see” + interrogative], as in:

24. “We’ll **see what** we can do.” **See what** we can do? (NEWS: *Colorado Springs Gazette*, 2017)

---

2. Nedelcheva (2019) studies ‘see to’ as a verb-particle construction and compares it to the synonymous ‘look to’ in its sense “taking care of”. The difference between them depends on their structural features: ‘see to’ is followed by a noun phrase, while ‘look to’ in this particular sense precedes another verb.

25. Let's take a look back at this moment and **see who** paid the cost. (SPOK: *Fresh Air*, 2017)

26. 1:30 a.m. when he heard a knock at the window, and looked outside to **see who** was knocking, police said. (NEWS: *Baltimore Sun*, 2017)

27. I'm glad you looked to **see who** was there before you opened the door. We'd have less crime if everyone would do that. (FIC: Double fudge brownie murder: a Hannah Swensen mystery with recipes, 2017)

In sentences, such as in (26) and (27), the purpose is to "find out" something unknown, for instance, who is at the window/ door.

A person who is instructed to perform the activity in sentence (27) would not interpret it as they are expected only to see someone at the door. The act of "seeing" in the sentences above includes going to the window, looking through it and noticing the one standing outside, identifying the person, and giving an account of what one has observed. That is to say, "see", combined with an interrogative, implies the meaning of "finding out an answer".

It is important to bear in mind, however, that while physical visual perception is part of the entire process implied by "see" in (26) and (27), in the contexts given in sentences (24) and (25) "see" meaning "find out" does not necessarily require visual perception. It follows that while visual perception is the major means of accomplishing the task implied by "see" there are occurrences where visual perception in the physical sense is not necessary. That is, "see" can bear the meaning of "find out" in an abstract sense.

Lastly, the phrase "see if," presents another usage of "see" in the meaning of "find out", as in the following sentence:

28. After a few minutes, she went outside to **see if** any neighbors were hurt. That's when she saw the wounded people on top of each other. (NEWS: *Chicago Tribune*, 2017)

The phrase "see if" may be considered as a type of interrogative as it implies a search for a yes-or-no answer. In this sense, the meaning of "see" in (28) is close to that of "see" in the ["see" + interrogative] construction, with the implication of "finding out" being profiled. Visual perception again is a means of finding out the answer in the context of (28). Yet, the following corpus lines suggest that the same construction can be used to mean finding out an answer through one's senses other than vision:

29. We now need to look to **see if** this works with patients as well as ensure safety (MAG: News-Medical.net, 2017)

30. without the pressure of a trade show, and I'm truly excited to **see if** the company can make this business model work. (MAG: *Engadget*, 2017)

31. We'll **see if** that changes. (SPOK: NPR, 2017)

In these sentences vision is no longer the main means of obtaining information, thus the meaning of visual perception which the verb “see” denotes is no longer present.

## 6. Mental Imagery-Dependent Meanings

The meanings of the verb “see” that are described below do not require physical vision, and consequently, may be accomplished either with or without a sensory organ.

### 6.1. To Understand / Find Out

Pattern 7: I/ we see

Meaning: “I/ we see” expresses understanding or acceptance of the meaning or implication of some proposition

Probably the most common abstract meaning of “see” is “understand” or “find out”. The use of “see” as a synonym of either to “understand” or to “find out”, however, again depends on context. Consider the following sentence often used in spoken English conversations:

32. OK. **I see**. Got it. (SPOK: CBS FACE THE NATION 10:30 AM EST, 2017)

The verb “see” in (32) bears the meaning of “understand,” although, “I understand what you mean” sounds more formal. This meaning seems to occur most frequently in the phrase “I see” or “You see.” The Corpus of Contemporary American English contains a total of 29406 instances of the phrase “I see” or “You see”, 9119 of which are to be found in spoken language.

The examples (33) ~ (35) are just a few of the many examples found in the COCA:

33. I **see** what you **mean**. (FIC: A beeline to murder, 2017)

34. You will **see** what I **mean** after you try them (FIC: Rosalia’s bittersweet pastry shop, 2017)

35. Oh, I **see** what you **mean** (SPOK: TODAY SHOW 7:00 AM EST, 2016)

The phrase “I see what you mean” is basically used as a single sentence. There are a total of 981 collocations “see + mean” in the COCA, compared to 370 for “understand + mean”. The expression “I see what you mean” appears as a set phrase in various contexts.

### 6.2. To Gain impression/ Express opinion

Pattern 8: An animate subject sees a proposition or a concept

Meaning: An animate subject achieves an understanding of a proposition or a concept

Gaining a certain impression/ understanding a proposition is another mental meaning that the verb “see” conveys. The following corpus lines demonstrate that one can gain an impression of someone or an event without physically “seeing” the person or the situation.

36. His colleagues **saw him** as emblematic of a new style in baseball, part of a crop of magnetic players (many of them Latino) who’d injected a little fire into the game’s worn traditions. (MAG: *Slate Magazine*, 2017)

37. I didn’t **see anything** wrong with it. (MAG: *Fortune*, 2016)

In sentences (36) and (37) “see” denotes the meaning of knowledge and impression gained by the subject of the sentence. A possible synonym for “see” in the sentences above may be “have a sense” or “have an impression”. The performer of the action does not gain an understanding through visual perception but is sharing his/ her own impression.

It cannot be determined how much of this impression is derived from what has been seen and how much comes from other sources.

This meaning of “see”, which is associated with the act of gaining a certain impression and making judgments about what has been seen, also covers the meaning “find out” and “understand” analysed in the previous part of this research. Consider the following examples:

38. **I see** a lot of hard work and heart going into practice... (NEWS: OregonLive.com, 2017)

39. Having lived through everything **I see** life differently now, (MAG: *The Atlantic*, 2017)

40. **I see** it more as a sign of desperation (NEWS: *Chicago Tribune*, 2017)

41. **I see** this as opportunity. (NEWS: OregonLive.com, 2017)

The corpus lines demonstrate that when the verb appears in various contexts, it often has different meanings, which means that any lexical item can be ambiguous. Thus, lexical ambiguity is not an issue to be examined only on the basis of a single sentence extracted from the context of the real world.

## 7. Conclusion and implications

The survey of the perception verb “see” has been conducted to examine how it can be interpreted in various contexts. The analysis has shown the different meanings that the verb expresses and the ways in which they change according

to the specific context and the concepts associated with it. The elicitations from the present paper may contribute to:

- identifying and classifying the literal and metaphorical uses of the verb “see”;
- the analysis of its linguistic realizations;
- examining its various meanings using actual patterns in natural texts and the kinds of cognitive processes involved when the perception verb is used in various contexts in English.
- within the domain of Foreign Language Acquisition (FLA) the study will contribute to a better understanding of cross-cultural communication and will thus help language teachers build up effective methods to improve learners’ competence in studying perception verbs.

## References:

- Baker, M. (1995). Corpora in translation studies: an overview and some suggestions for future research. *Target*, 7(2), 223-243.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, V. (2006). Lexical concepts, cognitive models and meaning-construction. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17(4), 491-534.
- Evans, V. (2009). *How words mean: Lexical concepts, cognitive models, and meaning construction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind’s hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (2002). *MIND-AS-BODY as a Cross-linguistic Conceptual Metaphor*. *Miscelánea. A Journal of English and American studies* 25, 93-119.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1991). *Concept, image, and symbol: The cognitive basis of grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, R. W. (2013). *Essentials of cognitive grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G. (1992). Corpora and theories of linguistic performance. In J. Svartvik (ed.). *Directions in corpus linguistics*, (105-122), Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Meyer, Ch. F. (2002) *English corpus linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nedelcheva, S. (2019). How seeing is different from looking? A cognitive perspective on verb-particle constructions with look and see. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT*. Vol. 7. Sofia: Asenevtsi, 7-21.
- Sinclair, J. (1996). *EAGLES preliminary recommendations on corpus typology*. EAG-TCWG-CTYP/P. Pisa: ILC-CNR.
- Sweetser, E. (1991). *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, E. (2007). Look again: phenomenology and mental imagery. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 6, 137-170.
- Viberg, Å. (1983). The verbs of perception: a typological study. *Linguistics*, vol. 21, no. 1, 123-162.
- Whitt, R. J. (2010). *Evidentiality and perception verbs in English and German*. Oxford, Bern: Peter Lang.

## Appendix

*Table 1. Visual conceptual metaphors in the perceptual domain (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2002, p. 114)*

<b>Vision:</b>
• Understanding is seeing
• Foreseeing is seeing
• Imagining is seeing
• Considering is seeing
• Studying/ Examining is seeing
• Finding out is seeing
• Making sure is seeing
• Taking care is seeing/ Looking after
• Witnessing is seeing
• Experiencing is seeing
• Helping/ going with someone is seeing

*Table 2. Literal and figurative meanings of the perception verb “see”*

<b>Physical meaning</b>	<b>Figurative meanings</b>	
	Visual Perception-Dependent Meanings	Mental Imagery-Dependent Meanings
<b>Pattern 1 : An animate subject sees a physical object</b>  Meaning : An animate subject perceives or observes a physical object with his or her eyes	<b>Pattern 4 : An animate subject sees a movie /a play, a book or information</b>  Meaning: An animate subject watches a movie / reads a book for entertainment	<b>Pattern 7: I /we see</b>  Meaning: “I/ we see” expresses understanding or acceptance of the meaning or implication of some proposition

Physical meaning	Figurative meanings	
<p><b>Pattern 2 : An animate subject sees a document or a document part</b></p> <p>Meaning: An animate subject refers to a document or document part for further information</p>	<p><b>Pattern 5: An animate subject sees an object or a situation</b></p> <p>Meaning: An animate object sees an object or a situation in order to check or confirm to verify an object</p>	<p><b>Pattern 8: An animate subject sees a proposition or a concept</b></p> <p>Meaning: An animate subject achieves an understanding of a proposition or a concept</p>
<p><b>Pattern 3 : An animate subject meets someone</b></p> <p>Meaning: An animate subject goes to and spends some time with someone, typically for social reasons</p>	<p><b>Pattern 6: See + that-clause or wh-clause</b></p> <p>Meaning: An animate subject achieves an understanding of a proposition or a concept embodied in that-clause or wh-clause</p>	

Abbreviations:

**ACAD** – Academic

**FIC** – Fiction

**MAG** – Magazine

**SPOK** – Spoken

# MEANS OF EXPRESSING GRATITUDE IN ENGLISH AND BULGARIAN – PRAGMATIC DIMENSIONS

Deyana Peneva<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** *The paper investigates different ways and means of indicating gratitude exploited in English and Bulgarian. It basically focuses on a number of thanking situations, strategies and expressions with respect to use, politeness orientation and specificities. A division is further made between thanks, appreciation and gratitude. The aim of the article is to present the English patterns of speech acts of thanking in context-dependent speech situations and the challenges to learners when being exposed to input settings similar to the linguistic reality of the target community. The paper also dwells on the disparities and inaccuracies which may occur between the learners' native pragmatic knowledge and the expressions of gratitude which are most likely to be uttered by native speakers of English.*

**Keywords:** *context, gratitude, politeness, pragmatics, thanks*

## 1. Introduction

The paper investigates ways of expressing gratitude (used as a broad term) in English and Bulgarian. It focuses on a three-dimensional analysis which makes a difference between thanks, gratitude and appreciation and examines the similarities and discrepancies between the data elicited by a corpus-driven research.

