Anglistics in Lithuania

Anglistics in Lithuania: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Aspects of Study

Edited by

Inesa Šeškauskienė and Jonė Grigaliūnienė

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

PUBLISHING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Three: Language Pedagogy: Lithuanian Learner of English

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Introduction: Anglistics in Lithuania

Inesa Šeškauskienė and Jonė Grigaliūnienė

The term 'Anglistics' has been used in the title of this book rather than 'English Studies', and, although the two terms can be used synonymously, the former also has certain specific meaning implications. The term 'English Studies', as noted by Engler (2000: 2–3),

> is surprisingly difficult to define and it means different things in different places. In some countries, especially English-speaking ones, 'English' refers exclusively to the study of literature(s), not only English, but also American, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, Australian, New Zealand, Black British, and (as the euphemism goes) emerging ones. This may increasingly be complemented by aspects of cultural studies. Elsewhere, literature and linguistics are both integral parts of 'English' and, as this tends to be the case where English is a foreign language, applied linguistics and language learning will, to different degrees, belong to it as well.

The term 'Anglistics' is mainly used outside English speaking countries and inevitably implies the perspective of the study of English as a foreign language.

Anglistics does not have a long history in Lithuania. As an independent academic discipline it was introduced as late as 1923 in Kaunas University, as a section within a larger unit—that of Germanic languages and literatures at the Faculty of Humanities (for more on the history of English studies in Lithuania see Grigaliūnienė 2008a, 2008b). In the first phase of its existence as an academic discipline, English Studies was characterized mainly by a literary paradigm. In 1923, the Council of the Faculty of Humanities made a decision to establish the Department of Philology where English literature, the history of English literature, the history of England and the history of the English language, as well as Lithuanian literature, were taught. In 1939, the Faculty of Humanities was moved from Kaunas to Vilnius. In 1940, after the Soviet Union annexed

Lithuania, the university also began to undergo reforms according to the Soviet university model. English Studies, as well as other disciplines, underwent major changes and transformations. The university was turned into a standard Soviet school of higher learning, with a curriculum mainly determined by the guidelines laid down by Moscow, so the staff had very little freedom in choosing which courses to teach. The pre-war literary tradition of English studies in Kaunas was superseded by a more linguistic approach, which had better chances of surviving than did literary scholarship (cf. Haas 2000: 361). The research fields and the first publications were closely connected with the demands of teaching English in Lithuania. Dictionaries were one of the main publications in post-war Lithuania (Baravykas 1958; Laučka et al. 1975; Piesarskas 1998). Apart from dictionaries, a number of significant contrastive studies were carried out in the field of English Studies: works on the English and Lithuanian phonological systems (Aprijaskytė-Valdšteinienė 1977, 1979; Svecevičius 1967), problems of translation from Lithuanian into English and from English into Lithuanian (Armalytė and Pažūsis 1990), the phonetic and morphological integration of English loan-words in North American Lithuanian (Pažūsis 1972), the history of the English vocalic system (Steponavičius 1987), contrastive syntax (Valeika 1974), semantics (Tekorienė 1990) and typological studies (Geniušienė 1987).

Since 1991, a number of new research paradigms have emerged and increased the scope of Anglistics. Due to relentless efforts by Laima Erika Katkuvienė, the issues of writing theory, research and pedagogy have started to receive long-deserved scholarly attention (Katkuvienė 2003). Learner of English as a foreign language corpora, both of written language and speech, were compiled as part of bigger international projects (ICLE, LINDSEI) and this has brought a wide empirical base to the field of EFL learner research. New links have also been forged across disciplines due to growing interest in perspectives of a more general dimension (e.g. gender studies, cultural studies). There is also a noticeable proliferation of research interests, a development reflected in the articles of this volume.

Throughout its history in Lithuania, English studies, or Anglistics, experienced different contexts, including a long and painful Soviet period. Probably for ideological reasons, linguistics was much more favoured than literature in English studies. Moreover, in one way or another, English studies involved language learning and teaching, thus entailing more focus on language than literature. A large number of researchers therefore matured in the field of linguistics or language pedagogy.

The present publication demonstrates the prevailing trends of research carried out by Lithuanian anglicists. Chapter 1 focuses on contrastive

linguistic research, which tackles different aspects of English and Lithuanian or Lithuanian with reference to English. Chapter 2 deals with learner language and mainly discusses aspects of the English language (L1 and L2) of university students. Chapter 3 offers several papers on language pedagogy. Each paper is briefly introduced further.

Chapter 1 *Cross-linguistic Research: English versus Lithuanian* includes six papers. Most of them focus on semantics or are, in one way or another, related to the study of meaning; however, the papers represent different approaches.

Ligija Kaminskienė and Dalia Mankauskienė's paper *Parallel Texts as Culture-Embedded Units of Thought* offers research into cultural aspects of parallel (English and Lithuanian) texts, which have been of particular interest in translation studies. The authors have chosen authentic English and Lithuanian public warnings and prohibitions for their investigation, such as *No trespassing*, *No pets allowed.* These texts perform a conative function and call either for taking an action or refraining from it.

However, more often than not, they differ in their linguistic expression. The grammatical form of such texts may differ significantly due to the language type: English is an analytical language and Lithuanian is a synthetic language. Imperative and no+ *-ing* forms prevail in English, whereas Lithuanian prefers such lexicalized forms as *draudžiama, atsargiai* ('it is prohibited', 'not allowed'). Cultural and social experience also determines preferences of expression. The English approach, manifested in the texts, signals direct communication with the addressee, implying personal responsibility. The Lithuanian approach refers to an abstract authority (presumably the law); no personal responsibility is implied.

