

*Nadezhda Riabtseva*  
**TRANSLATION STUDIES IN RUSSIA AND BEYOND**  
**PART 1. ANTHOLOGY**

*Надежда Рябцева*  
**Переводоведение в России и за рубежом**  
**Часть 1. Антология**

**1. Main Points. Исходные соображения**

Практическая ценность и эффективность любой теории зависит от ее объяснительной способности, а последняя – от качества соответствующего понятийного аппарата. Отечественная теория перевода в этом отношении требует в настоящее время уточнения ряда своих ключевых положений, особенно относительно терминологии, которая нуждается, в первую очередь, в выделении исходных понятий, а также в систематизации и опоре на качественную лингвистическую теорию.

Корни современного состояния отечественного переводоведения уходят в недалекое прошлое, в 1970–1980-е гг., на которые пришелся пик развития отечественной теории перевода. Именно в эти годы появились замечательные труды выдающихся советских переводчиков-теоретиков: Я.И.Рецкера, А.Д.Швейцера, В.Н.Комиссарова, В.Г.Гака, Г.В.Чернова и др., обладавших не только огромным практическим опытом перевода и предельно тонким чувством иностранного языка, но и необыкновенным даром блестяще переводить.

Но именно в эти годы господствовавшая советская тоталитарная идеологическая система не только замалчивала и «зажимала» наиболее значимые достижения в лингвистике (как в науке и культуре в целом) из-за «неблагонадежности» их авторов, отнесенных к инакомыслящим, но и преследовала их за правозащитную деятельность, всячески их третировала, дискредитировала и пыталась их изолировать, поместить в научный «вакуум». Что ей в большинстве случаев удавалось. Как пишет Ю.Д.Апресян, один из наиболее гонимых тогда ученых-лингвистов, на его имя и на имена других правозащитников-лингвистов был наложен запрет, в научных изданиях снимались ссылки на их работы, им было отказано в публикации научных трудов, их выгоняли из академических институтов, не давали преподавать и т.д. [Апресян 1995, I–VIII]. (Помню ярко иллюстрирующий советский дух случай с публикацией моей книги «Информационные процессы и машинный перевод» (1986 г.) в издательстве «Наука», когда редактор без моего ведома «вымарала» (как тогда говорили) ссылку на одного неугодного советской власти чешского лингвиста вместе с его цитатой, с которой я полемизировала. В результате весь фрагмент «повис в воздухе» и потерял смысл.).

В результате советские теоретики перевода, будучи не только блистательными переводчиками (и преподавателями), но и вынужденными проводниками господствующей идеологии, вольно или невольно должны были игнорировать не только этих авторов, но и их идеи, или относились к ним с недоверием. Это отразилось на теоретических основах советского переводоведения, которое было лишено возможности опереться на качественную лингвистическую теорию, каковой в те годы и по настоящее время является модель «Смысл – Текст». Что касается зарубежного переводоведения, то в нем ситуация была не лучше: ни одна зарубежная лингвистическая теория не могла сравниться с данной моделью по качеству разработки понятийного аппарата и по своей объяснительной силе.

Это показывает, что важнейшей прикладной проблемой отечественного переводоведения выступает в настоящее время уточнение и систематизация его исходных понятий и терминологии, а также установление их связи с современной лингвистической теорией.

Так, в переводоведении используются, казалось бы, все виды теоретических лингвистических и смежных с ними знаний. Тем не менее, на практике часто

оказывается, что они недостаточны, неточны или противоречивы. И периодически возникают новые предложения, например: «Только социолингвистика/ психолингвистика/ семиотика/ прагматика/ дискурс-анализ/ когнитивная наука/ культурология и т.д. может адекватно объяснить, что представляет собой перевод». На деле, правда, оказывается, что предлагаемые при этом объяснения также слабо связаны с практикой. Например, утверждения, что «переводчик рассматривает текст оригинала сквозь призму своего языка и культуры», что «при переводе переводу подвергаются не вербальные знаки, а концепты», или что «поиск вариантов перевода сопровождается одновременным намеренным выведением на «табло сознания» образов слов двух языков» недостаточны, чтобы научить хорошо переводить или последовательно и убедительно объяснить, что представляет собой процесс и результат перевода.

Соответственно, следует особо подчеркнуть, что перевод с одного языка на другой является, по определению, лингвистической деятельностью, поэтому он должен описываться в строгих лингвистических терминах, источником которых является самая развитая современная теория лингвистической семантики – «Интегральное описание языка» (Ю.Д.Апресян), основанное на модели «Смысл–Текст».

## 2. Materials. Характеристика материала:

### Н.К.Рябцева. Избранные опубликованные труды

В пункте 3 содержится антология избранных опубликованных статей автора, посвященных проблемам перевода и связанными с ними вопросами. Статьи были изданы по-английски в практически недоступных для русского читателя источниках. В них последовательно проводится идея использования достижений современной теоретической семантики в прикладных переводоведческих исследованиях.

## 3. *Nadezhda Riabtseva: Selected Publications in English*

### Н.К.Рябцева. Избранные публикации. Английский язык

#### CONTENTS / СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

(\*) *N. Riabtseva*. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND SCIENTIFIC METALANGUAGE // Soviet contributions to some topical linguistic issues. Moscow, Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1990.

(\*\*) *N. Riabtseva*. COMPUTER ASSISTANCE IN THE SELF-TRANSLATION OF SCIENTIFIC TEXTS INTO ENGLISH: A PROTOTYPICAL VERSION // Basic Issues in Translation Studies: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference. Ed. by Albrecht Neubert, Gregory M.Shreve, Klaus Commlich. Kent Forum on Translation Studies. Volume II, Ohio, 1993.

(\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva*. COGNITIVE RHETORIC: INVESTIGATING, TEACHING AND TRANSLATING ACADEMIC STYLE // Proceeding of the symposium on “Language and Technology”. Ed. by Cesare G. Cecioni, Catherine Cheselka. Firenze, 1995, 365-374.

(\*\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva*. LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE AND TRANSLATION IN CROSS-CULTURAL AND APPLIED PERSPECTIVES // Kinga Klaudy et al. (eds.) *Transfere necesse est: Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Current Trends in Studies of Translation and Interpreting*. 1996, Budapest. Budapest, Scholastica, 1997.

(\*\*\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva*. CONTRASTIVE PHRASEOLOGY IN A CROSS-CULTURAL AND COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE // Thelen M. & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.), *Translation and Meaning. Part 5. Proceedings of the Maastricht – Lodz Duo Colloquium*, 2000. Maastricht: Maastricht School of Translation and Interpreting, 2001, 365–378.

(\*\*\*\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva*. PHRASEOLOGY IN A CROSS-CULTURAL AND COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE / Report delivered at Emory University, Atlanta, USA, April, 2000. Доклад, прочитанный в Университете Эмори, Атланта, США, апрель 2000. (Полная версия)

(\*\*\*\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva*. COMBINATORY DICTIONARIES IN TEACHING AND PRACTICING TRANSLATION // Fleischmann E. et al. (ed.) *Translationsdidaktik: Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, 1997.

(\*\*\*\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva*. CONCEPTUAL BLENDING IN CULTURE-SPECIFIC METAPHORS (A Case Study of Russian and English Idioms) // *Journal of Philology*, 2003, N. 1.

(\*\*\*\*\*) N. Riabtseva. COMBINATORY DICTIONARIES IN TEACHING AND PRACTICING TRANSLATION // "Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft": YI Internationale Konferenz, Abstracts. Leipzig, 1996.

(\*\*\*\*\*) N.Riabtseva. STUDYING LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE AND TEACHING TRANSLATION // Second International Conference on Current Trends in Studies of Translation and Interpreting. Abstracts. Budapest, 1996, pp. 91–92.

(\*\*\*\*\*) List of other publications in English by the same author

\* \* \*

(\*) N. Riabtseva. **ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND SCIENTIFIC METALANGUAGE // Soviet contributions to some topical linguistic issues. Moscow, Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1990.**

Artificial intelligence (AI) is aimed at simulating human mental activities, one of the most important of which is scientific cognition. Problem-solving systems, retrieval systems, machine translation and other types of AI algorithms are still rather primitive in comparison with human capacities. That is why AI cannot but cause to emerge many disciplines, studying human cognition: psychology, linguistics, cybernetics, philosophy. They study cognitive activities from different points of view. Linguistics tries to expose how mental processes are reflected in language, text and discourse.

One of the most interesting objects of investigation in this respect is scientific discourse and its metalanguage in particular, as it is an instrument of scientific cognition.

There are at least two different interpretations for the notion "scientific metalanguage". One of them is a "linguistic interpretation". It views scientific metalanguage as the language of linguistics, or more strictly, its terminology. This approach was undertaken by prof. O.Achmanova from Moscow University, and her colleagues, who have been studying linguistic terminology for more than twenty years. The main idea of treating the problem of metalanguage linguistically is to differentiate the object of description – a natural language, – from the scientific language, or terminology, with the help of which the object (a natural language) is described. This interpretation of metalanguage may be called "a narrow approach", as it means that only linguistics, but not any other science has metalanguage elements.

Another approach is "mathematical". The notion of metalanguage was first introduced in 1934 by a great mathematician A.Tarsky, when he got acquainted with famous paradoxes that Whitehead and Russell were discussing at the beginning of this century: a liar paradox, a paradox of the sets theory, etc. Those two could not solve them and came to the conclusion that the basis of mathematics was elusive.

Tarsky successfully solved the problem by introducing the notion of metalanguage. He called such words as *truth*, *falsity*, *a set*, etc., metalinguistic. It is obvious that these words are not linguistic terms. So O.Achmanova and her school would not, of course, include them into metalanguage. They are the notions of logic and philosophy, so, in fact, any science can have metalinguistic elements, and it is quite rational.

I want to introduce another, a wider interpretation of the notion "metalanguage".

Every scientific discipline has its own terminology. It is a conscious representation of the knowledge that describes the corresponding reality: biological terminology, for example, is a systematized knowledge of living nature, astronomic terminology represents knowledge in cosmic objects, linguistic terminology reflects what we have already discovered and described in language, and so on.

But there is a certain volume of non-terminological concepts that are used as metalanguage elements in many (or sometimes in all) sciences. If we exclude terminological elements from scientific texts we then can easily detect those words without which scientific discourse would not be actualized. These words are *theory*, *structure*, *function*, *law*, *rule*, *problem*, *system*, *possibility*, *necessity*, *truth*, *conclusion*, and many others. We shall call them metalanguage ones.

The fact is that metalanguage is such a subtle thing, that we do not reflect upon it. When we are engaged in a scientific discourse, we use metalanguage subconsciously and do

not pay any special attention to it. That is why metalanguage is particularly valuable for cognitive sciences: it reflects cognitive processes of which we are unaware. The things we do consciously, can be detected, described, and analysed, but what we do subconsciously, cannot be analyzed in detail. And it is metalanguage that reflects subconscious cognitive activity.

So cognitive approach to scientific discourse means differentiating between terminology and metalanguage. The former provides conscious representation of disciplinary knowledge, the latter – subconscious conceptualisation of cognition. Metalanguage is a complex and universal system of scientific means meant for knowledge production and representation, comprising:

- (1) cognitive modality operators: *necessity, adequate, verify, validity*, etc;
- (2) quantifiers: *a set, subclass, sequence*, etc.;
- (3) different types of qualifiers;
- (4) "research predicates": *investigate, study, discover*, etc.;
- (5) intentional variables: *hypothesis, conclusion, theory, concept, point of view, prediction*, etc.;
- (6) extensional variables: *a law, tendency, rule*, etc.;
- (7) theoretical (logical) predicates: *system, structure, function, feature*, etc.;
- (8) logical and referential operators.

In my paper on cognitive predicates (Riabtseva 1988) I described how new knowledge is introduced in science through using metalanguage elements. In another paper (Riabtseva 1989) I analyzed semantic, logical and functional features of theoretical predicates that organize scientific discourse into question-answer system. Such theoretical predicates as *system, function, structure* and many others provide science with means to put unstandard questions and to give unpredictable answers to them. It was also stressed there that the main features of metalanguage lexical classes are:

- they have specific syntactic distribution,
- their meaning is organized according to specific semantic patterns,
- they expose different cognitive processes.

Metalanguage elements have also specific cognitive functions. They are: (1) organizing science in question-answer system; (2) generating, processing and improving scientific knowledge; (3) stimulating cognition; (4) uniting different scientific disciplines into Science and providing exchange of knowledge between them.

Here I am going to analyze how common sense has penetrated into scientific discourse and what consequences this fact has caused in the domain of defining cognition.

Common sense is traced in the expressions like **The sun rises in the morning, Time is flying, Time is money**. We say such things, though we know that the sun is not a human being and cannot rise, and that time has no wings to fly. But still common sense is full of such representations. All abstract or less perceptible things like time, emotions, communication, mental products, are interpreted in commonsense language as if they were material objects. The mechanism of generating such representations as **Time is money, it is precious and can be spared**, was brightly and in detail analyzed by G.Lakoff and M. Johnson (1980). The mechanism, called "folk theories" by G.Lakoff, that is generating commonsense representations of abstract things as if they were perceptual, is that abstract things are structured in the terms of physical world, for example: *fruitless idea, empty words, to spare time*. This mechanism means metaphorization. It is overt and implicit, and we are not aware of it.

Such metaphors help to conceptualize and structure abstract things in familiar and simple images. They are so widely spread in any language, that native speakers do not realize them and are unaware of them. Moreover, conceptual metaphors are incorporated in

the culture. As G.Lakoff believes, we live according to such metaphors, as **Discussion is a war**, **Time is a limited resource**, and many others (Lakoff 1985).

Cognitive and artistic role of metaphorization is well known: it can transfer what is imperceptible into "perceptible". It identifies new characteristics of an object, generates new cognitive associations and introduces impressive images in the text, making it more expressive. In other words, metaphorization enriches our knowledge of the world.

How physical and emotional world of human beings is conceptualized through metaphorization, was analyzed by N.D.Arutiunova (1976). She also called metaphorization "a categorical mistake", meaning that it is a "fruitful mistake", as it promotes cognition (Arutiunova 1978).

There are a lot of such "mistakes" in scientific discourse as well. "Scientific" metaphorization has been studied up to now only as a heuristic mechanism in creating scientific terminology (Nikitina 1987; Hoenigswald, Viener 1987; Telia 1988). For example, linguistics *qua* a science has introduced such metaphorical terms, as a *derivational nest*, *genealogical tree*, *a family of languages* that have further terminological derivations. Metaphorical terminology is introduced consciously and demands obligatorily, as any other terminology, strict definitions, as it is a law of introducing new terms.

Metaphorical images are also characteristic to scientific metalanguage. But metalanguage is opposed in this respect to terminology, as it employs metaphorization according to the patterns of commonsense language. That is, metaphorization is used unconsciously and implicitly. Hence, metalanguage uses "physical" language to conceptualize ideal things, such as beliefs, knowledge, theories and other mental "products", and thus exploits implicit comparisons. The corresponding representations are not fixed in definitions, as terminology is, cf.: *a route of scientific research*, *fruits of science*.

Now we shall pass over to intentional variables. They are of our particular concern, as they refer to the results of human cognition and belong to scientific metalanguage. We shall see how intentional variables are defined and conceptualized in scientific metalanguage through metaphorization, particularly in Russian, and what positive and negative results it produced from the point of view of artificial intelligence and modeling of human cognition by computers. We are thus going to expose and identify the "cognitive paradox" that arises as the consequence of using commonsense mechanism of defining mental products.

Intentional variables name the elements and components of scientific cognition: intellectual operations, mental states, results of scientific cognition? etc. These names are: *theory*, *hypothesis*, *idea*, *thought*, *conception*, *point of view*, *knowledge and belief*, *opinion*, *suggestion*, and many others. They are defined in metalanguage as if they were material, physical objects. To study their usage in metalanguage means to detect what we do know about scientific cognition, and what we do not know about it, or to put it in another way, what knowledge about cognition is fixed in scientific metalanguage and to what degree it is valuable, adequate and reliable.

\*

Through scientific texts there emerge different images of sciences and scientific cognition. Three of them will be of our particular concern, as they are the dominating ones: a "perceptive" image of science, a "mechanical" image, and a "biological" image. They are incorporated into such expressions as *to observe a problem*, *to build a theory*, *a mature conception* and many others. In fact, there are a lot of images that are exploited in representing human and scientific thinking, but they are not analyzed here in detail because they either belong to the mentioned above or were studied by G.Lakoff or other philosophers, for instance, the metaphors "container", "a structural metaphor", "mind is a computer", and many others. Further on they will be meant, but not mentioned.

To structure the world of ideas and cognition with familiar "physical" language is to implicate a lot:

- (1) This is the way scientific metalanguage generates, unconsciously, images of science and cognition;
- (2) This is the way to produce new synonymous and antonymous expressions;
- (3) and to expose contradictions in representing cognition and causing to emerge new ones;
- (4) This is the way that metaphorization forms the style of scientific discourse;
- (5) and produces semantic conflicts that appear when different images of science are compared.

Besides, metaphorization exploits certain psychological beliefs, characteristic of common sense, which are, no doubt, of prescientific, naive character. Thus the depth is considered to be not only a quantitative, but also a qualitative parameter: "the more" is better, than "the less" (**richness is better than poverty**). Such beliefs are incorporated into the expressions **a deep thought, a deep structure (in syntax)**, which implicate that they are opposed to less important (less good) *surface thoughts* and *surface structures*.

It is clear that every image of science and cognition does expose something new and particular and extends our knowledge about them. Different images are to complement each other. But at the same time they cannot but darken certain features of cognition and conflict with each other: we cannot say *\*to construct a tree of cognition*, because a tree should *grow*. Neither can we completely transfer a physical language to cognitive activity: we cannot say *\*to construct a theory in the Empire style (Gusev 1984)*.

So those are the aspects according to which the analysis of science images is presented below.

1. The perceptual metaphor "brains are eyes" develops in such expressions as **to observe a tendency** (cf. *proslezivat' zakonomernosni*), **rassmatrivat' smisl predlozheniya** ("to observe the sense of a sentence"). This metaphor is based on the connections between perception and cognition and can be explained by the fact that perceptual verbs are capable to develop epistemic meanings, like in the following examples: **to demonstrate the supremacy of systemic approach, to follow the way of thinking**. They can also acquire axiological meanings, like in the expressions *This belief seems simplified* = "is **appreciated** negatively", **to observe (rassmatrivat')** *the air resistance as unimportant* = "to neglect it".

The metaphor "brains are eyes" generates an image of a science which is "looking" at the reality and trying to "see" the truth: **osvetit' problemu, peresmotret' teoriyu**. This "paradigm" makes synonymous such expressions as *point of view, observation, view* on the one hand, and *belief, statement, prediction, hypothesis, theory, knowledge* on the other. This fact is exemplified by the following interpretations:

- our views are deeper ("nashi vzgliady stali glubze")* = "our knowledge is deeper";
- the partisans of the antagonistic views* = "of the antagonistic **beliefs**";
- this point of view turned correct* = "this **prediction** turned correct".

So perceptual notions acquire "mental" meanings, and, what is of particular significance, knowledge and belief are not differentiated, thus becoming almost identical.

"Perceptual" metaphor is based on commonsense belief that "observable is true". That is why it treats unobservable things as if they were observable, thus implying that their cognition is correct, cf.: **to scan a tendency** (though you cannot see it, as a tendency is unobservable), **a blurred concept**. But this metaphor, at the same time, correctly reflects the goals that science pursues, i.e. seeing through observable objects their unobservable essence, cf.: *to see in the development of science the dialectics of relative and absolute truth* = "to see the dialectics in the (through) the development"; *to observe (rassmatrivat')* *abstractions as an element of cognition* – "abstractions = element".

So, prescientific "roots" of the metaphor "brains are eyes" come from the belief that observation is the main and especially truthful way of gaining knowledge. But it is quite clear

that science studies mainly unobservable things: scientific cognition differs from common sense in that its aim is to expose unobservable: laws of nature, society and cognition.

2. "Mechanical" (dynamic) metaphor is characteristic to several images of science.

(1) The image "cognition is a hard route" appears in such expressions as *in the course of the research, to go beyond the **limits** of widely spread beliefs that..., Lacatos' conception **leads** to interesting historical openings*. According to this metaphor cognition has a starting point: *ottalkivat'sya ot predpolozheniya* ("to start from the presupposition that..."); a final point, or a goal: *to come to a conclusion*; it has a direction: *a direction of thoughts, to continue the research in the same direction*; it has its own orientations and barriers: *to pursue a theoretical goal, an impact of the idea, natalkivat'sya na noviy problemi* ("to come across unexpected problems"). It demands great efforts: *to try another approach to solving the problem, to come back to the idea that...*

(2) The image 'cognition is "constructing a building" of science' develops in the expressions like *mathematical constructions, the building of science* (literal translation for Russian *zdaniye nauki*), *to build a theory*. "The building" of science should have a basement: *the research is based on broad factual data/ is supported by the conceptual system Q/ is strengthened by the supplied arguments*. Its "constructive blocks" should be fitted to each other: *This practical systematization is fitted to the theory, to build the conception Q into the theory T*. The process of constructing the building of knowledge is a hard work that is why it is accompanied by fundamental reconstructions and even with breaking down the basements: *to break traditional beliefs, to reconstruct a theory, to subvert the base of mathematics*.

(3) Another image represents science as a process of extracting valuable matters out of deep layers of substance, or producing material wealth. This picture develops in the expressions like *to gain / save / produce / extract / use knowledge; to generate ideas / hypotheses / interpretations, etc.*

(4) The representation of cognition as if it were combat activities, or a struggle, is implied in such expressions as *a **strategy** of scientific research, to **mobilize** knowledge, intellectual **arsenal**, Theory T was a **victory***, etc. This image is based on a commonsense belief that to get some material wealth one should struggle for them, i.e., apply substantial physical efforts.

In general, "mechanical" (dynamic) metaphor exploits the belief that mechanical (physical) work should yield material products useful in everyday life. This metaphor defines intellectual work as if it were a physical one, and intellectual results as if they were material, cf.: *the **mechanisms** of generating ideas, the **chain** of thoughts, to **build** a theory on solid factual data*.

The effect is similar to the one produced in case 1: the difference between knowledge and belief is neutralized. Thus, in Russian, speaking about both, knowledge and belief, we can say that they are *produced, constructed, reviewed*. They are both placed in the initial and in the final points of research process: *to start from a belief / idea / hypothesis / theory / knowledge – to come to a belief / thought / theory, etc.; cf.: to implement the theory into practice – to implement one's knowledge*.

3. "Biological" metaphor implicitly relates cognition and its results to a living being or a plant. They are born, they grow, flourish, have "roots" and dye. This metaphor develops in the expressions *a **fruitful** hypothesis, a new **birth** of the idea, the roots of the theory*, etc. The metaphor stems from a commonsense belief that growing is a natural process, which should provide a natural quantitative enlargement of matter and should lead to natural qualitative changes. It is based on the assumption that "to grow means to bring fruits". Thus the growth of knowledge is represented as a natural process whose development necessarily turns quantitative changes into qualitative ones, for example, "the deeper the roots of a theory, the better the theory". It is quite clear that cognition and science may well go in a different way: cardinally new and consequently particularly important scientific results

should and would contradict widely spread beliefs ("roots") and cause reconstructions in previously gained knowledge. (Suffice it to remind of the relativity theory).

The images that are used to define cognition are, on the one hand, incompatible (we cannot *\*grow the building of science*). But, on the other hand, they do fit each other, cf.: *the route, chosen by the scientist, was fruitful*. This compatibility can be explained by the fact that all the images defining cognition are well structured and are logically congruent: they fix the dynamics and progression of cognition, its cyclelike character, its direction and goals. The starting point of cognition is identified with a basement, or with the beginning of a route, or with a seed, etc. A progress in cognition is introduced metaphorically as constructing a building, a movement forwards, growth, or a struggle. All the metaphors fix the difficulties that arise during the process of cognition and the need to apply great efforts to gain results. The final point of cognition is identified with completion of a work, or a struggle, or with "fruits", or reaching the "depths", or the point of destination. Cf.: *to finish theoretical constructions, to generate a fruitful idea*.

Among the effects caused by metaphorization in representing mental activity one is that "desired" is being given for a real state of affairs. That means an unconscious introduction of common sense, which cannot be always adequate to "scientific sense". For example, sometimes unobserved is being given for observed: it is impossible *\*rassmatrivat' funkzii* ('to observe functions'); sometimes quantity is being given for quality: *to deepen cognition* (as in Russian: *uglubl'at' znaniya*), *growth of knowledge*; sometimes opinion is being given for knowledge because the starting and ultimate points of cognition are represented by one and the same notions: *idea, theory, thought, hypothesis*, etc. These notions are treated identically and can mean both an opinion and knowledge, depending on a context. This is in conflict with our strong belief that science should produce knowledge, but not opinions. Quantitative growth of knowledge (new facts) is very important in everyday life, but in science new facts testifying to the effect of a well-known law do not mean new scientific knowledge.

So it is clear that common sense should not substitute scientific consciousness, though it happens sometimes, as scientific metalanguage exposes it. But it does not mean that common sense is quite alien to the scientific one. Hegel was the first to expose, analyse and appreciate the role that common sense and language have been always playing in forming and developing scientific language (Hegel 1972, p.82). To testify to the same effect, we shall point out positive results in using the pre-scientific manner of defining ideal matters by "physical" language, through metaphorization. This mechanism is very productive and provides:

(1) boundless variety of language means to reveal new characteristics of mental activities (and not only them). For example, since the end of '50-s the metaphor "mind is a computer" was very fruitful and progressive. At present it has already worked out its cognitive potential and is to be substituted by a more productive and, perhaps, more exact one. U. Neisser pointed out in 1967 that computational metaphor considerably simplifies human mental abilities, which are far more complicated when compared with computers (Neisser 1967; cf. Gardner 1985). So the computational metaphor is to be substituted by a next one, and it may be, say, a chemical metaphor, or any other, cf.: *assimilation of knowledge, crystallization of a thought*;

(2) a simple, convenient, comfortable and even artistic way to present complicated and intricate mental activity;

(3) scientific metalanguage with a paradigm that helps to organize thoughts and their account, thus generating a style of scientific thinking;

(4) the metalanguage with creative potential. As is well known, image-bearing thinking is a most creative one. Science, being a creative activity, cannot manage without figurative, picturesque and image-bearing mentality. Metaphorization helps to develop such mentality, as



images are implemented and introduced in language through metaphors. That is why scientific cognition and discourse would never cope without explicit or implicit images.