Data were collected from BNC (British National Corpus 2015-17) in which all cases of gratitude presented in a public debate TV format were extracted and classified. Since there is not a Bulgarian national corpus in this sphere of pragmatic research the Bulgarian database was collected via computer-based examination of tape-scripts from 20 consecutive public debate TV programs (*Referendum* and *Paths* on BNT 1 TV channel – Nov 2018-Feb 2019). The participants in both corpora are English and Bulgarian native speakers from different professional spheres of life (university professors, doctors, architects, managers and others) hence, in the discussions the interlocutors share similar social variables in order to be competent in a polemic setting. Though considerable similarities were revealed, there are certain cross-cultural disparities identified in terms of gratitude perception, thanks awareness and appreciation interpretation.

---

1. Assistant Prof., PhD at at Shumen University, Department of English Studies, Shumen, Bulgaria, e-mail: d.peneva@shu.bg

Apart from this, the linguistic material under examination shows deviations in grammatical structures and syntactic patterns.

The article focuses specifically on three expressions of gratitude in the English language, namely, *I am thankful*, *I am grateful* and *I appreciate* and their respective translations in Bulgarian. Additionally, the syntactic patterns are identified and discussed in both corpora. Last but not least in importance is the pragmatics of the utterances in TV debates.

## 2. Previous research in the field

In recent years the number of research works regarding the issue of speech acts in intercultural surroundings has piled up dramatically due to the fact that scholars analysing international communication need to better understand the linguistic models in expressing politeness functions. That, in its part, asks for a proper and adequate expertise in communicative acts. The pragmatics of speech acts of thanking, though still nascent, now turns to be a fast-developing area of research and analysis with its specific illocutionary force and concrete implications starting from Searle (Searle, 1969) and Leech (Leech, 1983), who investigate thanks in general, going further with cross-cultural examinations (Ahar, 2011; Einstein & Bodman, 1993; Mahdi, 2010). Particularly, there is not an in-depth comparative investigation with respect to English and Bulgarian thanks strategies and their respective cultural aptitudes and connotations. The speech acts of gratitude are subsumed under the set of expressive illocutionary acts in Speech act theory (Bach, 2004) in that they illustrate a psychological state or sincerity condition of the communicative act where the speaker reacts positively to the hearer who carried out an act which in some way was favourable or beneficial to the hearer (Searle, 1969). In this sense, the act of thanking is considered to be a counter effect or action which has been affected by a previous or current activity by the addressee. Additionally, expressions of gratitude bear a high level of politeness as they aim to maintain the social harmony and balance of respect to either party in the interaction. According to politeness theory (Bach, 2004) utterances of gratitude are regarded as negative face-threatening acts (FTAs) limiting the hearer's personal freedom (Thomas, 1986). From a psychological point of view, positive face-threatening acts are supposed to add something, whereas negative ones 'take something away'. Positive FTAs add closeness and warm feelings between the interlocutors, whereas in the case of negative FTAs boundaries, hierarchy and respect are established (Bach, 2004).

The choice of utterance depends also on the relationship between the (oral) text producer (speaker) and the text receiver (hearer) (Aleksandrova, 2017). By saying 'Thank you', for example, the speaker acknowledges that the hearer you are thanking is an independent individual with his/ her own needs who is held in

high respect by the speaker. That is quite the reverse of warmth and attachment (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986).

Most of the rules we follow in expressive speech acts are a form of etiquette and strategies of negative politeness which are hearer-oriented rather than speaker-oriented.

### **3. Research questions**

The paper collects material for analysis taken from BNC of spoken language in public debate shows and a series of Bulgarian TV programs in a similar format, settings and participants. The English corpus consists of 519 examples while the Bulgarian set of data is represented by 169 utterances. The phrases in both languages begin with a subject in the first person singular, Present Simple tense though the succeeding word, which bears the semantic meaning of gratitude, may not be represented by the same part of speech. There are certain questions that the article attempts to answer:

- 1) What are the favoured gratitude patterns in both sets of data?
- 2) To what extent do Bulgarian representatives differ from English native speakers in their pragmatic manifestation and politeness strategies?

### **4. Methods**

The paper classifies the linguistic material by following the grammatical structures of the performative entries in the two languages.

In connection with the identification and examination of the linguistic items in patterns *Quantitative and qualitative corpus analysis* (following Biber, Conrad & Reppen, 1998) is used, which is both corpus-based and corpus-driven (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001). In regard to the former (corpus-based), the corpus database serves to validate or refute, or add to politeness theory, while the latter approach (corpus-driven) prioritizes on the linguistic constructs which emerge from analysis of a corpus.

### **5. Data analysis**

The analysis is three-dimensional in that it observes the grammatical, lexicosemantic and pragmatic aspects of the respective entries in English and Bulgarian.

Both corpora contain a total number of 688 utterances, 519 of English origin, 169 from the Bulgarian source. They are further subdivided into three main groups according to the three phrases under observation.

### 5.1. Expressions of gratitude – English corpus (EC)

The three expressions explored in the present paper are *I am thankful*, *I am grateful* and *I appreciate* which are presented in the table below with their percentage rates:

Table 1. Case distribution of gratitude expressions in EC

expression	number of cases	percentage rate
I am thankful	83	15.99%
I am grateful	280	53.94%
I appreciate	156	26.9%
Total	519	100%

There are 83 *I am thankful* cases identified in the corpus, which stands for 15.99% of the total, that is well under fifth of all gratitude utterances in English. *I am grateful* gains prominence with 280 examples which occupy more than half of all extracted phrases. *I appreciate* is present with 156 utterances which is approximately a quarter of the total number of occurrences.

#### ➤ *I am thankful*

The performative entry *thankful* is a content word which possesses the specific features of an adjective being of two-morpheme structure: a root morpheme and a suffix *-ful*. The latter serves not only as a derivational marker but also adds to the semantic meaning of the root morpheme. The suffix *-ful* comprises several meanings: ‘characterized by, having the qualities of ‘full of’ (The New Oxford Dictionary, 2014). In general, the suffix implies the aspect of adding a quality or ability – full of thanks.

The adjective *thankful* in itself reveals two basic semantic meanings:

- pleased and relieved. Ex. ... *I am thankful that the meeting is over...* (2016)
- expressing gratitude and relief. Ex. ... *I am thankful to John Brinkman ... for her remarkable work on ...* /2017/

For the purposes of the current research only the second lexical meaning is regarded in the analysis as the first one does not bear the semantics of gratitude.

Syntactically the expression becomes explicit in three basic patterns, namely:

#### 1. *I am thankful + to* /infinitive/:

1a: *I am thankful + to* /inf./ + NP

1b: *I am thankful + to* /inf./ + VP

1c: *I am thankful + to* /preposition/ + NP + *for* /preposition/ + NP/VP /gerund/

#### 2. *I am thankful + for* /preposition/

2a: *I am thankful + for + NP*

2b: *I am thankful + for + what-clause*

3. *I am thankful + that + clause*

With respective number of occurrences illustrated in the table below:

Table 2. Case distribution of 'thankful' expressions in EC

expression	number of cases	percent
1a: I am thankful to + VP	2	0.38%
1b: I am thankful to + NP	10	1.92%
1c: I am thankful to + NP +for + NP/ VP /gerund/	16	3.08%
2a: I am thankful for + NP	51	9.82%
2b: I am thankful for + what-clause	1	0.19%
3: I am thankful + that-clause	3	0.57%
Total	83	15.99%

There are two cases in which the phrase is succeeded by a *to*-infinitive verbal form. With respect to its pragmatic meaning, the aspects of feeling glad and pleased become more distinct whereas the aspect of gratitude comes second in prominence. For example:

ex. ... *I am thankful to be in a position to do something about this ...*

Actually, there is no obvious manifestation of a real act of thanking someone for a favour or other activity. It sounds more as a feeling of relaxation or satisfaction to comfort oneself.

As for the next structure 1b: *I am thankful to + NP*, the noun phrase refers to a person and in real-life situations it corresponds to the addressee, whom the speaker is thanking. There are no pragmatic deviations from the semantic content, though obviously judging by the number of cases identified in the corpus, it does not come first in the scale of preference and practical usage in TV debate format programmes.

The third sub-pattern 1c: *I am thankful + to /preposition/ + NP + for /preposition/ + VP /gerund/* follows a rather complicated grammatical where the preposition is followed by a noun phrase with the semantic features [+animate; + person]/, after which comes the preposition *for* in a combination with either a NP or a gerundial verbal element. For instance:

ex. ... *I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity of telling ...*

The lexical items which follow the preposition *for* indicate the reason why the speaker is performing the communicative act of thanking; the act which in some way is or has been favourable to the addresser. Pragmatically, although there is a case for saying that the exact pattern ranks first in preference compared to

the former two sub-structures, we cannot make generalizations of its practical prominence since all three derivational sub-patterns are of limited occurrence in the corpus.