The cross-cultural aspect of research also features in **Jūratė Ruzaitė's** paper *What is a Culinary Crime? A Study of Online Bread Promotion in Lithuania and the UK*. It focuses on the language of advertising and promotion in English and Lithuanian. The research is based on bread descriptions available on the official websites of four major bread producers in the UK and Lithuania. The author explores linguistic and semiotic choices of bread promotion in the two cultures. The research methodology relies on the principles of corpus linguistics and multimodal discourse analysis. The lexical choices in the website texts are evaluated by referring to the frequency and usage of these words in two reference corpora: the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL).

The paper also demonstrates that bread discourse disseminates and emphasizes certain values and ideologies. Interestingly, the Lithuanian cultural myth of bread emphasizes tradition, inheritance and continuity more extensively than the British one. The title of the paper refers to one Lithuanian website which claims that not to taste bread when in Lithuania is a "culinary crime", thus demonstrating the strongly mystified and mythologized status of this product in the country. British bread promotion seems to reflect more the global trends related to ecology and environment-oriented issues and, unlike Lithuanian bakeries, does not rely so much on the appreciative aspect.

Two papers in the present book deal with metaphors in English and Lithuanian, which, following the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, help account for human reasoning and understanding. **Jurga Cibulskienė's** paper *What is Economic Recession: A (Pot)hole or a Burden? A Cross-Cultural Study of the Conceptualization of Economic Recession via the JOURNEY Metaphor* investigates cross-cultural differences in the conceptualization of economic recession in the discourse of conservative parties of both cultures via the conceptual element of OBSTACLE within the JOURNEY metaphor scenario. The research employs a three-step procedure originally suggested by Charteris-Black (2005): first, linguistic metaphors are identified in the discourse; next, they are interpreted in relation to their underlying conceptual metaphors; and finally, they are explained—or, in other words, they are analyzed from a rhetorical perspective (*Identified→ Interpreted→ Explained*). The paper focuses mainly on the third stage *Explained* which relates to the ideological motivation of language use.

The research suggests a similar conceptualization of the JOURNEY metaphor in both cultures, with *obstacle* featuring to a very large extent. Interestingly, in Lithuanian the element of *(pot)hole* is employed much more explicitly, whereas in English it is more frequently referred to via the conceptual element of container.

Inesa Šeškauskienė in her paper *Metaphoricity of Academic Metadiscourse: What can be Raised in English and Lithuanian?* explores metadiscourse from the point of view of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). She argues for metadiscourse as a text type shared by all discipline-specific academic discourses and probably demonstrating its own specific metaphors. In this context, the investigation of the selected cross-linguistic metalinguistic patterns *raise + N/N+ (a)rise* in English and *kelti/kilti +N* in Lithuanian seems to be plausible. In the data collected from the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian (CoraLit) and the academic section of the BNC*,* an attempt is made to identify the most frequent nouns

employed in the above patterns and to account for them in the framework of the CMT.

The results reveal the prevalence of mental activity and emotion-related nouns employed in both languages with some language-specific variation. The patterns under study are interpretable within the metaphors MORE IMPORTANT IS UP and CAUSATION IS UPWARD MOTION. They both manifest language-specific features of realization, for example, in English thoughts are never raised, but ideas are; in Lithuanian both can be raised; Lithuanian employs more (negative) emotional vocabulary in the realization of the second metaphor. CONTROL IS UP is a minor metaphor underlying some specific expressions in Lithuanian.

Violeta Kalėdaitė and Renata Jokubaitytė in their paper *Cleft Sentences in English and their Equivalents in Lithuanian* discuss specific types of English sentences, *it*-clefts and *wh*-clefts, such as *It is his callousness that I shall ignore* and *What I shall ignore is his callousness.* The authors attempt to identify their differences in terms of syntactic structure and the distribution of information. On the basis of corpus data and considering different patterns of information sequencing, the authors also discuss possible translation variants of such sentences into Lithuanian. The two types of sentences tend to follow different strategies of translation. It-clefts are rendered in two ways. The first pattern follows the "subjective", or emotive, word order, i.e. from new to old information, and attaching a lexical intensifier to the focused element. The second pattern places the focused element at the end of the clause. Wh-clefts are rendered with the focused element placed at the end of the clause, which is a neutral word-order pattern in Lithuanian.

Solveiga Armoskaite's paper *Featuring Conversion* is a typological study of the role of the category of gender in conversion. The research has been carried out in the framework of a feature driven syntax approach and on the basis of data from Lithuanian, German, Greek and some other languages. The author's major focus is on Lithuanian, which demonstrates an unexpected shift in gender in such cases as *kurpė—kurpius* ('shoe'—shoemaker'). The author argues that conversion is driven by an abstract feature, such as gender. However, it need not be the only abstract feature. The author claims that features like animacy and number can also play a role.

Chapter 2 *Learner Language: Lithuanian Learner's English* offers four papers on the written and spoken language of Lithuanian learners of English. Such research continues the tradition of university English teachers in Lithuania studying their students' language. Nowadays,

however, with the advent of corpora, this type of research has definitely gained a new perspective in terms of scope and reliability.