But nevertheless, apart from common sense, artistic and poetic creative activities, the mechanism of defining mentality in physical terms plays in scientific activity not only a positive role, but a negative one as well. It comes from the fact that it produces an illusion as if science and its metalanguage had an unlimited volume of linguistic means to represent and describe mentality, and, consequently, have already achieved great progress in studying human intelligence. The point is that these linguistic means are indirect, alien, with limited heuristic potential; they cannot identify mental operations and their results in full.

No doubt, "physical" language, defining mentality, is, in this particular respect, an obstacle through which we cannot see our ignorance in human intellectual possibilities. It conceals this ignorance.

It was computers that threw light on considerable gaps in our knowledge of mentality and cognition. All researchers in artificial intelligence and cognitive sciences agree that human mentality is extremely difficult to model and simulate by computer programs only because we know too little about its structure, functions and operation (Fodor 1987; Searle 1984; Winograd, Flores 1985, etc). Now that we come to realize this fact, we can find proofs to it in scientific and everyday language as well.

The first point is that most verbs and predicates describing cognitive activities and operations are interchangeable in contexts:

*to observe the problems of semantics = to study / investigate / lay down / discuss / expose, etc., the problems of semantics.*

On the contrary, verbs describing physical activities and operations strictly and exactly identify the corresponding situations and in their direct meaning cannot substitute each other, cf. *to walk, to fly, to swim, to run*. It does not imply that science has no exact knowledge at all about mental activity. It is fixed in the oppositions *analyse - synthesize, differentiate – generalize, etc.* But still they are not sufficient to model human intelligence by computer programs.

The second point is that any natural language vocabulary contains much more verbs describing physical world than those describing mental world, though the latter is at least not less diverse than the former.

The third point is that new "mental" lexics emerge very slowly, despite the growing interest to the problems of knowledge and mentality and much investigation in this domain, all evoked by artificial intelligence problems. For example, Ch.Pierce introduced a new term *abduction* in supplement to *induction* and *deduction*. Then Carnap introduced the term *traduction*, and, just now, McMullin (1987) defined still another term *retroduction* for identifying specifically scientific causal explanation. The advantage of the notions is evident as they do not correspond to physical world, but only to the mental one, and can be formally exemplified, as they are terms. (Terminology is, as it was pointed above, a conscious representation of scientific knowledge).

So, we may conclude, that applying physical language to mental world generates a semantic conflict: it produces the effect that scientific metalanguage disposes of infinite variety of language means to define mental activity and its products, but still our knowledge about them is quite insufficient.

Using the notions of reference theory, we may state that commonsense way of defining mental activities gives us the opportunity to name them by attributive descriptions, while the present imperatives of scientific investigation demands definite reference to them by their "proper names", which we are to give.

#### REFERENCES

Arutiunova 1976 - Arutiunova N.D. Predlozenie i ego cmisl (Sentence and its meaning). Moscow, 1976.

- Arutiunova 1978 - Arutiunova N.D. Funktsionalnie tipi yasikovoy metafori (Functional types of language metaphors) //Izvestiya AN SSSR, Seria literaturi i yazika, 1978, N 4.
- Fodor 1987 - Fodor J.A. Mental Representations // Scientific Inquiry in Philosophical Perspective. Ed. by N.Rescher. Lanham, 1987.
- Gardner 1985 - Gardner H. The Mind's New Science. New York, 1985.
- Gusev 1984 - Gusev S.S. Nauka i metafora (Science and metaphor). Leningrad, 1984.
- Hegel 1972 - Hegel G.F.W. Nauka logiki (The science of logics). Moscow, 1972.
- Hoenigswald, Viener 1987 - Hoenigswald H.M., Viener L. (eds) Biological Metaphor and Cladistic Classification: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. Pinter, 1987.
- Lakoff 1985 - Lakoff G. Metaphors, Folk Theories and the Possibilities of Dialogue // Dialogue: An Interdisciplinary Approach. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, etc., 1985.
- Lakoff, Johnson 1980 - Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago, Univ. Press, 1980.
- McMullin 1987 - McMullin E. Explanatory Success and the Truth of Theory // Scientific Inquiry in Philosophical Perspective. 1987.
- Neisser 1967 - Neisser U. Cognitive Psychology. New York, 1967.
- Nikitina 1987 - Nikitina S.E. Semanticheskiy analiz yazika nauki (Semantic analysis of the language of science). Moscow, 1987.
- Riabtseva 1988 - Riabtseva N.K. Protivopostavleniya v klas se kognitivov (Oppositions in the class of cognitive verbs) // Pragmatika i problemi intensionalnosti. Moscow, 1988.
- Riabtseva 1989 - Riabtseva N.K. Interrogativnost' nauchnogo yazika (Interrogative frame in scientific language) // Loghicheskii analiz yazika: Problemi intensionalnikh i pragmaticheskikh kontextov. Moskow, 1989.
- Searle 1984 - Searle J.R. Mind, Brains, and Science. Harward, 1984.
- Telia 1988 - Telia V.N. (ed.) Metafora v yazike i texte (Metaphors in language and in text). Moscow, 1988.
- Winograd, Flores 1985 - Winograd T., Flores F. Understanding Computers and Cognition: A New Foundation for Design. New Jersy, 1985.

\* \* \*

(\*\*) *N. Riabtseva*. **COMPUTER ASSISTANCE IN THE SELF-TRANSLATION OF SCIENTIFIC TEXTS INTO ENGLISH: A PROTOTYPICAL VERSION** // **Basic Issues in Translation Studies: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference**. Ed. by Albrecht Neubert, Gregory M.Shreve, Klaus Commlich. Kent Forum on Translation Studies. Volume II. Ohio, 1993.

*"Knowledge is no more important  
than the way in which it is presented"*  
M.Clyne

### **Basic assumptions**

To spread their ideas and results scientists have to translate their papers into foreign languages, preferably into English. There are many advantages to self-translating one's own scientific papers. The main one is that because the best way to translate is ostensibly to translate "by ideas", but not "by words" or "by sentences", the "author" of a scientific text should be the best renderer of its ideas into another language. But, then, of course, the author has to overcome a psychological and linguistic barrier, as academic writing in a foreign language requires certain communicative knowledge, such as the ability to combine words idiomatically. A good translation should sound idiomatic, in order to imitate the linguistic competence of a native speaker. This task is not easy. A native speaker has a subconscious "feel" for how to combine words properly, an implicit knowledge that cannot always be consciously explained (Chomsky 1986, 25). A native speaker produces discourse collocations without paying attention to their lexical interdependency. It's much more difficult for a foreigner to do the same at the outset: he should first do it consciously. From an interlinguistic and translation point of view, the greater majority of word combinations in discourse turn out

to be idiomatic, – as they can't be translated word by word. In Russian, for example, we don't *a k e a bus*, but "sit on it", we don't *go to bed*, but "go for sleeping", and so on. Intralinguistically such expressions are not considered to be idiomatic, but interlinguistically they are, for they are not literal translations of each other. Lexical co-occurrence hasn't become yet a matter of persistent and systematized presentation in dictionaries and foreign language teaching (Smadia 1989, 163). The BBI practice is only the beginning in this area (Benson e.a. 1986). Still less attention is paid to "scientific phraseology".

Writing scientific texts is an intricate task even in the native language. Doing it in a foreign language is twice as difficult (Riabtseva 1991). Academic writing style differs drastically from all other kinds of literature: its contents and language are inseparable. Scientific writing is, to some extent, science itself; it is a means of doing science properly. Writing science is an obligatory, and integral part of science. That's why "Knowledge is no more important than the way in which it is presented" (Clyne 1987, 238). The purpose of an academic paper is to introduce new scientific knowledge. Its rhetoric is a linguistic/ textual device to assist the reader in understanding and accepting this knowledge. Knowledge and language combine in the rhetorical organization of a scientific discourse. The effect of their combination is to manifest valid scientific reasoning communicatively. This implies logical progression in thought and a recursive textual structure. Rhetorical organization helps delineate the author's thoughts and line of argument and induce acceptance of the ideas he is offering. It is the primary instrument for converting scientific research into scientific communication.

An academic paper is not a chronological, or even logical account of scientific research. Research is usually done intuitively, with interruptions, bifurcations, and circular regressions. Scientific writing, on the contrary, is a recursive, progressive and cumulative exposure of how new scientific knowledge is reasonably developing out of facts, arguments, and theories. The rhetorical organization of scientific discourse is of a unique, distinguished, and peerless character because it creates a cognitive chain or progression of thoughts and ideas. It is supported by explicit causal relations between propositions, conceptual cohesion between scientific notions, and prospective succession of thought (as opposed to their intersection). A recursive textual structure develops through explicating "the plot", contrasting its constituents, and associating them with the main idea. Cognitive progression is the effect created if the author consciously selects, assembles, and associates the appropriate linguistic means of presenting the contents. As R.Day (1979, 97) comments, "the writing will almost take care of itself if you can get the thing organized". All epistemic operations over text organization are realized in the text by metadiscursive expressions and collocations, or their functional equivalents, formal and conceptual. Rhetorical organization creates cognitive progression of the contents either explicitly or implicitly, formally or conceptually. But more often it combines all the possibilities. Linguistically these possibilities are derived from metadiscourse elements, whose prototypical objective is to expose, explicate, organize, and bind the propositional contents of discourse.

Every scientific text, from a rhetorical point of view, has a "textual" and a "metatextual" part. There are propositional contents, dictum, representing scientific knowledge, and the characteristic mode of "wrapping" it up (Crismore 1989). Disciplinary terminology, constituting the dictum part, comprises less than one-quarter to one-third of all the words used in a scientific paper. The rest of the words are mostly of a metadiscursive character. The better part of them are not registered in dictionaries, though they are highly idiomatic: *to adopt an approach, to meet constraints, to extract information, to advance a distinction, to cover a problem, to introduce a notion*, and so on. It is much easier for a scientist to translate his disciplinary terminology than to translate metadiscourse collocations. They, not the terminology, are the main barrier that prevents foreign scientists from writing their papers in English.

Metadiscourse elements in academic style are communicatively obligatory, as they participate in organizing a rhetorically appropriate "scientific plot", to explicate the cognitive progression of ideas. They are also axiologically relevant, because they serve to evaluate the contents. Scientific metadiscourse is comprised of metacommunicational, metalinguistic, metatextual, and metascientific – epistemic – expressions, and modal, logical, and other operators. They all facilitate text production and promote text perception. They are the main means of text organization. They identify and qualify propositional contents in the text, cohere and structure scientific accounts, and explicate the progression of thought or line of argument (Techtmeier 1990).

From a translation point of view one of the most important problems is to expose the phraseological realization of metadiscourse and propose ways to translate them. Most metadiscourse collocations are idiomatic word combinations that can't always be translated literally. The reason is that they are a result of the subconscious metaphorization of a mental world and implicit conceptualization of cognition, e.g., *to come/ go to the theatre - to come/\*go to a conclusion*.

It is not accidental that most discourse collocations are idiomatic. Their idiomaticity is "meaningful" because it is conceptually grounded and motivated. Our mentality is organized conceptually, and this conceptual organization can be traced in the way how words combine with each other in discourse. Conversely, lexical co-occurrence in discourse exposes conceptual organization of mentality. Every language reflects the mentality of its speakers and their cultural/ national environment. Different cultures can think in different ways about processes, events or phenomena, leading to culturally variable concept systems (Vendler 1972, 112). Common cultural traditions often lead to similar conceptual systems, but they never coincide completely. That's why a Frenchman may say *\*I made attention at*, instead of *I paid attention to*, translating word for word his native expression *Je fais attention a (qch.)* (Smadia 1989, 164).

There are several ways philosophers discuss the conceptual organization of mentality. George Lakoff speaks of "folk theories", Eleanor Rosch talks about prototypes. All such notions have much in common and complement each other. They involve images, common sense, categorization, and motivation as an instrument in explaining interdependences between language and mentality (Lakoff 1986; Rosch 1975). Scientific metadiscourse collocations are the result of metaphorical categorizations of a mental world. This categorization involves several conceptual patterns, motivating various lexical co-occurrences in scientific metadiscourse and resulting in numerous different phraseological collocations. The main patterns of conceptualizing are the metaphors "brains are eyes", "cognition is hard (physical) work or a struggle", "knowledge is a plant", although there are some other patterns (Riabtseva 1990).

The metaphor "brains are eyes" creates a perceptive image of science and cognition. It develops through such expressions as *to observe a tendency, to show/ trace/ scan a problem, to demonstrate/ display an approach, to review a theory, to throw light on the question, a blurred concept, a bright idea, a vague meaning*, etc. Such collocations are motivated by the existing connections between perception and cognition. In different languages this conceptual pattern generates similar, but not identical collocations. For example, in Russian we can say "to look at the meaning", "to glance at the principles", etc.

The metaphor "cognition is hard work or a struggle" reflects a dynamic image of science, presenting it as a hard route that should be traversed from beginning to end and as a struggle against difficulties. It is also seen as "mining", "digging", and extracting something important out of deep layers and bringing it to the surface, or, alternatively, as building or constructing something high, solid, and strong. Such a dynamic conceptualization of science gives birth to numerous collocations, such as *to build a theory, to come across unexpected problems, to supply arguments, to hit upon an idea, to accumulate knowledge, to follow the author's way of thinking, to shake beliefs, a direction of thoughts, a rough idea, a deep understanding*.

Such collocations are motivated by the fact that cognition is hard mental work consisting of numerous intellectual operations. In different languages this conceptual pattern generates similar but not identical expressions and word combinations. For example, in Russian we can say "to build a chain of thoughts", "to deepen cognition and understanding", "to brake an opinion", "to go beyond the limits of a widespread belief", "the edifice of science", "to return to the idea", etc.

The metaphor "knowledge is a plant" reflects a "biological" interpretation of cognition and science. It is implicitly present in such expressions as *a mature theory, a fruitful hypothesis, the roots of the theory, to generate an idea*, among others.

There are many ways to metaphorize cognition and present it textually as if it were a physical or visible process. This is the most common practice in the subconscious conceptualization of abstract and imperceptible phenomena, generally characteristic of mentality and, accordingly, common to all languages. Most of these metaphoric constructs are used in scientific metadiscourse subconsciously in the form of idiomatic metadiscourse expressions, e.g., *to venture/ entertain/ hand down an opinion (idea); to proceed on the hypothesis/ theory/ concept; to provide a basis for a theory; to supply/ put forward/ present*

*an argument*. When translating a scientific paper one should realize that such patterns can't be translated word for word, but ought to be "restored" in the target language according to similar conceptual patterns. In this way the author enters another conceptual world, switches to another conceptual system. In Russian, for example, we say "to open a law", but in English the law is discovered.

### Computer Implementation

All the considerations sketchily laid out above were a background to support the argument for compiling an expert computer system *Version*. The purpose of the system is to assist non-English-speaking scientists in writing or translating their papers into English. It provides linguistic assistance, helping the scientific writer "to package" disciplinary information in appropriate metadiscourse idiomatic expressions and collocations. It also assists in organizing the narrative of the scientific text and promotes stylistic skill in explicating scientific reasoning and the inference structure of the argument. *Version* provides three types of information on metadiscourse collocations characteristic of the academic style: grammatical, lexical, rhetorical.

The *Grammatical* module provides assistance in combining words idiomatically according to the grammatical peculiarities of English verbs, nouns, adjectives, and adverbs; it provides special assistance in choosing the correct prepositions, verbal adverbs, or derivatives, e.g., *to pass ON to consider a problem, to come TO a conclusion - to arrive AT a conclusion*, etc. The *Lexical* module helps the user to idiomatically combine words and choose discourse collocations and patterns characteristic of the English academic style, e.g., *to meet a necessity, to span the gap, to adopt an approach, to discuss at length, severe/conventional constraints*, etc.

The *Rhetorical* module helps users to introduce, discuss, and infer scientific knowledge and to choose communicative patterns for logical text organization, e.g., *The purpose of the present paper is to outline P; It should be pointed out [immediately] that P; P may be objected; Consider a different approach; We shall place constraints on P; We are going to describe direct approaches to the problem P; It proved to be informative that P; In conclusion, P; It is reasonable/ important to point out that P; This method appears to be relevant to P*; etc.

The metadiscourse lexicon in *Version* is organized in patterns by form and into classes by meaning, to provide easy access to the linguistic information. The patterns use the alphabetic characters X, Y, and P as "place holders" for the (terminological) nouns or dictum propositions that would occur in a scientific text. All the collocations, phraseological units and discourse patterns, included in the system, were extracted from original English texts of various scientific disciplines. All of them are typical of the English academic style.

This software for processing "scientific collocations" is meant for use in self-translating scientific papers into English. Its operation is multi-directional; there are a number of access paths to one and the same item – grammatical, lexical, or rhetorical. The operator interacts with the system in the form of dialogue; he chooses and calls up the required list when he wants to check which grammatical form can be used for the item in question, with what modifiers and "lexical functions" it can be used, or what collocations are most appropriate at the present step of reasoning.

To improve the ability of the software to assist in self-translation, it was used in translating abstracts and summaries. All its failures to provide assistance, and all unanswered queries were registered and classified. Changes were made to the software to account for any recorded deficiencies. It is and will be open for extension.

### Linguistic information in the System

Grammatical information, incorporated in the system reflects the mutual interdependency between notional and auxiliary lexical items and provides information on their idiomatic combination. "Grammatical idioms" are constructed from "governors" (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs) and their dependent elements (prepositions, particles, and adverbials).

"Grammatical" prepositions are among the most idiomatic elements in a language. Their idiomaticity is also of conceptual origin (Pinker 1989, 370). That is why they cannot be translated but should be "restored" according to the grammatical rules of the target language; e.g., *in the theory – within the paradigm*. Verbs, nouns and adjectives in the system have a list of prepositions with which they prefer to combine, and patterns for when they are used

without prepositions, e.g., *to reach a solution, beyond any doubt, interested in – contrary to – different from.*

Russian and English verb derivation differs drastically: the first prefers prefixes, the second adverb particles. English verbs denoting mental operations have a list of adverb particles with which they usually combine in scientific texts, e.g., *to pass on to consider P, the analysis is set forth, to run into difficulties, to bring about changes, to set about axioms, to spark off a debate, to be involved into a matter,* etc.

Lexical information incorporated in the system reflects lexical interdependency between adjectives, nouns, verbs, and adverbs and provides for their idiomatic combination. "Lexical idioms" are of three types: attributive, noun-verb, verb-adverb. With respect to attributive forms it is often difficult to find the right foreign attributive modifier (adjective) to associate with the one in the native language. "Direct" translation is seldom helpful. The difficulty comes from combinatorial restrictions. For example, in Russian we can say "a profound hypothesis", but in English this sounds rather strange. All the metadiscourse nouns in the system have a list of attributes by which they are usually qualified in English academic style. So the user is given the opportunity to choose the most appropriate one out of the list, e.g., *an illustrative example, a careful distinction, the problem involved, a detailed model, the constraints specified, the observed differences, a convincing solution, aggregated possibilities, clear indication,* etc. Or, for instance, if considering an attribute for the word *constraints* the user can review a list: *explicit/ fine/ severe/ admitted/ strong/ principled/ conventional / fundamental,* etc.

In scientific texts metadiscourse ('mental') nouns are conceptualized through 'physical' predicates, e.g., *to introduce (a definition), to extend (the theory), to ground (the idea), (the division) is based on P,* etc. Such predicates execute "lexical functions", according to the Meaning-Text Theory (Melchuk 1974, Apresian 1974), e.g., *Magn (error) = grave.* The predicates describe typical operations that can be carried out over the corresponding mental objects. As has already been pointed out, conceptualizing the world of mentality is selective and idiomatic in every language, that's why all the nouns in the system have a list of verbs with which they usually combine in scientific texts, e.g., *to develop (a system, an algorithm, an approach), to provide (an argument, a cue, a proof), to identify (the nature of P), to adopt (the approach), to make (an attempt), to consider (the evidence, a problem), to depend on (an assumption), to serve (the purpose), to remove (the necessity), to meet/ arrange/ relax (a constraint), to span (the gap), to cover (the field P, all the aspects Q), to render (the meaning), to provide/ extract (information, knowledge, data), to produce (a diversity of P),* etc. All the verbs also have a list of nouns that serve as their typical objects, e.g., *to debate/ attack/ test/ defeat/ confront/ advance/ share/ favor/ support/ oppose/ adapt/ follow - a theory/ doctrine/ hypothesis/ approach / distinction/ strategy,* etc.

Every scientific text contains descriptions of various mental actions, operations and processes. Often they are characterized by adverbs of manner. That is why most verbs in the *Version* software have a list of typical adverbs with which they idiomatically combine, e.g., *the argument would apply equally, to distinguish firmly, to additionally offer, to actually affect, to discuss at length, to suitably explicate, to be flexible with respect to P,* etc.

Rhetorically a scientific text is a form of reasoning, with its own "plot". It is constructed in the following way. The author introduces the object A of his scientific interest, asks a question B about whether A has a quality C and then tries to give and prove his answer P to the question B. He evaluates any ideas concerning C, for instance, those of other scientists, then gives his own ideas and draws conclusions and takes the steps to verify P. It is this basic scheme that is referenced when "rhetorical idioms" are invoked in the system. The main idea here is that the author's thoughts (statements) are logically and linguistically connected with each other. They form a progression and mark the stages of reasoning. This progression is explicated by the following expressions:

I. Performative patterns: they introduce the object, express suppositions, mark discussions, evaluate facts, introduce classifications, notions, definitions, and conclusions. E.g., *The purpose of the present paper is to outline P, to cast light on to the ways in which P, It should be pointed out immediately that P; P may be objected; Consider a different approach; We shall place constraints on P; to form and test hypothesis A; We are going to describe (in)direct approaches to the problem P; Thus, concluding; In conclusion; It proved to be (un)informative,* etc.

2. Axiological patterns, e.g., *It is interesting/ important/ necessary/ useful/ reasonable, etc., to point out/ stress/ repeat, etc. that P, It is surprising/ doubtful/ obvious/ remarkable, etc., that P.*

3. Methods, approaches: *This [particular] method appears to be relevant to [the proposal that] Q; to propose a model; to resort to (in)direct methods; to abandon experimental techniques; to adopt the approach.*

4. Parenthesis: *as a rule, obviously, however, so far, in this case, though this is merely an opinion, consequently, etc.*

5. References: *The article is concerned with P; According to X; The paper by X inquires into the question Q; The only reference to be made is that P, etc.*

6. Argumentation, objections: *For the moment assume that P; If P is used, then Q; in the sense that P; To me it is remarkable that P; It goes without saying that P; Since it appears that P; It becomes essential to do P; Instead of specifying P, Q; to resort to the argument P; If such a view proves to be reasonable, then Q; If we take P, etc.*

7. Experiments: *to observe directly, to gather evidence for experimental purposes; Such results are not easily obtained; an experimental inquiry into P; to conduct an experiment; to make laboratory experiments upon P; to control experimentally, conventional experimental techniques, under laboratory conditions; a set of empirical results that bear on the hypothesis that P; to collect data by means of observation; to abandon experimental techniques; to reveal properties, etc.*

8. Comparisons: *if these types of items are compared we can P, etc.*

9. Communicative patterns: thematization, emphasis, rhematization, e.g., *As far as P is concerned / As for P, Q / It is particularly for this reason that P, etc.*

10. Negation patterns. English has negating patterns different from those in Russian. Suffice it to note that a Russian sentence may have more than one negation. Special patterns of negation are presented in the system to contrast the difference between Russian and English general and particular negation.

All the items included in the lexicon, can be used metadiscursively. They are classed in semantic groups, to make access to the system more flexible. The main classes are:

- general research verbs, meaning 'carrying out scientific research': *to investigate, discuss, study, analyse, undertake a study, to carry out a research, etc.;*
- particular mental verbs: *to argue, mean, believe, suppose, assume, conclude, formulate, propose, etc.;*
- deductive verbs and phrases: *be in a relation/ connection/ contrast/ accordance / correspondence, etc.;*
- logical (theoretical) predicates: *to be a structure / function / system / feature / characteristic, etc.;*
- "intentional variables" qualifying scientific statements: *idea, hypothesis, theory, point of view, description, definition, proposal, conclusion, supposition, etc.;*
- "extensional constants" (that can be discovered): *a law, tendency, fact, reason, effect, factor, condition, apposition, difference, identity, etc.;*
- "mental instruments" (they are applied): *a method, approach, principle, model, scheme, formula, rule, procedure, strategy, paradigm, result, knowledge, information, etc.*
- quantifiers and parameters: *a class, majority, set, extent, group, length, scope, scale, degree, etc;*
- qualifiers: *important, interesting, complex, difficult, insightful, (in)complete, traditional, standard, original, etc.;*
- modal operators: *necessary, probable, possible, valid, adequate, true, apparent, etc.;*
- connectors: *first, second, now, later, above, since, before (doing P); the following, previous, last, etc.*

### Perspectives

The system can be used not only by Russian-speaking scientists, but also by anyone for whom English is a foreign language. Moreover, scientists of diverse specialties can use it, as metadiscourse patterns are similar across academic disciplines, their role being to introduce

scientific knowledge and promote understanding. The system can be combined with other kinds of linguistic software, particularly with terminological data banks, or play the role of a "shell-system" (Hahn 1989, 489) for text processing algorithms.