Regarding pattern 2: *I am thankful for*, it depicts two syntactic sub-structures: NP; + *what*-clause. 2a: *I am thankful + for + NP* gains significant prominence with 51 extracts over pattern 2b with only one example extracted from the corpus. Similar to pattern 1c the NP implies the idea of an explanation or account of the act which was/has been in favour to the speaker:

ex....*I am thankful for Michael Anderson's extensive knowledge and generosity ...*

The last syntactic structure 3: *I am thankful + that*-clause is present with three cases in the database with a *that*-clause suggesting an explanation or account for the reason for the act of thanking.

In all, *I am thankful* syntactic patterns comprise well over a fifth of all gratitude expressions with a prevalence of the sub-pattern *I am thankful for + NP*. Obviously, for English native speakers it is more typical to give explanation or communicate what they are thankful for rather than indicate who the speaker is thanking (to). This, on its part, confirms the negative politeness orientation that is associated with thanks speech acts as the speaker preserves his/her personal autonomy without explicit emotional markers. The pattern sounds distant, void of sentiment, formulaic, routinized. And as it is seen, it is not among the most typical gratitude expressions in debate TV programmes (see the table above).

### ➤ *I am grateful*

With the largest number of occurrences, the pattern *I am grateful* follows an almost identical grammatical behaviour to the *I am thankful* pattern. The performative adjective *grateful* has a similar morphological structure in that it is a two-morpheme adjective with a root *grate* (from old Latin *gratus* – pleasing) and a derivational suffix – *ful*.

With a view to semantics, the entry is synonymous to the adjective *thankful* in that the same meanings characterize it: 1. pleasing to the mind or senses; agreeable or welcome; refreshing, and 2. expressing or actuated by gratitude; showing or expressing thanks to benefits received especially to another person (The New Oxford Dictionary 2014). The second meaning is under consideration in the article.

Grammatically (syntactically), the performative adjective can add prepositional phrases:

4a: *I am grateful+ to /preposition/ +NP*

ex. ... *I am grateful to Katherine Borland and Diane Tye for the opportunity ...*

4b: *I am grateful + for + NP*

ex. ... *I am grateful for the comments of Dominique Tobbell and the anonymous reviewers ...*

Although the adjective could also add infinitive verbal forms, this syntactic structure is excluded from the survey since it refers to the first semantic meaning of the entry.

The number of cases for the respective patterns is illustrated in the table below:

Table 3. Case distribution of 'grateful' expressions in EC

expression	number of cases	percent
4a: I am grateful to + NP	213	41.04%
4b: I am grateful for + NP	67	12.2%
Total	280	53.94%

Actually, the overall number of all *grateful* expressions comprises the impressive 280 examples, well over half of all expressions of gratitude with 213 cases for 4a: *I am grateful + to + NP* structure and 67 occurrences of 4b: *I am grateful + for + NP* sub-pattern.

Turning to 4a first, the main entry /*grateful*/ is followed by the preposition *to* which asks for a NP, the latter denoting a person. While in the case of 4b the adjective *grateful* is succeeded by the preposition *for* plus a noun phrase with semantic features [- animate; -human], hence it is a noun which falls into the group of abstract nouns which refer to concepts or entities that cannot be perceived physically but mainly refer to conditions, ideas. In the given paper the most common abstract nouns after the preposition *for* are *attention, concern, support, opportunity, suggestion, guidance, answer*.

When analyzing the usage of the performative adjective several implicatures were noticed:

- the performative entry is used mainly in a formal register compared to more informal management of *thankful*;
- *grateful* refers to an internal feeling of thankfulness coming out from within and may be considered more expressive than *thankful*, which in turn, sounds slightly void of emotion, less expressive;
- *grateful* comes as an emotional response to an utterance or series of utterances performed by the other interlocutor in the speech situation;

➤ *I appreciate*

In relation to *I appreciate* expressions, 156 utterances were found in the corpus, which make well over a quarter of all gratitude phrases in the database. In contrast to the above performative entries, *appreciate* is not an adjective, but a verb.

With reference to its semantics, it could appear that it bears the content meaning of *thankful* and the emotional contour of *grateful* but adds an extra semantic aspect, namely, of value and admiration.

The verb can accept as its complement a noun phrase or a *what*-clause. For example:

ex. ... *I appreciate the transparency of your answer* ... (NP)

ex....*Indeed, that's the correct view. I appreciate what you are saying*... (what-clause)

There are 149 NP extracts compared to 7 *what-clause* utterances. Obviously, the phrase is common with nominal words which stand for an explanation or the reason for the performance of the speech act of thanking. Practically, in real-life situations the phrase differs from *I am grateful* expression in that the former illustrates, to some extent, an external feeling of gratitude when recognizing the other party's merits or positive qualities, whereas *I am grateful* is more of character which expresses readiness to show appreciation and is an indicator more of an internal state rather than an outward expression (Guy 1995).

## 5.2. Expressions of gratitude – Bulgarian corpus (BC)

In view of the Bulgarian database, 169 utterances were extracted, classified and analyzed. Interestingly, the English expressions *I am thankful* and *I am grateful* share the same one word-for-word translation equivalents in the Bulgarian language, that is, *Blagodaren sam* (Благодарен съм). There are no other translation variants in Bulgarian. However, the translation counterpart of *I appreciate* in Bulgarian is: *Otsenyavam* (Оценявам).

The utterances were divided into two sets of data: *Blagodaren sam* expressions; *Otsenyavam* expressions.

➤ *Blagodaren sam*

In both phrases in English, i.e. *I am thankful*, *I am grateful*, the performative entry is an adjective as it is in the Bulgarian translation. The latter bears the same grammatical properties of its English equivalents. The Bulgarian entry adds the same complements:

***Blagodaren sam* + na /prep/ + NP**

*/I am thankful/grateful + to /prep/ + NP/*

ex. ...*Blagodaren sam na G-n Iliyazov* ...

***Blagodaren sam + za /prep/ + NP/clause***

*/I am thankful + for /prep/ + NP/clause/*

The adjective consists of four morphemes: *- blag – o – dar – en*. *Blag* and *dar* bear certain semantic meanings; the former refers to kindness, gentleness, whereas the latter refers to something given as a gift or present, as a token of gratitude. Indeed, the overall denotation of the word can be paraphrased in the following way: feeling thankful to someone who was/ has been so kind to do a favour or provide someone with something that he/ she is in need of.

Semantically, the Bulgarian representative entry has a broader meaning which combines the semantic aspects of *thankful* and *grateful*. Yet, it cannot reveal fully the emotional relief and the personal involvement that are distinctive in *grateful*. On the other hand, pragmatically, the Bulgarian entry is closer in meaning to *thankful* in its expressively neutral apprehension. It sounds routinized, formulaic.

Another rather essential point is that among the 114 expressions extracted from the corpus with a root morpheme *-blag* only 4 utterances possess the adjective *blagodaren* while the rest 110 become explicit in a combination:

***blagodarya + to + NP<sub>person</sub>*** (4 cases)

***blagodarya + for + NP<sub>other</sub>*** (15 cases);

***blagodarya + to + NP<sub>person</sub> + for + NP<sub>other</sub>*** (91 cases):

ex. ... *Blagodarya na D-r Chilingirov za izcherpatelniya otgovor* ... /in Eng.: *I am grateful to Mr Chilingirov for the in-depth answer.*/

The table shows the number of the respective utterances with a root morpheme *-blag*:

*Table 4. Case distribution of 'blagodarya' expressions in EC*

expression	number of cases	percent
<i>blagodaren sam + to/for</i>	4	2.36%
<i>blagodarya + to + NP<sub>person</sub></i>	4	2.36%
<i>blagodarya + to + NP<sub>other</sub></i>	15	8.87%
<i>blagodarya + to + NP<sub>person</sub> + for + NP<sub>other</sub></i>	91	53.84%
Total	114	68.63%

In open debate TV programmes *blagodarya + to + NP<sub>person</sub> + for + NP<sub>other</sub>* pattern becomes distinct. Apparently, in Bulgarian spoken debate discourse, when a speech act of gratitude is required, the interlocutors prefer to exploit phrases which address both the addressee and give explanation/ account for the particular reason which has provoked an utterance of thanking. It may

seem that negative politeness strategies are present in the relevant cases as the speaker's freedom of choice and action are deterred, in that the speaker in order to preserve the social balance and show him/herself as a decent member of society is obliged to express politeness by performing a communicative act of gratitude. By using the exact grammatical pattern (specifying the other party and giving explanation) the utterance sounds more genuine and sincere.

### ➤ *Otsenyavam*

There are 55 cases of the investigated item found in the corpus, which are divided into two groups: *otsenyavam* + *NPother*; *otsenyavam* + *what (tova koeto)-clause*. The table below illustrates the respective number of utterances with regard to their pattern:

Expression	number of cases	percent
<i>otsenyavam</i> + <i>NPother</i>	49	28.99%
<i>otsenyavam</i> + <i>what (tova koeto)-clause</i>	6	3.55%
Total	55	32.54%

The word *otsenyavam* is a full verb of transitive character, non-perfective. Semantically, it matches its English counterpart denoting the lexical meaning of worth and value.

In real-life situations, in debate format shows, it becomes clear that *otsenyavam* + *NP<sub>other</sub>* is more favoured in that the speaker by specifying what he/ she is actually *other* thanking for, shows respect to the high level of competence and intelligence in the addressee's answer; the speaker seems to assess the other party's utterances as being quite essential and of high value. In that case the speech act of appreciation does not fully correspond to a negative face-threatening act (threatening the speaker's negative face), which is considered to be intrinsic in speech acts of thanking, but more as a means to establish social relationships and show regard or even admiration.

