

Are the Same Cohesive Patterns Used in English and Lithuanian Texts?

Janina Buitkienė

*Such is our pride, our folly, or our fate,
That few, but such as cannot write, translate.*

(Sir John Denham)

Abstract. The article, on the basis of English texts and their translations into Lithuanian, aims to analyze cohesive patterns in the two languages. The major study question addressed was that two languages, possessing features of different grammatical structure, might display different patterns of cohesive devices, especially in case of reference and ellipsis/ substitution. As far as lexical cohesion is concerned, the research addressed the question whether the two languages employ the same or different sets of lexical ties. To provide answers to the above mentioned questions, content analysis was carried out which focused on how particular cohesive patterns render the texts of SL and TL cohesive and coherent. Contrastive analysis, aimed at comparing these patterns, focuses on the ways they differ and the reasons for these differences. The research showed that the usage of referential items differs because of 1) presence/ absence of the articles in two languages; 2) the possibility to omit personal pronouns in the subject position in the Lithuanian language; 3) irrelevance of the inalienable possessives in Lithuanian. Different patterns of ellipsis/ substitution emerged because of a greater variety of substitution forms and greater amount of analytical forms in English. Differences in lexical cohesion are caused by stylistic preferences and languages' semantics.

Key words: *cohesive patterns, reference, ellipsis/ substitution, lexical cohesion, translation.*

Introductory Observations

Translation has been an important part of cultural communication for many centuries. Even with this long history, according to some scholars (Neubert & Shreve, 1992), translation is a paradox, i.e. is it possible to use a foreign language to convey messages originally expressed in another language?; in the process of translation much is lost; but if there is loss, there may be gain etc.

Though translation has evolved as a unique answer to a basic need for intercultural communication, the process of translating carries with it many debatable issues. First of all, the difference is made between translation as a *product* or *process*, involving the negotiation of meaning between producers and receivers of texts. Next, traditional debates take place on the following issues: *literal* vs *free translation*, *formal equivalence* and *dynamic equivalence*, *form* vs *content*, *objectivity/ subjectivity* of translations etc (Hatim & Mason, 1994). Recently, however, emphasis has been laid on text as defining issue in translation and the situation in which it is used (Neubert & Shreve, 1992), and it is assumed that translation should be viewed as an act of communication. The interpretation of any act of communication (written or oral) requires some specific shared knowledge, cultural schemes etc between interactants. Therefore, in the process of translation, next to other standards of textuality, cohesion and coherence are of major importance. Though they are distinct from each other, they share one crucial feature: they both have the function of binding the text together: cohesion – overtly (on the surface level), coherence – covertly (at the deep structure) (Bell, 1991). This study mainly concentrates on the distribution of cohesive ties (reference, ellipsis/ substitution, lexical cohesion) in the source text (ST) and target text (TT)

though sometimes shifts in coherence are also noted. Though cohesive ties were widely analysed on the basis of separate languages (e.g. Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Alaunienė, 1978), less attention was paid to contrastive studies. Therefore, the obtained results might give a deeper insight into the functioning of cohesive ties in the texts of the English and Lithuanian languages as well as the ways translators employ them in TT to preserve the overall meaning of ST.

English and Lithuanian display features of different grammatical structures, the first being an analytical language, the other – a synthetic one. This means that English possesses more function forms, and grammatical functions are shown by word order; in Lithuanian grammatical distinctions are realized by inflections. Consequently, it could be presumed that in the process of translation the translator employs, next to other alterations, different cohesive patterns.

Therefore, the main aim of the study is to investigate similarities/ differences in the patterning of cohesive devices in ST and TT, especially in the case of reference and ellipsis/ substitution. As far as lexical cohesion is concerned, the research addresses the question whether the two languages employ the same or different sets of lexical ties. To achieve this aim, content analysis was carried out which focused on how particular cohesive patterns render the texts of SL and TL cohesive and coherent, i.e. meaningful. Contrastive analysis, aimed at comparing these patterns, focuses on the way they differ and reasons for these differences.

The research was carried out on the basis of English and Lithuanian literary texts; literary texts by English/ American authors and their translations into Lithuanian

were taken into consideration, and about fifty most illustrative passages were selected.