### References

- Apresian, Yu.D. 1974. *Leksicheskaja semantika*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Benson, M., Benson E., Ilson R. 1986. *The BBI Combinatory dictionary of English: A guide to word combinations*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York, etc.: Praeger.
- Clyne, M. 1987. Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. English and German. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2, 211-247.
- Crismore, A. 1989. *Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical act*. New York: Lang.
- Day, R.A. 1979. *How to write and publish a scientific paper*. Philadelphia: ISI Press.
- Hahn, W. 1989. LSP and computer application: New fields of activity for LSP-research and development. In *Special Language: From human thinking to thinking machines*, ed. Chr. Lauren, M.Nordman. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lakoff, G. 1986. Classifiers as a reflection of mind. In *Noun classes and categorization*, ed. G.Craig. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Melchuk, I.A. 1974. *Opit teorii lingvisticheskich modelej "Smisl-Tekst"*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Pinker, S. 1989. *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Riabtseva, N.K. 1990. Artificial intelligence and scientific metalanguage. In *Soviet contributions to some topical linguistic issues*, ed. A.P.Vasilevich. Moskva: Nauka.
- Riabtseva, N.K. 1991. Academic style: teaching, translating, investigating. In *Lingua e Technologia: Abstracts of International Symposium*. Firenze: Universita degli Studi.
- Rosch, E. 1975. Cognitive representations of semantic categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychological - General*. 104, 192-233.
- Smadia, F.A. 1989. Lexical co-occurrence: The missing link. *Literature and linguistic computing*. 3, 163-168.
- Techtmeier, B. 1990. Interaktionswissen und Metakommunikation. *Z. Phon. Sprachwiss. Kommun.forsch. (ZPSK)* 2, 175-185.
- Vendler, Z. 1972. *Res Cogitans: An essay in rational psychology*. London: Ithaca.

\* \* \*

(\*\*\*) N. Riabtseva. **COGNITIVE RHETORIC: INVESTIGATING, TEACHING AND TRANSLATING ACADEMIC STYLE** // *Proceeding of the symposium on "Language and Technology"*. Ed. by Cesare G. Cecioni, Catherine Cheselka. Firenze, 1995, 365-374.

#### ABSTRACT

The article consists of three parts:

1. Academic problems of academic style;
2. Metadiscourse collocations in academic style and their translation;
3. Computer assistance to foreigners in writing and translating scientific texts into English.

The main point is to show that theoretical, didactical and applicational problems of academic writing can and must be solved together. Combining language theory and computer technology is a promising perspective for developing both.

#### 1. Acquiring academic writing: The educational perspective

Academic style has not become yet a matter of education. To say nothing of teaching how to translate it. Still less how to "write science" in a foreign language. All these problems are of the same origin – they spring off from the way how linguistic traditions in academic writing are supported. There are at least three ways to acquire academic writing: imitating, intuitively, "standard" stylistic manners; applying to tutors, supervisors and colleagues for editing; teaching students and postgraduates to write science.

Scientific community is steadily and stubbornly pursuing the first opportunity, combining it with the second one, and is completely neglecting the third. The result is



miserable: the number of poorly written scientific papers is increasing, as intuition often fails to differentiate between what helps to convey scientific ideas and what prevents from doing it.

It's much more difficult to extract scientific information out of poorly written scientific papers. Besides, bad style often repels potential readers, nipping their interest in the bud. To improve the situation we should realize that academic writing must become a particular conscious concern not merely for supporting academic standards, but mostly for their promotion and perfection. That's why academic style should constitute the object of a special academic discipline. The only discipline which will manage with such an object is cognitive rhetoric.

## **2. Cognitive rhetoric: The academic perspective**

Cognitive rhetoric is the only discipline, which is able to investigate, teach and promote academic style.

Academic style differs drastically from all other kinds of literature: its contents and language are inseparable, as writing science is science itself, is doing science proper; writing science is an obligatory, necessary and integral part of science. That's why "Knowledge is no more important than the way in which it is presented" [Clyne, 1987, 238].

"Ordinary" linguistic stylistics has never suspected this liaison, but noticed only its manifestations, and is, moreover, unable to explain the fact. That is the reason why stylistics or any other linguistic discipline will never explain how scientific papers are to be written, what stylistic traditions are worth following and which could and should be broken; why scientific ideas must be presented in a way that promotes their understanding and acceptability. It's the job of cognitive rhetoric to explain cognitive destination and rhetorical singularity of academic style, and to use these explanations in academic practice.

The purpose of an academic paper is to introduce new scientific knowledge. Its rhetoric is in linguistic assistance to the reader at understanding and accepting this knowledge. Both combine themselves in the rhetorical organization of scientific discourse. The effect of their combination is valid scientific reasoning.

It means logical progression in thoughts trending, and recursive text structure. Rhetorical organization helps to follow the author's thoughts and accept the ideas he is inferring. It is the instrument of converting scientific research into scientific communication.

## **3. Rhetorical organization of a scientific discourse: The linguistic perspective**

A scientific paper has its own rhetorical organization incompatible with any other text. This organization is the result of transforming scientific research into scientific communication.

An academic paper is not a chronological or even logical account of scientific research. Research is usually done intuitively, with interruptions, bifurcations and circular regressions. Scientific writing, on the contrary, is recursive, progressive and cumulative exposure of how new scientific knowledge is reasonably developing out of facts, arguments and theories.

Rhetorical organization of scientific discourse is of a unique, distinguished and peerless character because it creates cognitive progression of thoughts and ideas. It is supported by explicit causal relations between propositions; conceptual cohesion between scientific notions; and prospective succession of thoughts (as opposed to their intersection).

Recursive text structure develops through explicating "the plot", contrasting its constituents, and associating them with the main idea. Cognitive progression is the effect being created if the author is consciously selecting, assembling and associating linguistic means of presenting the contents.

As prof. R. Day profoundly recommended, "The writing will almost take care of itself if you can get the thing organized" [Day 1979, 97]. All the epistemic operations over text

organization are presented in it by metadiscourse expressions and collocations, or their functional equivalents, formal and conceptual.

#### 4. Cognitive progression: Metadiscourse collocations

Rhetorical organization creates cognitive progression of the contents either explicitly or implicitly, formally or conceptually. But more often it combines all the possibilities. Linguistically these possibilities are derived from metadiscourse elements, whose prototypical destination is to expose, explicate, organize and bind propositional contents of discourse [cf. Techmeier 1990].

Thus every scientific text, from rhetorical point of view, has a "textual» and a "metatextual" part: prepositional contents, dictum, representing scientific knowledge, and its "wrapping", modus characteristics [cf. Crismore 1989].

Most of them take a form of metadiscourse collocations, such as *to adopt an approach, to meet constraints, to extract information, to advance a distinction, to cover a problem, to introduce a notion*, etc.

Metadiscourse collocations in academic style are communicatively obligatory, as they participate in organizing a "scientific plot", and rhetorically relevant, as they explicate cognitive progression of ideas. There are a lot of linguistic problems of scientific communication that can be successfully solved in case we realize the cognitive and rhetorical role of metadiscourse elements in rhetorical organization of scientific discourse, including improving, teaching and translating academic style.

From translational point of view one of the most important problems is to expose their phraseological character and propose the way how to translate them. Most metadiscourse collocations are idiomatic word combinations that can't always be translated literally. The reason is that they are a result of subconscious metaphorization of mental world and implicit conceptualization of cognition, cf. *to come / go to the theatre – to come / \*go to a conclusion*.

Lexical co-occurrence has not become yet a matter of persistent and systematized presentation in dictionaries and foreign language teaching [cf. Smadja 1989, 163]. The BBI practice is only the beginning in these domains [Benson e.a. 1986]. Still less attention is paid to specifically "scientific phraseology".

#### 5. The conceptual background of idiomaticity

It is not accidental that most discourse collocations are *i d i o m a t i c*. Their idiomaticity is "meaningful", it is *c o n c e p t u a l l y* grounded and *m o t i v a t e d*. Our mentality is *c o n c e p t u a l l y o r g a n i z e d*, and this conceptual organization can be traced in the way how words *c o m b i n e* with each other in discourse. And vice versa: lexical *c o - o c c u r r e n c e* in discourse exposes *c o n c e p t u a l* organization of mentality.

Every language reflects the mentality of the nation. Different nations think in different ways, in a certain conceptual respect [Vendler 1972, 112]. Common cultural traditions often lead to similar conceptual systems, but they never coincide completely. That's why a Frenchman may say in stead of *I paid attention to* – \*I make attention at, translating word for word his native expression *Je fais attention a qch*. There are several ways in which philosophers present conceptual organization of mentality. George Lakoff speaks of "folk theories", Eleanor Rosch of prototypes, etc. All of these theories have much in common and complement each other. Such theories involve images, common sense, categorization and motivation as an instrument in explaining interdependences between language and mentality.

Scientific metadiscourse collocations are the result of metaphorical categorization of mental world. This categorization is of several conceptual patterns, motivating lexical co-occurrences in scientific metadiscourse and making it idiomatic.

## 6. Conceptual patterns of implicit metaphors that motivate lexical co-occurrence in scientific metadiscourse

Mental world is conceptualized in a lot of implicit ways, resulting in divergent and numerous phraseological collocations. The main patterns of conceptualizing are the metaphors "brains are eyes", "cognition is hard (physical) work or a struggle", "knowledge is a plant", and some others [Riabtseva 1990].

The metaphor "brains are eyes" creates a "perceptive" image of science and cognition. It develops through such expressions as *to observe a tendency, to show / trace / scan a problem, to demonstrate / display an approach, to review a theory, to throw light on the question, a blurred concept, a bright idea, a vague meaning*, etc.

Such collocations are motivated by the existing connections between perception and cognition. In different languages this conceptual pattern generates similar but not identical collocations. For example, in Russian we can say, "to look at the meaning", "to glance at the principles", etc.

The metaphor "cognition is hard work or a struggle" creates a dynamic image of science, presenting it as a hard route that should be gone from its beginning to the end, a struggle against difficulties, or "mining", "digging" and extracting something important out of deep layers and bringing it to the surface, or as if it were building or constructing something high, solid and strong. A dynamic image of science gave birth to numerous collocations, such as *to build a theory, to come across unexpected problems, to supply arguments, to hit upon an idea, to accumulate knowledge, to follow the way of thinking, to shake beliefs, a direction of thoughts, a rough idea, deep understanding*, etc.

Such collocations are motivated by the fact that cognition is hard mental work consisting of numerous intellectual operations. In different languages this conceptual pattern generates similar but not identical expressions and word combinations. For example, in Russian we can say "to build a chain of thoughts", "to deepen cognition and understanding", "to brake an opinion", "to go beyond the limits of widespread beliefs", "the edifice of science", "to return to the idea", etc.

The metaphor "knowledge is a plant," reflects a "biological" interpretation of cognition and science. It is implicitly present in such expressions as *a mature theory, a fruitful hypothesis, the roots of the theory, to generate an idea*, etc.

## 7. Translation implications

In fact there are a lot of ways to metaphorize cognition and present it as if it were a physical thing. This is the most common tradition of subconscious conceptualization of abstract and unperceptive phenomena, generally characteristic of mentality and accordingly to all languages. Most of them are used in scientific metadiscourse subconsciously in the form of idiomatic metadiscourse expressions; e.g., *apportare / mutare / condividere / approfondire / arricchire un'opinione (idea) vs. to venture / entertain / hand down an opinion (idea); partire da un concetto / ipotesi / idea vs. to proceed on the hypothesis / theory / concept; gettare le basi (le fondamenta) di una theoria vs. to provide a basis for a theory; munire / fornire / dotare di argomenti vs. to supply / put forward / present an argument*.

When translating a scientific paper, or teaching to do it, one should realize that such patterns can't be translated word for word, but ought to be "restored" in the translating language according to similar conceptual patterns. It means as if thinking in another language, entering another conceptual world, switching into another conceptual system.

## 8. Linguistic assistance to scientists in writing their papers in English or translating them into it: Computer system "Version"

All the considerations sketchily laid out above were the reason and the basis for compiling a unique computer program "Version". It is linguistically assisting foreign

scientists in writing their papers in English or translating them into it. Besides, it promotes stylistic skills in accounting scientific reasoning and inferring scientific knowledge.

The frame of the "Version"-system linguistic software comprises three types of information on metadiscourse collocations, characteristic of scientific discourse:

- grammatical
- lexical
- rhetorical.

**G r a m m a t i c a l** information helps to combine words idiomatically according to grammar peculiarities of English verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs, and to chose correct prepositions, verbal adverbs or derivatives, cf.: *to set about axioms; to pass on to consider a problem, to come TO a conclusion - to arrive AT a conclusion*, etc.

**L e x i c a l** information helps to idiomatically combine words and chose discourse collocations and patterns characteristic of English academic style, cf.: *to meet a necessity; to span the gap, to adopt an approach; to discuss at length; severe/conventional constraints*, etc.

**R h e t o r i c a l** information helps to reasonably introduce, discuss and infer scientific knowledge and to chose communicative patterns for logical text organization, cf.: *The purpose of the present paper is to outline P; It should be pointed out immediately that P; P may be objected; Consider a different approach; We shall place constraints on P; We are going to describe direct approaches to the problem P; It proved to be informative that P; Thus, concluding, P; In conclusion, P; It is reasonable / important to point out that P; This method appears to be relevant to P*; etc.

The metadiscourse lexicon in the system is organized in patterns by form and in classes by meaning, to proved an easy access to the linguistic information; the patterns use the alphabetic characters X, Y, P, etc. as "place holders" for the (terminological) nouns or dictum propositions. All the collocations, phraseological units and discourse patterns, included in the system, were extracted from original English texts of various scientific disciplines. All of them are typical of the English academic style. This software for processing "scientific collocations" is meant for use in self-translating scientific papers into English. Its operation is multi-directional; there are a number of access paths to one and the same item – grammatical, lexical, or rhetorical. The operator interacts with the system in the form of dialogue; he chooses and calls up the required list when he wants to check which grammatical form can be used for the item in question, with what modifiers and "lexical functions" it can be used, or what collocations are most appropriate at the present step of reasoning.

## 9. Linguistic information in the System

**Grammatical** information, incorporated in the system reflects the mutual interdependency between notional and auxiliary lexical items and provides information on their idiomatic combination. "Grammatical idioms" are constructed from "governors" (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs) and their dependent elements (prepositions, particles, and adverbials).

"Grammatical" prepositions are among the most idiomatic elements in a language. Their idiomaticity is also of conceptual origin (Pinker 1989, 370). That is why they cannot be translated but should be "restored" according to the grammatical rules of the target language; e.g., *in the theory – within the paradigm*. Verbs, nouns and adjectives in the system have a list of prepositions with which they prefer to combine, and patterns for when they are used without prepositions, e.g., *to reach a solution, beyond any doubt, interested in – contrary to – different from*.

Russian and English verb derivation differs drastically: the first prefers prefixes, the second adverb particles. English verbs denoting mental operations have a list of adverb particles with which they usually combine in scientific texts, e.g., *to pass on to consider P, the analysis is set forth, to run into difficulties, to bring about changes, to set about axioms, to spark off a debate, to be involved into a matter*, etc.

**Lexical** information incorporated in the system reflects lexical interdependency between adjectives, nouns, verbs, and adverbs and provides for their idiomatic combination. "Lexical idioms" are of three types: attributive, noun-verb, verb-adverb. With respect to attributive forms it is often difficult to find the right foreign attributive modifier (adjective) to associate with the one in the native language. "Direct" translation is seldom helpful. The

difficulty comes from combinatorial restrictions. For example, in Russian we can say "a profound hypothesis", but in English this sounds rather strange. All the metadiscourse nouns in the system have a list of attributes by which they are usually qualified in English academic style. So the user is given the opportunity to choose the most appropriate one out of the list, e.g., *an illustrative example, a careful distinction, the problem involved, a detailed model, the constraints specified, the observed differences, a convincing solution, aggregated possibilities, clear indication*, etc. Or, for instance, if considering an attribute for the word *constraints* the user can review a list: *explicit/ fine/ severe/ admitted/ strong/ principled/ conventional/ fundamental*, etc.

In scientific texts metadiscourse ('mental') nouns are conceptualized through 'physical' predicates, e.g., *to introduce (a definition), to extend (the theory), to ground (the idea), (the division) is based on P*, etc. Such predicates execute "lexical functions", according to the Meaning-Text Theory (Melchuk 1974, Apresian 1974), e.g., *Magn (error) = grave*. The predicates describe typical operations that can be carried out over the corresponding mental objects. As has already been pointed out, conceptualizing the world of mentality is selective and idiomatic in every language, that's why all the nouns in the system have a list of verbs with which they usually combine in scientific texts, e.g., *to develop (a system, an algorithm, an approach), to provide (an argument, a cue, a proof), to identify (the nature of P), to adopt (the approach), to make (an attempt), to consider (the evidence, a problem), to depend on (an assumption), to serve (the purpose), to remove (the necessity), to meet/ arrange/ relax (a constraint), to span (the gap), to cover (the field P, all the aspects Q), to render (the meaning), to provide/ extract (information, knowledge, data), to produce (a diversity of P)*, etc. All the verbs also have a list of nouns that serve as their typical objects, e.g., *to debate/ attack/ test/ defeat/ confront/ advance/ share/ favor/ support/ oppose/ adapt/ follow - a theory/ doctrine/ hypothesis/ approach / distinction/ strategy*, etc.

Every scientific text contains descriptions of various mental actions, operations and processes. Often they are characterized by adverbs of manner. That is why most verbs in the *Version* software have a list of typical adverbs with which they idiomatically combine, e.g., *the argument would apply equally, to distinguish firmly, to additionally offer, to actually affect, to discuss at length, to suitably explicate, to be flexible with respect to P*, etc.

**Rhetorically** a scientific text is a form of reasoning, with its own "plot". It is constructed in the following way. The author introduces the object A of his scientific interest, asks a question B about whether A has a quality C and then tries to give and prove his answer P to the question B. He evaluates any ideas concerning C, for instance, those of other scientists, then gives his own ideas and draws conclusions and takes the steps to verify P. It is this basic scheme that is referenced when "rhetorical idioms" are invoked in the system. The main idea here is that the author's thoughts (statements) are logically and linguistically connected with each other. They form a progression and mark the stages of reasoning. This progression is explicated by the following expressions:

1. Performative patterns: they introduce the object, express suppositions, mark discussions, evaluate facts, introduce classifications, notions, definitions, and conclusions. E.g., *The purpose of the present paper is to outline P, to cast light on to the ways in which P, It should be pointed out immediately that P; P may be objected; Consider a different approach; We shall place constraints on P; to form and test hypothesis A; We are going to describe (in)direct approaches to the problem P; Thus, concluding; In conclusion; It proved to be (un)informative*, etc.

2. Axiological patterns, e.g., *It is interesting/ important/ necessary/ useful/ reasonable*, etc., *to point out/ stress/ repeat*, etc. *that P, It is surprising/ doubtful/ obvious/ remarkable*, etc., *that P*.

3. Methods, approaches: *This [particular] method appears to be relevant to [the proposal that] Q; to propose a model; to resort to (in)direct methods; to abandon experimental techniques; to adopt the approach*.

4. Parenthesis: *as a rule, obviously, however, so far, in this case, though this is merely an opinion, consequently*, etc.

5. References: *The article is concerned with P; According to X; The paper by X inquires into the question Q; The only reference to be made is that P*, etc.

6. Argumentation, objections: *For the moment assume that P; If P is used, then Q; in the sense that P; To me it is remarkable that P; It goes without saying that P; Since it appears*

that *P*; It becomes essential to do *P*; Instead of specifying *P*, *Q*; to resort to the argument *P*; If such a view proves to be reasonable, then *Q*; If we take *P*, etc.

7. Experiments: to observe directly, to gather evidence for experimental purposes; Such results are not easily obtained; an experimental inquiry into *P*; to conduct an experiment; to make laboratory experiments upon *P*; to control experimentally, conventional experimental techniques, under laboratory conditions; a set of empirical results that bear on the hypothesis that *P*; to collect data by means of observation; to abandon experimental techniques; to reveal properties, etc.

8. Comparisons: if these types of items are compared we can *P*, etc.

9. Communicative patterns: thematization, emphasis, rhematization, e.g., As far as *P* is concerned / As for *P*, *Q* / It is particularly for this reason that *P*, etc.

10. Negation patterns. English has negating patterns different from those in Russian. Suffice it to note that a Russian sentence may have more than one negation. Special patterns of negation are presented in the system to contrast the difference between Russian and English general and particular negation.

All the items included in the lexicon, can be used metadiscursively. They are classed in semantic groups, to make access to the system more flexible. The main classes are:

- general research verbs, meaning 'carrying out scientific research': *to investigate, discuss, study, analyse, undertake a study, to carry out a research*, etc.;
- particular mental verbs: *to argue, mean, believe, suppose, assume, conclude, formulate, propose*, etc.;
- deductive verbs and phrases: *be in a relation/ connection/ contrast/ accordance / correspondence*, etc.;
- logical (theoretical) predicates: *to be a structure / function / system / feature / characteristic*, etc.;
- "intentional variables" qualifying scientific statements: *idea, hypothesis, theory, point of view, description, definition, proposal, conclusion, supposition*, etc.;
- "extensional constants" (that can be discovered): *a law, tendency, fact, reason, effect, factor, condition, apposition, difference, identity*, etc.;
- "Mental instruments" (they are applied): *a method, approach, principle, model, scheme, formula, rule, procedure, strategy, paradigm, result, knowledge, information*, etc.
- Quantifiers and parameters: *a class, majority, set, extent, group, length, scope, scale, degree*, etc.;
- qualifiers: *important, interesting, complex, difficult, insightful, (in)complete, traditional, standard, original*, etc.;
- modal operators: *necessary, probable, possible, valid, adequate, true, apparent*, etc.;
- connectors: *first, second, now, later, above, since, before (doing P); the following, previous, last*, etc.

## 10. Perspectives

The system can be used not only by Russian-speaking scientists, but also by anyone for whom English is a foreign language. Moreover, scientists of diverse specialties can use it, as metadiscourse patterns are similar across academic disciplines, their role being to introduce scientific knowledge and promote understanding. The system can be combined with other kinds of linguistic software, particularly with terminological data banks, or play the role of a "shell-system" (Hahn 1989, 489) for text processing algorithms.

## References

- Apresian, Yu.D. 1974. *Leksicheskaja semantika*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Benson, M., Benson E., Ilson R. 1986. *The BBI Combinatory dictionary of English: A guide to word combinations*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Clyne, M. 1987. Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. English and German. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2, 211-247.
- Crismore, A. 1989. *Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical act*. New York: Lang.
- Day, R.A. 1979. *How to write and publish a scientific paper*. Philadelphia: ISI Press.

- Hahn, W. 1989. LSP and computer application: New fields of activity for LSP-research and development. In *Special Language: From human thinking to thinking machines*, ed. Chr. Lauren, M. Nordman. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lakoff, G. 1986. Classifiers as a reflection of mind. In *Noun classes and categorization*, ed. G. Craig. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Melchuk, I.A. 1974. *Opit teorii lingvističeskich modelej "Smisl-Tekst"*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Pinker, S. 1989. Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure. Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Riabtseva, N.K. 1990. Artificial intelligence and scientific metalanguage. In *Soviet contributions to some topical linguistic issues*, ed. A.P. Vasilevich. Moskva: Nauka.
- Rosch, E. 1975. Cognitive representations of semantic categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychological - General*. 104, 192-233.
- Smadja, F.A. 1989. Lexical co-occurrence: The missing link. *Literature and linguistic computing*. 3, 163-168.
- Techtmeier, B. 1990. Interaktionswissen und Metakommunikation. *Z. Phon. Sprachwiss. Kommun. forsch. (ZPSK)* 2, 175-185.
- Vendler, Z. 1972. *Res Cogitans: An essay in rational psychology*. London: Ithaca.

\* \* \*

(\*\*\*\*) N. Riabtseva. LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE AND TRANSLATION IN CROSS-CULTURAL AND APPLIED PERSPECTIVES // Kinga Klaudy et al. (eds.) *Transfere necesse est: Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Current Trends in Studies of Translation and Interpreting, 1996, Budapest, Budapest, Scholastica, 1997.*

### 1. The theory of translation and adjacent linguistic perspectives

The theory of translation is quite a mature discipline with its own problems to solve, conceptions to develop, methods to apply, and applications to promote. Perhaps it is for this reason that notions from adjacent linguistic disciplines would not easily find their way into its mainstream. Meanwhile some recently emerged linguistic perspectives dealing with the linguistic competence of a native speaker could contribute to translation theory and help update its applications. Moreover, they are able to shed new linguistic light on seemingly plain questions thus bringing to the foreground a new interplay of translational topics.

The most important linguistic perspective which has already given impetus to diverse theoretical and applied disciplines is the idea that linguistic competence is closely connected with national mentality and ethnic worldview. All three are related to each other, but what is of more importance, are directly linked with switching from one language into another. But the conception of linguistic competence as such has not yet assumed its place within translation theory.

### 2. Linguistic competence in Igor Melchuk's "Meaning-Text" model

It is a kind of paradox that such an original and profound linguistic innovation as Igor Melchuk's "Meaning-Text" model has not ever been discussed within the theory of translation, though it directly involves translational topics and can promote their understanding and modeling.

According to the model, the linguistic competence of a native speaker is a composition of two opposite, complementary and inseparable linguistic abilities: a passive understanding of speech versus its active generation. The active linguistic competence means the ability to express one and the same meaning and intention in different/ diverse/ various/ synonymous ways, and, further, the ability to (subconsciously) combine words idiomatically in discourse. A translator, by definition, is a "professional speaker" and when translating he is expressing the same meaning in a "different", "synonymous" way. There is but one crucial peculiarity with the process – he is bound to do this by "the most closely synonymous expression". Still, has he any freedom in choosing between synonyms, and what are the distinctions of "interlinguistic synonymy"? Do traditional dictionaries supply this type of linguistic information?

Further, when producing a text in a foreign language the translator has to combine words idiomatically, according to the rules, grammatical and lexical, of their admitted and preferred co-occurrence in it. The peculiarity here is that the rules of word co-occurrences are language-specific and seldom coincide in different languages. Do traditional dictionaries supply "interlinguistic" combinatorial information?