Nida Burneikaitė's paper *Writer Positioning in Linguistics MA Theses in English L1 and L2* deals with writer positioning in MA theses in English L1 and L2 through the usage of *I* and *We*. They are considered to be among the most powerful linguistic means of creating authorial presence.

The author focuses on studying *I*-references and *We*-references in linguistics MA research papers in terms of their discourse functions and rhetorical effects. Four functional types of I-references have been identified: methodological, metalinguistic, autobiographical and stance. Their distribution in the two types of English shows some variability, but overall they seem to be largely universal.

Linguistics MA theses contain three functional types of *We*-references: metalinguistic, methodological and stance references which are realized by the exclusive *We*; and representative and metalinguistic references which are realized by the inclusive *We*. In the paper, each type is described in more detail.

When comparing L1 and L2 texts, a major tendency has been identified: personal references, particularly *I*-references, are underused in L2 texts. This is explained by a difference between the cultural background of Lithuanian students and the Anglo-American writing tradition.

Rita Juknevičienė's paper *Recurrent Word Sequences in Written Learner English* explores lexical bundles in the written language produced by Lithuanian learners of English as a foreign language at two different levels of proficiency: intermediate and advanced. Lexical bundles are understood as multi-word units that appear in the corpus as uninterrupted sequences, for example, *the nature of the, on the basis of.*

The research data has been drawn from two corpora of Lithuanian learners of English and the methodology involves a contrastive analysis of automatically retrieved sequences of 4–7 words which were analysed in terms of the clause segments that they span.

The findings suggest that students of lower proficiency level tend to use more identical word sequences. From the structural point of view, their language contains more recurrent sequences incorporating full sentence stems and predicates, ending in a lexical word or containing no evidence of the complementation pattern. The author discusses possible reasons for such tendencies.

The author also addresses the issue of the manual revision of automatically extracted clusters and argues for a more analytical approach

when dealing with the chunkiness of learner language, especially at a lower level of proficiency.

The paper by **Lina Bikelienė** *Sentence Initial Additive Linking Words in Lithuanian Learners' Language and British English* has been inspired by the persisting problem that English dictionaries and grammar books present linking words by giving circular definitions or even misleading information. The sentence initial usage of six additive linking words: *moreover*, *in addition*, *also*, *besides*, *furthermore* and *what is more* has been studied in two segments of the Lithuanian subcorpus of the International Corpus of Learner English (LICLE), the British Academic Written English Corpus (BAWE), the British segment of the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS) and the BNC. The results indicate some significant differences between learner and native language varieties and, can thus find practical application in language teaching.

The paper by **Jonė Grigaliūnienė** *The Status and Use of the Word RIGHT in Native Speaker and Learner Speech: A Case of Lithuanian Learners of English* deals with the spoken English of Lithuanian learner. The research data has been collected from two spoken corpora: the Louvain Corpus of Native English Conversation (LOCNEC) and the Lithuanian component of the Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI-LITH).

Focusing on a single word, *right,* which is arguably one of the most culture-specific words (Wierzbicka 2006: 61) in English, the author shows that the most frequent phrase in the native speaker corpus is *that's right*. Interestingly, it is not used in the Lithuanian corpus at all and is significantly underused in other learner subcorpora. The most frequent phrase in the Lithuanian learner of English corpus is *right now* which does not appear in the native speaker corpus. The author suggests that the reasons for such striking differences between native and non-native speakers relate to the cultural specificity of communication: native speakers tend to show involvement with the interlocutor, whereas non-native speakers are more concerned with the accuracy of expression.

Chapter 3 *Language Pedagogy: Lithuanian Learner of English* focuses on a seemingly "practical" field, language pedagogy. The results of such research are usually transferrable and applicable to class-room situations. The papers included in the book offer a modern perspective, which largely incorporates the multi-cultural and/or multi-modal aspect of study.

Roma Kriaučiūnienė's paper *English Language Teaching/Learning as a Multifunctional Phenomenon: Intercultural Aspects* focuses on the importance of developing intercultural competence in the process of

English language teaching and learning. The author argues that intercultural competence is acquired by learning to communicate in terms of another country's cultural values and practices. Thus, educationalists have to find ways in which the components of the English language teaching/learning process at contemporary universities could serve the development of students' intercultural communicative competence and their internalization of intercultural values so that they could communicate well in a multilingual and multicultural environment. The paper describes some aspects of the development of English language learners' intercultural communicative competence based on the analysis of the results of empirical research into the respondents' views on the English language teaching/learning process and the results of the educational project. The aim of the educational project was to reveal and experimentally verify the educational prerequisites of intercultural communicative competence development at universities.

The last contribution, **Giedrė Balčytytė-Kurtinienė's** paper *A Rhythm-Based Approach to Teaching English Pronunciation to VAK Learners*, introduces a rhythm-based approach to teaching English pronunciation to Lithuanian learners with VAK, or specific learning modalities: visual, auditory and kinaesthetic. The approach seems to have numerous advantages over traditional auditory instruction, as it highlights the priority of suprasegmentals over segmentals in conveying message and meaning and takes into consideration the students' personal differences.

The quantitative and qualitative methodology helps prove the efficiency of the above approach when teaching Lithuanian learners of English those specific features of English pronunciation where they experience greatest difficulties: rhythm, strong and weak forms and vowel reduction.