Theoretical Prerequisites

Any text, created by a writer, can be characterized as possessing structural and semantic wholeness and unity and is in a way subjective because it expresses its author's beliefs, values and intentions. It is not created for the sake of creation; it has certain functions – to inform the reader, persuade, challenge him/ her etc. To achieve these aims and objectives, the author chooses such means from the formal language code which serve him best. Each language is peculiar and specific; each language possesses unique structures and vocabulary, which cannot be encountered in any other language. Translator's task is to transfer the author's intentionality and preserve his/ her style having at his disposal a different formal linguistic code which may lack certain structures and lexical expressions present in the source language text.

Therefore, we might be tempted to assume that the sequence of coherence relations would, under normal circumstances, remain constant in translation from ST to TT. Such basic relations as cause-effect, problem-solution, temporal sequence etc are universally fundamental to meaning and the way it is structured within a text. But the ways in which this under-lying coherence is reflected on the surface of text – cohesion, or sequential connectivity of surface elements – are more likely to be language-specific or text-specific. There are many cohesive devices capable of relaying, say, a given relationship between propositions, and a certain language has preferred options.

However, Blum-Kulka, who views coherence “as a covert potential meaning relationship among parts of a text, made overt by reader or listener through processes of interpretation” and cohesion as “an overt relationship holding between parts of the text, expressed by language specific markers” (Blum-Kulka, 2004, pp.298-299), speaks about shifts of both coherence and cohesion in translation. The scholar distinguishes between reader-focused and text-focused shifts of coherence. Shifts in reader-based coherence are, to a large extent, unavoidable and mainly hinge on audience types, shared/ non-shared referential networks, inferences from indirect speech acts, cultural schemes etc. Text-based shifts of coherence are linked to differences between linguistic systems, i.e. the translator's failure to realize functions of particular linguistic forms. Blum-Kulka even argues (ibid) that reader-based and text-based shifts in coherence occur despite the fact that cohesive markers remain the same in the TT. However, we mainly concentrated on shifts in cohesion which are closely associated with grammatical differences between languages, stylistic preferences for types of cohesive markers in two languages and the level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text.

Discussion of the Results

Reference. In many languages reference is realized by personal pronouns, demonstratives, comparatives, and the definite article (Ellis, 1992; Toolan, 2002; Spraunienė, 2008). So, in the first place the Lithuanian language lacks

articles as cohesive devices, and this factor might present some interest for the contrastive analysis of both languages and, consequently, the ways of rendering the meaning of definiteness in Lithuanian texts. In English texts the definite article looks back in the text (anaphoric reference) or forward (cataphoric reference), or refers to shared worlds outside the text (exophoric reference). What is more, in anaphoric reference cases the article is usually followed by semantically akin lexical items making the tie between two text items stronger (e.g. *Protestantism – the new religion*); it is of double nature. In Lithuanian, however, we have only a lexical tie (*protestantizmas – nauja religija*). Some Lithuanian linguists (e.g. Rosinas, 1996; Valeckienė, 1998) claim that Lithuanian demonstratives can fulfill a dual function: anaphoric and deictic. In many cases Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns *tas, ta, šitas, šita* “lose” their deictic function, acquire the meaning of the definite article and can fulfil functions characteristic of the English definite article. Compare:

1) *It was absurd that a juvenile schoolmistress should so insistently occupy his thoughts or that he should be concerned by what she might think of him. <...> He did not ask himself if she was pretty. It was enough that the teacher stood, spare and living.* (Cronin)

2) *Ir ar ne kvaila, kad kažkokia jauniklė mokyklos mokytoja taip atkakliai skverbiasi į jo mintis, ir jis nerimauja dėl to, ką jinaį galės apie jį pagalvoti. <...> Endriui nerūpėjo, ar ji buvo graži. Kokia ji bebūtų buvusi, toji mokytoja įkyriai stovėjo jo vaizduotėje it gyva.* (Kroninas)

As the example clearly demonstrates, the Lithuanian indefinite pronoun stands for the English indefinite article, and the demonstrative pronoun – for the definite article. Consider one more Lithuanian example:

3) *Pro langą žiūri vidun ir mirksi kažkokia žvaigždutė. Jau daug metų toji žvaigždutė žiūri naktimis Girnių trobon ir padeda senai šeimininkei savo dūmas dūmoti.* (Vaižgantas)

However, it would be dangerous to claim that Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns could always substitute for the English definite article. Next to the function of pointing to already known object or quality, they mainly function as deictic elements in Lithuanian (Valeckienė, 1998). Therefore, translators have to employ other linguistic means to render the meaning of the definite article:

4) *Goshen held a peculiar fascination and horror for children. Among Roger's and Sophia's schoolmates there were a number whose relatives were in the poorhouse. <...> All had heard the account of Mrs. Cavanaugh's transference. She lived in the big house next to the Mason's Hall, mortgaged and remortgaged. <...> But the Day came. She fled upstairs and hid in the attic...* (Wilder)

5) *Vaikų vaiduotei Gošenas buvo kartu ir patraukli, ir siaubingai vieta. Rodžerio ir Sofijos bendraklasiai tarpebuvo ir nemaža tokių, kurių giminės atsidūrė prieglaudėje. <...> Visi buvo gir-dėję, kaip ten atsidūrė misis Kavana. Ji gyveno galutinai pra-skolintame, didžiuliamename šalia Masonų rūmų. <...> Bet a-tėjo lemiamoji diena. Ji užbėgo laiptais ir pratūnojo ant aukš-to...* (Vailderis)

In the above presented example the English definite article refers to the shared world outside (exophoric reference) as everybody knows that *the Day* is the time when elderly and

impoverished people are taken to the poorhouse. The definite article in the TT is replaced by the adjective *lemiamoji* which brings a shift in text coherence as it evokes a slightly different schema in the readers' minds, and, consequently, they draw different inferences. Thus Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns cannot equal to the English definite article in both their meaning and functions. The definite article reinforces cohesion of the English text; therefore, in Lithuanian the translator has to look for some additional means to achieve a similar effect.

Personal pronouns. Pronouns are universally used in many languages, English and Lithuanian included, but their distributional pattern is different. Numerous linguistic examples prove that English texts show a very high degree of frequency in the usage of personal pronouns while in Lithuanian texts pronouns are avoided where possible. Instead, we see the omission of a pronoun (*zero* nomination) or pronouns are replaced by lexical items. For example:

6) *He* called out, but no more answer. *He* stepped in. *He* knocked at the door, but again there was no answer. *He* turned the handle and entered. The stench that assailed *him* turned *him* horribly sick. *He* put his handkerchief to his nose and forced himself to go in. (Maugham)

7) *Daktaras* kelis kartus šūktelėjo, bet niekas neatsiliepė, *(O)* įėjo į verandą. *(O)* Pabeldė, bet irgi niekas neatsakė. Pasukęs rankeną, *jis* pravėrė duris. Nuo užplūdusio tvaiko *jam* pa-sidarė bloga. Su nosine *jis* užsidengė nosį ir prisivertęs įėjo į vidų. (Moemas)

Reference chains, which ensure cohesion in the ST and TT, clearly differ. The original text employs a homogeneous cohesive chain which is realized through personal pronouns: *he, he, he, he, him, him, he*. In the translated version, on the other hand, the cohesive chain is heterogeneous: *daktaras, (O), (O), jis, jam, jis*. These differences, in the first place, could be linked to the grammatical differences between the two languages: Lithuanian, being a synthetic language, can dispense with formally stating the subject of the sentence. Hence, the cohesive chain in the TT contains two *zero* nominations of the participant¹ (Gutwinski, 1974), in this case also the subjects of the sentences. Secondly, shifts in the TT cohesive chain could be explained by stylistic preferences and cohesive explicitness. According to Blum-Kulka (2004, p.300), English native speakers „tend to prefer referential linkage over lexical cohesion, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction” while speakers and writers of other languages, German, Hebrew, or Lithuanian, for example, give preference to lexical cohesion. In addition, if we considered these short passages as independent units, the Lithuanian version is more explicit as we know from the beginning who the participant is, i.e. *daktaras* while the ST does not provide this information.