## 6. Results/ Key findings

The analysis of the data based on the findings and examination of the respective expressions in both corpora indicates that:

- all performative entries share almost equal semantics and aim at expressing gratitude either to a particular person or for a particular act;
- similarities were also found between the usage and proper awareness of gratitude expressions, expressions of thanks and appreciation;
- on the other hand, the adjectives *thankful* and *grateful* do not have exact translation equivalents in Bulgarian language, instead, there is a two-in-one translation variant – *blagodaren*;

- the most preferred gratitude patterns in English public debate programmes are *I am grateful to* +NP *person* and *I appreciate* + NP<sub>other</sub> patterns which sound less formulaic and average;
- the most favoured syntactic structures in the Bulgarian set of data are: *blagodarya* + *na (to)* + NP<sub>person</sub> + *za (for)* + NP<sub>other</sub> and *otsenyavam* + NP<sub>other</sub>.
- In the *blagodarya* + *na (to)* + NP<sub>person</sub> + *za (for)* + NP<sub>other</sub> pattern the main performative expression *blagodarya* belongs to a different class of words compared to its counterpart in English which is an adjective.
- In English debate programmes the interlocutors either specify the person or the act, whereas in Bulgarian debate formats the speakers use both in a combination which strengthens the sincerity condition and the personal attitude towards the addressee's communicative act.
- Though it is true to say that negative politeness strategies are present in the data, the explicit emotional contour and expressive nature of the preferred patterns in English and Bulgarian convey the idea that communicative acts of gratitude in public debate shows are mainly means of sustaining social relationships and showing concern/appreciation rather than means of showing that the speaker should submit his/her will to someone or something else.

## 7. Conclusion and implications

The paper will contribute positively to a more detailed study on the issues of speech acts of thanking and politeness approaches in different cultural and social contexts. The qualitative and quantitative approach to the study could be used in investigating syntactic similarities and discrepancies in a cross-cultural research work. It could prove essential with Bulgarian learners of English when mastering pragmatic skills and communicative competences.

## References:

- Ahar, V. (2011). The effect of social status and size of imposition on the gratitude strategies of Persian and English speakers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), pp. 120-128.
- Aleksandrova, A. (2018). I Know Them by Name. In V. Kambovski et al. (eds.). *KNOWLEDGE – International Journal*. Vol. 19.3. GRAFOPROM. Bitola. 1077-1081.
- Bach, K. (2004). Pragmatics and the philosophy of language. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (463-487). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics. Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1986). I very appreciate: Expressions of gratitude by native and nonnative speakers of American English". *Applied Linguistics*, 7. 67-185.
- Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1993). Expressing gratitude in American English. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (64-81) Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Guy, A. (1995). Say 'thank you': Some pragmatic constraints in conversational closings. *Applied Linguistics*, 16. 57-86.
- Mahdi, A. H. (2010). Expressions of gratitude in American-English and Iraqi-Arabic. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 19(2): LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing. 77-97.
- Searle, J. (1969). *An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Site.meta-Author. (n.d.). Добрите новини. Retrieved from <https://www.bnt.bg/bg/a/pteki-6012019>
- Site.meta-Author. (n.d.). Ще се запази ли управляващата коалиция в сегашния си формат? Retrieved from <https://www.bnt.bg/bg/a/shche-se-zapazi-li-upravlyavashchata-koalitsiya-v-segashniya-si-format>
- The New Oxford dictionary of English. (2014). 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1986). *The dynamics of discourse: a pragmatic analysis of confrontational interaction*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Lancaster University.
- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work*. *Studies in Corpus Linguistics*, 6. XII. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

# THE ROLE OF ELECTRONIC CORPORA IN TRANSLATION TRAINING

Silvana Neshkovska<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract:** *Corpus linguistics has surely secured its position and status in the world of science nowadays. Its role in linguistic research, and consequently its implications for the linguistic theory and practice are practically indisputable today. Nevertheless, what started capturing researchers' attention in the last decades is the role that corpus linguistics has in the domain of translation studies and training. In fact, corpus linguistics has extended its influence so much that it is safe to claim that providing proper training to trainee translators and doing translation in general is inconceivable and inadmissible without taking full advantage of the benefits of corpora.*

*The paper aims to take a closer look at the current research done on the role of corpus linguistics in the sphere of translation studies and translation training by examining closely some of the most recent and relevant studies which have dealt with this issue recently. More specifically, the aim of the paper is to offer an overview of the most salient findings and results obtained from these studies, and eventually to draw conclusions as to how future translators could apply these insights into their practical work in order to secure their competitiveness in the global labour market.*

**Key words:** *corpora, corpus linguistics, translation training*

## 1. Introduction

In the contemporary world translation is in high demand. Consequently, priority should be given to high quality translation teaching in order to produce highly competent and skillful translators, adept at meeting the increasingly versatile and challenging demands of the global market.

Traditionally translation teaching has been teacher centred and text based. In other words, in such a traditional setting, teachers introduce and explain translation theories and then assign exercises to their students in order to evaluate their performance. This practically means that, generally speaking, students are mere passive recipients who engage in little or no creative thinking and have little or no interaction with their teacher or fellow students.

The aim of this paper is to shed some light on a rather novel method of translation teaching and doing translation. This method of teaching gives priority to students' participation in teaching by placing the focus on student-centred and

---

2. Ph.D. at "St. Kliment Ohridski" University, Faculty of Education, Bitola, Macedonia, e-mail: silvanakolevska@yahoo.com

autonomous learning. More specifically, the paper discusses the application of corpus linguistics in translation studies, by highlighting the benefits of corpus-based translation studies in the course of translation training as well as while doing translation in general.

Initially, the paper outlines the beginnings of compiling corpora and the emergence of corpus linguistics. Then, it sheds some light on the inception of corpus-based translation studies and their practical implications in the context of translation training and doing translation.

The salience of the paper rests on the fact that by tracing the development and application of corpora, it attempts to prove the validity for the claim that nowadays it is inconceivable and unacceptable to envision and realise the translation training of future translators without taking advantage of corpora and the opportunities that corpora proffer for advancing and alleviating the process of transferring linguistic material from a source language to a target language.

## 2. A historic overview of corpora and different types of corpora

When the term ‘corpus’ was originally introduced into the Latin language it meant ‘body’ (Niladri & Arulmozi, 2018). Nowadays, the term ‘corpus’ is associated with a collection of written texts or transcribed speech which can serve as a basis for linguistic analysis and description. Nevertheless, one has to acknowledge that compiling and utilising corpora for linguistic research is not a new endeavour at all. On the contrary, it has a long tradition, dating back to medieval times when a lot of scholars, mostly clergymen, were engaged in compiling and investigating corpora for various research purposes. Thus, for instance, there was a considerable tradition of corpus-based linguistic analyses of various kinds occurring in several main fields of scholarship such as biblical and literary studies, lexicography, dialect studies, language education studies and grammatical studies. Understandably, since compiling and analysing corpora was done manually, the researchers were going through a painstakingly long and time-consuming experience. Also, since the analysis of huge bodies of texts was done ‘by hand’, the analysis was prone to error and was not always exhaustive or easily replicable (Kennedy, 1998). From today’s perspective, all these corpora can be referred to as *pre-electronic corpora* (Hofmann, 2004, cited in Lüdeling & Kytö, 2008).

As of 1960s, however, with the advent of computers and information technology, the terrain was set for a brand new type of corpora – *electronic corpora* (Hofmann, 2004, cited in Lüdeling & Kytö, 2008), which present a systematic, planned and structured collection of texts stored in an electronic database, specifically compiled for linguistic analysis. In the case of electronic corpora,

unlike in the pre-electronic corpora, the analysis is carried out at an incredible speed; electronic corpora provide total accountability, accurate replicability, statistical reliability and display an ability to handle huge amounts of data (Kennedy, 1998).

The first electronic corpora were compiled in the 1960s and 1970s. The Brown University Standard Corpus of Present-day American English (*The Brown Corpus*) and Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpus of British English (*LOB*) were in fact the first samples of electronic corpora (Kennedy, 1998). The Brown Corpus was initiated in 1961 and was completed with remarkable speed in 1964. It consisted of approximately one million words and the samples were taken from a large number of text categories from both informative and imaginative prose, excluding verse and drama. The Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpus, on the other hand, was compiled from 1970 to 1978. This corpus of written British English was compiled at the University of Lancaster and the University of Oslo. It also contained one million words of different genres of texts, but what is peculiar about this corpus is that all texts included in it were produced in 1961. In addition, because *LOB* was compiled one decade after the Brown corpus, the compilers were able to take an advantage of the developments in computer technology. In other words, apart from the general version of the corpus, they produced a partly analysed version with tags to each word and Key Words in Context Concordances (KWIC) (Hu, 2016).

In the 1980s it became obvious that the existing corpora were too small to meet the needs of researchers conducting lexical and semantic analysis. Fortunately, developments in technology for text capture and storage came at the right time and made bigger corpora (“mega-corpora”) possible. Thus, by the 1990s corpora of millions of words or more became available (Kruger et al., 2011). The Cobuild Corpus, the Longman Corpus Network and the British National Corpus (BNC) are some of them. The British National Corpus, for instance, contains 100 million words of contemporary British English (90 million words are from written texts and 10 million from spoken texts) (Kennedy, 1998). The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) is, in fact, the largest freely-available corpus of English, which contains more than 560 million words of text and is equally divided among spoken texts, fiction, popular magazines, newspapers, and academic texts.

Unsurprisingly, all these existing corpora are not of the same type. Depending on the purpose they have been created for, we can distinguish between *general* and *specialised corpora*. General corpora, as their name suggests, are compiled for unspecified linguistic research and contain texts from different genres and domains. Linguists use them to research the grammar, vocabulary, etc. of a specific language. In contrast, specialised corpora, are designed with special research in mind. Further distinction can be made between *synchronic corpora*,

in which an attempt is made to present the language at a particular time, and *diachronic corpora*, in which a language is depicted over a certain period of time (e.g. Helsinki Corpus, ARCHER, aims at representing an earlier stage or earlier stages of a language). Additionally, some corpora are dubbed *regional corpora* as they represent one regional variety of a language (e.g. Wellington Corpus of Written New Zealand English) and they can be juxtaposed to *corpora containing more than one regional variety*. Then, there are *learner corpora* which aim at representing the language as produced by its learners (e.g. International Corpus of Learner English), which are contrasted with *native speaker corpora*. Distinction can also be made between *multilingual corpora* whose aim is to represent several, at least two, different languages, often with the same text types (for contrastive analyses), as opposed to *monolingual* or *bilingual corpora*. Finally, there exist *spoken corpora* which aim at representing spoken language (e.g. London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English) as well as *written corpora* which comprise only written texts, and *mixed corpora* which include both spoken and written texts.