The present volume provides some account of the developments in the scholarship of English Studies in Lithuania. However, it is more a sketch than a comprehensive study of Anglistics in Lithuania as it focuses on linguistic research and does not cover the literary tradition, which is presently enjoying growth and popularity among our graduates.

References

Aprijaskytė-Valdšteinienė, Rachilė. 1977. *Teaching Aid in Pronunciation.* Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto biblioteka.

Aprijaskytė-Valdšteinienė, Rachilė, 1979. *Introductory-Remedial Phonetic Course.* Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Armalytė, Olimpija and Lionginas Pažūsis. 1990. *Vertimo teorijos pradmenys.* Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Baravykas, Vaclovas. 1958. *Anglų-lietuvių kalbų žodynas*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: the persuasive power of metaphor.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Engler, Balz. 2000. Writing the European history of English Studies. In Balz Engler and Renate Haas, eds. *European English Studies: contributions towards the history of a discipline.* Leicester: The English Association. 1–12.

Geniušienė. Ema. 1987. *The Typology of Reflexives.* Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Grigaliūnienė, Jonė, 2008a. English studies in Lithuania. In Renate Haas and Balz Engler, eds. *European English Studies: contributions towards the history of a discipline.* Leicester: The English Association University of Leicester. 2: 43–58.

Grigaliūnienė, Jonė. 2008b. Towards the history of English Studies in Lithuania. *Kalbotyra* 59 (3): 98–108.

Haas, Renate. 2000. European survey: parameters and patterns of development. In Balz Engler and Renate Haas, eds. *European English Studies: contributions towards the history of a discipline.* Leicester: The English Association. 349–371.

Katkuvienė, Laima Erika. 2003. *Writing Matters.* Vilnius: Vilnius University Press.

Laučka, Alfonsas, Bronislovas Piesarskas and Elena Stasiulevičiūtė. 1975. *Anglų-lietuvių kalbų žodynas*. Vilnius: Mintis.

Pažūsis, Lionginas. 1972. English loanwords in American Lithuanian: morphological integration vs morphological non-integration. *Kalbotyra* 24 (3): 43–45.

Piesarskas, Bronislovas. 1998. *Didysis anglų-lietuvių kalbų žodynas*. Vilnius: Alma littera.

Steponavičius, Albertas. 1987. *English Historical Phonology.* Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.

Svecevičius, Bronius. 1967. *Anglų kalbos fonetikos įvadas.* Vilnius: VVPI.

Tekorienė, Dalija. 1990. *Bevardės giminės būdvardžiai.* Vilnius: Mokslas.

Valeika, Laimutis. 1974. *Word Order in Lithuanian and English in Functional Sentence Perspective.* Vilnius: Vilnius University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2006. *English: meaning and culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CHAPTER ONE

CROSS-LINGUISTIC RESEARCH:
ENGLISH VERSUS LITHUANIAN

Parallel Texts as Culture-Embedded Units of Thought

Ligija Kaminskienė
and Dalia Mankauskienė

Abstract

Idiomatic parallel texts have been a topic of interest in translation studies since 1958, when J. P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet compared texts of public road signs in French and English. From comparative linguistics attention has shifted to culture studies, bringing forward cultural aspects of parallel texts. This paper is concerned with some authentic public directives in English and Lithuanian. The purpose of the analysis is to reveal linguistic and cultural differences in the units of thought, with emphasis on the tension between the linguistic form of the text and its public function. Besides, social aspects of the rise and fall of such texts in Lithuanian will be brought to the fore to reveal social changes taking place in public communication.

Keywords: translation, parallel texts, conative function, Lithuanian public warnings and prohibitions.

1. Introduction

Parallel texts as a topic and a field of academic studies deserves discussion for several reasons: first of all, for the different implications the term acquires in linguistics and in translation studies; second, for the impact of social and cultural shift which keeps the source text and the target text at a varying pragmatic distance. Both aspects will be dealt with in the present paper, with special emphasis on cultural and social aspects of parallel texts deriving from historical and social changes in Lithuania.

The essay is confined to translation studies only; the reason for the limitation is that translation studies have retained the initial definition of parallel texts suggested by Snell-Hornby (1988: 86): "[Whereas a translation is always derived from another text], parallel texts are two linguistically independent products arising from an identical (or very similar) situation", while the shift of linguistic research towards corpus linguistics has yielded new definitions, mostly in computational linguistics, where parallel texts are defined as "bits of discourse from corresponding varieties or text types in the two languages in question. If we knew, or so the argument goes, what the semantic ranges and collocational restrictions of words were in the textual contexts of one language, then we could match them in parallel texts from the other language"(Hartmann 1994: 293). Thus the difference of focus should be emphasized from the very start: corpus linguistics deals, mainly, with a text placed "alongside its translation or translations. Parallel text alignment is the identification of the corresponding sentences in both halves of the parallel text"[1]; while translation studies propose situational analysis as the point of departure, naming two different texts as parallel, or comparable texts.

The paper will be concerned with social and cultural aspects of Lithuanian public signs (notices, messages) at large, i.e. with signs that surround us today, in the public life of the second decade of the 21st century. To achieve this, a large selection of public signs (384) will be analysed, taking into account their form and function: by "form" we mean the grammatical structure of the text, while the "function" will be interpreted as an utterance of request, command, warning and prohibition (Snell-Hornby 1988: 88). It will also deal with differences in the communicative function and natural language forms in Lithuanian and English. Structural differences of the two languages will also be taken into account, Lithuanian being a synthetic and English an analytic language.