Possessive pronouns. The obtained data concerning the ways how possessive pronouns are translated/ not translated from English into Lithuanian shows a

conspicuous tendency: the so-called inalienable possessives in the English text are omitted in the Lithuanian version:

8) *She* was a woman of thirty seven, rather tall, and plump, without being fat; *she* was not pretty, but *her* face was pleasing, chiefly, perhaps, on account of *her* kind brown eyes. *Her* skin was rather sallow. *Her* dark hair was elaborately dressed. (Maugham)

9) *Ji* buvo kokių trisdešimt septynių metų moteris, aukštoka ir apkūni, bet nenutukus; *(O)* grožiu nepasižymėjo, bet *veidą* tu-rėjo patrauklų – turbūt, dėl *švelnių rudų akių*. *Ji* buvo tamsaus gymio, rūpestingai sušukuotais *plaukais*. (Moemas)

The English cohesive chain *she, she, her face, her kind brown eyes, her skin, her dark hair* realizes “double” cohesion – lexical and referential – as it employs, in the first place, hyponyms as cohesive items and, secondly, possessive pronouns which strengthen the cohesive effect. In the translated text the cohesive chain *ji, (O), veidą, švelnių rudų akių, ji, plaukais* is devoid of possessive pronouns as the rules of the Lithuanian grammar do not require the presence of “the inalienable possessive” when semantic relationship between/ among lexical items is clear and defined; referential cohesion is considered to be redundant and stylistically unacceptable in such cases. However, referential cohesion, expressed by possessive or demonstrative pronouns, becomes an important tie in Lithuanian when lexical items are not semantically related:

10) *Jau* keletą metų visos stropesnės priemiesčio moterys ken-tėjo nuo *kurmių* antplūdžio. Kol *Šančių* smėlynai buvo negyvi, nebuvo ir *tu dievo padarų*, bet kai žmonės ėmė į savo darželius vėžti juodžemį ir mėšlą, pasirodė ir *tie keturkojai artojai*.

Only the demonstrative pronouns *tu, tie*, which might be said to correspond to the referential/ anaphoric function of the English definite article, establish linkage among lexical items *kurmių, dievo padarų, keturkojai artojai*.

Ellipsis/ substitution. It is a relationship involving the omission of some lexical item of a verbal or nominal group which is presupposed in the text or a place-holding element is inserted to signal the gap (McCarthy, 1991; Vaskelienė, 2007). Ellipsis/ substitution as a notion is a universal feature of languages, but the grammatical options, which realize it in the text, may vary markedly. If we take into consideration the English and Lithuanian languages, shifts in these cohesive ties, as the research showed, do not follow set rules. We came across cases where instances of ellipsis/ substitution coincided in both languages, but the majority of cases pointed to the fact that in the ST this cohesive item stretches through several text items while in the TT lexical repetition predominates. Compare the following examples:

11) “Dr. Gillies *didn’t believe* a word of it,” she said. “I *did*. I *believed* every word of it. And so *did* my father. I couldn’t walk straight if I *didn’t*.” (Wilder, p.25)

12) – *Daktaras Gilis pats netiki* nė vienu savo pasakytu žodžiu, – tarė ji. – O aš *tikiu*. Aš *tikiu* kiekvieno jo žodžiu. Taip *tikėjo* ir mano tėvas. Aš negalėčiau žengti tiesiai, jeigu *netikėčiau*. (Vailderis, p.19)

¹ Following Gleason’s contribution to the stratificational theory, Gutwinski (1974: pp.42-47) distinguishes event-line and participant-line which are relevant to text production and development.

The cohesive chain in English contains three cases of ellipsis/substitution (verbal group) while Lithuanian gives preference to lexical repetition. Similar pattern is observed in the case of the omission and substitution of a nominal group. If in English we have, e.g. "We have said that the hopeful found nourishment in marvels. Such for her, was Ashley's rescue", in the Lithuanian variant we read „Jau minėjome, kad min-tantieji viltimi randa sau pelno stebuklingose reiškiniuose. Toks reiškinys jai buvo Ašlio išgelbėjimas". This notable frequency of ellipsis/substitution in ST could be attributed to grammatical differences between the languages: English possesses more analytical verb forms, which allow the omission of the notional part of the predicate, and a greater variety of substitution forms at nominal and verbal levels, e.g. *one, so/ not, such, do* etc.