So, according to the "Meaning-Text" model, a translation is a process of transferring the meaning from a text in one language into a text carrying the same meaning in another language, and is supported by the linguistic information of two types: that of "interlinguistic synonyms" and by the combinatorial one; and is supposed to be provided by the corresponding dictionary information: synonymous and combinatorial. Traditional dictionaries supply such information only occasionally and are supposed to be complemented by dictionaries of quite a new type.

### 3. Traditional dictionaries and dictionaries of a new type

Dictionaries have always been an indispensable linguistic support in teaching and practicing translation. They provide quite a wide range of linguistic information, but from the contemporary, "Meaning-Text" view, they do not differentiate between "an active" and "passive" approach to translation, between combinatorial and synonymous linguistic information, and between translating into a foreign and into a native language.

For example, there are a lot of dictionaries of synonyms, even computerised, especially in English, most of which are called thesauri. They give *l e x i c a l* synonyms, such as *to propose - suggest - offer*, etc., and thus can be called traditional. According to the "Meaning-Text" model, a language can be presented as a system of synonymous expressions of *v a r i o u s* grammatical structures, not exceptionally lexical, but "collocational" as well; cf. *the reason is - that is why; I suggest that we go to the theatre - What about going to the theatre? I prefer staying at home - I'd rather stay at home*, etc. The idea is that one and the same situation can be described in different synonymous ways and by different lexical and grammatical means. A native speaker knows all of them, and a translator should be trained to possess such diverse knowledge. So we need, first, a special "active" dictionary presenting this type of linguistic knowledge, and, second, which is more difficult to present, what are the differences and similarities between synonymous ways of expressing one and the same meaning.

The lexicographic application of the "Meaning-Text" model has been developed in the works of Yury Apresjan and is gaining ground since 1968. Lexicographically the linguistic competence of a native speaker is simulated by two kinds of active dictionaries – of synonymous expressions, and by combinatory ones. The most prominent example of the latter is "The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English" (1986).

Dictionaries of quite a new type, those that are called active, now supplement traditional dictionaries. Dictionaries of an active type reproduce the linguistic competence of a native speaker and thus provide a new perspective in teaching and practicing translation. But in order to integrate an "active" approach to teaching translation, its theory is to comprise the underlying ideas and perspectives first.

The notion that every language provides various synonymous, lexical and grammatical, means for expressing one and the same meaning and intention has a special significance for translation, as what is grammaticalized in one language can have only lexical expression in another. Grammaticalized are primarily those meanings that are of particular importance in the corresponding national mentality and culture. For example, an elaborated system of grammatical markers for expressing politeness in Oriental languages testifies to the effect that the social life there appreciates and cultivates social distinctions, while Western languages and cultures prefer a more democratic approach to social interaction and express politeness only lexically, i.e. optionally.



That is why the inventory of synonymous expressions in every language involves national mentality and is ethno-specific. Moreover, combinatory preferences in speech are often motivated by the same phenomena.

#### 4. The national mentality and a national language in the translational perspective

The central concept in the "Meaning–Text" model is that of a lexical function. There are more than forty lexical functions in it, such as Magn ('Magnus'), meaning "the highest quantity or quality"; for example Magn (*It is raining*) = *It is raining cats and dogs*. There are standard ways of expressing it, such as *very much*, *extremely*, *awfully*, and idiomatic, such as *cats and dogs*, which can refer only to rain. Another important lexical function is Oper ('Operatio'), which describes such expressions as *The sun shines*, cf. Oper (*a sun*) = *to shine*.

A native speaker, according to the model, "knows" all the ways, including idiomatic, of verbalising lexical functions and learns and uses such verbalisations subconsciously, while a translator has to consciously study them first. To make this process easier and more comprehensive we can provide some information explaining why word combinations and their synonymous expressions often differ in a native and foreign language. And here the conceptions about national mentality come into play.

For example, it would seem extremely strange for a Russian speaker to learn that we cannot say in English "a strong rain; The rain is becoming stronger/ weaker; It is raining strongly", because such expressions are quite natural in and typical to Russian. Moreover, they are very characteristic to it.

The Russian notion of "being strong" is one of the most important in describing what is happening in the world, and in comparison with English it combines the ideas of power, strength and force and can express all of them simultaneously, as the corresponding noun is almost the most polysemous in the language implying its great significance in it, and the ability of being applied to widely ranging situations. In Russian "strong" is one of the most common words used to express the idea of "intensive action" thus becoming a standard and most common way of verbalising the Magn lexical function. That is why in Russian we can shout, speak, run, age, grow, love, drink, etc. "strongly", meaning 'intensively', 'very actively'.

The ability of "being strong" is characteristic, according to Russian, of rage, heat, eyesight, argumentation, speech, cinema, a football play, cold, and to many other phenomena, while in English their intensity or "high quality and quantity" is described in quite a different idiomatic way: the heat in English cannot be "strong", but *fierce*, the eyesight *keen*, the argument *potent*, speech *impressive*, rain *heavy*, cold *severe*. Such word combinations are very often language- and ethno-specific, as they are connected with the corresponding mentality and worldview fixed in the language. The idea of 'being strong' is central to Russians when they conceptualise the changes that take place in the world, while the English represent them by quite different linguistic means, in particular – by auxiliary and semi-auxiliary verbs in combination with adverbs. The Russians thus "think" that the world is changing under the influence of different forces, while the English "notice" the changes that take place and the results that emerge therefrom. So in Russian 'being strong' means to control a situation, to be able to cause changes and dominate; cf. *good at math's* vs. Rus. "strong in math's".

The fact that the concept of "being strong" plays a prominent role in the Russian mentality and world view is supported by other numerous types of evidence, but the most convincing proof lies in that this notion is grammaticalized in Russian, where it can be expressed derivatively, while English, in contrast, can verbalise it only lexically. In Russian there are special derivational devices that denote that the action is intensive, so that the idea of 'intensive running, shouting, burning, walking, worrying, entering' and almost all other actions and states can be rendered by affixes within the word, meaning something like 'to begin/ keep-running, etc., intensively', with its literal dictionary definition 'to begin/ keep running strongly', cf. "razbegatsja".

Here comes the importance of realising that meanings can be expressed both lexically and grammatically, that there are synonymous relations between those variants, that the notion of synonymity should not mean only direct lexical equivalents, and that different languages grammaticalize different concepts, which can in other languages be only lexicalized; and that synonymity should be studied across languages.

Lexical combinatory preferences are not casual, accidental or random, but quite meaningful, as they are motivated by the national mentality of the native speakers. Cross-cultural study of combinatory peculiarities in different languages can make the process of studying them a matter of active cultural involvement. So the dictionaries of a new, active type can assist in this process.

## 5. "A guide to academic writing"

The ideas of combinatory peculiarities of languages and their synonymous resources were taken as a background for compiling a guide to academic writing in English, its full title is "English for scientific purposes: Guide to academic writing. Word combinations in academic style", and it is under completion now. It provides synonymous expressions typical to the English scientific discourse and word combinatorial peculiarities. As the same scientific situations are described in different languages in similar, but not always identical ways, many "scientific" expressions cannot be translated word for word; that is why the Guide provides various synonymous means of expressing ideas so that the user would choose between them in stead of trying to find an equivalent in traditional dictionaries, which seldom provide combinatorial information.

The Guide is designed for all scientists and students of science, regardless of their specialty, for whom English is a foreign language. It helps to write scientific papers in several ways.

- It provides synonymous ways of expressing one and the same idea, cf. *I doubt if it is possible - It is hardly possible; I am sure that connected discourse is not random - Connected discourse is clearly not random; Now we are faced with two possibilities - There are two possibilities here. I want to emphasise - It is important*, etc.

- It gives grammatical patterns for text generation: *to delve into/ dwell on a problem*; and typical attributive and adverbial word combinations, cf. *a striking/ wide discrepancy*, thus combining the ideas of active, synonymous and combinatory, dictionaries.

Its main notion is that in the language of science, lexical combinatorial selectiveness is determined by the same mechanisms which are characteristic to the language in general, thus being language-specific. So in English it is natural to say *to discuss fully/ at length/ in detail*, while in Russian, for example, the "volume" of discussing is described as "to discuss in particulars"; in English a disagreement can be *sharp* or *bitter*, while in Russian it is in this case "acute"; a decrease or a change in English can be *sharp* and *dramatical*, while in Russian they are "strong". Much more things in Russian scientific texts can be strong while in English they are described as: *severe* (constraint, restriction, limitation, distortion, damage, vibration, corrosion); *close* (connection); *heavily* (attenuate); *significantly/ markedly/ drastically/ badly* (affect); *highly/ crucially/ critically* (depend); *profoundly* (alter); *widely* (deviate); *grossly* (change, overestimate); *highly* (branched, diluted, inclined, heated, susceptible), etc. Such word combinations cannot be translated word for word from or into English, that is why the description of the corresponding situation should be "restored" rather than "translated", according to the language's combinatory rules; cf. in English *constraints* are *met*, while in Russian they are "satisfied"; in English we *supply* arguments, *introduce* a notion, *impose* a constraint and *cover* a problem, while in Russian the arguments are "led", a notion and a constraint "brought", and a problem should be "exhausted"; in Russian we can "light" a problem, while in English – *throw/ cast/ shed light* on it, etc.

The Guide is to assist scientists in writing their articles in English, as opposed to translating them from a native language. That is why it raises a number of interlinguistic

problems, one of them involves comparisons between generating a text and its translation. Should there be specialised methods, dictionaries and instructions supporting each of them, or are they quite similar?

## 6. "Interlinguistic competence" and translation

It seems that there should be a difference between generating a text in a foreign language and its translation into it. The implications of the "Meaning–Text" model suggest, however, that a translator is supposed to imitate the linguistic competence of a native speaker and thus be trained not just to translate a text, but rather "generate an equivalent one in a foreign language". Such an interpretation of interlinguistic communication has undoubtedly certain advantages, as the main problem in translation into a foreign language is that of interference – subconscious transferring of what is characteristic to and specific of a native language and text – into the translated text: its lexical, grammatical and communicative patterns, combinatory peculiarities, etc.

So to better understand what translation is, we have to contrast and compare it with similar activities, those of an author of a text, its editor, annotator, etc. There are similarities in the linguistic competence of professionals engaged in text-processing activities, as they share common professional linguistic knowledge involved in text processing, its generation, re-generation, improvement, compression, etc.

Another important problem is that of translation errors and mistakes. To analyse them often means not only comparing languages, texts and translators, but also linguistic competence proper. Translation mistakes, moreover, are undoubtedly instructive. For example, the sentence

*"We have developed a programme destined, for instance, to be a training supply in learning general linguistics, to choose diploma's and course's subjects"*

- is an opening to an abstract (with the title "The Polyling system: a training supply for general linguistics and testing grounds for typological studies"); it can be identified as literally translated from its Russian prototype, which, in its turn, is not the best choice to start a presentation.

The sentence can be improved in quite a number of ways. An abstract should not start with an "for instance" expression, but introduce the main topic, that which is *new*. "Programme" is a technical notion, while what is meant here is *a computerised linguistic database*. "Destined" is the direct translation of a Russian word which, in contrast to its English equivalent, easily applies to various phenomena; besides, its passive meaning deactivates the subject of presentation. "A training supply" is a word for word translation from Russian, resulting in an incorrect word combination motivated by the fact that in English we can *supply ammunition, arguments, information*, but we can't *\*supply studying and learning*. Students are supposed to *study* general linguistics before they "learn" it, "training" in "training supply" should be replaced with *scholarly* and "supply" for support, as that is what is expected from theoretical linguistics in this case. There is a grammatical failure in the phrase: "a supply in learning + to choose"; a stylistic one (in enumerating applications), and a conceptual one – the author failed to demonstrate the diversity of applications of the database. In addition, the beginning "We have developed" means that the author is not describing only what she has done, but herself (and somebody else?) as well, thus distracting the reader's attention. On the whole the sentence is linguistically miserable, stylistically clumsy, conceptually without prospect; translationally – a direct word for word substitution, resulting in almost mere verbiage. The "Guide" provides linguistic means for generating "scientific sentences" of quite a different type. For example, this unfortunate phrase can be turned into such as:

*A new computer database "Polyling" provides a comprehensive scholarly support for all linguistic students and those involved into language research.*

## 7. Conclusions

Cross-cultural and applied problems of teaching and practicing translation can be put into a new perspective promoting their understanding and updating within the theory of translation. They can be interpreted as acquiring and demonstrating the active linguistic competence of a native speaker who is using two kinds of linguistic information, synonymous and combinatorial, for discourse generation, which, in turn, is closely connected with the national worldview and mentality.

\* \* \*

(\*\*\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva. CONTRASTIVE PHRASEOLOGY IN A CROSS-CULTURAL AND COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE // Thelen M. & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.), Translation and Meaning. Part 5. Proceedings of the Maastricht – Lodz Duo Colloquium, 2000. Maastricht: Maastricht School of Translation and Interpreting, 2001, 365–378.*

Phraseology is language specific, culturally bound, and cognitively charged, thus presenting difficulties for foreigners trying to understand, use, and translate set phrases into their native language. Contrastive comparison of English and Russian idioms shows many differences between the two and helps define what linguistic, conceptual, and cultural information should be provided to a foreign language learner to facilitate their acquisition and rendering. For example, Russian phraseology is rich in highly expressive grammatical markers – diminutives, intensifiers, emphatic and archaic forms, reduplications, etc. Most of them do not have analogues in English and thus their translation into it will make the text sound much more emotional than it is supposed to be by the English language stylistics and cultural norms.

Phraseology occupies a particularly prominent place within language. It is much more language-specific, culturally bound and cognitively charged than any other language phenomenon. It accumulates language's most characteristic – lexical and grammatical – features as well as the national spirit and mental dispositions of its speakers. That is why it presents particular difficulties for a foreigner in its understanding, acquisition, usage, and translation into one's native language. Phraseology's linguistic, cultural, and cognitive peculiarities become clearly apparent when one contrasts phraseologies of a native and a foreign language.

Here the differences begin from the beginning: one's own and foreign phraseology are perceived, apprehended and reproduced in quite an opposite way. Idioms of one's native language are acquired naturally, automatically, “unconsciously”, without explication, explanation, effort or learning – just with and as one's native language is mastered. Their meaning is derived by analogy with similar language patterns, models and constructions, and on the basis of other linguistic and extralinguistic – cultural – background knowledge. They are actively, frequently and appropriately reproduced in speech, cannot be forgotten and are felt to be language's integral and inseparable part. Their usage is an obligatory characteristic of a native speaker's linguistic competence (as it is defined by Yu. Apresjan [1974, 31] within I. Melchuk's [1995] “Meaning–Text” Model; cf. [Riabtseva 1997b]). “Being competent” in one's native language and its phraseology entails, in particular, the ability of “correctly” modifying or exploiting the form of idioms, transforming their contents, punning, or playing on their words, cf. *to stop* vs. *stand dead* vs. *stock-still*.

Idioms are easily acquired and employed by a native speaker because, in particular, their perception provokes associations between their elements while also generating stable connections among different idioms which have similar, analogous, or common elements, thus contributing to the organizing one's inner lexicon into an integral system. This is confirmed by associative experiments and is fixed in associative dictionaries, cf. [Kiss et al. 1972; Karaulov et al. 1992]. Karaulov's dictionary shows, for example, that phraseological associations are quite a common, highly frequent, easily provoked and readily (re)produced reaction to a stimulus word. For instance, Russian stimulus words *nos* ‘a nose’, *palka* ‘a stick’, etc., are associated with their idiomatic usage, cf. (1).

(1) *nos*: *vodit' za nos* lit. “to lead by the nose” ~ *to deceive*

*veshat' nos* “to hang one’s nose” ~ *to loose heart*

*ostat'sa s nosom* “to be left with one’s nose”

~ *to be left out in the cold*

*palka: palka o dvux konzax* “a stick with two ends”

~ *to be a double-edged sword*

*delat' iz-pod palki* “to do smt under a stick” ~ *under compulsion*

Idioms of a foreign language are “mastered” in quite a different way. They demand explanation and translation – word for word/ literal, and literary – into one’s native language, as their inner semantic form is not transparent. They are the first to be forgotten, are difficult for a foreigner to be identified as such in speech, or to be differentiated from a similar free word combination; they are hard to memorize and reproduce in speech naturally and thus can be used out of place. For example, an American journalist when speaking on the Russian TV not long ago made the following – quite unliterary – conclusion: *Togda vashemu pravitelstvu xana*, without even suspecting that it was absolutely out of place, as such a non-standard expression is possible only in an informal dialogue with a friend.

In most instances foreign idioms are just “learned by heart”, rather than mastered, and thus are used only if they are memorized and remembered, being mechanically reproduced rather than automatically employed. For example, Russian English-language learners sooner or later come to know that the expressions *It is raining cats and dogs* and *Ljet, kak iz vedra* “to come down in buckets” are used analogously, similarly, to describe a heavy shower. But still they will never use it in English as naturally and appropriately as their native expression to say nothing of daring to make a pun of it, or of “correctly distorting” it. While native speakers can easily modify the expressions, cf. *Ljet, kak iz xudogo vedra* – *It is pouring cats and dogs*.

English Russian-language learners, in their turn, would not understand expressions (2–3) without special comment. For example, an American professor teaching English mass media stylistics in Moscow State University interpreted the expression (2) as “one’s boots are so clean that they may provoke someone to make them dirty”.

(2) *sapogi kashi prosjat* “one’s boots are asking for porridge/ are very hungry”

~ *one’s boots are yawning at the toes/ are torn*

(3) *s nim kashi ne svarish* “It is impossible to cook porridge with him”

~ *you won’t get anywhere with him*

*Nu i zavaril ty kashu!* “What porridge you have boiled!”

~ *You’ve made a mess of it!/ stirred up trouble.*

All these differences can be explained not only by the opposite ways in acquiring one’s native and foreign language. Of course, a foreign language is usually studied, not naturally mastered, it needs support by textbooks and dictionaries, it is founded on memorizing, etc. But still, phraseology is the most difficult part to be learned (by heart) first of all, because it occupies a particular place in any language. Being connected with the whole language inventory it inevitably concentrates and compresses over its most characteristic and specific properties, as well as cultural knowledge, practical and historical experience and mentality of its speakers.

It is well known that phraseology, and especially idioms, are more expressive and stylistically marked than ordinary, free word combinations. But still, are there any differences between them in this respect? Contrastive comparison of English and Russian idioms and set phrases, as well as their translations shows that the Russian ones have a number of features, which make them more emotional and peculiarly stylistically marked. This becomes apparent when comparing their vocabulary equivalents, cf. [Lubensky 1995; Kunin 1984]. In translations from Russian into English most of emotional connotations, cultural implications and stylistic coloring of Russian idioms disappear, as their highly colloquial – non-standard – character cannot be rendered into English, cf. (4); while highly colloquial English

expressions, such as (5), can be, on the contrary, rendered by no less expressive Russian phrases.

- (4) *v akkurat vs. exactly, just, only*  
*babushka nadvoe skazala vs. that's an open question*  
*merit' starym arshinom vs. to measure by the old yardstick*
- (5) *the back of beyond vs. u cherta na kulichkax;*  
*as crazy as a bedbug vs. mozgi na bekren'*  
*to go bananas vs. rexnut'sa; to give smb beans vs. zadat' zharu*  
*you can't put it in the bank vs. iz spasiba shuby ne soshesh'*  
*when the band began to play vs. kogda zavarilas' kasha*

What linguistic means make Russian idioms sound “non-standard colloquial” and create their emotional coloring? And Why?

### Russian Idioms And Their Grammatical Peculiarities

Russian phraseology, idioms, and set phrases are notable for capitalizing on most expressive linguistic – mostly grammatical – means available in the Russian language. They also activate all types of peripheral language phenomena, and create on their basis their own – highly colloquial, “non-standard” speech patterns.

1. Almost all lexical means in Russian have expressive grammatical modifications. They are all actively exploited and extensively used in phraseology making it highly emotional. For example, in (6) the following grammatical patterns are used: (a) diminutive or diminutive-hypocoristic suffixes; (b) complete or partial reduplication; (c) plural forms of nouns instead of singular.

- (6) a) *kak na blud-echk-e, po svoej mer-k-e; pod shum-ok*  
 b) *vidimo-nevidimo (vs. no end to smt); vsego-navsego (vs. not more than); polnym-polno; davnym-davno; tol'ko-tol'ko*  
 c) *naxvatat'sa verxov (vs. to scratch the surface); idti okol'nymi putjami, vsemi pravdami i nepravdami*

Such grammatical forms are either absent in English, or belong to the very periphery and are not productive, or cannot be used to heighten an expressive effect of an utterance. For example, plural forms in Russian are often used instead of singular when the speaker wants to express his negative attitude towards the object of communication and thus towards his addressee. Phrases like (7) mean that the speaker is resentful and hostile towards his addressee: he excludes people who graduated from a university from his personal sphere and does not want to contact with them (cf. [Apresjan 1988, 18]). What is important and interesting here is that the speaker knows that there is common knowledge that in Russia people usually graduate (at least till the very present) from one university, not several.

- (7) *My universitetov ne konchali.*  
 “We (Pl.), people like me, didn't finish universities (Pl.)”.

Such plural forms are hyperbolic and intensifying, they mark an unfair, unjust, prejudiced attitude. They differ from proper plural forms in that they are used in a situation when there is only one thing present or meant, but the speaker is exaggerating just to express his emotions and feelings. This intensification of expression makes the pattern highly – non-standard – colloquial. It is used only in oral speech and in a face-to-face dialogue, where it is quite frequent, productive and emotionally charged; cf. (9). In English, in contrast, plural forms are not a regular means of expressing one's (negative) attitude towards situation and for intensifying rendition of one's emotional state.

- (8) *Ne ustraivaj scen! (Pl.)! “Do not make scenes!”*  
*A oni tut chai (Pl.) raspevaut (poka ja rabotau)!*  
 “They are drinking teas here (while I am working)!”

2. Russian phraseology actively uses all kinds of peripheral, marginal, rare, archaic, relic or outdated lexical elements or their grammatical forms, many of them being used only

in set expressions, cf. (9), as well as all kinds of auxiliaries: deictics, interjections, onomatopoeic words, form and link words, and what is most significant, their derivatives, which are easily, freely and frequently formed in oral informal speech in Russian. All these phenomena make the whole expression highly emotional and intensified. There are plenty of such set phrases in Russian like the ones given in (10), while in English, corresponding patterns are quite rare, cf. (11). As an instance, take the expression *ni bum-bum* (*v matematike*) ~ “not to know (mathematics) at all” which characterizes smb’s knowledge by comparing it with the sound made by wood when one is knocking on it.

- (9) *s gskom, so svoim arshinom, bit’ baklushi, igrat’ v birulki  
ispokon veku, v koi-to veki, s nezapamjatnyx vremen  
berech’ pusche glaza, ni zgi ne vidno  
ne Bog vest’ uchto/ kak/ skolko* (vs. *not all that well/ good/ far*)
- (10) *ne axti kak/ skol’ko* (vs. *not all that well; anything but plentiful*)  
*axnut’ ne uspet’, ni bum-bum, ni be ni me, tjap-ljap, uvy i ax, na ura, s buxyt-  
baraxty, tutel’ka v tutel’ku, dlja xoxmy, xixan’ki da xaxan’ki, beliberda, kak  
auknetisa, tryn-trava, razvodit’ muru, nakarkat’ bedu*
- (11) *willy-nilly; not to say boo; betwixt and between* (vs. *ni to, ni se*).

3. Russian oral speech abounds with highly colloquial grammatical – case- and prepositional – patterns which are formed exclusively in and for non-standard or informal communication. Such patterns are highly productive, very emotional, and are common in all types of everyday personal communication, cf. (12). In English, a similar expressiveness can be traced in phrases like (13), where it is provoked by quite different – less emotional, but no less meaningful – linguistic phenomena: word play, rhythmic organization, sound consonance/ harmony, usage of numerals, etc., that is, through exploiting all other language means except grammatical.

- (12) *smotret’ volkom, revet’ belugoj, valom valit’, krichat’ durnym golosom, vyjti bokom* (vs. *to give smb trouble*), *vertet’sa vjunom/ volchkom, rassypat’sa melkim besom* (vs. *to dance attendance on smb*), *sporit’ do umopomrachenia, lubit’ do bezumia, napit’sa do polozhenia riz, dojti do ruchki, proigrat’sa/ napit’sa v dym, ubej Bog (ne pomnu), i dumat’ zabyt’* (vs. *just forget*); *xot’ stoj, xot’ padaj; xot’ kol na golove teshi*
- (13) *rag, tag and bobtail* vs. *vsakaja shantrapa*  
*cool, calm and collected* vs. *i brovju ne povel*  
*born and bred* vs. *do mozga kostej*  
*better fed than taught* vs. *dubina staerosovaja*  
*forever and ever* vs. *na veki vechnye*  
*high and dry* vs. *ostat’sa na bobax; next to nothing* vs. *vsego nichego*  
*to stop/ stand dead/ stock-still* vs. *stojat’ kak vkopannyj*  
*as dumb as they come* vs. *glupyj kak probka*

But still, Russian equivalents in (13) seem at least no less emotional than their English counterparts. Take the expression *as dumb as they come* as an example. In its Russian equivalent, *glupyj kak probka* ‘as fool as a cork’, a mental state is explicitly compared with a physical object, which is a very emotional way of expressing one’s attitude, as in real life there is a great distance between abstract and physical things. Thus, when they are compared and combined, the effect is quite dramatic. Or there may be other reasons for the differences. For example, the equivalents in (14) are differently colored in Russian and in English because of their “attitude” toward rationality and the way this attitude is expressed. The Russian expression is quite emotional because there is a word in it – *nezapamjatnyx* – which is used only in this expression and in this particular grammatical form: it exists in the language only thanks to this expression thus making it particular, charged, and involving. Besides, it is non-standard, informal, extremely “inexact”, meaning that nobody will be able to say more exactly, or “there is nobody who could remember when it all happened”. On the contrary, the

English expression *from day one* is quite literary, rational, matter-of-fact, and, one may say, “exact”, thanks to the numeral it incorporates. Another example of more literary character of English idioms is (15) where the Russian equivalent is extremely non-standard.