2. Parallel texts: definitions

Lithuanian students of translation and interpretation studies find parallel texts to be an amusing and highly unexpected aspect of translation practice. That is a moment in translator training when translation for equivalence has to be put aside and a different strategy has to be adopted. The often used examples of *Beware of (the) dog* or *No smoking* never fail to attract students' attention: though easily understood, the examples call

---

[1] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parallel_text

for a choice of parallel texts which perform the same function in a similar setting, but the linguistic expression in Lithuanian is different: *Piktas šuo* ('An angry dog'); *Nerūkyti* ('Not to smoke').

To define a parallel text in translation one has to refer to the issue of the unit of translation—whether it is a word or a longer stretch of the language. When discussing the unit of translation, Vinay and Darbelnet reject the word as a possible "unit of translation since translators focus on the semantic field rather than on the formal properties of the individual signifier. For them, the unit is "the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually" (1958/1995: 21). This is what they call the lexicological unit and the unit of thought" (Hatim and Munday 2004: 18). Thus the textual approach to translation unit does not impose limits on the unit of translation, either in terms of length or structure; rather, it emphasizes the internal cohesion of the text, the semantic and structural unity of the element. In this sense a parallel text may be interpreted as a unit of translation where the signs are linked in such a way that they cannot be translated individually (ibid., p. 18), or, following Snell-Hornby's concept, "parallel texts are two linguistically independent products arising from an identical (or very similar) situation" (1988: 86), e.g., a notice on a gate in capital letters, starting with a traffic warning sign in a black triangle with an exclamation mark reading *Warning. Do not enter. Authorised personnel only* would not translate word by word in Lithuanian. Graphically it would have similar traffic sign features (red background; *no entry* regulatory sign, but the message would read *Įėjimas personalui be leidimo draudžiamas* ('Entrance for personnel without a permit [is] prohibited').

It should be pointed out that the concept of the parallel text is firmly based on the theory of speech acts developed and presented by Jakobson in his study *Linguistics and Poetics* published in 1960. Switching from language study to speech (and, specifically, to utterances) he distinguished six potential functions of a speech act: referential, emotive, conative, meta-lingual, phatic and poetic. Of these, though in combination with the others, the conative function is most prominent in parallel texts. The conative function is manifested by such utterances that are directed towards the receiver in order to influence him/her in one way or another, usually to urge him/her to take or not to take an action. In the language system the conative function is usually reflected by the forms of the imperative mood and addresses (Jakobson 1960). Snell-Hornby quotes Searle's (1969) terminology, where a "directive can be described as an illocutionary speech act with perlocutionary function. In other words, it expresses an intention on the part of the speaker to effect *future* action on

the part of the addressee" (Snell-Hornby 1988: 87). Thus, a parallel text combines features of an utterance with the dominant conative function (with an action or absence of action expected) and features of a written text as a unit of thought and a unit of translation.

It should also be pointed out that the topic of parallel texts in translation was brought to light when Jakobson and others (Nida 1964, Newmark 1981, 1988) departed from the traditional concept of language functions to go back to de Saussure's division between the signifier (the written and spoken signal) and the signified (the concept signified); "together, the signifier and the signified form the linguistic sign, but that sign is arbitrary or unmotivated" (Saussure 1916/1983: 67–69). In translation, the arbitrariness of the sign explains why the target text may result in a great variety of lexical units and, eventually, in a number of appropriate translations. In the case of parallel texts, when the "signified" remains the same, the variety of translation options must be smaller, as the conative function has to be retained in a manner which most effectively appeals to the addressee.

To achieve maximum effect in rendering parallel texts, traditional and cultural aspects of the utterance have to be taken into consideration. In other words, it should be taken into account that the communicative message of public signs, both in form and in content, is conditioned by real life situations, i.e. by the authentic cultural, political and economic situation of the locality in which they function. Consider two prohibition signs from the Baltic seaside. The first one is posted at the foot of a dune in a charming spot of the Lithuanian seaside known as the Curonian Spit:

(1) *Lipti į kopas ir leistis nuo jų draudžiama. It is prohibited to climb up and down the dunes.* (The English translation is printed on the sign in smaller font).

It may look puzzling and not friendly to a visitor, unless he or she is well informed about the specific features of the place. The dunes in the Lithuanian National Park of the Curonian Spit are known to be the tallest and the steepest in Europe. Sculptured by wind of fine sand blown from the beaches, they are very delicate and may easily be damaged. Nonetheless they are visitors' greatest attraction and the prohibition signs are often ignored.

(2) *Dėmesio! Atsargiai su ugnimi! Nekurk laužo – durpė! Nešiukšlink, nelaužyk medžių. Saugokite gamtą! Bauda iki 1000 Lt. ATPK straipsniai 77;83.*

'Attention! Be careful with fire! Don't light a bonfire—peat! Don't throw rubbish, don't damage trees. Take care of nature! The fine is up to Lt 1000. Articles of the Administrative Law Code: 77; 83.'

The public sign indicates that the visitor is in a highly preserved area, which, though covered by a beautiful forest, is very sensitive to fire: the forest grows on a peat bed, which is highly flammable.