Lexical cohesion. Lexical cohesion comprises a wide range of cohesive ties: lexical repetition, complex repletion, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, situational repetition or collocations (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Vaskelienė, 2007). On the basis of the accumulated material we only noted some general tendencies in the distribution of lexical cohesion in the ST and its translation in Lithuanian, which will be briefly presented below. A separate study is necessary to investigate distributional patterns of each of these ties in both languages. Consider the following example:

13) *With the discovery of coal came black, gray, yellow, and white dust; came turbid water into the Kangahala; came the town's first and rich man, Airlee McGregor; came more foreigners – the Silesians and West Virginians <...>. Many birds, beasts, fishes, and plants retreated from the region. It became customary to say that the soil was "sour". Above all came poverty and unrest and the threat of violence.* (Wilder)

14) *Aptikus anglį, užplūdo juodi ir pilki suodžiai, geltonos ir bal-tos dulkės; susidrumstė Kangahilos vandenys; čia atsikėlė gy-venti pirmasis ir paskutinis turtuolis Erlis Makgregoras; atvyko daugiau užsieniečių – iš Silezijos ir Vest Virdžinijos <...>. Daugelis paukščių, gyvulių, žuvų ir augalų dingo iš šios srities. Visi ėmė kalbėti, kad žemė pasidarė „rūgšti“. Bet svarbiausia – atsirado skurdas, neramumai, smurto grėsmė.* (Vailderis)

The cohesive chain in the ST consists of simple lexical repetition *came, came, came, came, came* while the TT gives preference to „elegant variation“: *užplūdo, susidrumstė, atsi-kėlė gyventi, atvyko, atsirado*, which is realized through synonyms or near synonyms. These differences in lexical cohesive patterns, on the one hand, could be explained by wide semantics of the verb *came*: *people can come, poverty can come* etc. In Lithuanian *žmonės can atvykti* but not *van-denys* or *skurdas*. On the other hand, stylistic preferences also play a great role in Lithuanian; as the data shows, English simple lexical repetition is rendered into Lithuanian by synonymous expressions (as in the previous example *atsi-kėlė gyventi – atvyko*), and English personal reference in a large number of cases is rendered into Lithuanian by lexical repetition as in the following example:

15) *The picture itself – that was evidence. <...> Once it had given him pleasure to watch it changing and growing old. Of*

late he had felt no such pleasure. It had kept him awake at night. (Wilde)

16) *Tas įrodymas – portretas. <...> Kadaise jam buvo malonu žiūrėti, kaip portretas keičiasi ir sensta. Bet pastaruoju metu to malonumo nebejautė. Portretas trukdė užmigti nakčia.* (Vaidas)

All in all, with the investigation of translations and originals, we may gain an insight into the creation of cohesion during the process of translation. Moreover, it is possible to trace shifts in cohesion on the textual level and identify factors influencing these shifts.

Conclusions

As the study shows, in the process of translation, cohesive patterns of the ST undergo certain changes and are rendered differently into Lithuanian.

These differences are caused by the differences in the languages' grammatical and lexical systems and each language's stylistic preferences.

In the case of reference and ellipsis/ substitution, the major role is played by grammatical factors, i.e. loose/ strict word order, obligatory/ non-obligatory inalienable possessive, a greater or poorer variety of substitution forms at nominal and verbal levels, greater or smaller amount of analytical forms and presence/ absence of the article.

We could claim that the absence of the definite article in Lithuanian forces the translator to look for some supplementary means (lexical, for example) to express the intended meaning of the ST, thus causing shifts not only in cohesion but in coherence as well.