(14) *s nezapamjatnyx vremen* vs. *from day one*

(15) *to pull the wool over one's eyes* vs. *zabivat' baki*

All expressive language means, particularly grammatical, are concentrated by the Russian language in its phraseology to produce an emotional effect. The resulting idiomatic expressions are not rude, literary incorrect or vulgar. They are informal and non-standard, and their non-standard character is exploited to make the distance between the speakers shorter. In such intimate communication, the speakers become a part of a close community sharing common problems, having similar attitudes and feelings, and experiencing one and the same sense of collectivity. That is, the Russian language grammaticalizes meanings that best correspond to “the Russian spirit” and its readiness to display one’s empathy – sentiments, feelings, emotions, and thus personal involvement in the affairs of the community members.

### English And Russian Phraseologies Compared

1. Comparison of English and Russian idiomatic equivalents shows that the English ones are more rational, businesslike, matter-of-fact, are more oriented towards luck, success, interest (cf. set phrases with *care*), personal self-consciousness, “take it easy – don’t worry” position (cf. [Sakhovsky 1996]), and are more charged with humor and irony. For example, dictionaries show that there are at least three times as many humorous expressions in English as in Russian; compare examples in (16) which testify that there are no analogously – humorously – colored Russian equivalents to the given English phrases.

(16) *as phony as a three dollar bill* vs. *so strannostjami*

*to bear the bell* vs. *byt' zavodiloj*; *the great beyond* vs. *zagrobnaja zhyzn'*

*to be too big for one's boots* vs. *zadirat' nos*

*to go to meet one's maker* vs. *otdat' Bogy dushu*

2. English phraseology actively exploits contamination, blending and telescopic patterns. They can be characterized as economizing, compressive and thus “rationally saving resources”, cf. (17), these means are but rarely exploited in Russian. English phraseology is also rich in all sorts of allusions as it is more closely connected with English and world literature and culture than the Russian one. There are a lot of expressions in English which initially belonged to a particular author or a speaker – a writer, poet, political or religious figure. The latter, as we know, often make it their point to say something short, impressive, original and meaningful. English phraseology borrowed much and exploits freely allusions to world mythology, to the Bible, and to various historical precedents, cf. (18). Take (19) as an example. It is an allusion to Esop’s tale in which a stranger blew on his fingers so that to warm them and on his soup so that to cool it.

(17) smoke + fog = *smog*; *to gild the lily* = to gild refined gold + to paint the lily

(18) *Care killed a cat* – *Curiosity killed a cat*; *a kiss of death* – *a kiss of life*

(19) *to blow hot and cold*

Of course, there are quite a number of citations, allusions and Bible expressions in Russian, but they are considerably less numerous and are less frequently used than, say, folklore or fairy tale allusions. It should be noted here that there is no writer either in the Russian culture or in the world literature who made a contribution to a language comparable to that of Shakespeare’s (cf. [Klukina 1990]). Still, in Russian, Griboedov can be compared in this respect to, say, Dickens. As far as all kinds of allusive citations, set phrases, catch-words and frozen expressions are concerned, they have always been and still are popular in English oral and written speech, are widely used in mass media, literature and political debates, and are a usual object of punning and meaningful transformations – because they are known by native speakers, are transparent for them and are easily recognized and understood by them,



cf. (to work) *delicately like Agag*; (to cast one's) *bread upon the waters*; (there is) *no discharge in that war*; *corn in Egypt*; *a fly in the ointment*.

Expressions of these types are a big problem for Russian translators from English, whose cultural background is insufficient for detecting, attributing, interpreting and rendering them or their modifications into Russian. Now that Russia's cultural contacts are increasing, there is a correspondingly increasing need felt by interpreters' departments for the specialists who could acquaint future interpreters with foundations of Christianity and its traces in the world culture.

3. While Russian phraseology is rich with "historically bound" – archaic, relic or outdated forms, and with emphatic, marginal and auxiliary words, the English one, particularly American, is full of modern jargon, slang and professional expressions. The former make Russian phraseology more emotional, the latter make the English one more pragmatic. English phraseology has approximately three times as many "special language" words as the Russian one has. At least almost one fourth of entries in English phraseological dictionaries are marked as slang or jargon. But it should be borne in mind that "slang" is an English notion covering various and diverse lexical items and phrases borrowed from all kinds of professional or special fields of activity, including sports, theater, TV, show business, etc., while in Russian the meaning of this word is narrower and it is connected mainly with criminal lexicon. For example, the NTC's Dictionary of American slang [Spears 1991] differentiates between the following types of entries: *acronym, advertising, Amerindian, black, blend, California, collegiate, deliberate spoonerism, drugs, euphemistic, eye-dialect, financial, folksy, jargon, journalistic, juvenile, Pig Latin, play on*, etc.

As it is noted in NTC's Preface, slang expressions are in frequent use in the USA nowadays, and are familiar to many Americans; they are often some type of entertaining wordplay or clever and humorous expressions, cf. (20). They make a major part of American communication in movies, television, radio, newspapers, magazines and informal spoken conversation. They can or have already become standard American English. [Ibid. 6]. Many of the expressions included in the Dictionary are businesslike, rational, clever, witty, humorous or funny. But if we compare them with their counterparts – correspondences in Russian, we shall see that the Russian ones are more emotional and far from being slang-like, cf. (21). In particular, in Russian *ljapsus, v prosak* are relic and are used only in these expressions; *do posinenija* is based on a special intensifying expression – non-standard colloquial and very emotional.

(20) deliberate spoonerism: *dear old queen – queer old dean*  
eye-dialect/ respelling: *says – "sez"*; Pig Latin: *junk – unkjay*  
play on: *eagle-freak – eco freak*

(21) *to pull a boner vs. sdelat' ljapsus, popast' v prosak*  
*till all is blue vs. do posinenija*

*an abbreviated piece of nothing 'an insignificant person' vs. dyrka ot biblika*

Phraseology as a special layer of language lexicon is distinguished by a number of culturally marked qualities which make phraseologies of different languages comparable, similar, and equally valuable. They comprise neat, apt, pointed, nice, smart, real, keen, expressive, figurative and picturesque, image-bearing, formula like set phrases. That is why many English and Russian idioms are worth each other, cf. (22). But still much more of them leave a foreigner puzzling, strike him as unusual, are hard to understand and remember as they are deeply embedded into the culture, history and everyday life of the people who created them. They make a foreigner realize that the speakers of another language interpret the same thing or situation from an unexpected, so to say, seemingly unmotivated point of view and thus their meaning turns to be quite alien to him, cf. (23).

(22) *kazhdyj vstrechnyj-poperechnyj vs. people right, left and center/*  
*every Tom, Dick, and Harry*  
*sed'maja voda na kisele vs. second cousin twice removed*

- nagovorit' sem' verst do nebes* vs. *to talk a lot of hot air*  
*esche ne vecher* vs. *nothing is set in stone yet*  
*otojti v vechnost'* vs. *to join the choir invisible*  
 (23) *His elevator doesn't go to the top floor* vs. *u nego ne vse doma*  
*to read till its frayed and dog-eared* vs. *zachitat' do dyr*  
*double-Dutch* vs. *кумайская грамота*

Such expressions cannot be “translated” word for word, they should be rendered by a kind of analogue or a similar description, a kind of a counterpart. But in any case its national coloring and figurative meaning would be mostly lost. That is why to find and set cross-cultural parallels for language-specific idioms and their proper explications is still one of acute problems in teaching a foreign language and translating from it or into it.

### Cultural Implications

Phraseology has important cultural implications both for foreign language learners and for linguists, as it exploits, concentrates, and manifests culturally and ethnically specific material and spiritual realities and values, and does it in its own – effective and symbolic way, which helps reveal its priorities, cf. *The tongue ever turns to the ailing tooth*. Phraseology is thus a carrier of attitudes, dispositions, inclinations, preferences, biases, aspirations, morals, manners and stereotypes of native language speakers, that is, of those background – ethnic, historical and cultural – components of an idiomatic meaning which are almost impossible to assimilate when studying a foreign language.

Phraseology of any language makes a wide use of most habitual and usual for its speakers, common everyday situations and objects for conceptualizing their life experience. But even congenial/ kindred language communities choose for these purposes non-similar, different or even opposite means to represent it and symbolize [Strazhas 1993; Riabtseva 2000], cf. (24). Thus, there can be a suspicion that Russians deceive each other a little bit differently than Englishmen do, or rather, to be more exact, conceptualize deception in their own specific way, cf. (25), and seem to be biased towards manipulating other persons body parts [Shakhovsky, Panchenko 1999, 287], or even more exactly, perceive deception as a manipulation with other person's body parts, perhaps so that to distract the person's attention from the real state of affairs. (By the way, this “inclination” agrees with what has been said above: the distance between the speakers in the Russian community is shorter, thus, so to say, “they can easily reach other person's body part and manipulate it”.)

- (24) *ni v kakie vorota ne lezet* “not to get into any gates” ~ *sheer effrontery*  
*poluchit' ot vorot povorot* ~ *to get the brush off*  
*za sem' verst kiselja xlebat'* vs. *to go on a wild-goose chase*  
*as common as blackberries*  
 vs. *kak sobak nerezannyx, xot' prud prudi; kury ne klujut*

(25)	Object	Russian	English
	teeth:	<i>zagovarivat' zuby</i> (“to talk away smb's teeth”)	–
	ears:	<i>veshat' lapshu na ushi</i> (“to hang noodles on smb's ears”)	–
	eyes:	<i>vtirat' ochki</i> ~ <i>to pull the wool over smb's eyes</i>	
		<i>puskat' pyl' v glaza</i> ~ <i>to throw dust into in one's eyes</i>	
	nose:	<i>natjanut' nos</i> (“to pull smb's nose”)	–
		<i>vodit' za nos</i>	–
	brain:	<i>pudrit' mozgi</i> (to powder smb's brains)	–
	finger:	<i>obvesti vokrug paltsa</i> (“to turn smb around one's finger”)	–
	leg:	–	<i>to pull smb's leg</i>
	face:	–	<i>to shoot off one's face</i>

Still, an understanding of motivations for such expressions as given in (25), demands special research into etymology, history and jargon. But many set phrases are quite transparent. For example, (26) is a direct manifestation of peasantry life experience of Russians most of which for centuries lived in the country. English idioms, like the ones given in (27), in their turn, are often based on experience connected with handicraft, sea and military occupations, banking, sports and games (horse-races, baseball, boxing, cards, etc.), such themes occupying quite a peripheral place in Russian phraseology.

(26) *pjatoje koleso v telege* “the fifth wheel in the cart” ~ *an odd man out*  
*nositsja, kak kuritsa s jajtsom* “to brood over like a hen over an egg”  
 ~ *to make a great fuss over smt*

(27) *to draw a blank* vs. *nesolono xlebavshi*  
*to drop the ball* vs. *poterpet' neudachu*  
*to sell smb a bill of goods* vs. *pojmat' na udochku*

The ethnotheory – views and life experience of language speakers, standing behind phraseology, accumulates their practical associations, historical reminiscences and common sense knowledge, etc. For example, all Russians know since their childhood that “kasha”, porridge, has always been a most common Russian meal. It is still cooked and served in all nurseries, kinder-gardens, schools and school summer camps, in hospitals and in the army, etc. It has a characteristic consistency, should be properly set, and its taste depends on the way it is cooked. This familiar to all Russian community members notion is widely exploited in conveying various attitudes, ideas and dispositions, cf. set phrases in (2), (3), (28), which a member of other community will find unmotivated and obscure. A similar function in English has, perhaps, the word *pie*, set phrases with which (29) will surely be puzzling for a foreigner.

(28) *kasha vo rtu/ golove* “porridge in the mouth/ head” ~ *speech/ brain is mush*  
*malo kashi jel* “to have eaten too little porridge”  
 ~ *to be still wet behind one's ears*

(29) *easy as a pie; have a finger in every pie; pie in the sky; pie-eyed.*

There are also a lot of historical reminiscences in all languages each carrying a specific evaluative connotation, which is hard to capture and render. For example, the expression *sidet' kak barin* is translated in the dictionaries as “to sit around like royalty/ on one's hands”, which is not exact enough to convey the connotation that *barin* is a proprietor who is associated in Russian (history and mentality) with “doing nothing”.

But still a most culturally marked phenomenon in every phraseology is the use of culturally and ethnically specific key concepts. Comparison of Russian and English phraseology reveals that they capitalize on rather different spiritual values and attitudes. In Russian it is important not only to identify, characterize and evaluate what is going on, but also to display one's involvement, express one's sympathy or dislike, approval or disapproval, to demonstrate that you are not indifferent, that is, to show one's emotions. That is why Russian phraseology is not only highly expressive, but is very emotional as well.

The fact that Russians are actively taking at heart what they see or are told, is supported by various and extensive linguistic information. In particular, there is a long list of corresponding “emotional” verbs which are used in Russian as if they are “action verbs”, that is, describing a conscious, purposeful and voluntary action [Wierzbicka 1988, 254] (*bespokoit'sa, trevozhit'sa, gorevat', toskovat', skuchat', grustit', pechalit'sa, volnovat'sa, unyvot', uzhasat'sa, negodovat', ljubovat'sa*), while modern English has only one such verb – *to worry* that is used similarly. In addition, each such Russian verb, very widely used in everyday speech, has a number of derivatives describing its various aspectual correlations, cf. *nervnichat'*: *raznervnichat'sa, iznervnichat'sa, perenervnichat', etc.*, most of them having a causative form: *bespokoit', trevozhit', volnovat', etc.* In contrast, almost all their English counterparts are describing inner involuntary passive states, but not “emotional actions”, cf. (30).

(30) *radovat'sa* vs. *to be happy; gordit'sa* vs. *to be proud*

*stydit'sa vs. to be ashamed; zlit'sa vs. to be angry*  
*gnevat'sa vs. to be outraged; vozmuschat'sa vs. to be indignant*

There are a number of key notions that reflect this national disposition and related nationally characteristic attitudes: of readiness for displaying all sorts of feelings, in particular, such as concern, compassion, sympathy, resignation and submissive behavior, cf. *sud'ba* 'destiny', *dusha* 'soul', *vera* 'belief', *zhalost* 'pity', *toska* 'yearning', *beda* 'grief', *gore* 'misfortune'; *terpenie* 'patience', *bol'* 'suffering'. They are also connected with nationally relevant inclinations toward collectivity, readiness to be patient and to rely and hope on outer external and higher forces and one's destiny, to follow one's feelings rather than mind or reason, cf. *kak Bog na dushu polozhit vs. any old way; pobojsa Boga vs. be reasonable*, etc. [Bulygina, Shmelev 1997]. In Russian even time is "submissive": *vremja terpit* 'there is no rush', to say nothing of the man, cf. *sam Bog velel (terpet')* vs. *Its only natural to do smt.*

That is why it is easy to explain why Russians make an extensive use of the word *bol'no* (~ "painful") as an intensifier, cf. *bol'no xitryj/ umnyj/ dorogoj; serdo-bol'-nyj*, as well as of the word *beda* ("misfortune") – to mean "very much", cf. *Ludej tam beda skol'ko!* Their usage displays and confirms highly emotional, involved and readily expressed attitude conveyed by these expressions. Further, in Russian, the notion *beda* is closely connected with the no less emotional notion *gore* "grief". They both denote a deep and intensive feeling – "being upset to the utmost" and thus enter into a large number of set expressions which are widely and actively used in speech, cf. (31; 32) and which cannot be fully rendered into English, cf. (33). There is only one word in English which has a similar function and plays an analogous role in the English phraseology. It is the word *trouble*. But it differs greatly from *beda, gore* in that it is quite rational, matter of fact and commonsensical. It means a difficulty, inconvenience, that is, "an obstacle; what is preventing". That is why derivatives, set phrases and idioms connected in Russian with *beda, gore* are more emotional than their more rational English equivalents, including their most direct counterpart *trouble*, cf. (34).

- (31) *beda-to kakaja, dolgo li do bedy, bedovaja golova, bedolaga bedstvovat', sem' bed odin otvet; gorevat', prigorunut'sa goremyka, goremychnyj, goresti i napasti*
- (32) *ubityj gorem, xlebnut'/xvatit' gorja, pomoch' gorju, s gorja, gore lukovoe jemu i gorja malo, gore mne s toboj, s gorem popolam, gorushko-gore*
- (33) *ne beda vs. It doesn't matter*  
*ne velika beda vs. Its not the end of the world*  
*Chto za beda! vs. What harm is there in that?*  
*Lixa beda nachalo vs. A good start is half the race*  
*na bedu/ na moje gore vs. unluckily/ unfortunately*
- (34) *to give smb trouble; to put smt to trouble; to take the trouble; to be in trouble*  
*to get into trouble; to make trouble for smb; to look for trouble; heart trouble*

There are a lot of similar linguistic facts testifying to the effect that Russians are more biased towards feelings, emotions and other non-rational states, while English demonstrates more rational attitude in dealing with everyday problems. For example, one of the central Russian concepts – *dusha*, enters into more than sixty set expressions [Mikheev 1999], while its English equivalent *soul* is but rarely used. Instead, English has more than thirty expressions with the word *mind*, e.g., *to get into/ out of one's mind, make up/ speak/ set/ change/ turn one's mind, bear in mind, be of the same mind, keep an open mind, know one's own mind; A sound mind in a sound body*, etc. The very existence of the word *mind* in English and its linguistic properties, and particularly the absence of its exact equivalent in Russian, expose great differences in the attitude toward rationality in the corresponding cultures.

The idea that can be traced in American phraseology – "I feel good, I feel nice" – is absolutely absent in the Russian one. For example, Russians almost never answer the question "How are things going?" with "Fine", but often say *Kak sazha bela* – which is commented in

[Lubensky 1997] as “a vague reply implying that things could be better”, and which literally means “as white as smoke-black”. There are a lot of catch-phrases that reveal predominance of rather passive, awaiting attitude of Russians towards the future and one’s possibilities, “unreadiness” to face difficulties and troubles, cf. *vyshe golovy ne prygnesh’, plet’u obuxa ne pereshibesh’, sila solomu lomit, sterpit’sa – sljubit’sa, avos’ proneset, ne sud’ba, ne dano*, etc. [Riabtseva 1997a].

While Russian mentality is oriented towards collectivity and involvement in the affairs of the community and its members, the English language gives priority to individuality, personality, self-sufficiency, self-respect and independence. This idea is conveyed by the words *privacy, face, challenge, encourage*, and some others, set phrases with which are difficult to translate into Russian. The word *face*, in particular, has become a symbol and a carrier of an active attitude towards life, self-control, etc., cf. *to save/ not to lose face; to have the face to do smt; to face out; to face the music; to face up to reality; to set one’s face against smt/ to make face against smt; to fly in the face of smt; to meet smt in the face*. *Face* is used in expressions whose equivalents in Russian expose quite a different interpretation of what is going on [Kunin 1984], cf. (35). And when Russians pay particular attention to what reaction their action will cause on the part of other people, or the whole community, in English the situation is presented only in a personal perspective, cf. *ne udarit’ litsom v graz’ (pered lud’mi / collectivom) vs. to keep one’s face*.

- (35) *to pull/ make/ wear a long/ sad face vs. sostroit’ postnuju phisionomiju*  
*to keep a straight face vs. ostavat’sa nevozmumym*  
*to put a bold/ good/ brave face vs. ne rasterjat’sa*  
*not to show one’s face vs. ne pokazivat’ nosa*  
*before smb’s face vs. pod nosom*  
*to open one’s face vs. razvjazyvat’ jazyk*  
*to put a new face on smt vs. predstavit’ v novom svete*  
*to straighten one’s face vs. prinimat’ nevozmumyj vid*  
*to put one’s best face vs. byt’ ljubeznym*  
*to run one’s face vs. vvezhat’ na prijatnoj vneshnosti*  
*to set one’s face to smt vs. napravljat’sa*  
*till black in the face vs. do posinenia*

Russian and English phraseologies expose diametrically opposed attitudes of their speakers toward many other cultural, social, psychological and personal phenomena (for more detail, see [Wierzbicka 1996; Stepanov 1997]), which cannot be dealt with here.

On the whole, English phraseology is oriented more towards the dynamics of the situation, its rational and often ironic evaluation, towards actions and overcoming difficulties or getting out of trouble rather than emotional experiencing them. And it is not a mere accident that it exploits for describing all these phenomena most vivid, characteristic and rational language tendency in the modern English – short operational words, particularly auxiliary, semi-auxiliary and phrasal verbs with all sorts of particles: *up, down, off, on, out, in, away*, etc. (cf. *an odd man out*), which not only reflect, but also create an active, dynamic, matter-of-fact attitude towards life. Such short words as *cut, come, get, give, have, make, take*, etc., correspond best to the attitude of “we shall overcome”. This tendency is increasingly obvious in newly formed expressions [Trofimova 1993], cf. *to cross over, to crack down, to opt out*, etc.

Thus there is an obvious harmony between a national character and a national language. The language creates and provides its users with grammatical and lexical means of verbalizing their intentions, attitudes, priorities, dispositions and values, while the latter are generating, activating and developing linguistic means necessary for their embodiment. And this harmony is most transparently seen in phraseology.

### Some Cognitive and Translational Implications

It is evident that foreign language learning should be supported by special culturally charged materials providing students with the possibility to plunge into the alien culture and absorb it. One of the ways of doing it is compiling of a dictionary, encyclopedia or a reference book of cultural and practical concepts where every key notion will be given a concise, many-faceted, historically and culturally oriented qualification demonstrating and explicating its contents, associations and connotations, and directing its understanding and usage in speech context, something of the kind of characterization that was given above to the Russian notion *kasha* “porridge”. Russian English-language learners would like to know, for example, why the words *beans* and *a pie* are so widely used in English phraseology, and what other key concepts, besides privacy and individuality, and in what way are present in it. Obviously, such a “cultural dictionary” can be compiled only by linguists – native speakers, but the questions that they should answer in it, should be asked by foreigners. Such cooperation can be based on the latest developments in conceptual analysis presented and developed in the writings by Aroutunova [1999], Wierzbicka [1992; 1996] and their followers.

That is, cultural information should be interpreted from a cognitive point of view. Every language incorporates background cultural knowledge shared by all its speakers. It is embodied in word meanings, grammatical patterns, speech formulas and modes of communication. The attitudes, norms and dispositions standing behind (or lying beneath) their usage are seldom verbalized, or are a subject of only indirect verbalization. But this is what is essential for foreign learners and demands explication and contrasting. “Cognitive phraseology”, based on intercultural comparisons, can contribute to exposing differences in conceiving the outer world, interpersonal relations and the inner world of native speakers.

There is another practical implication of what has been said, this time for translation theory, as there is an opinion that a translation should render all meaningful components of the original. This opinion is expressed, for example, in [Shakhovsky 1997], where the author critically compares an extract (36) from Sholokhov’s “And Quiet Flows the Don” with its translation (37) into English. The critic notes, in particular, that the translation is less expressive and emotive than the original, and has losses, as it does not render the intensity of feelings, grief and desperateness of the heroin, whose daughter is dying, and is thus emotionally poorer. He proposes another variant of the translation which he considers more adequate, cf. (38).

(36) *Zernyshko moe, dochurka! – pryglushenno zvenela mat’. – Cvetochek moj, ne uxodi, Tanushka! Glan’, moja krasotushka, otkroj glazki. Opomnis’ zhe! Guljushka moja chernoglazaja...*

(37) *My little one, my little daughter, she groaned, – my flower, don’t go away, Tania. Look, my pretty one, open your little eyes, come back, my dark-eyed darling...*

(38) *Oh, my own little daughter, my dearest one, – mother pleaded sadly. My sweetest baby-flower, oh, don’t die, Tania. My precious love, please, don’t! Look at your mummy, open your darling eyes. Wake up, please. My black-eyed jewel...*

The extracts reveal that there are “emotional gaps” in English in comparison with Russian in expressing intensive emotions. But the question is whether they should be bridged. Other examples show that attempts to do it may seem clumsy or funny. Consider the notes with which interpreters provide their translations. In English translation of Turgenev’s novel “Asja” (1964), the diminutive-hypocoristic form of the word *golova* “head” – *golovka* was commented on in a footnote in the following way: *golovka* – “Here the diminutive adds a note of tenderness, which cannot be similarly expressed in English and which should not be exaggerated; perhaps, *little head* will do”.

Our contrastive comparison shows, however, that many emotional components of a Russian original cannot and even should not be transferred into its translation into English. Russian speech is more emotional, open and “extremely sincere” in exposing the speaker’s inner states, and this is in accord with Russian speech culture and mentality. But when fully transferred into English, it would not comply with the readers’ norms of everyday

communication and thus would make them form an impression that Russians are even more emotional than they really are (cf. [Nida 1996]). That is, an adequate translation should not reproduce all and everything, and, perhaps, some neutralization will be more authentic than complete “re-dressing” of what has no direct grammatical or lexical equivalents in another language. And though “Whatever can be meant can be said” [Searle 1969, 47], sometimes it should not.

This conclusion comes from the fact that lexicalized meanings differ from grammaticalized ones in that the latter are more difficult to render in the foreign language as they are more deeply embedded in the culture and on many occasions cannot and even should not be “translated”; cf. highly expressive Russian grammatical – diminutive, intensifying, emphatic, etc. – markers, which do not have analogues in English and whose translation will make the text sound much more emotional than it is expected to be by the English language stylistics and cultural norms.

There are a number of adjacent and no less challenging problems connected with the meaning, use and comparison of idioms.

Although idioms are mostly monosemantic, their meaning can change with time. This rather paradoxical fact can be inferred when tracing their usage. For example, there are a lot of highly colloquial idioms in Russian meaning “to die” or “to seize to live”, cf. *otdat' Bogu dushu* “to surrender one’s soul to God”. But at present they are not used to describe another man dying as that would be tactless and rude and is thus a subject of cultural restriction. But such expressions are beginning to be used to mean “to seize to exist” with reference to organizations, newspapers and similar things, cf. ‘The firm kicked the bucket/ croaked/ turned up its toes’. While for self-reference or for the reference to human beings they are used in the meaning which can be called “intensification”, that is, “very much”, to the utmost degree, extremely, etc. [Yuminova 1999], as in the speech pattern “I was so (much/ very/ extremely, etc.) cold (frightened/ tired/ happy, etc.) that I almost died”.