### 3. Corpus linguistics

The emergence of all these corpora, from 1950s onwards made it possible for corpus linguistics (CL) to spring to life. According to Nilardi and Arulmozi (2018) corpus linguistics is not a new branch of linguistics; it is rather a new approach to language study which supplies samples and linguistic information for all the branches of linguistics. Crystal (1997) refers to CL as “a body of language texts both in written and spoken form ... which being preserved in machine readable form, enables all kinds of linguistic description and analysis” (cited in Nilardi & Arulmozi, 2018). In other words, CL is based on the empirical study of “real life” language use, done with the help of specialised computer software. It is used for the investigation of many different types of linguistic questions (lexical, semantic, syntactic, etc.), and it has been shown that it has a great potential to yield highly interesting, fundamental, and often surprising new insights about language. Namely, CL in the recent decades has become widely used and has become fundamental in lexicography, textbooks writing and language teaching in particular. Furthermore, currently, electronic corpora are often used in the research conducted in sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, language acquisition, semantics, pragmatics, stylistics, literary study, discourse analysis, forensic linguistics, computational linguistics, lexical studies, grammatical studies, translation studies, contrastive analysis, etc. (Laviosa, 2011).

Obviously, electronic corpora have earned an excellent reputation of being both objective and scientific due to the fact that they rely both on qualitative and quantitative analysis, and, as a result have been put to numerous theoretical and practical uses in a variety of scientific fields.

#### 4. Corpus-based translation studies

Translation studies, which despite its long tradition was established as a separate scientific discipline in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, was also quick to recognise the potential of corpora and corpus linguistics for its own purposes. This so-called marriage between descriptive translation studies and corpus linguistics is now known as corpus-based translation studies (Laviosa, 2011). Corpus-based translation studies is focused on investigating the nature of translation as a product and a process by means of corpora, based on the statistical analysis of the features of translated texts in relation to non-translated texts and source texts (Hu, 2016). More specifically, since the mid-1990s a great number of corpora were compiled and investigated purposefully to ascertain: the specific features of translated texts on syntactic, lexical, semantic, and textual levels; translator's style (i.e. translator's choices in the use of lexicon, syntactic structure, punctuation, discourse structures, etc.); translational norms (which are changeable and depend on the historical period in which a particular translation is done); translator training (allows students to better understand the regularities, the patterns of language transfers by observing large numbers of existing translation samples) and interpreting (insights into the features of interpreted texts, interpreting norms, strategies and methods) (Hu, 2016).

The publication of Baker's seminal paper entitled "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications" (1993) is believed to have instigated the emergence of corpus-based translation studies. Baker (1993, p. 243) predicted that the compilation of various types of corpora of both original and translated texts, together with the development of a corpus-driven methodology, would enable translation scholars to uncover "the nature of translated text as a mediated communicative event" through the investigation of what she then termed "universals" of translation, i.e. linguistic features that occur in translated texts and which are free from the influences of specific language pairs involved in the translation process. Baker (1993, p. 248) insisted that "translated texts record genuine communicative events and as such are neither inferior nor superior to other communicative events in any language."

Naturally, at the very core of corpus-based translation studies is the design and navigation of corpora created not only as sources for the retrieval of translation equivalents or improving the quality and efficiency of the final translation product, but also as repositories of data used to better understand translational processes and language behaviour. Bernardini (2003) distinguishes several distinct types of corpora compiled and used for the purposes of translation studies:

a) **Parallel corpora** comprise the source texts of a language and their target texts in another language, which are aligned at a certain level. In terms of the number

of the languages involved, a parallel corpus can be categorised as a bilingual parallel corpus or a multilingual parallel corpus. According to the direction of translation, however, parallel corpora can be divided into a unidirectional parallel corpus, a bidirectional parallel corpus, and a multidirectional parallel corpus. A unidirectional parallel corpus includes source texts of one language and their target texts into another language. A bidirectional parallel corpus includes the source texts of language A and their target texts in language B and the source texts of language B and their target texts in language A. A multidirectional parallel corpus includes the source texts of one language aligned with their translations of two or more languages.

b) **Comparable corpora** include texts that are comparable at different levels. A comparable corpus can be monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual. A monolingual comparable corpus is composed of the non-translated texts and translated texts in the same language. Texts in the two corpora are similar with regard to registration, language variation, and time span, and the size of the two sub-corpora is roughly the same. A bilingual or multilingual comparable corpus contains texts in two or more languages which are comparable but not in translational relationship to one another. The corpus of this kind is primarily used in contrastive studies between languages.

c) **Translational corpora** consist exclusively of texts translated from one or more languages into a certain language. Generally, a translational corpus is compiled for the investigation of features of translations, translational norms, translators' style, etc. However, it should be used hand in hand with a corpus which contains original texts.<sup>1</sup>

d) **Interpreting corpora** include texts transcribed orthographically from video or audio files with the purpose to investigate interpreting strategies, linguistic features of interpreted texts, interpreting norms, the cognitive process of interpreting, etc.<sup>2</sup>

Irrespective of the specific type of a corpus, as Hu (2016) remarks, it is important to bear in mind that the usage of corpora into translation teaching, has two major

---

1. The earliest and most influential translational corpus, which was started in 1996 and completed in 1999 and which offers a website for free use by the general public, is the Translational English Corpus (TEC). TEC has ten million words and consists of English biographies, novels, newspaper reports, and magazine articles translated from more than a dozen languages including French, German, Italian, Chinese, etc. TEC was designed to be comparable with the British National Corpus, and it was compiled for investigating the similarities and differences between translated and non-translated English texts (Hu, 2016).

2. The European Parliament Interpreting Corpus compiled by Bologna University is one such corpus. An interpreting comparable corpus collects transcribed interpreted speeches and non-interpreted speeches in the same language which are comparable. This kind of corpus is useful for studies of linguistic features of interpreted texts and interpreting norms.

advantages: (1) automatic extraction and analysis of data, and (2) automatic presentation of abundant translation examples. Both these features are crucial for advancing and enhancing the translation teaching process, and the process of doing translation as well.

## **5. The usage of corpora in translation training**

Considering the fact that virtually all translators nowadays use computers in their everyday work and process texts electronically, it goes without saying that they should be proficient in using corpora for their own specific purposes. Namely, their familiarity with corpora for translation purposes should be instigated even when they still have the status of translator trainees; they need to be taught how to utilise ready-made corpora but also how to compile their own corpora.

Hu (2016) is one of the researchers who recognises the salience of corpora in translation training, claiming that corpora today are “valuable resources/aids not only for translators but also for translation trainees”.

The advantage of corpora, according to Beeby et al. (2009), is that they present repositories which can help students fill their knowledge gaps, and which can be used in translators training and second language acquisition either as a means for autonomous learning or a source of materials for classroom use. Thus, for instance, Cosme (2006) provides an overview of corpus-based translation tasks and specific instances that can be used in class. He identifies three kinds of tasks: awareness raising tasks; translation enhancement tasks and production. Beeby et al. (2009) also point out that by means of corpora, translator trainees become more and more aware of the typical mistakes or errors that they make and that different types of corpora lend themselves to different kinds of pedagogic exploration, depending on whether they are monolingual, multilingual, parallel, comparable, general or subject-specific etc. In that context, Bernardini et al. (2003) outline that parallel corpora, for instance, help translators opt for natural, native-like terms and phrases in particular communicative situations. This is very important since trainee translators are also second language learners of a specific language. Also parallel corpora which contain original texts and their translations offer learners the possibility to observe what strategies translators appear to privilege; how they adopt and localise something; omit something; directly transfer something from SL to TL, etc. This observation and analysis helps translator trainees to start developing their own strategies, as well as to realise that different solutions can be appropriate in different situations, text types and registers. For instance, by observing how professional translators have dealt with culture specific terms which can be particularly tricky, they come to realise that depending on factors such as who commissioned the translation, what the purpose of the translated text is, who the target audience is, what

the publisher's guidelines are, etc. they must be equipped with a number of translation strategies in order to render the source text correctly into the target language. According to Pearson (2003), a parallel corpus is useful in revealing the translation strategies adopted by professional translators and in helping students establish their own translation principles, while a comparable corpus can help the translator check whether the terminologies and collocations in translations conform to the norms of target languages and cultures and whether solutions to translation problems are appropriate. Fernandes (2000) (in Hu, 2016) stressed that the use of a parallel corpus can help student translators compare their own works with translations by professionals to find out why certain decisions made in the translation process are ill-advised.

According to Zanettin (1998, p. 618-621), the functions of comparable corpora in translator training lie in three aspects: a) the trainees can evaluate the behaviour of similar textual units in respective languages and select proper target-language equivalents for the source-language words, which are compatible with the linguistic and stylistic norms of the target language, b) a comparable corpus can be used to inform translators of related expressions and terminology concerning specialised research fields, c) a comparable corpus helps students to testify the interrelationship between languages, carry out linguistic comparison, and find out similarities between different languages.

Moreover, both Bernardini et al. (2003) and Beeby et al. (2009) seem to agree that corpora of students' translations are essential as they allow learners to observe their own performance and progress over time, as well as provide a means for identifying areas of difficulties that could be integrated into the curriculum and discussed in depth in class.

The use of corpora also seems to be particularly useful for the improvement of the translator's autonomy and flexibility in translation (Monzó, 2003). Thanks to the use of corpora in translation teaching, students involve themselves in the learning process by collecting and evaluating texts, extracting terminologies, and establishing correspondence between different languages, which coincides with the highly advocated principles of "autonomy," "motivation," and "authenticity" and the idea that translator education is "a process of socialization in a professional community." Moreover, the use of corpora in translation teaching provides opportunities for the development of the students' innovation ability and problem-solving abilities. As Bernardini et al. (2003) contend, the greatest pedagogical value of corpora lies in their "thought-provoking" rather than "question-answering" potential. In other words, students should be trained to develop their own hypothesis about textual data and to devise their own strategies for extracting information from corpora and eventually decide on the interpretation of the data they have found in the corpus.