References

1. Alaunienė, Z., 1978. *Sakinių siejimas ir mokinių kalba*. Vilnius: PMTI.
2. Bell, R. T., 1991. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London/ New York: Longman.
3. Blum-Kulka, S., 2004. Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In: L. Venuti, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London/ New York: Routledge, pp.298-313.
4. Ellis, D. G., 1992. *From Language to Communication*, New Jersey /Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
5. Gutwinski, W., 1974. *Cohesion in Literary Texts: a Study of Some Grammatical and Lexical Features of English Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
6. Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R., 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London/ New York: Longman.
7. Hatim, B. & Mason, I., 1994. *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman, London & New York.
8. McCarthy, M., 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
9. Neubert, A. & Shreve, M., 1992. *Translation as Text*. The Kent State University Press.
10. Rosinas, A., 1996. *Lietuvių bendrinės kalbos įvardžiai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijos leidykla.
11. Spraukienė, B., 2008. The Category of Definiteness and Its Investigation in Lithuanian Linguistics. In: *Lietuvių kalba*, (2). Available at: <http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php?id=102> [Accessed March 2010].
12. Toolan, M., 2002. *Language and Literature. An Introduction to Stylistics*. London: Arnold.
13. Valeckienė, A., 1998. *Funkcinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

14. Vaskelienė, J., 2007. *Trumpas teksto lingvistikos žinynas*. Šiauliai: Šiaulių universiteto leidykla.

Sources

1. Cronin, A., 1983. *The Citadel*. Boston: Pyerson.
2. Kroninas A., 1994. *Citadelė*. Vilnius: Vaga.
3. Maugham, S., 1973. *The Moon and Sixpence*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
4. Moemas, S., 1964. *Mėnulis ir skatikas*. Vilnius: Vaga.

5. Tumas-Vaižgantas, J., 1974. *Dėdės ir dėdienės. Nebylys. Rimai ir Nerimai*. Vilnius: Vaga.
6. Wilde, O., 1979. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
7. Vaildas, O., 2001. *Doriano Grėjaus portretas*. Vilnius: Alma littera.
8. Wilder, T., 1967. *The Eighth Day*. New York: Harper & Row.
9. Vailderis, T., 1978. *Aštuntoji diena*. Vilnius: Vaga.

Janina Buitkienė

Rišumo priemonių vartojimas anglų ir lietuvių kalbų tekstuose

Santrauka

Vertimo vaidmenį sunku būtų pervertinti; suvokimas, kaip originalūs šaltiniai turėtų būtų verčiami į svetimas kalbas keitėsi per amžius ir davė peno daugeliui šiuo metu egzistuojančių vertimo teorijų. Viena iš jų teigia, kad verčiamas tekstas yra interpretacijos objektas; vertimas turi atspindėti autoriaus ketinimus, valią ir tuo pačiu išlaikyti teksto giluminį rišumą. Norint pasiekti tai, skirtingos kalbos vartoja nevienodas kalbines priemones. Todėl šiame straipsnyje bandoma patyrinėti, remiantis anglų kalbos grožiniais teksta ir jų vertimais į lietuvių kalbą, tarpfrazinio ryšio priemonių koreliaciją. Kaip parodė tyrimas, referencijos ir substitucijos/ elipsės neatitikimai lietuvių ir anglų kalbų tekstuose yra sąlygojami šių kalbų gramatinės struktūros skirtumų: lietuvių kalbos tekstuose 3-iojo asmens referencija yra žymiai retesnė nei angliškame tekste dėl dviejų priežasčių. Pirma, sintetinė lietuvių kalbos struktūra nereikalauja nuolatinio 3-iojo asmens įvardžio vartojimo veiksnio pozicijoje; antra, lietuviškuose tekstuose pastebimos ryškesnės stilistinės variacijos. Elipsės/ substitucijos vartojimo neatitikimai yra taip pat šių dviejų kalbų gramatinės sistemos skirtumų pasekmė. Angliškuose tekstuose šios ryšio priemonės yra dažnesnės, nes ši kalba, būdama analitinės struktūros, turi daugiau pagalbinių žodžių, substitutų ir kt. Leksinių ryšio priemonių neatitikimas grindžiamas stilistiniais motyvais ir kultūriniais aspektais.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2010 01
Parengtas spaudai 2010 04

About the author

Janina Buitkienė, Dr., Assoc. Prof., Vilnius Pedagogical University, Faculty of Philology, Department of English Philology.

Research interests: discourse analysis, pragmatics, literary text analysis, translation studies.

Address: Vilnius Pedagogical University, Studentų str. 39, LT-08106 Vilnius, Lithuania

E-mail: janina.buitkiene@vpu.lt

DOI: 10.5755/j01.sal.1.16.43358