Such usage is best described within Melchuk’s [1995] “Meaning–Text” Model, where there is a special “lexical parameter” for the meaning of very (much, intensive, big, etc.). It is called *Magn* – from the Latin *Magnus*. It is usually expressed in language idiomatically, the corresponding expressions acquiring an additional function of intensifying the communicative burden of an utterance, cf. *Magn* (dark) = *pitch black*; *Magn* (to cry) = *to scream bloody murder*; *revet' belugoj* ~ *to cry one’s head off*. That is why the “death-idioms” used to mean *Magn*: “extremely much”, “to the limit/ ultimate degree” – are just emotional intensifiers, cf. *to almost die from fear*, *to be on the verge of death from cold*, etc. Such usage is not directly connected with death and thus shifts away cultural restrictions. By the way, the very fact that the meaning *Magn*, which is very expressive, is grammaticalized in Russian – through derivational affixes – provides a further proof that “emotion-ness” in Russian occupies a prominent place and obligatorily accompanies everyday communication, cf. *razrydat'sa* “to begin to cry intensively” = *Magn* (to cry); *rasxoxota'sa* “to begin to laugh intensively” = *Magn* (to laugh), etc. Here comes the importance of realising that meanings can be expressed both lexically and grammatically, and that different languages grammaticalize different concepts, which can in other languages be only lexicalized.

In sum, the burden of phraseology, as well as of all other super-segmental language devices – intonation, intensification, modality, evaluation, etc. – is to express and convey some additional extra-linguistic information: personal, interpersonal, cultural, social, etc. But every phraseology has its own preferences in choosing what and how to convey.

*contrastive phraseology, translation of phraseology, key cultural concepts, grammaticalization, lexicalization*

#### References

- Apresjan, Yu.* Lexicheskaya semantica. Moskva, Nauka, 1974.  
*Apresjan, Yu.* Pragmaticheskaya informatia dl'a tolkovogo slovarja // Pragmatika & problemy intencional'nosti. Moskva, Institut jazykoznanija, 1988.

- Aroutunova, N.* Jazyk & mir cheloveka. Moskva, Jazyki ruskoj kultury, 1999.
- Bulygina, T., Shmelev A.* Jazykovaja konceptualizacija mira. Moskva, Jazyki ruskoj kultury, 1997.
- Dobrovolsky, D., Karaulov, Yu.* Phraseologija v asociativnom slovare // *Izvestija OLJa*, 1992, N 6.
- Karaulov, Yu., et al.* Russkij asociativnyj slovar'. Moskva, Institut rusckogo jazyka, 1992.
- Kiss G., Armstrong C., Milroy R.* The Associative Thesaurus Of English. Edinburgh, 1972.
- Klukina, T.* Literaturnye alluzii, obrazy & citaty v anglijskom jazyke. Moskva, Ministerstvo inostrannyx del, 1990.
- Kunin, A.* Anglo-russkij phraseologičeskij slovar'. Moskva, Russkij jazyk, 1984.
- Lubensky S.* Russian–English Dictionary of Idioms. New York, Random House, 1995.
- Mel'chuk I.A.* The Russian Language In The Meaning–Text Perspective. Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. Sonderband 39. Moskau–Wien, 1995.
- Mikheev, A.* Otrazhenie slova “dusha” v naivnoj mifologii rusckogo jazyka // *V. Telia* (ed.) Phraseologija v kontexte kultury. Moskva, Jazyki ruskoj kultury, 1999.
- Nida, E.* The Sociolinguistics of Interlingual Communication. Bruxelles, Les Editions du Hazard, 1996.
- Riabtseva, N.* Axiologičeskie modeli vremeni // *N.Aroutunova* (ed.) Logičeskij analiz jazyka: Jazyk I vremja. Moskva, Indrik, 1997a.
- Riabtseva N.* Linguistic Competence and Translation in Cross-Cultural and Applied Perspectives // *Kinga Klaudy, Janos Kohn* (eds.) Transfere necesse est: Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Current Trends in Studies of Translation and Interpreting. Budapest, Hungary, Scholastica, 1997b.
- Riabtseva, N.* Razmer & kolichestvo v jazykovoj kartine mira // *N.Aroutunova* (ed.) Logičeskij analiz jazyka: Jazyki prostranstv. Moskva, Jazyki ruskoj kultury, 2000.
- Searle, J.* Speech Acts. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1969.
- Shakhovskij, V.* Emozional'nye kulturnye koncepty: paralleli & contrasty // *V.Karasik* (ed.) Jazykovaja lichnost': Kulturnye koncepty. Volgograd, Peremena, 1996.
- Shakhovskij, V.* O perevodimosti emotivnyx smyslov // *A. Shvejcer, N. Riabtseva, A. Vasilevich* (eds.) Perevod & komunikacija. Moskva, Institut jazykoznanija, 1997.
- Shakhovskij, V., N. Panchenko.* Nacional'no-kulturnaja specifika concepta “obman” vo phraseologičeskome aspekte // *V. Telia* (ed.) Phraseologija v kontexte kultury. Moskva, Jazyki ruskoj kultury, 1999.
- Spears, R.* Dictionary of American Slang. National Textbook Company, 1991.
- Stepanov, Yu.* Konstanty: Slovar' ruskoj kultury. Moskva, Jazyki ruskoj kultury, 1997.
- Strazhas, N.* Semiotics of work and idleness // *Semiotica*. 1993, v. 1/2.
- Trofimova, Z.* Slovar' novyx slov & znachenij v anglijskom jazyke. Moskva, Pavlin, 1993.
- Wierzbicka, A.* The Semantics of Grammar. Amsterdam, 1988.
- Wierzbicka, A.* Semantics, culture, and cognition: Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations. Oxford, 1992.
- Wierzbicka, A.* Dictionaries vs. Encyclopaedias: How to draw a line // *Ph.W.Davis* (ed.) Alternative Linguistics: Descriptive and Theoretical Models. John Benjamins, 1995.
- Wierzbicka, A.* Semantics: Primes and Universals. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Yuminova, A.* Idiomy polja smert' v sovremenmom rusckom jazyke // *V. Telia* (ed.) Phraseologija v kontexte kultury. Moskva, Jazyki ruskoj kultury, 1999.

\* \* \*

(\*\*\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva. PHRASEOLOGY IN A CROSS-CULTURAL AND COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE / Report, delivered at Emory University, Atlanta, USA, April, 2000. Доклад, прочитанный в Университете Эмори, Атланта, США, апрель 2000. (Полная версия)*

Phraseology occupies a particularly prominent place within language. It is much more language-specific, culturally bound and cognitively charged than any other language phenomenon. It accumulates language's most characteristic features as well as the national spirit and mental dispositions of its speakers. That is why it presents particular difficulties for a foreigner in its understanding, acquisition, usage, and translation into one's native language. Phraseology's linguistic, cultural, and cognitive peculiarities become clearly apparent when one contrasts phraseologies of a native and a foreign language.



Here the differences begin from the beginning: one's own and foreign phraseology are perceived, apprehended and reproduced in quite an opposite way. Idioms of one's native language are acquired naturally, automatically, and «unconsciously», without explication, explanation, effort or learning – just with and as one's native language is mastered. Their meaning is derived by analogy with similar language patterns, models and constructions, and on the basis of other linguistic and extralinguistic – cultural – background knowledge. They are actively, frequently and appropriately reproduced in speech, cannot be forgotten and are felt to be language's integral and inseparable part. Their usage is an obligatory characteristic of a native speaker's linguistic competence (as it is defined by Yu. Apresjan within I. Melchuk's "Meaning–Text" Model; cf. [Апресян 1974, 31; Mel'chuk 1995]; (see Note 1). "Being competent" in one's native language and its phraseology entails, in particular, the ability of "correctly" modifying or exploiting the form of idioms, transforming their contents, punning, or playing on their words, cf. (1).

(1) a) *ловить* vs. *схватывать на лету* vs. *с лету*

b) *to stop* vs. *stand dead* vs. *stock-still*; *Early to rise and early to bed makes men healthy, wealthy and dead* vs. *healthy, wealthy and wise*.

Idioms are easily acquired and employed because, in particular, their perception provokes direct associations between their elements while also generating stable connections among different idioms which have similar, analogous, or common elements, thus contributing to the organizing one's inner lexicon into an integral system. This is confirmed by associative experiments and is fixed in associative dictionaries, cf. [Kiss et al. 1972; Караулов и др. 1992]. Karaulov's dictionary shows, for example, that phraseological associations are quite a common, highly frequent, easily provoked and readily (re)produced reaction to a stimulus word. For instance, stimulus words "нос", "палец", "палка", "семь" and many others are associated with their idiomatic usage, cf. (2):

(2) a) нос: *водить за нос* lit. "to lead by one's nose" ~ to deceive  
*вешать нос* lit. "to hang one's nose" ~ to loose heart  
*остаться с носом* lit. "to be left with one's nose"

~ to be left out in the cold

b) палец: *палец в рот не клади* "to treat smb with caution"  
 (about a dangerous person)

*палец о палец не ударить/ пальцем не пошевелинуть*

"not to do a single move (to help smb)"

c) палка *палка о двух концах* lit. "a stick with two ends"

~ to be a double-edged sword

*делать из-под палки* lit. "to do smt under a stick" ~ under compulsion

*перегибать палку* lit. "to bend a stick too much" ~ to overdo

d) семь: *на седьмом небе* lit. "on the seventh sky" ~ on cloud nine

Idioms of a foreign language are "mastered" in quite a different way. They demand explanation and translation – word for word/ literal, and literary – into one's native language, as their inner semantic form is not transparent, and memorizing. They are the first to be forgotten, are difficult for a foreigner to be identified as such in speech, or to be differentiated from a similar free word combination, they are hard to be reproduced in speech naturally and thus can be used out of place. For example, an American journalist when speaking on the Russian TV not long ago made the following – quite unliterary – conclusion: "Тогда вашему правительству хана", without even suspecting that it was absolutely out of place, as such a substandard expression is possible only in an informal dialogue with a friend.

In most instances foreign idioms are just "learned by heart", rather than mastered, and thus are used only if they are memorized, remembered, being mechanically reproduced rather than automatically employed. For example, Russian English-language learners sooner or later come to know that the expressions (3) are used analogously, similarly, to describe a heavy shower. But still they will never use it in English as naturally and appropriately as their native

expression to say nothing of daring to make a pun of it, or of “correctly distorting” it. While native speakers can easily modify the expressions, cf. (4) a), b).

(3) *It is raining cats and dogs*

*лечь, как из ведра* ~ to come down in buckets

(4) a) *Льет, как из худого ведра, Льет и льет, как из ведра.*

b) It is pouring cats and dogs.

English Russian-language learners, in their turn, would not understand expressions (5) without special comment. For example, an American professor teaching English mass media stylistics in Moscow State University interpreted the expression (5)a) as “one’s boots are so clean that they may provoke someone to make them dirty”.

(5) a) *сапоги каши просят* lit. “one’s boots are asking for porridge”

~ one’s boots are yawning at the toes

b) *с ним каши не сваришь* lit. “It is impossible to cook porridge with him”

~ you won’t get anywhere with him

c) *ну и заварил ты кашу!* lit. “What porridge you have boiled!”

~ You’ve made a mess of it!/ stirred up trouble.

All these differences can be explained not only by the opposite ways in acquiring one’s native and foreign language. Of course, a foreign language is usually studied, not naturally mastered, it needs support by textbooks and dictionaries, it is founded on memorizing, etc. But still, phraseology is the most difficult part to be learned (by heart) first of all, because it occupies a particular place in any language. Being connected with the whole language inventory it inevitably concentrates its most characteristic and specific properties, as well as cultural knowledge, practical and historical experience and mentality of its speakers.

It is well known that phraseology, and especially idioms, are more expressive and stylistically marked than ordinary, free word combinations. But still, are there any differences between them in this respect? Contrastive comparison of English and Russian idioms and set phrases and their translations shows that the Russian ones have a number of features which make them more emotional and peculiarly stylistically marked. This becomes apparent when comparing their translations. In translations from Russian into English most of emotional connotations, cultural implications and stylistic coloring of Russian idioms disappear as their highly colloquial – substandard – character cannot be rendered into English [Lubensky 1995], cf. (6); while highly colloquial English expressions, such as (7), can be, on the contrary, rendered by no less expressive phrases [Кунин 1984].

(6) *в аккурат* vs. exactly, just, only

*бабушка надвое сказала* vs. that’s an open question

*мерить старым (общим) аршином/ по своей мерке*

vs. to measure by the old (common) yardstick/ to judge by one’s own standards

(7) the back of beyond vs. *у черта на куличках*

as crazy as a bedbug vs. *мозги набекрень*

as bare as a bone vs. *хоть шаром покати*

to go bananas vs. *рехнуться*

to give smb beans vs. *здать жару*

to get off one’s bike vs. *лезть в бутылку*

you can’t put it in the bank vs. *из спасибо шубы не сошьешь*

when the band began to play vs. *когда заварилась каша*

What linguistic means make Russian idioms sound “substandard colloquial” and create their emotional coloring? And Why?

### Russian Idioms And Their Peculiarities

Russian phraseology, idioms, and set phrases are notable for capitalizing on most expressive linguistic means available in the Russian language. They also activate all types of peripheral language phenomena, and create on their basis their own – highly colloquial, “substandard colloquial” speech patterns.

1. Almost all grammatical and lexical means in Russian have expressive modifications. They are all actively exploited and extensively used in phraseology making it highly emotional. For example, in (7) the following grammatical patterns are used: (a) diminutive or diminutive-hypocoristic suffixes; (b) complete or partial reduplication; (c) plural forms of nouns instead of singular, etc.

- (7) a) *как на блюдечке; по своей мерке; под шумок*  
 b) *видимо-невидимо* (vs. no end to smt); *всего-навсего* (vs. not more than)  
 c) *нахвататься верхов* (vs. to scratch the surface)

Such forms are either absent in English, or belong to the very periphery and are not productive, or cannot be used to heighten an expressive effect of an utterance. For example, plural forms in Russian are often used instead of singular when the speaker wants to express his negative attitude towards the object of communication and thus towards his addressee. Phrases like (8) mean that the speaker is resentful and hostile towards his addressee: he excludes people who graduated from a university from his personal sphere and does not want to contact with them (cf. [Апресян 1988, 18]). What is important and interesting here is that the speaker knows that there is common knowledge that in Russia people usually graduate (at least till the very present) from one university, not several.

- (8) *Мы университетов не кончали*  
 lit. “We (Pl.), people like me, didn’t finish universities (Pl.)”

Such plural forms are hyperbolic and intensifying, they mark an unfair, unjust, prejudiced attitude. They differ from proper plural forms in that they are used in a situation when there is only one thing present or meant, but the speaker is exaggerating just to express his emotions and feelings. This intensification of expression makes the pattern highly – substandard – colloquial. It is used only in oral speech and in a face-to-face dialogue, where it is quite frequent, productive and emotionally charged; cf. (9). In English, in contrast, plural forms are not a regular means of expressing one’s (negative) attitude towards situation and for intensifying rendition of one’s emotional state.

- (9) *Не устраивай истерик!* (Pl.)  
*А они тут чай (Pl.) распевают (пока я работаю)!*  
 lit. “They are drinking teas here (while I am working)!”  
*Книги везде разбросаны!* “Books are scattered about everywhere!”  
 (when there is only one book lying, say, on a chair).

2. Russian phraseology actively uses all kinds of peripheral, marginal, rare, archaic, relic or outdated lexical elements or their grammatical forms, many of them being used only in set expressions, cf. (10), as well as all kinds of auxiliaries: deictics, interjections, onomatopoeic words, form and link words, and what is most significant, their derivatives, which are easily, freely and frequently formed in oral informal speech in Russian. All these make the whole expression highly emotional and intensified. There are plenty of such set phrases in Russian like the ones given in (11), while in English corresponding patterns are quite rare, cf. (12). As an instance, take the expression *ни бум-бум (в математике)* ~ “not to know (mathematics) at all” which characterizes smb’s knowledge by comparing it with the sound made by wood when one is knocking on it.

- (10) *с гаком, со своим аршином, бить баклуши, играть в бирюльки*  
*испокон веку, в кои-то веки, с незапамятных времен*  
*беречь пуще глаза, ни зги не видно*  
*не бог **весть** что/ как/ какой/ сколько* (vs. not all that well/ good/ few/ far)

- (11) *как аукнется, не ахти как* (vs. not all that well)  
*не ахти сколько* (vs. not very much; anything but plentiful); cf. *Настроение у него тоже не ахти (Максимов)* vs. He was not in the best humor himself.  
*ни бум-бум; ни бе ни ме; тяп-ляп; увы и ах; на ура; с бухты-барахты*  
*тютельница в тютельница; для хохмы, хиханьки да хохоньки; белиберда*  
*трын-трава, ахнуть не успеть; разводиться муру; накаркать беду*
- (12) *willy-nilly; not to say boo; betwixt and between* (vs. *ни то, ни се*).

3. Russian oral speech abounds with highly colloquial case- and prepositional patterns which have been formed exclusively in and for substandard or informal communication. Such patterns are highly productive, very expressive and emotional, and are common in all types of everyday personal communication, cf. (13). In English, a similar expressiveness can be traced in phrases like (14), where it is provoked by quite different – less emotional, but no less meaningful – linguistic phenomena: word play, rhythmic organization, sound consonance/harmony, usage of numerals, etc.

- (13) *смотреть волком, реветь белугой, валом валить; кричать дурным голосом, выйти боком* (vs. to give smb trouble); *вертеться вьюном/ волчком, рассыпаться мелким бесом* (vs. to dance attendance on smb); *спорить до бесконечности/ умопомрачения; любить до безумия; напиться до положения риз; дойти до ручки; проиграться/ напиться в дым; убей бог (не помню); и думать забыть* (vs. just forget); *хоть стой, хоть падай; хоть кол на голове теши*

- (14) a) *rag, tag and bobtail* vs. *всякая шантрапа*  
*cool, calm and collected* vs. *и бровью не повел*  
*born and bred “закоренелый”* vs. *до мозга костей*  
*booted and spurred* vs. *в полной боевой готовности*  
*better fed than taught* vs. *дубина стоеросовая*  
*forever and ever* vs. *на веки вечные*  
*high and dry* vs. *остаться на бобах*; *next to nothing* vs. *всего ничего*  
*to stop/ stand dead/ stock-still* vs. *стоять как вкопанный*  
*on cloud nine* vs. *быть на верху блаженства/ на седьмом небе*  
*from day one* vs. *с незапамятных времен*
- b) *as dumb as they come* vs. *глупый как пробка*

But still, Russian equivalents in (14) seem at least no less expressive and emotional than their English counterparts. Take (14) b) as an example. In its Russian equivalent, a mental state is explicitly compared with a physical object, which is a very emotional way of expressing one's attitude, as in real life there is a great distance between abstract and physical things. Thus, when they are compared and combined, the effect is quite dramatic. Or there may be other reasons for the differences. For example, the equivalents in (15) are differently colored in Russian and in English because of their “attitude” toward rationality and the way this attitude is expressed. The Russian expression is quite emotional because there is a word in it – *незапамятный* which is used only in this expression: it exists in the language only thanks to this expression thus making it particular, charged, and involving. Besides, it is substandard, informal, extremely “inexact”, meaning that nobody will be able to say more exactly, or “there is nobody who could remember when it all happened”. On the contrary, the English expression *from day one* is quite literary, rational, matter-of-fact, and, one may say, “exact”, thanks to the numeral it incorporates. Another example of more literary character of English idioms is (16) where the Russian equivalent is extremely substandard:

- (15) *с незапамятных времен* – from day one
- (16) *to pull the wool over one's eyes* vs. *забивать баки*

All expressive language means are concentrated by the Russian language in its phraseology to produce an emotional effect. The resulting idiomatic expressions are not rude,

literary incorrect or vulgar. They are substandard, and their substandard character is exploited to make the distance between the speakers shorter. In such intimate communication the speakers become a part of a close community sharing common problems, having similar attitudes and feelings and experiencing one and the same sense of collectivity.

### English And Russian Phraseologies Compared

1. Comparison of English and Russian idiomatic equivalents shows that the English ones are more rational, businesslike, matter-of-fact, are more oriented towards luck, success, interest (cf. set phrases with *care*), personal self-consciousness, “take it easy – don’t worry” position (cf. [Шаховский 1996]), and are more charged with humor and irony. For example, dictionaries show that there are at least three times as many humorous expressions in English as in Russian; compare examples in (17), that testify that there are no analogously – humorously – colored Russian equivalents to the given English phrases.

- (17) as phony as a three dollar bill vs. *со странностями*  
 to bear the bell vs. *быть заводилой*  
 to be too big for one’s boots vs. *задирать нос*  
 to go to meet one’s maker vs. *отдать богу душу*  
 the great beyond vs. *загробная жизнь*

2. English phraseology actively exploits contamination, blending and telescopic patterns. They can be characterized as economizing, compressive and thus “rationally saving resources”, cf. (18), these means are but rarely exploited in Russian. English phraseology is also rich in all sorts of allusions as it is more closely connected with English and world literature and culture than the Russian one. There are a lot of expressions in English which initially belonged to a particular author or a speaker – a writer, poet, political or religious figure. The latter, as we know, often make it their point to say something short, impressive, original and meaningful. English phraseology borrowed much and exploits freely allusions to world mythology, to the Bible, and to various historical precedents, cf. (19) a). Take (19) b) as an example. It is an allusion to Esop’s tale in which a stranger blew on his fingers so that to warm them and on his soup so that to cool it.

- (18) smoke + fog = smog; to gild the lily = to gild refined gold + to paint the lily  
 (19) a) Care killed a cat – Curiosity killed a cat; a kiss of death – a kiss of life.  
 b) to blow hot and cold

Of course, there are quite a number of citations, allusions and Bible expressions in Russian, but they are considerably less numerous and are less frequently used than, say, folklore or fairy tale allusions. It should be noted here that there is no writer either in the Russian culture or in the world literature who made a contribution to a language comparable to that of Shakespeare’s (cf. [Клюкина 1990]). Still, in Russian Griboev can be compared in this respect to, say, Dickens. As far as all kinds of allusive citations, set phrases, catchwords and frozen expressions are concerned, they have always been and still are popular in English oral and written speech, are widely used in mass media, literature and political debates, and are a usual object of punning and meaningful transformations – because they are known by native speakers, are transparent for them and are easily recognized and understood by them [Жельвис 1996], cf. (20).

- (20) (to work) delicately like Agag (бояться наказания, возмездия)  
 to lay the axe to the root of the tree (класть секиру при корне дерев)  
 (to cast one’s) bread upon the waters (делать ч.-л. бескорыстно)  
 (there is) no discharge in that war (нет избавления в этой борьбе)  
 corn in Egypt (“изобилие”)  
 a fly in the ointment (“муха в бальзаме” ~ ложка дегтя)

By the way, expressions of these types are a big problem for Russian translators from English. Their cultural background is insufficient for detecting, attributing, interpreting and rendering them or their modifications into Russian. Now that Russia’s cultural contacts are

increasing there is a correspondingly increasing need felt by interpreters' departments for the specialists who could acquaint future interpreters with foundations of Christianity and its traces in the world culture.

3. While Russian phraseology is rich with "historically bound" – archaic, relic or outdated forms, and with emphatic, marginal and auxiliary words, the English one, particularly American, is full of modern jargon, slang and professional expressions. The former make the Russian phraseology emotional and involving, the latter make the English one pragmatic and interested. The English phraseology has approximately three times as many "special language" words as the Russian one has. At least almost one fourth of entries in English phraseological dictionaries are marked as slang or jargon. But it should be borne in mind that "slang" is an English notion covering various and diverse lexical items and phrases borrowed from all kinds of professional or special fields of activity, including sports, theater, TV, show business, etc., while in Russian the meaning of this word is narrower and it is connected mainly with criminal lexicon. For example, the NTC's Dictionary of American slang [Spears 1991] differentiates between the following types of entries, cf. (21):

- |      |              |             |            |          |             |            |
|------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|------------|
| (21) | acronym      | advertising | Amerindian | black    | blend       | California |
|      | collegiate   | deliberate  | spoonerism | drugs    | euphemistic |            |
|      | eye-dialect  | (streets)   | financial  | folksy   | jargon      |            |
|      | journalistic | juvenile    | Pig Latin  | play on, | etc.        |            |

As it is noted in the Preface, slang expressions are in frequent use in the USA nowadays, and are familiar to many Americans; they are often some type of entertaining wordplay or clever and humorous expressions, cf. (22). They make a major part of American communication in movies, television, radio, newspapers, magazines and informal spoken conversation. They can or have already become standard American English. [ibid., 6]. Many of the expressions included in the Dictionary are businesslike, rational, clever, witty, humorous or funny. But if we compare them with their counterparts – correspondences in Russian, we shall see that the Russian ones are more emotional and far from being slang-like, cf. (23). In particular, in Russian *ляпсус*, *в просак* are relic and are used only in these expressions; *до посинения* is based on a special intensifying expression – substandard colloquial and very emotional.

- (22) deliberate spoonerism: dear old queen – queer old dean  
 eye-dialect/ respelling: says – "sez"  
 Pig Latin: junk – unkjaj  
 play on: eagle-freak – eco freak

- (23) to pull a boner "совершить бестактность"  
 vs. *сделать ляпсус, попасть в просак*  
 till all is blue "до скончания века" vs. *до посинения*  
 an abbreviated piece of nothing "an insignificant person" vs. *дырка от*

*бублика*

### Similarities In Phraseology

Phraseology as a special layer of language lexicon is distinguished by a number of culturally marked qualities which make phraseologies of different languages comparable, similar, and equally valuable. They comprise neat, apt, pointed, nice, smart, real, keen, expressive, figurative and picturesque, image-bearing, formula like set phrases. That is why many English and Russian idioms are worth each other, cf. (24). But still much more of them leave a foreigner puzzling, strike him as unusual, are hard to understand and remember as they are deeply embedded into the culture, history and everyday life of the people who created them. They make a foreigner realize that the speakers of another language interpret the same thing or situation from an unexpected, so to say, seemingly unmotivated point of view and thus their meaning turns to be quite alien to him, cf. (25).