Needless to say, the translator may learn a lot from the two cases of example (2): first, that both posters are of prohibitive nature and based on real life situations which should be known, or else they may seem either strange or exaggerated; second, that the grammatical and syntactic structure of both signs might be slightly puzzling to an English reader, which in its turn suggests that the English version might be structurally different—or independent—if rendered in English; and finally the social respect, or distance, between the addressor and the addressee, though not immediately obvious, indicates that rules of social communication based on the local tradition are different and have to be reconsidered in translation.

3. Social relations in public messages and parallel texts

Public signs are usually thought to be impersonal, characterized by lexico-grammatical features such as nominalization and the passive voice. They are, in fact, more complicated and subtle than this simple view would suggest. By their nature they present a very concise instance of appeal in writing. As Hyland (1994: 240) has indicated speaking about academic writing, "[r]ather than being factual and impersonal, effective academic writing actually depends on interactional elements which supplement propositional information in the text and alert readers to the writer's opinion". In the case of public signs, the interactional elements are of utmost importance, no matter how brief the message is and how limited the choice of the elements may be. Their purpose is to draw the reader's attention (hence the semiotics of the format) and to appeal to the reader's conscience, knowledge, sense of security, sense of cooperation, sense of common welfare etc.

Linguistically, the communicative aims of a writer can be realized through the use of politeness strategies, information structuring and specific lexico-grammatical structures such as personal pronouns (Kuo 1998: 122). As Myers (1989) prompted speaking about the style of scientific articles, a text is related not only to the motivation of being

polite and maintaining face; it reflects the complicated role of relationships among the writer, his or her readers and the community at large. In the case of public signs one can expect that relationships play an even more important role, as the reader of the public sign is not specified, or is a generic reader in the sense that he/she does not share one particular discourse with the writer of the message.

Consider the interactive elements of the following public signs:

(3) *It is a disciplinary offence to smoke in this building.*
(4) *No smoking beyond this point.*
(5) *No smoking—anywhere on grounds. Thank you for your cooperation.*
(6) *Thank You For Not Smoking In Or Within 25 Feet Of This Facility.*
(7) *Please do not smoke.*

All five signs carry the same semiotic message, namely smoking prohibition. All the signs have the same structure, i.e. the no-entry traffic sign with a cigarette crossed out and a text message. The text messages, though, differ significantly in the way the message is delivered.

Example (3) demonstrates a clear absence of power balance between the addressor and the addressee: with the implications of legal consequences brought to the fore (*it is a disciplinary offence*) the addressor takes a power stand towards the addressee. The addressee is regarded as a potential offender and is warned against the wrongdoing. A distance is created between the two participants of the speech act due to the difference of their communicative roles.

Example (4) is, in a way, an unmarked instance of prohibition. The prohibition is expressed by an impersonal utterance, the power is subdued, it is manifested in the pictogram rather than the text.

The fifth sign differs from the fourth one in its phatic and conative functions: starting with a prohibition (*No smoking—anywhere on grounds*) the message turns into a request (*Thank you for your cooperation*), which indicates that the addressor presents the prohibition as an implied understanding and, eventually, cooperation on the part of the addressee. The contrast between the prohibition and the request minimizes the difference in the power position and creates an impression that the addressee has already made an attempt not to smoke on the grounds and thus deserves recognition of his or her good will (*Thank you for your cooperation*).

The sixth prohibition starts with a *thank you* which immediately demonstrates an intention on the part of the speaker to effect a future action on the part of the addressee (Searle 1987) by changing the position of the addressee from that of a potentially corrupt individual to that of a conscientious citizen, somebody who is in peer relations with the author of the message.

The seventh sign is a prohibition in the form of a request, where the addressor intentionally chooses an equal or even slightly inferior stance: the simplicity of the mode implies a habitual request which does not call for much effort to comply to it. Using Halliday's terms, the utterance brings forward the interpersonal function, which is the "participatory function of language" (Halliday 2007: 184). It allows for the expression of attitudes and evaluations and is realised by mood and modality. It also allows the expression of a relation established between the text-producer and the text-consumer (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 7).

Thus public messages may differ in their intensity, and the scale of power relations between the addressor and the addressee may also be very different, ranging from highly formal prohibitions and warnings to friendly requests. The aim of this paper is to interpret public messages as parallel texts, the Lithuanian language being the object of comparison.

4. Parallel texts in Lithuanian: addressor and addressee relations

There is hardly any doubt that the "participatory function of language" in Lithuanian does not differ from that in any other language. In both English and Lithuanian the speech acts are identical, and there is no difference between the two languages as regards the relation between the two participants in the speech act, speaker and addressee. In either an English or Lithuanian request the addressor uses expressions of courtesy to elevate the addressee to a level somewhat higher than himself, while in command and prohibition his situational position is clearly superior; in warnings the addressor is superior in that he or she possesses information and envisages, or, as it is, knows the consequences of which he assumes the addressee might be unaware.

Thus requests, commands, warnings, prohibitions can easily be found in any public space, yet the language forms may be very different. In the case of Lithuanian, they are different because Lithuanian is a synthetic language while English is an analytic one. Lithuanian still retains many of the original features of the nominal morphology found in some ancient Indo-European languages like Sanskrit and Latin, i.e. it is abundant in

cases, declensions and in shades of meaning a single word can carry; it has not been influenced by the Germanic languages up until relatively recently. As well as nouns, Lithuanian has a rich pronoun system, especially that of personal pronouns. The nominal and pronominal agents, in many cases implicit, are in coordination with the verb inflections, thus creating very rich and delicate semantics of the text.