Finally, apart from using ready-made corpora, translation trainees should be involved in creating their own corpora as well. The benefits of that can be multifarious depending on what their purpose is. For instance, students can compile a corpus of their own translated texts which can be used to study the features of translations done by students and track students' learning process so as to make it more efficient. Besides, students can compile a disposable corpus, which is created for a specific translation task only. In order to do that successfully they need to be acquainted with all the factors that they need to take into consideration in the process of compiling the corpus such as the types of genres to be included in the corpus; the length not just of the corpus but of the samples to be included in it; the proportion of speech vs. writing that will be included; the educational level, gender, and dialect backgrounds of speakers and writers included in the corpus; and the types of contexts from which samples will be taken, etc. (Hu, 2016). Also, they need to explore how existing corpora function in terms of tagging, annotations, concordancing, etc.

Hu (2016) also notes that given the differences among students, particularly in terms of the extent to which they understand what is taught, the learning materials which vary in difficulty are extracted from the corpus and used for the analysis of translation strategies and methods by the students. Specifically, the students with high language proficiency can be assigned to analyse more complex statistics and translate more challenging texts, while those with lower language proficiency can be asked to extract and analyse texts comparatively easier to understand or investigate the translation of a single word or syntactic structure. In this way, translation teaching can be tailored to students' aptitude, and students' translation competence can thus be improved more effectively.

## **6. Conclusion**

As a means of cross-cultural communication, translation serves as a bridge for people who speak different languages, enabling them to understand each other. Over the past decades, with the increase of global trade, cross-border immigration, globalisation, and the widespread application of the mass media, translation activities have been growing exponentially. As mediators in cross-cultural communication, translators play an increasingly important role. On the one hand, a translator has to cope with the transfer of avalanches of new information and new concepts across languages and cultures. On the other hand, a translator is often required to complete a translation task within a short period of time, during which a tiny error may cause grave consequences. Therefore, translation teaching or translator training is particularly important in the modern era when translation plays an increasingly important role. In the last decades, corpora have been increasingly used in establishing corpus-based mode of translation teaching.

Translator training can benefit a great deal from what corpora and corpus linguistics have to offer to it. Or as Bernardini et al. (2003) put it “the final goal is to make students better language professionals in an environment where computational facilities for processing texts have become the rule rather than the exception.”

Finally, it is important to note that, in order to implement this novel corpus-based mode of translation teaching, as Hu (2016) rightfully remarks, the existing textbooks, pedagogy, and syllabus for the translation courses have to undergo an adequate revision, in view of enacting a shift of the students’ role from a passive one to an active one. Moreover, one should not lose sight of the fact that since the compilation and use of corpora involve the use of software tools and statistical analysis, translation teachers should also be equipped with adequate ICT skills as well. It is therefore evident that the application of corpora in translation training promises to make translation teaching not only more objective and efficient but also much more independent and autonomous, thus, leading to the creation of well-versed future translators capable of facing the translation challenges of the modern era head-on.

## References:

- Baker, M. (1993). Corpus linguistics and translation studies – Implications and applications. In M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds), *Text and technology, in honour of John Sinclair*, (pp. 233-252), Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Beeby, A., Rodríguez-Inés, P., & Sánchez-Gijón, P. (2009). Corpus use and translating: Corpus use for learning to translate and learning corpus use to translate. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bernardini, S., Stewart, D. & Zanettin, F. (2003). Corpora in translator education: An introduction. In F. Zanettin, S. Bernardini, & D. Stewart (Eds.), *Corpora in translator education* (pp. 1-14). Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Cosme, C. (2006). Clause combining across languages: A corpus-based study of English-French translation shifts. *Languages in Contrast* 6(1):71-108, DOI: 10.1075/lic.6.1.04cos.
- Hu, K. (2016). *Introducing corpus-based translation studies*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press, Shanghai and Springer-Verlag.
- Kennedy, G. (1998). *An introduction to corpus linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Kruger, A., Wallmach, K. & Munday, J. (2011). *Corpus-based translation studies research and applications*. London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Laviosa, S. (2011). Corpus-based translation studies: Where does it come from? Where is it going? In A. Kruger, K. Wallmach & J. Munday (Eds.), *Corpus-based translation studies: research and application*. London and New York: Continuum Advances in Translation Studies.
- Lüdeling, A., & Kytö, M. (2008). *Corpus linguistics*, Volume 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.

- Monzó, E. (2003). Corpus-based teaching: The use of original and translated texts in the training of legal translators. *Translation Journal* 7, 1-3.
- Niladri, S., D., & Arulmozi, S. (2018). *History, features, and typology of language corpora*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
- Pearson, J. (2003). Using parallel texts in the translator training environment. In F. Zanettin, S. Bernardini, & D. Stewart (Eds.), *Corpora in translator education*, (pp. 15-24). Manchester: St Jerome.
- Zanettin, F. (1998). Bilingual comparable corpora and the training of translators. *Meta* 4, 616-630.

# STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES IN THE TRANSLATION OF MOVIE TITLES (AN ENGLISH-RUSSIAN COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY)

Radostina Iglíkova<sup>3</sup>, Olga Usataya<sup>4</sup>

**Abstract:** *The purpose of the present article is to popularize the findings and observations acquired from a corpus-based comparative case study of 200 English-language titles and their officially promoted Russian-language versions. The study observes and analyzes on a comparative basis the strategies and techniques employed in the translation of movie titles in the specific context of English-Russian translation. As a result of the nature of the study and its predominantly qualitative character, the results and observations are not intended to be representative or conclusive, but rather to provide a glance into the process of translation within a specific context, through the prism of a systematic classification of strategies and techniques. Due to volume limitations, the proposed article includes detailed analysis of only 10 titles excerpted from the entire corpus. These examples have been selected by the authors as representative to a large degree of the case study findings.*

**Key words:** *translation strategies, translation techniques, movie titles, English-Russian translation*

## 1. Introduction

The title of any piece of textual or audio-visual material has the crucial effect of establishing the initial contact between the audience and the product. Whether the material is in printed or electronic/ digital form, whether it is a work of fiction or non-fiction, whether the heading is called a “title” (in the case of books and films, songs etc.) or a “headline” (as in the case of newspapers and website articles) – the importance of the first impression it creates is widely recognized by researchers (Iglíkova, 2016; Iglíkova, 2017a; Iglíkova, 2017b; Iglíkova, 2018; McGovern, 2002; Nielsen, 1998; Orendorff, 2014; Redish, 2012).

The title plays a significant role in the understanding of a film and the message it carries, which makes it serve as a key for decoding the presented information. In the context of globalization (see Giulianotti & Robertson, 2006; Iglíkova,

---

3. Assistant Prof. PhD at Shumen University, Department of English Studies, Shumen, Bulgaria, e-mail: r.iglikova@shu.bg

4. BA student at Shumen University, Department of English Studies, Shumen, Bulgaria, e-mail: olealiolik@mail.ru

2013; Robertson & White, 2007) and the hegemony of English-language movies the appropriate and successful translation of a movie's title is a must, as it affects a variety of aspects of film production, marketing and consumption. The badly or inappropriately translated title can affect the success of the movie and the size of the audience it reaches. The importance of the translator's work in rendering the title from the Source Language (SL) to the Target Language (TL) and the various difficulties this entails motivates the choice of the subject of the present study.

Film title translations are an interesting subject and have thus become a popular topic of discussion. As Counts (2005) claims:

As cinema evolved, so did the titles. After the implementation of sound, titles began to function as a transition. The translator must be able to write; he must be an original writer, sometimes it is not possible to translate the title verbatim – only the original title gives a clue how it should be translated, but the translator reveals the thoughts and ideas of the work by searching for equivalents in his native language.

Furthermore, the American graphic designer and Academy Award-winning filmmaker Saul Bass (Haskins, 1996, p. 12-13), best known for his design of motion-picture title sequences, film posters, and corporate logos claims:

My initial thoughts about what a title can do was to set mood and the prime underlying core of the film's story, to express the story in some metaphorical way. I saw the title as a way of conditioning the audience, so that when the film actually began, viewers would already have an emotional resonance with it.

Thus, creating a title is similar to making a poster – you concentrate the event in one phrase, produce one metaphor, a story to be told, or a character to be entered. Titles are often more innovative than the film itself and they can give the viewer considerable emotional satisfaction. The titles have a unique tone setting function, providing a mood and foreshadowing the action itself.

## **2. Theoretical background of the case study**

### **2.1. Research on the roles and functions of titles**

Regarding research into title translation, Nord (1995, p. 261-284) distinguishes six functions of titles that are to be taken into consideration in the process of translation. They can be grouped into two sets: essential and optional functions. The essential functions comprise the following types of function: distinctive (each title should be different from other titles which belong to the same corpus and culture), metatextual (each title should obey the genre conventions of the

culture it pertains to), and phatic (each title must engage its culture-specific audience and, if required, should be remembered for some time). Among the optional functions we find the additional ones: referential (the information which is conveyed by means of the title must be easily understood by the addressees by resorting to their culture-specific world-knowledge), expressive (if there are any emotions or evaluations involved in the original title, they should be carried over to the target text), and appellative (any appellative intention must take into consideration the audience's susceptibility and expectations). Newmark (1988a, p. 57) also sheds some light on the functions and classification of titles, although this scholar pays considerable attention to the titles of literary works. According to Newmark, titles can be either descriptive (if they express the topic of the text) or allusive (if they relate referentially or figuratively to the topic of the text).

## **2.2. Research on translation as a process.**

### **Translation strategies and techniques**

Translation involves the retextualization or recodification from a source text to a target text (Fernandez, Sacristan & Olivera, 2005, p. 61-81). As Baicchi (2003, p. 319-341) observes, "the translator shapes his own representation of the meaning of the text". Since translation takes into account the specific communicative circumstances of both texts, Reiss, Vermeer, Nord and Dudenhofer (2014) focus on the purpose of translation, which guides the translation techniques and methods that are to be used in order to render a functionally adequate product. Moreover, any text will be regarded as a translation if it is accepted as such within a given cultural system (or polysystem) at a given point in time leaving aside its quality and faithfulness to the original (Toury, 1995, p. 70-73).

Newmark's (1988b) discussion of the difference between translation methods and translation procedures equates the first with global translation strategies and the second with local translation strategies (i.e., "techniques", according to Jaaskelainen, 1993, p. 116). He writes that, "(w)hile translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language" (1988b, p. 81).