- (24) *каждый встречный-поперечный* vs. people right, left and center/  
every Tom, Dick, and Harry  
*седьмая вода на киселе* vs. second cousin twice removed  
*вкривь и вкось* vs. crisscrossing; *толочь воду в ступе* vs. to beat the air  
*наговорить семь верст до небес* vs. to talk a lot of hot air  
*еще не вечер* vs. nothing is set in stone yet;  
*отойти в вечность* vs. to join the choir invisible.
- (25) His elevator doesn't go to the top floor vs. *у него не все дома*  
to read till its frayed and dog-eared vs. *зачитать до дыр*  
to die a second death vs. *в гробу перевернуться*  
double-Dutch vs. *китайская грамота*

Such expressions cannot be “translated” word for word, they should be rendered by a kind of analogue or a similar description, a kind of a counterpart. But in any case its national coloring and figurative meaning would be mostly lost. That is why to find and set cross-cultural parallels for language-specific idioms and their proper explications is one of acute problems in teaching a foreign language and translating from it or into it.

### Cultural Implications

Phraseology has important cultural implications both for foreign language learners and for linguists, as it exploits, concentrates, and manifests culturally and ethnically specific material and spiritual realities and values, and does it in its own – effective and symbolic way, which helps reveal its priorities, cf. (26). Phraseology is thus a carrier of attitudes, dispositions, inclinations, preferences, biases, aspirations, morals, manners and stereotypes of native language speakers, that is, of those background – ethnic, historical and cultural – components of an idiomatic meaning which are almost impossible to assimilate when studying a foreign language.

- (26) *У кого что болит, тот о том и говорит.*

The tongue ever turns to the ailing tooth.

Phraseology of any language makes a wide use of most habitual and usual for its speakers, common everyday situations and objects for conceptualizing their life experience. But even congenial/ kindred language communities choose for these purposes non-similar, different or even opposite means to represent it and symbolize [Strazhas 1993; Рябцева 2000], cf. (27). Thus, there can be a suspicion that Russians deceive each other a little bit differently than Englishmen do, or rather, to be more exact, conceptualize deception in their own specific way, cf. (28), and seem to be biased towards manipulating other persons body parts [Шаховский, Панченко 1999, 287], or even more exactly, perceive deception as a manipulation with other person's body parts, perhaps so that to distract the person's attention from the real state of affairs.

- (27) *ни в какие ворота не лезет* lit. “not to get into any gates” ~ sheer effrontery  
*(получить) от ворот поворот* ~ to get the brush off  
*веревка плачет по к.-л.* vs. smb is cruising for a browsing  
*вить веревки* vs. to twist smb around one's little finger  
*печь как блины* vs. to turn smt left and right  
*за семь верст киселя хлебать* vs. to go on a wild-goose chase  
*ехать в Тулу со своим самоваром* vs. to carry coals to Newcastle  
as common as blackberries vs. *как собак нерезанных, хоть пруд пруди;*  
*куры не клюют*

- (28) teeth: *заговаривать зубы* (“to talk away smb's teeth”) –  
ears: *вешать лапшу на уши* (“to hang noodles on smb's ears”) –  
eyes: *втирать очки* ~ to pull the wool over smb's eyes  
*пускать пыль в глаза* ~ to throw dust into in one's eyes  
nose: *натянуть нос* (“to pull smb's nose”) –

brain:	<i>пудрить мозги</i> (to powder smb's brains)	–
finger:	<i>обвести вокруг пальца</i> (“to turn smb around one's finger”) –	
leg:	–	<i>to pull smb's leg</i>
face:	–	<i>to shoot off one's face</i>

Still, an understanding of motivations for such expressions as given in (28), demands special research into etymology, history and jargon. But many set phrases are quite transparent. For example, (29) is a direct manifestation of peasantry life experience of Russians most of which for centuries lived in the country. English idioms, like the ones given in (30), in their turn, are often based on experience connected with handicraft, sea and military occupations, banking, sports and games (horse-races, baseball, boxing, cards, etc.), such theme occupying quite a peripheral place in Russian phraseology.

- (29) *пятое колесо в телеге* “fifth wheel in the cart” ~ an odd man out  
*толоть воду в ступе* “to pound water in the mortar” ~ to beat the air  
*носиться, как курица с яйцом* “to brood over like a hen over an egg”  
 ~ to make a great fuss over smth  
*надеть на себя ярмо/ хомут* “to hang a yoke on one's neck”
- (30) to draw a blank “вытянуть пустой лотерейный билет” vs. *несолоно хлебавши*  
 to drop the ball “уронить мяч” vs. *потерпеть неудачу*  
 to sell smb a bill of goods vs. *поймать на удочку, обвести вокруг пальца*

The ethnotheory – views and life experience of language speakers, standing behind phraseology, accumulates their practical associations, historical reminiscences and common sense knowledge, etc. For example, all Russians know since their childhood that “каша”, porridge, has always been a most common Russian meal. It is still cooked and served in all nurseries, kinder-gardens, schools and school summer camps, in hospitals and in the army, etc. It has a characteristic consistency, should be properly set, and its taste depends on the way it is cooked. This familiar to all Russian community members notion is widely exploited in conveying various attitudes, ideas and dispositions, cf. set phrases in (5) and (31), which a member of other community will find unmotivated and obscure. A similar function in English has, perhaps, the word *pie*, set phrases with which given in (32) will surely be puzzling for a foreigner.

- (31) *каша во рту/ голове* “porridge in the mouth/ head” ~ speech/ brain is mush  
*мало каши ел* “to have eaten too little porridge” ~ to be still wet behind one's ears
- (32) easy as a pie vs. *плевое дело*  
 have a finger in every pie vs. *к каждой бочке затычка*  
 pie in the sky ~ “рай на небесах, пустые посулы”  
 pie-eyed vs. *напиться в дым*

There are also a lot of historical reminiscences in all languages each carrying a specific evaluative connotation which is hard to capture and render. For example (33) a) is translated in the dictionaries as (33) b), which is not exact enough to convey the connotation that “барин” is a proprietor who is associated in Russian (history and mentality) with “doing nothing”.

- (33) a) *сидеть как барин*  
 b) to sit around like royalty/ on one's hands

But still a most culturally marked phenomenon in every phraseology is the use of culturally and ethnically specific key concepts. Comparison of Russian and English phraseology reveals that they capitalize on rather different spiritual values and attitudes. In Russian it is important not only to identify, characterize and evaluate what is going on, but also to display one's involvement, express one's sympathy or dislike, approval or disapproval, to demonstrate that you are not indifferent, that is, to show one's emotions. That is why Russian phraseology is not only highly expressive, but is very emotional as well.

The fact that Russians are actively taking at heart what they see or are told, is supported by various and extensive linguistic information. In particular, there is a long list of



corresponding “emotional” verbs which are used in Russian as if they are “action verbs”, that is, describing a conscious, purposeful and voluntary action [Wierzbicka 1988, 254], cf. (34) a), while modern English has only one such verb – *to worry* that is used similarly. In addition, each such Russian verb, very widely used in everyday speech, has a number of derivatives describing its various aspectual correlations, cf. (34) b), most of them having a causative form, as in (34) c). In contrast, almost all their English counterparts are describing inner involuntary passive states, but not “emotional actions”, cf. (34) c).

(34) а) *беспокоиться, тревожиться, горевать, тосковать, скучать, грустить, печалиться, волноваться, хандрить, унывать, ужасаться, негодовать, томиться, любоваться*

б) *нервничать: разнервничаться, изнервничаться, понервничать, перенервничать*

с) *беспокоить, тревожить, волновать, ужасать*

д) *радоваться vs. to be happy*

*гордиться vs. to be proud*

*стыдиться vs. to be ashamed*

*злиться vs. to be angry*

*гневаться vs. to be outraged*

*возмущаться vs. to be indignant*

*нервничать vs. to be nervous*

*огорчаться vs. to be sorry*

There are also a number of key substantive notions that reflect this national disposition and related nationally characteristic attitudes: of readiness for displaying all sorts of feelings, in particular, such as concern, compassion, sympathy, resignation and submissive behavior. They are also connected with nationally relevant inclinations toward collectivity, readiness to be patient and to rely and hope on outer external and higher forces and one’s destiny, to follow one’s feelings rather than mind or reason, cf. (35), etc. [Булыгина, Шмелев 1997], cf. (36). In Russian even time is “submissive” (37), to say nothing of the man, cf. (38).

(35) *как Бог на душу положит vs. any old way*

*побойся Бога vs. be reasonable*

(36) *судьба ~ destiny; душа ~ soul; вера ~ belief; тоска ~ yearning*

*беда ~ grief; горе ~ misfortune; терпение ~ patience; боль ~ suffering*

(37) *время терпит vs. there is no rush*

(38) *сам Бог велел vs. Its only natural to do smt*

*на роду написано: Бог терпел, и нам велел*

That is why it is easy to explain why Russians make an extensive use of the word *больно* (~ “painful”) as an intensifier, cf. (39), as well as of the word *беда* (“misfortune”) – to mean “very much”, cf. (40): their usage displays and confirms highly emotional, involved and readily expressed attitude conveyed by these expressions. Further, in Russian the notion *беда* is closely connected with the no less emotional notion *горе* “grief”. They both denote a deep and intensive feeling ~ “being upset to the utmost” and thus enter into a large number of set expressions which are widely and actively used in speech, cf. (41; 42) and which cannot be fully rendered into English, cf. (43). There is only one word in English which has a similar function and plays an analogous role in English phraseology. It is the word *trouble*. But it differs greatly from *беда, горе* in that it is quite rational, matter of fact and commonsensical. It means a difficulty, inconvenience, that is, “an obstacle; what is preventing”. That is why derivatives, set phrases and idioms connected in Russian with *беда, горе* are more expressive than their more rational English equivalents, including their most direct counterpart *trouble*, cf. (44).

(39) *больно хитрый/ умный/ дорогой/ деловой, cf. сердо-боль-ный*

(40) *Людей там беда (сколько)!*

(41) *беда-то какая, долго ли до беды, бедовая голова, бедолага*

*бедствовать, семь бед один ответ; горевать, пригорюниться*

- горемыка, горемычный, горести и напасти*
- (42) *убитый горем, хлебнуть/ хватить горя, помочь горю, с горя ему и горя мало, горе мне с тобой, с горем пополам*  
*горюшко-горе, горе луковое*
- (43) *не беда* vs. It doesn't matter  
*не велика беда* vs. Its not the end of the world  
*что за беда* vs. What harm is there in that?  
*лиха беда начало* vs. a good start is half the race  
*на беду/ на мое горе* vs. unluckily/ unfortunately
- (44) to give smb trouble; to put smth to trouble  
to take the trouble; to be in trouble; to get into trouble  
to make trouble for smb “создавать к.-л. неудобства”  
to look for trouble; heart trouble; troubled waters “мутная вода”

There are a lot of similar linguistic facts testifying to the effect that Russians are more biased towards feelings, emotions and other non-rational states, while English demonstrates more rational attitude in dealing with everyday problems. For example, one of the central Russian concepts – *душа*, enters into more than sixty set expressions [Михеев 1999], while its English equivalent *soul* is but rarely used. Almost the same can be said about the Russian *сердце* and the English *heart*, cf. [Маслова 1999]. Instead, English has more than thirty expressions with the word *mind*. Some of them are given in (45). The very existence of the word *mind* in English and its linguistic properties, and particularly the absence of its exact equivalent in Russian, expose great differences in the attitude toward rationality in the corresponding cultures.

- (45) to get into/ out of one's mind, make up/ speak/ set/ change/ turn one's mind  
bear in mind, be of the same mind, keep an open mind, know one's own mind  
A sound mind in a sound body, etc.

The idea that can be traced in American phraseology – “I feel good, I feel nice” – is absolutely absent in the Russian one. For example, Russians almost never answer the question “How are things going?” with “Fine”, but often use “как сажа бела” – which is commented in [Lubensky 1997] as a vague reply implying that things could be better, and which literary means “as white as smoke-black”. There are a lot of catch-phrases that reveal predominance of rather passive, awaiting attitude of Russians towards the future and one's possibilities, “unreadiness” to face difficulties and troubles, cf. *выше головы не прыгнешь, плетью обуха не перешибешь, сила солому ломит, стерпеться – слюбиться, авось (пронесет), не судьба, не дано*, etc. [Рябцева 1997a].

While Russian mentality is oriented towards collectivity and participation in the affairs of the community and its members, the English language gives priority to individuality, personality, self-sufficiency, self-respect and independence. This idea is conveyed by the words *privacy, face* and some others, set phrases with which are difficult to translate into Russian. In them the word *face*, in particular, has become a symbol and a carrier of an active attitude towards life, self-control, etc., cf. (46). *Face* is used in expressions whose equivalents in Russian expose quite a different interpretation of what is going on [Кунин 1984], cf. (47). And when Russians pay particular attention to what reaction their action will cause on the part of other people, or the whole community, in English the situation is presented only in a personal perspective, cf. (48).

Russian and English phraseology exposes diametrically opposed attitudes of their speakers toward many other cultural, social, psychological and personal phenomena (for more detail, see [Карасик 1992; Вежбицкая 1996; Степанов 1997]), which cannot be dealt with here. See Note 2.

- (46) to save/ not to lose face “сохранить/ не потерять лицо”,  
“сохранять собственное достоинство”  
to have the face to do smt – “иметь смелость/ наглость что-то сделать”

- to face out “настаивать, продолжать делать активно/ смело/ нагло”  
 to face the music “смотреть в лицо неприятностям, расплачиваться;  
 стойко встречать критику; бороться с трудностями”  
 to face up to reality “смотреть правде в глаза”  
 to set one’s face against smt./ to make face against smt.  
 “решительно противиться ч.-л”  
 to fly in the face of smt “открыто неповиноваться, бросать вызов,  
 не считаться с ч.-л”  
 to meet smt in the face – “энергично взяться за ч.-л.”
- (47) to pull/ make/ wear a long/ sad face vs. соорудить постную *физиономию*  
 to keep a straight face vs. оставаться невозмутимым  
 to put a bold/ good/ brave face vs. действовать решительно, не растеряться  
 not to show one’s face vs. не показывать *носа*, “не появляться”  
 before smb’s face vs. у кого-то *под носом*  
 to open one’s face vs. развязывать *язык*  
 to put a new face on smt. vs. представить в новом *свете*  
 to straighten one’s face vs. принимать невозмутимый вид, сдерживаться  
 to put one’s best face vs. быть любезным, вести себя наилучшим образом  
 to run one’s face vs. выезжать на приятной внешности  
 to set one’s face to smt. vs. направляется  
 till black in the face vs. (спорить) до посинения  
 to grind the faces of the poor vs. эксплуатировать бедняков
- (48) *не ударить лицом в грязь* (перед другими людьми/ коллективом)  
 vs. to keep one’s face

On the whole, English phraseology is oriented more towards the dynamics of the situation, its rational and often ironic evaluation, towards actions and overcoming difficulties or getting out of trouble rather than emotional experiencing them. And it is not a mere accident that it exploits for describing all these phenomena most vivid, characteristic and rational language tendency in modern English – short operational words, particularly auxiliary, semi-auxiliary and phrasal verbs with all sorts of particles: *up, down, off, on, out, in, away*, etc. (cf. *an odd man out*), which not only reflect, but also create an active, dynamic, matter-of-fact attitude towards life. Such short words as *cut, come, get, give, have, make, take*, etc., correspond best to the attitude of “we shall overcome”. This tendency is increasingly obvious in newly formed expressions [Трофимова 1993], cf. (49).

- (49) to cross over “переметнуться из одной партии в другую”  
 to crack down “закручивать гайки”  
 to opt out “отойти от дел”, flat out (campaign) “выдыхающаяся” кампания

Thus there is an obvious harmony between a national character and a national language. The language creates and provides its users with the means of verbalizing their intentions, attitudes, priorities, dispositions and values, while the latter are generating, activating and developing linguistic means necessary for their embodiment. And this harmony is most transparently seen in phraseology.

On the other hand, it is evident that a foreign language learning should be supported by special culturally charged materials providing students with the possibility to plunge into the alien culture and absorb it. One of the ways of doing it is compiling of a dictionary, encyclopedia or a reference book of cultural and practical concepts where every key notion will be given a concise, many-faceted, historically and culturally oriented qualification demonstrating and explicating its contents, associations and connotations, and directing its understanding and usage in speech context, something of the kind of characterization that was given above to the Russian notion *каша* “porridge”. Russian English-language learners would

like to know, for example, why the words *beans* and *a pie* are so widely used in English phraseology, and what other key concepts, besides privacy and individuality, and in what way are present in it. Obviously, such a “cultural dictionary” can be compiled only by linguists – native speakers, but the questions that they should answer in it, should be asked by foreigners. Such a cooperation can be based on the latest developments in conceptual analysis presented and developed in the writings by Aroutunova and Wierzbicka [Арутюнова 1994; 1999; 2000; Wierzbicka 1992, 1995, etc.] and their followers.

That is, in short, cultural information should be interpreted from a cognitive point of view. Every language incorporates background cultural knowledge shared by all its speakers. It is embodied in word meanings, grammatical patterns, speech formulas and modes of communication. The attitudes, norms and dispositions standing behind (or lying beneath) their usage are seldom verbalized, or are a subject of only indirect verbalization. But this is what is essential for foreign learners and demands explication and contrasting. “Cognitive phraseology”, based on intercultural comparisons, can contribute to exposing differences in conceiving the outer world, interpersonal relations and the inner world of native speakers.

Besides, there is another practical implication of what has been said, this time for translation theory, as there is an opinion that a translation should render all meaningful components of the original. This opinion was formed when critically comparing extracts from Sholokhov’s “And Quiet Flows the Don” with their translations into English [Шаховский 1997]. The critic notes, in particular, that the translation is less expressive and emotive than the original, and that there are losses, as it does not render the intensity of feelings, grief and desperateness of the heroin, and is thus emotionally poorer, cf. (50) a), (50) b). He proposes another variant of the translation which he considers more adequate, cf. 50 c):

(50) a) Аксинья (главная героиня романа), подавленная страхом за жизнь ребенка (ее дочка умирала), теряла рассудок... Она неистово молилась, просила у Бога последнюю милость – сохранить жизнь ребенка... Ночи напролет простаивала она на коленях у кровати. Булькающий хрип полосовал ее сердце.

*Зернышко мое, дочурка! – пригуженно звенела мать. – Цветочек мой, не уходи, Танюшка! Глянь, моя красотишка, открой глазки. Опомнись же! Гулюшка моя черноглазая... за что же, Господи?*

(50) b) My little one, my little daughter, she groaned, – my flower, don’t go away, Tania. Look, my pretty one, open your little eyes, come back, my dark-eyed darling! Why, oh Lord..?

(50) c) Oh, my own little daughter, my dearest one, – mother pleaded sadly. My sweetest baby-flower, oh, don’t die, Tania. My precious love, please, don’t! Look at your mummy, open your darling eyes. Wake up, please. My black-eyed jewel! Oh my Lord, please, not Tanya.

The extracts reveal that there are “emotional gaps” in English in comparison with Russian in expressing intensive emotions. But the question is whether they should be bridged. Examples show that attempts to do it may seem clumsy or funny. Consider the notes with which interpreters provide their translations. In English translation of Turgenev’s novel “Asja” (1964) the diminutive-hypocoristic form of the word *голова* “head” – *головка* was commented on in a footnote in the following way (51) a). While (51) b) is a comment to the translation of a flash of dialogue from Leo Tolstoy’s “War and Peace”, where the word *голубчик* is translated as “my dear”.

(51) a) *головка* – “Here the diminutive adds a note of tenderness, which cannot be similarly expressed in English and which should not be exaggerated; perhaps, *little head* will do”

(51) b) “*My dear*”, *said the princess*. – “In the original she calls him the pet name *golubchik*”.

Our contrastive comparison shows, however, that many emotional components of a Russian original cannot and even should not be transferred into its translation into English. Russian speech is more emotional, open and “extremely sincere” in exposing the speaker’s inner states, and this is in accord with Russian speech culture and mentality. But when fully transferred into English it would not comply with the readers’ norms of everyday communication and thus would make them form an impression that Russians are even more emotional than they really are (cf. [Nida 1996; Рябцева 1997]). That is, an adequate translation should not reproduce all and everything, and, perhaps, some neutralization will be more authentic than complete “re-dressing” of what has no direct equivalents in another language. For example, all TV channels in Russia now regularly show American films, a considerable part of dialogues in which cannot be translated but is substituted by more or less analogous expressions, as their lexicon is too rude, tabooed or has no stylistically adequate equivalents in Russian. And though “Whatever can be meant can be said” [Searle 1969, 47], sometimes it should not.

### Some Further Prospects

There are a number of adjacent and no less interesting problems connected with the meaning, use and comparison of idioms (See: *Note 2*).

Although idioms are mostly monosemantic their meaning can change with time. This rather paradoxical fact can be inferred when tracing their usage. For example, there are a lot of highly colloquial – substandard – idioms in Russian meaning “to die” or “to seize to live”, cf. (52). But at present they are not used to describe another man dying as that would be tactless, rude or brutal and is thus a subject of cultural restriction or a taboo. But such expressions are beginning to be used to mean “to seize to exist” with reference to organizations, enterprises, newspapers and similar things. While with self-reference or with the reference to human beings they are used in the meaning which can be called “intensification”, that is, “very much”, to the utmost degree, extremely, etc. [Юминова 1999, 221-225], as in (54), where they are accompanied by the markers “almost”, “on the verge of”, “be going to” in the speech pattern: “I was so (much/ very/ extremely, etc.) cold (frightened/ tired, etc.) that I almost died”.

- (52) умереть (~ slang.): *отдать Богу душу* “to surrender one’s soul to God”  
*испустить дух* “to breath one’s last”  
*отдать концы* “turn up one’s toes”  
*отбросить копыта/ коньки* “to kick the bucket”  
*дать дуба* “to croak”; *сыграть в ящик* “to pop off”
- (53) *Фирма “Мелодия” приказала долго жить* ~ The firm kicked the bucket.  
*Старина комсомол отбросил копыта* ~ Komsomol croaked.  
*Уголовное дело № 5 испустило дух.* ~ The persecution popped off.
- (54) “I was so (much/ very/ extremely, etc.) cold (frightened/ tired, etc.)  
that I almost died”  
*(Разве можно так пугать/ смешить) –*  
*я от страха/ смеха чуть дуба не дал/ коньки не отбросил.*  
*Я так замерз/ устал, что едва Богу душу не отдал.*

Such usage is best described within Igor Melchuk’s “Meaning–Text” Theory/ Model (see Note 1), where there is a special “lexical parameter” for the meaning of very (much, intensive, big, etc.). It is called Magn – from the Latin Magnus. This special meaning Magn (as well as all other lexical parameters and functions: Oper, Funk, Real, etc.), is usually expressed in language idiomatically, the corresponding expressions acquiring and additional function of intensifying the communicative burden of an utterance, cf. (55), (56), cf. *super-, ultra-, over, extra-*.

- (55) Magn (темно): *темно, хоть глаза выколи* ~ pitch black  
Magn (смотреть): *смотреть во все глаза* ~ to look all eyes

Мaгн (кричать): *кричать дурным голосом* ~ to scream bloody murder

Мaгн (бежать): *бежать очертя голову/ сломя голову*

~ to run like a bat out of hell/ at a breakneck speed

(56) красный, как рак ~ as red as a beet

ад крошечный ~ sheer hell

как белка в колесе вертеться ~ be continually/ constantly on the go

реветь белугой ~ to cry one's head off

прочсть от корки до корки ~ to read from cover to cover

That is why the “death-idioms” used to mean Magn: “extremely much”, “to the ultimate degree”, “to the limit” – are just emotional intensifiers, cf. *to almost die from fear*, *to be on the verge of death from cold*, etc. Such usage is not directly connected with death and thus shifts away cultural restrictions. By the way, the very fact that the meaning Magn, which is very expressive, is grammaticalized in Russian – through derivational affixes – provides a further proof that expressiveness in Russian occupies a prominent place and obligatorily accompanies everyday communication, cf. (57), (58).

(57) *разрыдаться* “to begin to cry intensively” = Magn (to cry)

*расхохотаться* “to begin to laugh intensively” = Magn (to laugh)

*распрыгаться* “to jump intensively” = Magn (to jump)

*расходиться* “to walk intensively” = Magn (to walk)

(58) Magn-grammaticalization: подлюга, домина, голосина, пылища, бородачица

наповал, нарасхват, наглухо, насухо, добела, донага, до отвала,

без умолку, радешенек, здоровенный, иссохнуть, иззябнуть, обыскаться

задрознить, закормить, сгрызть, изработаться, исходить, набегаться

настрадаться, объесться, развеселый, разнесчастный, раскудрявый

ультрасовременный, экстрамодный

In sum, the burden of phraseology, as well as of all other super-segmental language devices – intonation, intensification, modality, evaluation, etc. – is to express and convey some additional extra-linguistic information: personal, interpersonal, cultural, social, etc. But every phraseology has its own preferences in choosing what and how to convey.

### Notes

1. According to the “Meaning–Text” Theory (Model), the linguistic competence of a native speaker is a composition of two opposite and complementary linguistic abilities: passive understanding of speech vs. its active generation. The active linguistic competence means the ability to express one and the same meaning and intention in different/various linguistic ways; and the ability to (subconsciously) combine words idiomatically in discourse. The theory of linguistic competence and its lexicographic application have been developed by Yury Apresjan, Igor Melchuk and their colleagues since 1968. Lexicographically the linguistic competence is simulated (modeled, “reproduced”) by two kinds of active dictionaries - of synonymous expressions (cf. *I want to emphasize - It is important*), and in combinatory ones. The most prominent example of the latter is “The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English” [1986].