Speaking about personal pronouns in English, grammarians standardly divide pronouns into subsets, one of which is the set of personal pronouns: *I, you, he, she, we, they* (and their corresponding object and genitive forms). The personal pronouns are typically deictic and referential, especially in the 1st and 2nd person. That is, "the first person forms refer to the speaker/writer, while the 2nd person refers to the addressee or a group including at least one addressee but not speaker/writer" (Huddleston 1984: 288). In Lithuanian, the set of personal pronouns: *aš, **tu**, jis, ji, mes, **jūs**, jie, jos* differs, first of all, in the fact that *jūs (*'you' in the plural form) is used as a form indicating plural and (quite similarly to French) as a form of formality and politeness, thus the personal pronoun *jūs* may be used when addressing a whole group of people or just one person. The rules of politeness change with time, but the general rule of the usage of *jūs* as a form of politeness remains firmly rooted in Lithuanian: a stranger or a group of strangers is greeted and addressed with *jūs* even if the stranger is of generic nature (if addressed in a text, or a public sign). It has always been a matter of cultural taboo to address him or her in the singular form, unless the person is either very young, a trespasser, or very inferior in his position, especially in "heavy duty" work relations (Kučinskaitė 1985; Čepaitienė 2007). Even if the pronouns *tu* and *jūs* are not used directly in the text, their presence is inferred in inflections, especially in the ending suffixes of the verb forms, e.g. *Stop* could be rendered in two ways: *Stok* (singular) and *Stokite* (plural).

The pronoun *we* can be inferred in yet another ending of the same imperative: *Stokime.* Thus one imperative form in English can be rendered in three forms in Lithuanian depending on the grammatical context: *Stop— stok, stokite, stokime.* It implies, first of all, that the translator's task in the case of texts with conative function is not only finding an equivalent in Lithuanian; it implies a much more complex task of selecting an appropriate command depending on the linguistic and extralinguistic context. Thus, the common request *Please switch your phones off. Concert in progress* may be rendered, depending on the circumstances, as ***Išjunkite*** (*you* plural) *mobiliuosius* (*you* who are sitting in the concert hall [please] switch off your mobiles) *Vyksta koncertas;* or ***Išjunkime*** (inclusive *we* plural) *mobiliuosius* (*we* and *you* who are sitting in the concert hall

[please] switch off your mobiles) *Vyksta koncertas.* It would be grammatically correct, but not appropriate to use the straightforward form: **Išjunk** (*you* singular) *mobilųjį* (*you* who is sitting in the concert hall switch off your mobile) *Vyksta koncertas.* The *you singular* would imply familiarity on the verge of contempt and it could not be treated as a parallel text for the source language text which has no such implications. Thus the translator's task is to render a parallel text with consideration of its cultural and traditional counterpart in the translation language.

As can be seen from the example above, the choices of grammatical forms of the imperatives and their semantic and pragmatic meanings in Lithuanian are broader due to their inflectional nature, which might mean that the addressor and addressee relations are more complex and the choices of rendering those relations might be more manipulative than in English. English does not differentiate formally between exclusive and inclusive *we;* neither does Lithuanian, but it achieves a similar effect by shifting from *we* to *you plural* in verbal endings: the grammatical difference is rather insignificant, (*išjunki**me*** 'let us and you switch off'—*išjunki**te*** 'you switch off') yet the perlocutionary function is shifted from both the addressor and the addressee to the addressee alone.

The manipulative aspect of public signs, notices and posters was (not always masterly) exploited by the Soviet regime, which would use the inclusive forms to camouflage dictatorship, e.g. two posters from the collection of Lithuanian museums[2] illustrate how in the early fifties the occupied Lithuania was drawn into the new Soviet propaganda by exploiting the inclusive *we*: the background of the poster is yellow, with a red contour of mounted Red Army, daggers and flags directed towards an invisible enemy, the text reading *Ugdykime liaudies revoliucines ir darbo tradicijas!* ('Let us foster workers' revolutionary and labour traditions!'). The other poster exploits plural *jūs* ('you') urging to work obligatory labour days in the kolkhoz digging and cleaning potatoes. The poster presents unnaturally happy faces of men and women carrying sacks and baskets of potatoes, some still working in the fields. As an afterthought, it is emphasized that only those who work have the right to eat*: Valykite šakniavaisius! Darbas gamina maistą* ('Clean root-crops! Labour produces food'). The exclusive aspect is hardly noticed in the poster, but it is there, carrying the meaning of a divided society, one part of which has to earn food by hard labour (notably, at the time of famine) and the other part has the right to dictate its rules over the working people.

---

[2]   http://ausrosmuziejus.lt/Apie-muzieju/Muziejaus-rinkiniai/Naujausios-istorijos-sektoriaus-rinkiniai/14.-Plakatas.-XX-a.-6-desimt.-T-S-3152;
http://menas.lnb.lt/politinis_ir_agitacinis.htm

Another case of manipulation would be the usage of the familiar—and culturally unacceptable—form of *tu* to emphasize the intimate, yet patronizing relationship with the addressee, e.g. on a poster: *Nedarkyk savo kalbos* ('Don't foul your language'). Or: *Nenaikink žuvų neršto metu* ('Don't catch fish at spawning').