According to Newmark, "only semantic and communicative translation fulfill the two main aims of translation, which are first, accuracy, and second, economy. [...] In general, a semantic translation is written at the author's linguistic level, a communicative at the readership's. Semantic translation is used for 'expressive' texts, communicative for 'informative' and 'vocative' texts" (Newmark, 1988a, p. 47; Peneva, 2018). In addition, according to Newmark there exists a continuum between "semantic" and "communicative" translation – any translation can be "more, or less semantic – more, or less, communicative – even a particular section or sentence can be treated more communicatively or less semantically" (1991, p. 10-12).

Jaaskelainen (1993, p. 116) shows the difference between two strategies: global strategies (i.e., “the translator’s general principles and preferred modes of action”) and local strategies (i.e., “specific activities in relation to the translator’s problem-solving and decision-making”). From his point of view, global strategies include literal and free translation, as the translator should think about the goal of the translation and the effect of the target text on readers. The chosen global strategy will influence the translation process. Since local strategies are classified by comparison with the source text, and they exist together with specific techniques which affect the translation result and the micro-units of the text (Molina & Albir, 2002, p. 509), local strategies are in fact translation techniques.

Among local translation strategies, Chesterman (1997, p. 87-116) distinguishes between comprehension strategies (for understanding and analyzing the source text) and production strategies (for the production of the target text). From a linguistic perspective, he divides production strategies into mainly syntactic/grammatical, mainly semantic and mainly pragmatic strategies, with each category containing ten techniques. Syntactic strategies involve purely syntactic changes, manipulate form, and include such techniques as calque, transposition, and sentence structure change. Semantic strategies mainly pertain to changes concerning lexical semantics. They manipulate meaning and contain techniques such as synonymy, emphasis change, and paraphrase. Pragmatic strategies have to do with the selection of information in the target text, and often involve syntactic and/or semantic changes as well. Pragmatic strategies include cultural filtering, explicitness change, information change, etc. Some of these techniques are obligatory during translation in a given language pair, while most are optional.

For the purposes of the present study, the term translation strategy will be taken to refer to one of the two methods of translation or global strategies (see Jaaskelainen, 1993, p. 116; Newmark, 1988a) – i.e. the overall intention of the translator to either stay as close to the original as possible in every sense of the word, or, on the contrary, to attempt to make the translation as close to the TL and its specificities and requirements as possible. Thus, the existing continuum between SL-oriented semantic and TL-oriented communicative translation strategies will be explored. On the other hand, the so-called local strategies (see Chesterman, 1997, p. 87-116) will be referred to as translation techniques, subsuming the actual transformations and procedures utilized by the translator in the process of translation.

### **3. Case study**

Due to objective limitations concerning the volume of the present article, it offers a detailed analysis of 10 of the 200 titles comprising the corpus. For the

purposes of the present study, the titles analyzed in detail here will be classified in terms of the global strategy of translation they most closely follow and will thus be grouped in two separate groups – SL-oriented and TL-oriented.

### 3.1. SL-oriented – semantic translation

#### Example 1: The Great Wall – Великая стена (2016)

**Strategy:** SL-oriented (semantic translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation – phrase structure change

This title refers to one of the most famous and largest monuments of architecture – the Great Wall of China. It has an established Russian equivalent – “Великая Китайская стена” – which allows the translator to remain very close to the original. The original title employs a reduced version of the name, omitting “of China” and so does the translation by omitting “Китайская”. The only necessary and inevitable transformation involves a syntactic change in the phrase due to the discrepancy in expressing definiteness between Russian and English. Therefore, the definite article “the” and the grammatical definiteness it entails are omitted in the Russian variant.

#### Example 2: City of Ghosts — Город призраков (2002)

**Strategy:** SL-oriented (semantic translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation – calquing; phrase structure change

The title contains an allusion to the set phrase “ghost town”, defined as “an abandoned village, town, or city, usually one that contains substantial visible remains” (“Ghost town”, n.d.). This is a well-established notion among the English-speaking world and the United States in particular – illustrated by the existence of a number of literary works and movies carrying that title (“Ghost town (disambiguation)”, n.d.). The title itself employs a paraphrased version of the set phrase, substituting “town” for “city” and employing syntactic change by expressing the attributive function of “ghost” in relation to city/ town not by means of a word order (as in the original set phrase) but by using the preposition “of”. In the Russian translated version this distinction between “town” and “city” is not felt – “город” is the lexeme denoting urban rather than rural settlement, which does not have specific size connotations like the English *town* versus *city* does. Thus, the Russian variant is closer to the English set phrase “ghost town” and preserves the semantic connotations of the expression, thereby employing the technique of calquing. It does, however, employ the inevitable syntactic transformations as required by the TL grammatical requirements. For this purpose the attributive function is expressed not by means of a word order or preposition (as is the case in English) but instead by means of the use of the

plural Genitive case form of the lexeme “призрак” (“ghost”) – „призраков” (“of the ghosts”/ “ghosts”).

**Example 3: Chocolat – Шоколад (2000)**

**Strategy:** SL-oriented (semantic translation)

**Techniques:** semantic transformation

Although it is an English-language production, the title of this movie is in fact a French word, as is demonstrated by its spelling – although they are extremely similar, the English lexeme is spelled “chocolate” instead of “chocolat”. The different spelling, however, has specific connotations and a specific pronunciation – thus adding to the special, romantic and exotic nature of the notion. The Russian variant, however, does not have a mechanism for graphically acknowledging the French overtones in the title and reduces it semantically to the neutral Russian lexeme “шоколад”. It could be argued, however, that the term “шоколад” itself has these connotations in Russian which imbue it with similar overtones of something special, romantic and perhaps forbidden, meaning that the Russian title is in fact quite faithful to the original.

**Example 4: Kingdom of Heaven — Царство небесное (2005)**

**Strategy:** SL-oriented (semantic translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation – phrase structure change; lexico semantic adaptation; pragmatic transformation – information change;

The original title is a paraphrased version of the “Heavenly Kingdom”. “Officially, The Heavenly Kingdom of Great Peace was an oppositional state in China from 1851 to 1864, supporting the overthrow of the Qing dynasty by Hong Xiuquan and his followers” (“Taiping Heavenly Kingdom”, n.d.). The semantic and functional equivalent of The Heavenly Kingdom of Great Peace in Russian is “Тайпинское Небесное Царство” (“Taipinskoe Nebesnoe Tsarstvo”, n.d.). In the Russian version of the title, however, is employed an inverted and reduced version – “Царство Небесное” (Tsarstvie Bozhie’/ “Царствие Божие”, n.d.), which has Biblical connotations („область на небесах, где души праведников пребывают в раю”/ “a specific area in the heavens where the souls of virtuous people abide in heaven”. The “Kingdom of God” and its equivalent form “Kingdom of Heaven” in the Gospel of Matthew is one of the key elements of the teachings of Jesus in the New Testament (“Kingship and kingdom of God”, n.d.). This way the translated version substitutes one set of culturally and historically specific connotations for another and redirects allusions made by the original title from Chinese to Biblical (the Old and/or the New Testament) objects. In this sense it might be argued that the translated variant is not a case of literal translation, since although the lexical items are extremely similar in their form, the connotations and meanings they involve are quite different and

remote from one another. This makes it plausible for the title to be treated as a case of adaptation.

**Example 5: Twilight – Сумерки (2008)**

**Strategy:** SL-oriented (semantic translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation

Since the title consists of a single noun which has a direct correspondence in Russian, the translator has decided to apply literal translation by rendering the lexeme “twilight” via “сумерки”. The only difference between the original and the Russian version is due to the grammatical specificities of the Russian language where the lexeme „сумерки” is a Pluralia tantum noun and therefore has no Singular form corresponding to the Singular English “twilight”.

**3.2. TL-oriented - communicative translation.**

**Example 6: Seven Sisters – Тайна 7 сестер (2017)**

**Strategy:** TL-oriented (communicative translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation – phrase structure change, lexical addition; pragmatic transformation – information change;

The original title quite obscurely uses enumeration (“Seven Sisters”), thus providing potential viewers with nothing but thematic information. Any rhematic information concerning the theme is left implicit in the original and is expected to be revealed by watching the movie – the seven sisters being the characters and the plot of the movie supplying the events taking place. The Russian variant employs lexical addition – “тайна” („secret”) and this leads to additional syntactic transformations related to the TL grammatical requirements, such as the use of the Genitive case to express attributive relations between “seven sisters” and “secret”. This way the title becomes “The secret [of the] Seven Sisters” or “[The] Seven Sisters’ Secret”, which constitutes the pragmatic transformation of information change – adding information which was not present in the original.

**Example 7: Spider-Man – 3 – Человек-паук-3: Враг в отражении (2007)**

**Strategy:** TL-oriented (communicative translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation – calque, sentence structure change – clause addition, cohesion change; semantic transformation – emphasis change; pragmatic transformation – information change;

The original title of this film is quite short and contains the numeral “3” spelled via a digit, which identifies the movie clearly as part of a series of movies, thus signaling and emphasizing relations of intertextuality. The noun phrase “spider-

man” is a well-established one, referring to a specific cartoon character who is recognizable around the globe. This requires the translator to use loan translation by employing the calque “человек-паук”. This, however, is the only part of the title where the TL variant is close to the original. The rest of the Russian variant places emphasis on the added description of the movie itself rather than on its being part of a series. The added clause is not present in the original title and is a case of information change – the entire part “враг в отражении” (“[the] enemy in the reflection”) represents information which is not part of the original title at all. It is, perhaps, added based on a combination of two elements. On the one hand, the addition can be the result of a quite literal description of the movie poster images, where the main character is represented as looking at his own reflection - in this case, the Russian variant is constructed via putting into words the visual information in the poster. On the other hand, the plot line can serve as inspiration for this addition, since in this movie Spider-man faces himself as his own enemy (or, as the movie’s slogan states, “the greatest battle lies within”).

**Example 8: Babe – Бэйб: Четвероногий малыш (1995)**

**Strategy:** TL-oriented (communicative translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation – transcription, sentence structure change; pragmatic transformation – information change;

The original title contains a single lexeme referring to the name of the main character, “Babe”, which is transcribed as „Бэйб”. In addition to this part, which is identical with the original title, the Russian variant employs syntactic transformation as a result of which the syntactic structure of the title is changed. The Russian variant thus contains a second part, „четвероногий малыш”(literally, “[the] four-legged baby”) which serves as an attribute to the first part, as the loan word „Бэйб” in Russian lacks the direct connotations of „baby” or “small one” which it has in English. By means of adding the second clause, the Russian version compensates for this discrepancy between the SL and TL and includes the information that the main character, Babe, is a four-legged baby (i.e. a young/small animal). Since the original title does not state explicitly that Babe is an animal, the addition constitutes a pragmatic transformation – information change.

**Example 9: Bad Moms - Очень плохие мамочки (2016)**

**Strategy:** TL-oriented (communicative translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation – unit shift; phrase structure change; pragmatic transformation – information change;

The original title of the movie contains a noun phrase which is neutral – “bad moms”, whereas the TL variant employs unit shift to give additional emphasis to both of the original elements. This way “bad” becomes „очень плохие”

(“very bad”) and “moms” becomes the diminutive „мамочки” (“mommies” or “mamas”), which constitutes a change in the phrase structure. These marked TL variants are in fact a case of information change, as they express meanings which are not present in the SL title, such as the gradation expressed by adding „очень” or “very” and the diminutive aspect of the lexeme „мамочки” that is not present in the neutral English “moms”.

#### **Example 10: Road to Perdition — Проклятый путь (2002)**

**Strategy:** TL-oriented (communicative translation)

**Techniques:** syntactic transformation – transposition, phrase structure change; semantic transformation – emphasis change; pragmatic transformation – explicitness change;

The SL version contains a play on words based on the dual meaning of the noun “perdition” in the context of the movie. “Perdition”, on the one hand, is a common noun synonymous with damnation and on the other – a toponym, referring to a fictional town on the shore of Lake Michigan (“Road to Perdition”, n.d.) where part of the action in the movie takes place. This way the title in English can be rendered in two ways: a road/pathway to being lost; the actual road to the place called Perdition. In Russian this ambiguity cannot be retained due to the lack of an equivalent lexeme expressing both notions, so the translator faces the choice between retaining either one or the other. In this case, the Russian variant employs syntactic changes due to which the notion of a “road to somewhere (a place/state)” is substituted for a “specific kind/type of road” – thus the noun “perdition” (literally, „проклятие”) is transposed and shifted into an adjective – „проклятый” (literally, “damned”) which results in a phrase structure change. Transformation also occurs on the semantic level, where emphasis is shifted from the rhematic element “Perdition” to the noun “road” („путь”). As the translator chooses to retain one of the meanings of the noun “Perdition” and renders it as „проклятый [путь]”, a pragmatic transformation can be observed as one explicit meaning in the original is omitted. These transformations result in the version „Проклятый путь” or “Damned road”.

#### **4. Conclusion**

In the current reality of global communication, translation plays a key role in establishing the exchange of information between languages. For this purpose and in order to successfully convey meanings from one language to another, translators need particular skills, which are subsumed under what we refer to as translation strategies and techniques.

In this study, translation in general, translational problems and mainly translation strategies and techniques were described, and different theories of

translation strategies, methods, techniques and procedures were mentioned. It was shown that different theorists suggest various definitions according to their different perspectives. However, the definition offered by each author or theorist represents his/her own point of view and their views differ from each other. Most theorists agree that strategies and techniques are used by translators when they encounter a problem and literal translation does not work.

The results from the study show the following preferences:

- In terms of Global Translation Strategies, there is a clear preference for employing SL-oriented strategy and semantic translation – out of the 200 randomly selected titles comprised in the corpus, 118 are translated by applying SL-oriented strategy and 82 - TL-oriented strategy;
- In terms of Local Translation Strategies, i.e. translation techniques, there is a consistent preference for employing specific sets of techniques depending on the global strategy employed; in other words, SL-oriented translations employ one set of techniques and TL-oriented ones – another;
- SL-oriented, semantic translations are usually realized by means of the use of syntactic transformations such as literal translation, calquing, transcription or transliteration; in case of grammatical differences between the two languages, there are usually phrase structure changes – often the use of case forms in Russian instead of the use of prepositions or word order in English;
- TL-oriented, communicative translations involve a much more complex set of transformations, usually including techniques of all three levels – syntactic, semantic and pragmatic; most often syntactic transformations involve phrase- and clause-structure changes, semantic transformations involve predominantly paraphrase and more rarely synonymy, while pragmatic transformations most commonly involve information change and more rarely – explicitness change.

As the present study does not claim to be statistically representative in its findings, it intends to serve as an additional piece of the puzzle known as translation studies and research on the practice of translation. It can also be useful for student translators of English into Russian (and not only) who might find it useful and interesting to study and analyze in detail the strategies and techniques professional translators employ.

## References:

- Baicchi, A. (2003). Relational complexity of titles and texts: A semiotic taxonomy. In L. M. Barberesi (Ed.), *Complexity in language and text* (pp. 319-341). Pisa: Edizioni PLUS - Università di Pisa.

- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 145-204.
- Bell, A. (1994). *The language of news media*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Counts, J. (2005). Just the beginning: The art of film titles. Retrieved from <http://www.twenty4.co.uk/on-line/issue001/project01/proj01index.htm>.
- Fernandez, S. E., Sacristan, V. M., & Olivera, F. P.A. (2005). Translations we live by: the impact of metaphor translation on target systems. In Olivera, F. P. (Ed.), *Lengua y sociedad: Investigaciones recientes en lingüística aplicada* (pp. 61-81). Valladolid, Spain: Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Giulianotti, R., & Robertson, R. (2006). Glocalization, globalization and migration: the case of Scottish football supporters in North America. *International Sociology*, 21(2), 171-198.
- Haskins, P. (1996). Saul, can you make me a title? Interview with Saul Bass. *Film Quarterly*, 50(1), 12-13.
- Iglikova, R. (2013). Nyakoi problemi na sapostavitelnite izsledvaniya varhu effektivnostta na tekstove ot elektronniya diskurs/ Игликова, Р. Някои проблеми на съпоставителните изследвания върху ефективността на текстове от електронния дискурс. In S. Nedelcheva & D. Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva (Eds.), *Dynamics, interdisciplinarity, diversity* (pp. 70-74). Shumen: Konstantin Preslavsky University Press.
- Iglikova, R. (2016). What's your number? – numeral preference in viral headlines from 3 websites. *Lyuboslovie*, 16, 203-211.
- Iglikova, R. (2017a). Efficiency and headline patterns on the Cosmopolitan United States website. *KNOWLEDGE – International Journal*, 19,3, 1295-1300.
- Iglikova, R. (2017b). Headline patterns in viral web content – English-Bulgarian comparative case study. In Todorova et al. (Eds.), *Series in Linguistics, Culture and FLT*, 2, 71-84.
- Iglikova, R. (2018). Efficiency and headline patterns on the Cosmopolitan Bulgaria website. *KNOWLEDGE – International Journal*, 23,5, 1473-1478.
- Jaaskelainen, R. (1993). Investigating translation strategies. In S. Tirkkonen-Condit & J. Laffling (Eds.), *Recent trends in empirical translation research* (pp. 99-120). Joensuu: University of Joensuu Publications in Humanities.
- Jaaskelainen, R. (1999). *Tapping the process: An explorative study of cognitive and effective factors involved in translating*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu Publications in Humanities.
- McGovern, G., Norton, R., & O'Dowd, C. (2002). *The web content style guide. An essential reference for online writers, editors and managers*. London: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Molina, L., & Albir, H. A. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: a dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta*, 47(4), 498-512.
- Newmark, P. (1988a). *A textbook of translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1988b). *Approaches to translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation: Multilingual matters*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Nielsen, J. (1998). Microcontent: how to write headlines, page titles, and subject lines. Retrieved from <http://www.nngroup.com/articles/microcontent-how-to-write-headlines-page-titles-and-subject-lines/>
- Nord, C. (1995). Text-functions in translation: titles and headings as a case in point. *Target*, 7(2), 261–284.
- Orendorff, A. (2014). The ultimate copy checklist: 51 questions to optimize every element of your online copy. Retrieved from <http://www.copyblogger.com/optimize-online-copy/>
- Peneva, D. (2018). A methodological approach in the comparative analysis of speech act patterns. *Lyuboslovie*, 18, 252-266.
- Redish, J. (2012). *Letting go of the words*. USA: Elsevier.
- Reiss, K., Vermeer, H. J., Nord, C., & Dudenhofer, M. (2014). *Towards a general theory of translational action: Skopos theory explained*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Robertson, R., & White, K. E. (2007). What is globalization? In *The Blackwell companion to globalization* (pp. 62-63). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Таипинское Небесное Царство. Тайпинское Небесное Царство. (2018, октябрь 7). Википедия, свободная энциклопедия. Retrieved 11:19, августа 10, 2019 from <https://ru.wikipedia.org/?oldid=95486647>.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tsarstvie Bozhie. Царствие Божие. (2019, июль 5). Википедия, свободная энциклопедия. Retrieved 11:20, августа 10, 2019 from <https://ru.wikipedia.org/?oldid=100837182>.
- Wikipedia contributors. (2019, August 10). Taiping Heavenly Kingdom. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:18, August 10, 2019, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Taiping\\_Heavenly\\_Kingdom&oldid=910150825](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Taiping_Heavenly_Kingdom&oldid=910150825)
- Wikipedia contributors. (2019, July 27). Road to Perdition. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:21, August 10, 2019, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Road\\_to\\_Perdition&oldid=908050619](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Road_to_Perdition&oldid=908050619)
- Wikipedia contributors. (2019, July 31). Ghost town. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:16, August 10, 2019, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ghost\\_town&oldid=908772503](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ghost_town&oldid=908772503)
- Wikipedia contributors. (2019, July 4). Kingship and kingdom of God. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:20, August 10, 2019, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kingship\\_and\\_kingdom\\_of\\_God&oldid=904760397](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kingship_and_kingdom_of_God&oldid=904760397)
- Wikipedia contributors. (2019, June 25). Ghost town (disambiguation). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved 11:18, August 10, 2019, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ghost\\_town\\_\(disambiguation\)&oldid=903419569](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ghost_town_(disambiguation)&oldid=903419569)