It is only natural that now, when the country is in a new stage of development, any attempt of manipulation is received with a raised eyebrow and thus avoided to the extent possible. Nevertheless, inexperience in writing public directives or simple carelessness sometimes yields puzzling results. It takes a culturally sensitive translator to notice such texts and interpret them as peripheral cases of otherwise culture-regulated public messages.

Let us turn back to example (2) as an example illustrating attitudinal inconsistency between the addressor and addressee. It starts with a very direct, straightforward command expressed in the singular *tu* imperative: *Dėmesio! Atsargiai su ugnimi!* **Nekurk** *laužo – durpė!* **Nešiukšlink,** **nelaužyk** *medžių.* ('Attention! Be careful with fire! Don't light a bonfire—peat! Don't throw rubbish, don't damage trees'). Such a message has an implication of an omnipresent guardian, a superior generic person who keeps watching visitors closely, as if all the visitors prove unaware of the circumstances, nor are used to strict order and may not conform to the requirements. Yet, right in the middle of the poster, the attitude changes from *tu* to *jūs*; the potential perpetrator is elevated to a peer relationship, with the polite *jūs* implied in the address: *Saugokite gamtą!* ('Take care of nature!'). Yet the responsibility is not taken by both, the addressor and the addressee: the imperative *Saugokite* implies 'each and all of you', but excludes the addressor. The poster ends with the peer relationship dropped and supervision resumed, as it lists implied consequences if the visitor does not obey; personal responsibility and personal remedies for a wrongful act are mentioned: *Bauda iki 1000 Lt. ATPK straipsniai 77;83.* ('The fine is up to Lt 1000. Articles of the Administrative Law Code: 77; 83'). This type of warning is not acceptable from the point of view of a modern addressee, it provokes resentment and defiance.

It may be concluded that grammatical reasons and, to a certain extent, some painful social experience may account for the fact that the imperative is by far not the most popular way of expressing requests, warnings and prohibitions. The evidence base of the current paper contains 348 public signs, of which Lithuanian ones make one half, 174. Of these, direct imperative is least represented, making 25 instances, while of 174 English warnings and prohibitions the imperative counts 52 instances.

Requests with *please* plus imperative are much more popular in English (28) than in Lithuanian (12).

5. Language preferences in public signs

Besides differences in the usage of the imperative, Lithuanian and English differ essentially in the type of identification of the addressee in his/her situational role. The body of research indicates that in Lithuanian the addressee is less visible than in English; also, Lithuanian warnings and prohibitions are more contextual, while the English ones are directed towards a category of addressees and tend to require personal responsibility. This applies particularly to warning and prohibition, where English favours imperatives: *beware, mind, do not...*, while Lithuanian favours the adverb *atsargiai* ('be careful'; 'attention'; 'beware') and the adjective *draudžiama* ('it is forbidden', 'banned', 'prohibited'). *Atsargiai* signals, as a rule, a state or a condition rather than the doer:

(8) *Atsargiai su ugnimi.*
   Lit. 'Be careful with fire'.
(9) *Atsargiai! Kraunama mediena.*
   'Be careful! Timber being lifted'.

Draudžiama ('prohibited') is usually used with the infinitive and also indicates an object of action. The semantics of *draudžiama* implies that there might be another participant of the speech act, an abstract legislator, who has delegated the right of prohibition to the addressor. It is not sufficiently clear who has prohibited one or another action, thus there is no other choice but to obey. Consider the following:

(10) *Draudžiama gabenti žmones.*
    Lit. 'It is prohibited to transport people'.
(11) *Draudžiama eiti ir sustoti, kai juda varteliai.*
    'It is prohibited to walk or stand when the gate is moving'.
(12) *Draudžiama perlipti per konvejerį.*
    'It is prohibited to climb over the conveyor belt'.

The examples demonstrate that the addressor-addressee relationship is rather indirect, both the addressor and the addressee focus more on the potential consequences than on the personal responsibility of the addressee.

In a similar setting, particularly in industrial areas, English prohibitions are expressed either in imperatives or passive forms, with imperatives prevailing:

(13) *Do not stand here.*
(14) *Do not switch on.*
(15) *Do not block driveway. Violators will be towed.*
(16) *Show your pass, pay your fare, take your ticket from the machine.*
(17) *Swim at your own risk.*
(18) *Wear goggles.*
(19) *Drive slowly.*
(20) *Visitors are requested not to pass beyond this step.*

In most of the English cases the addressee is there and is expected to act, while the circumstances are of minor importance.

The group of *prohibited*, *not allowed, no… allowed* notices is much smaller in English (10 cases) than that of *atsargiai* and *draudžiama* in Lithuanian (51 cases); such notices are also much more intense in their conative function:

(21) *Loud music strictly prohibited.*
(22) *No pets allowed.*
(23) *No ball games allowed.*
(24) *Firearms and weapons of any kind are strictly forbidden on the premises by law.*

The most often used group of warnings and prohibitions in English is the -ing group signs. They, differently from the ones discussed earlier, are focused on the action rather than the addressee and are less intense in their communicative charge, thus they could be treated as an unmarked category of prohibition and warning signs:

(25) *No smoking anywhere on grounds.*
(26) *No trespassing.*
(27) *No parking please.*

Their Lithuanian counterparts would be rendered in the form of the infinitive:

(28) *Neužstatyti įvažiavimo.*
    Lit. 'Not to block the passage'.