The central concept in the “Meaning-Text” model is that of a lexical function/parameter. There are more than forty lexical functions and parameters in it, such as Magn (‘Magnus’), meaning “very (much): the highest quantity or quality”; for example Magn (*It is raining*) = *It is raining cats and dogs*. There are standard ways of expressing it, such as *very much*, *extremely*, *awfully*, and idiomatic, such as *cats and dogs*, which can refer only to rain. Another important lexical function is Oper (‘Operatio’), which describes such expressions as *The sun shines*, cf. Oper (*a sun*) = *to shine*.

2. Phraseology in every language has its own peculiarities which make it unlike and unusual. For example, there were a lot of idioms in French which had proper names of historical personalities in them, as well as of those referring to particular historical events, traditions or rituals. But almost all of them are out of use now as social life, values and traditions have changed [Никитина 1999]. In Italian, on the contrary, there are a lot of old set phrases with proper names of saints, e.g. San Agostino/ Antonio/ Quintino/ Cristoforo/ Paolo, Santa Elisabetta/ Caterina, which are still actively used. The specifics here is that they are mostly substandard or even vulgar. The Arabic phraseology is notable for an uncommon connotations of color terms. For example, *white* combines in Arabic with heart and news meaning “kind”, “good”, sworn enemies are *blue* as the Byzantines with whom Arabs were permanently fighting were blue-eyed; a sour smile or laugh are *yellow*, etc. [Морозова 1999].

Still, it would seem extremely strange for a Russian speaker to learn that we cannot say in English “a strong rain; The rain is becoming stronger/ weaker; It is raining strongly”, because such expressions are quite natural in and typical to Russian. Moreover, they are very characteristic to it.

The Russian notion of “being strong” is one of the most important in describing what is happening in the world, and, in comparison with English, it combines the ideas of power, strength and force and can express all of them simultaneously, as the corresponding noun is almost the most polysemous in the language implying its great importance and the ability of being applied to widely ranging situations. In Russian “strong” is one of the most common words used to express the idea of “intensive action” – thus becoming a standard way of verbalising the Magn lexical function. That is why in Russian we can shout, speak, run, age, grow, love, drink, etc. “strongly”, meaning ‘intensively’, ‘very actively’.

The ability of “being strong” is also characteristic, according to Russian, to rage, heat, eyesight, argumentation, speech, cinema, a football play, cold, and to many other phenomena, while in English their intensity or “high quality and quantity” is described in quite a different idiomatic way: the heat in English cannot be “strong”, but *fierce*, the eyesight – *keen*, the argument – *potent*, speech – *impressive*, rain – *heavy*, cold – *severe*, cf. *severe* (constraint, restriction, limitation, distortion, damage, vibration, corrosion); *close* (connection); *heavily* (attenuate); *significantly/ markedly/ drastically/ badly* (affect); *highly/ crucially/ critically* (depend); *profoundly* (alter); *widely* (deviate); *grossly* (change, overestimate); *highly* (branched, diluted, inclined, heated, susceptible), etc.

Such word combinations are very often language- and ethno-specific, as they are connected with the national mentality and world view fixed in the language. The idea of ‘being strong’ is central to Russians when they conceptualise the changes that take place in the world, while the English represent them by quite different linguistic means, in particular – by auxiliary and semi-auxiliary verbs in combination with adverbs. The Russians thus “think” that the world is changing under the influence of different forces, while the English “notice” the changes that take place and the results that emerge therefrom. So in Russian ‘being strong’ means to control a situation, to be able to cause changes and dominate; cf. *good at maths* vs. Rus. “strong in maths”.

The fact that the concept of “being strong” plays a prominent role in the Russian mentality and world view is supported by numerous types of evidence, but the most convincing proof lies in that this notion is grammaticalized in Russian, where it can be expressed derivatively, while English, in contrast, can verbalise it only lexically. In Russian there are special derivational devices that denote that the action is intensive and thus “strong”, so that the idea of ‘intensive running, shouting, burning, walking, worrying, entering’ and almost all other actions and states can be rendered by affixes within the word, meaning something like ‘to begin/ keep running, etc. intensively’, with its literal dictionary definition ‘to begin/ keep running strongly’ – cf. “razbegatsja”. Here comes the importance of realising that meanings can be expressed both lexically and grammatically, and that different languages grammaticalize different concepts, which can in other languages be only lexicalized.

## References

- Апресян Ю.Д.* Лексическая семантика: Синонимические средства языка. М., Наука, 1974.
- Апресян Ю.Д.* Прагматическая информация для толкового словаря// Прагматика и проблемы интенциональности. М., ИЯз АН СССР, 1988.
- Арутюнова Н.Д.* Истина: фон и коннотации // Логический анализ языка: Культурные концепты. М., Наука, 1991.
- Арутюнова Н.Д.* (ed.) Понятие судьбы в контексте разных языков и культур. М., Наука, 1994.
- Арутюнова Н.Д.* Язык и мир человека. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1999.
- Арутюнова Н.Д.* Язык о языке. М., Языки русской культуры”, 2000.
- Булыгина Т.В., Шмелев А.Д.* Языковая концептуализация мира. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1997.
- Вежбицкая А.* Язык, культура, познание. М., “Русские словари”, 1996.
- Добровольский Д.О., Караулов Ю.Н.* Фразеология в ассоциативном словаре // Изв. ОЛЯ, 1992, № 6.
- Жельвис В.И.* Уроки Библии: заметки психолингвиста // Языковая личность: Культурные концепты. Волгоград–Архангельск, “Перемена”, 1996.
- Караулов Ю.Н., Сорокин Ю.А., Тарасов Е.Ф. и др.* Русский ассоциативный словарь. М., ИРЯ РАН, 1992.
- Карасик В.И.* Язык социального статуса. М., ИЯз РАН, 1992.
- Клюкина Т.П.* Литературные аллюзии, образы и цитаты в английском языке. М., МИД СССР, 1990.
- Кунин А.В.* Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. М., РЯ, 1984.
- Маслова В.А.* Связь мифа и языка // Фразеология в контексте культуры. Отв. ред. В.Н.Телия. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1999.
- Морозова В.С.* Символика цветообозначения в арабском языке // Фразеология в контексте культуры. Отв. ред. В.Н.Телия. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1999.
- Михеев* Отражение слова “душа” в наивной мифологии русского языка // Фразеология в контексте культуры. Отв. ред. В.Н.Телия. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1999.
- Никитина Т.П.* Об одной из причин исчезновения образных фразеологических единиц во французском языке // Фразеология в контексте культуры. Отв. ред. В.Н.Телия. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1999.
- Рябцева Н.К.* Теория и практика перевода: когнитивный аспект // Перевод и коммуникация. М., ИЯз РАН, 1997.
- Рябцева Н.К.* Аксиологические модели времени // Логический анализ языка: Язык и время. М., 1997а.
- Рябцева Н.К.* Размер и количество в языковой картине мира// Логический анализ языка: Языки пространств. М., 2000.
- Степанов Ю.С.* Константы: Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1997.
- Трофимова З.С.* Словарь новых слов и значений в английском языке. М., “Павлин”, 1993.
- Шаховский В.И.* Эмоциональные культурные концепты: параллели и контрасты // Языковая личность: Культурные концепты. Волгоград–Архангельск, “Перемена”, 1996.
- Шаховский В.И.* О переводимости эмотивных смыслов // Перевод и коммуникация. М., ИЯз РАН, 1997.
- Шаховский В.И., Панченко Н.Н.* Национально-культурная специфика концепта “обман” во фразеологическом аспекте // Фразеология в контексте культуры. Отв. ред. В.Н.Телия. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1999.
- Юминова А.Б.* Идиомы поля “смерть” в современном русском языке // Фразеология в контексте культуры. Отв. ред. В.Н.Телия. М., “Языки русской культуры”, 1999.
- Lubensky S.* Russian–English Dictionary of Idioms. New York, Random House, 1995.
- Kiss G., Armstrong C., Milroy R.* The Associative Thesaurus Of English. Edinburgh, 1972.
- Mel'chuk I.A.* The Russian Language In The Meaning–Text Perspective. Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. Sonderband 39. Moskau–Wien, 1995.
- Nida E.* The Sociolinguistics of Interlingual Communication. Bruxelles, Les Editions du Hazard, 1996.
- Searle J.* Speech Acts. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1969.
- Spears R.A.* Dictionary of American Slang. National Textbook Company, 1991.



Strazhas N. Semiotics of work and idleness // Semiotica. 1993, v. 1/2.

Wierzbicka A. The Semantics of Grammar. Amsterdam, 1988.

Wierzbicka A. Semantics, culture, and cognition: Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations. Oxford, 1992.

Wierzbicka A. Dictionaries vs. Encyclopaedias: How to draw a line // Ph.W.Davis (ed.) Alternative Linguistics: Descriptive and Theoretical Models. John Benjamins, 1995.

\* \* \*

**(\*\*\*\*\*) N. Riabtseva. COMBINATORY DICTIONARIES IN TEACHING AND PRACTICING TRANSLATION // Fleischmann E. et al. (ed.) Translationsdidaktik: Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, 1997.**

Dictionaries have always been an indispensable linguistic support in teaching and practicing translation. Traditional dictionaries are now supplemented by dictionaries of quite a new type – those that are called **active**. Dictionaries of an active type reproduce the linguistic competence of a native speaker and thus provide a new perspective in teaching and assisting translation.

The linguistic competence of a native speaker is a composition of two opposite and complementary linguistic abilities: passive understanding of speech plus its active generation. The active linguistic competence means the ability to express one and the same meaning and intention in different/various linguistic ways; and the ability to (subconsciously) combine words idiomatically in discourse. The theory of linguistic competence and its lexicographic application have been developed by Yury Apresjan, Igor Melchuk and their colleagues since 1968. Lexicographically the linguistic competence is simulated (modeled, “reproduced”) by two kinds of active dictionaries – of synonymous expressions (cf. *I want to emphasize – It is important*), and in combinatory ones. The most prominent example of the latter is “The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English” [1986].

Combinatory dictionaries represent lexical and grammatical combinatory preferences – which are selective, language specific and ethnospecific, as they are motivated by the national mentality and experience in world conceptualization: national mentality is imprinted in the language and in the way it is used – through words collocations, combinations and co-occurrences in discourse. That is why the idiomatics of discourse collocations is most difficult for a foreigner to acquire.

I am going to present a “Combinatory dictionary of English scientific collocations”. It registers combinatory – grammatical, lexical and rhetorical – peculiarities of general scientific notions and the most typical patterns of academic style, so that to assist scientists in writing their articles in English. It can be used either when generating a text, translating it, or when teaching how to do it correctly.

It is not accidental that most discourse collocations are idiomatic. Their idiomatics is “meaningful” – it is conceptually grounded and motivated. Our mentality is conceptually organized, and this conceptual organization can be traced in the way how words combine with each other in discourse. And vice versa: lexical (and grammatical) co-occurrence in discourse expose conceptual organization of mentality.

From interlinguistic, translational point of view, the most part of word combinations in discourse turn to be idiomatic, as they can't be translated word for word. Combinatory preferences expose how native speakers combine words idiomatically in discourse; but this very task causes main troubles in translating into a foreign language by both a human and a computer.

The main difficulty here is that a native speaker does it subconsciously, while acquiring it by a foreigner needs to consciously realize it first, and only then make it

"automatized". That is why modeling of linguistic competence and learning how to teach it should be based on detecting and presenting words combinatory preferences.

**Linguistic competence and idiomatics.** Combinatory preferences are and language specific and for this reason seem intricate to foreigners: in Russian, for example, we don't take a bus, but "sit on it", neither we take a medicine, but "drink it" (even if it is in pills); we experience "a heavy feeling", while the English speak (I hope, not very often) of a hard one; they also follow smb's words, but we "follow after them". So foreigners often wonder what words do native speakers use when typical operations, characteristics or objects are meant. For instance, the English can introduce a person, a notion, a theory, but can they do the same with ideas, perspectives, possibilities or questions? What they usually "do" with, say, questions, beside asking and answering them? Do they "settle", "solve" or "close" them? Can a question be "exhausted" in English, as it can in Russian, or should it be qualified by an equivalent sounding more English?

Words co-occurrence in discourse is a great linguistic problem first systematically introduced by, A.Zholkovsky [1984] and Yu.Apresjan [1974], – in Russia during the 60-s. Their ideas of explaining and formalizing discourse collocations are applicable to compiling combinatory dictionaries for translational purposes. And these ideas are "already" supported by a number of linguistic enterprises, and F.A.Smadia's publications [1989] among them. But they are only the beginning, as there are a lot of simplifications and inconsistencies in them. Beside, new linguistic theories, particularly on conceptual analysis, open quite a new perspective in developing a new type of translational dictionaries – presenting lexical co-occurrences in the native versus foreign languages.

Illuminating linguistic knowledge on national mentality (A.Wierzbicka [1992], G.Lakoff, E.Rosch, N.Arutiunova, etc.) is still looking forward to being applied to translation problems and to making them more definite and less obscure, combinatory dictionaries being the very place to represent it.

**Combinatory preferences and national mentality.** Translators don't even suspect that when translating a text they not only substitute languages, but mostly transfer one national mentality into another. National mentality is incorporating national character, history, culture, experience and feelings, cf. English character, Spanish temper, Nordic spirit, Slav sole, etc.

Every language reflects the mentality of the nation. Common cultural traditions often lead to similar conceptual systems, but they never coincide completely. That is why a Frenchman may erroneously say I made attention at instead of I paid attention to, translating word by word his native expression Je fais attention a (qch.) [Smadia 1989, p. 164].

There are several ways in which philosophers present and describe conceptual organization of mentality. George Lakoff speaks of "folk theories", Eleanor Rosch – of prototypes, etc. All such theories have much in common and complement each other. A most prominent, integral and consistent theory of presenting concepts (of emotional sphere) was formulated by Apresjans [1993].

**Lexical co-occurrences: Conceptual background.** Generally and roughly speaking, concepts are formed when non-physical objects are cognitively associated with physical ones, and described by language as if they were visible or perceptible; e.g. *time is flying* – as if it were a bird, *ideas become old-fashioned* – as if they were clothes [Riabtseva 1990]. Such implicit metaphorization is so much subconscious that native speakers are never aware of it. That is why it is difficult to bring it to consciousness. But when it is done, it becomes clear, that, *f i r s t*, conceptual systems are nationally specific and cognitively relevant, as they are the result of cognitive acquisition and representation of the reality; *s e c o n d*, they motivate words co-occurrences in language and are organized in patterns; *t h i r d*, they form "a conceptual world", structured by associations and oppositions, revealing national experience and mentality.

"Conceptual world" is a structure of notions and relations between them. A concept can be poor or rich, complex or simple, separate or dependent. Concepts materialize in language through words' meanings, usage, associations and connotations, that is, through their predicates. Since conceptual worlds do not coincide completely, as corresponding experiences and associations differ, words in different languages, though similar in meaning, often are used differently.

For example, in Russian the notions "a question" and "a task" are conceptualized similarly and thus express intersecting concepts: there are meanings that they both can render. In the expressions "to put a question", "to put a task" they both have a connotation of 'something that should be overcome', as if they were 'a barrier or an obstacle'. But in other respects they differ: in Russian it is possible to say "to close a question" and "to fulfill a task", and not vice versa. All such expressions expose the way that we conceptualize our experience, and how this experience directs lexical co-occurrences. So in Russian these two words show that there is something common between a question and a task, and that this fact is registered in the Russian conceptual world.

In English the corresponding notions have their own conceptual peculiarities, reflecting the corresponding experience concerning questions and tasks. On the one hand, their conceptual patterns differ, as in: *to resolve / bring up / raise a question* vs. *to perform / carry out / do / undertake a task*. On the other hand, they have something in common conceptually, as they both can be *coped with*, as in Russian. These conceptual links explain why Russian "question" can sometimes be translated into English as a task.

Conceptual patterns not only organize the conceptual world, but also generate conceptual stereotypes. These stereotypes very often hinder interpreters from realizing how people think in other languages. For example, the English word *question* has, among others, the meaning of 'doubt', 'uncertainty'. It can be traced in the expressions *beyond all questions, past question, without question, out of question, to call smth. in question*. In Russian conceptual world this "emotional" meaning is almost alien to the word "question": the Russian concept "question" doesn't include the connotation of 'doubt'. In other words, Russians do not (directly) associate "question" with doubt and uncertainty. The concept of question in Russian is associated with 'a thing that is hindering the normal course of affairs', or 'a barrier that should be overcome', as there are such expressions in Russian as lit. "to put the question aside / away", "to turn round the question", alien to English.

The conceptual differences between Russian and English words 'question' are also evident in their derivative meanings. In English, *questionable* means 'doubtful', in Russian the corresponding derivative means only 'not knowing'. That is why an Englishman can say *highly questionable*, but a Russian cannot use the word "question" analogously, to mean the same.

Such "conceptual situation" means at least two things. The first is a lexicographic one. Dictionary writers and compilers should realize that they present not only different meanings and usages of words, but also different conceptual worlds. The second is a translational one. Conceptual stereotypes very often form a conceptual barrier between two conceptual worlds. For example, it is very difficult for a Russian interpreter to associate 'doubt' with the English word *question* and *questionable*. The famous Hamlet's exclamation "To be or not to be – that is the question» was translated into Russian many times, and always – using the word 'question'. And there was not a single translator who ever suspected that it was not only a question, but also a doubt. Though – he could have to.

In order to translate the word *question* into Russian by 'doubt', or to render this meaning into English by a *question*, the interpreter should first realize the conceptual difference between two conceptual worlds. And this particular realization should become a matter of linguistic education and foreign language teaching, as when translating into a foreign language, or teaching to do it, one should realize that word combinations often cannot

be translated word by word, but should be "restored" in the translating language according to similar conceptual patterns.

The awareness of the conceptual background of lexical co-occurrences in discourse opens new perspectives in presenting word combinations in translators' dictionaries. Up to now lexicographic practice in this respect was empirical, ad hoc, occasional, unsystematic, incomplete and text-dependent. But now it can become theory-dependent. This will make it exhaustive, explanatory, progressive and complete.

**Practical applications.** The considerations sketchily and briefly laid out above, as well as some complementary theoretical results [Riabtseva 1993], were the reason and the background for compiling a computer combinatory dictionary of English scientific collocations. It registers combinatory, grammatical, lexical and rhetorical, peculiarities of general scientific notions and the most typical patterns of academic style, so that to assist scientists in writing their articles in English. It can be used either when generating a text, translating it, or when teaching how to do it correctly.

#### R e f e r e n c e s

- Apresjan, Yuriy. *Lexicheskaya semantika*. Moscow, Nauka, 1974.
- Apresjan, Valentina, Apresjan, Yuriy. *Metaphora v semanticheskom predstavlenii emoziy*. // *Voprosy Yazykoznaniiya*. 1993, N.3 .
- Benson, Morton, Benson, Evelyn, Illson, Robert. *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: A guide to word combinations*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1986.
- Dreyfus, H, Dreyfus. *Mind over machine: The power of human intention and expertise in the era of the computer*. N.Y., 1985.
- Melchuk, Igor, Zholkovsky, Alex. *Tolkovo-kombinatornyj slovar' russkogo yazyka*. Wien, Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, 1984.
- Riabtseva, Nadezhda. *Artificial intelligence and scientific metalanguage // Soviet contributions to some topical linguistic issues /Ed. by Alexander Vasilevich*. Moscow, Institute of linguistics, 1990.
- Riabtseva, Nadezhda. *Metadiscourse collocations in scientific texts and translation problems: Conceptual analysis // Terminologie et Traduction*, N. 2-3/1992. Bruxelles, 1993.
- F.A.Smadia. *Lexical co-occurrence. The missing link // Lit. & ling. computing*. 1989, N. 3.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. *Semantics, culture, and cognition*. New York, Oxford University press, 1992.

\* \* \*

(\*\*\*\*\*) *N. Riabtseva. CONCEPTUAL BLENDING IN CULTURE-SPECIFIC METAPHORS (A Case Study of Russian and English Idioms) // Journal of Philology, 2003, N. 1.*

## 0. Introduction

The burden of the paper is to show that conceptual metaphors are most neatly and intricately elaborated in idioms and set phrases – which are able to blend together conventional and culture-specific, ontological and axiological, denotative and connotative, expressive and stylistic, explicit and implicit information. The latter, in its turn, is not just an occasional combination of autonomous ideas, but a coherent and integral system of concepts that are deeply embedded in the culture of social relations of native speakers and their values. Thus the material examined sheds new light on some translation problems and the practice of foreign language learning and teaching as well.

## 1. Basic Assumptions

Culture-specific metaphors become particularly apparent when the phraseologies of different languages are compared and contrasted. Contrastive comparison of English and Russian idioms can expose many differences between the two and help define what linguistic,

conceptual, and cultural information should be provided to a foreign language learner to facilitate their acquisition and rendering.

Most prominently the culture of social relations of native speakers is manifested in the matrix domains of interpersonal interaction, social relations and self-consciousness. Basic concepts pertaining to these domains encode social behavior in general, particular attitudes towards other people and social order, and towards one's own personality. They are calibrated relative to social traditions and support conceptual configurations in the domain of social life. The experiential basis for metaphorizing social relations is that they are embodied in the actions that one person can/ may/ must/ dare perform with/ without/ over/ using/ ignoring/ for/ in favor of/ in the absence (presence), etc. of another person – that is, in their deontic modality; for detail, see (Riabtseva 2001a; 2001b). One of the most dramatic, socially, mentally and ethically marked of them is deception.

## 2. The metaphoric language of deception

The metaphoric language of deception is based mostly on the conventional metaphor “knowing is seeing”, which enables us to understand cognition in terms of visual perception: “Thanks to the general mapping between visual perception and intellectual activity, nearly any concept related to the experience of vision is likely to have a clear counterpart in the realm of knowledge and ideas”, as there is “a metaphorical association between vision and thought (cf. knowing is seeing)” (Grady & Oakley & Coulson, 1999: 3, 12). The metaphor constitutes a concrete and embodied experiential basis for metaphorical conceptualization of knowing the truth in terms of seeing what is going on. The cross-space mappings between the two inputs – the source one, observation, and the target one – knowledge, enable us to assimilate the truth to what is observable and a lie to what is used to hide, “decorate”, distort or replace it. This determines the way we metaphorically interpret other people's deceptive behavior and forms the conceptual grounds for such conventional metaphors in describing deception as “lying is preventing from seeing”.

Such metaphors depict deception as affecting what is going on or distracting and directing other person's attention – by using special objects or manipulations and tricks. These are *light, color, shadow, cloud, fog, dust, dirt, screen, curtain, veil*, etc., or twisting, juggling, bending, and so on. They either serve as obstacles, hindrances or barriers to another person's perception because of hiding, covering or making in some other way invisible what is going on, or create a false impression of it by imitating reality, substituting it, making it double, etc. As a consequence, many languages have similar idiomatic expressions that further elaborate these conventional metaphors, and that are quite transparent, immediately understandable and thus translatable from one language into another (for Russian equivalents, see Riabtseva 2001b), cf.:

*to cover up/ hide/ remove (one's) tracks/ all traces of smt, to screen/ conceal/ veil/ obscure one's intentions, to use (one's ignorance) as a cover, to cloud an issue, to keep in secret, to sweep under the carpet, to harbor ill will towards smb, under an assumed pretext; a shadow cabinet, a shady transaction; There is smt behind this; to juggle with facts, to turn facts upside down, to twist facts/ words/ the truth, to bend the truth, to exaggerate/ diminish (importance/ threat); to embellish, to color the truth, to lay it on thick, blackmail, to fling dirt about smb, to soil smb's reputation; to double-cross, to double back, to play double, double-faced/ -minded/ -hearted/ -tongued, etc.*

The conventional metaphor *Lying is preventing from seeing* allows us to understand deception in terms of perceiving what is going on, as the conceptual integration of the corresponding mental spaces (Fauconnier & Turner, 1998) – the source one, of physical perception, and the target one, of interpersonal interaction, share some common generic structure – a frame of a person being affected by some circumstances. Besides, deception

metaphors can get their further elaboration by developing a scenario of interfering into what is going on – in order to direct intentionally and thus subordinate other person’s behavior to one’s own will and benefit by affecting his knowledge – as a result of using special objects, instruments or manipulations. Do languages develop such structures in a similar way or are there any differences between them in this respect?

A contrastive comparison of Russian and English idioms metaphorically describing deception as an interference into what is going on shows that there are considerable gaps between them. In particular, in contrast to the English language, Russian is rich in idiomatic expressions, which metaphorically – figuratively, symbolically – picture deception as manipulating other person’s body parts. Table 1, based on Shakhovsky & Panchenko (1999: 287), contrasts the metaphoric description of deception in Russian and English in this respect and marks the gaps (by a dash).

Object	Russian	English
body:	<i>veshat' sobak</i> lit. 'to hang dogs on smb'	–
head	<i>morochit' golovu</i> 'to turn smb's head around'	–
brain:	<i>podrit' mozgi</i> 'to powder/ muddle smb's brains'	–
teeth:	<i>zagovarivat' zuby</i> 'to talk away smb's teeth'	–
ears:	<i>veshat' lapshu na ushi</i> 'to hang noodles on smb's ears'	–
	<i>yezdit' po usham</i> 'to drive over smb's ears'	–
nose:	<i>natjanut' nos</i> 'to pull smb's nose'	–
whiskers	<i>vkruचित' / zabivat' baki</i> 'to screw smb's whiskers'	–
finger:	<i>obvesti vokrug pal'tsa</i> 'to turn smb around one's finger'	–
eyes:	<i>dlja otvoda glaz</i> 'for misleading smb's glance'	
		~ to pull the wool over smb's eyes
	<i>puskat' pyl' v glaza</i>	~ to throw dust into smb's eyes
face:	–	to shoot off smb's face (BrE)

**Table 1. The metaphoric description of deception in Russian vs. English idioms.**

As can be seen, in Russian, the deceiver is affecting the other person through manipulating not only various objects, but the other person’s body parts as well – *head, brains, nose, teeth*, etc. That is, Russian has invented, so to say, its own specific way of metaphorizing deception. The point is that this “way” is not accidental. In what follows, I shall try to show that it is motivated by and is congruent with nationally specific attitudes towards social interaction, is coached in culturally specific ideas of personality, compresses over Russian speakers’ attitudes towards interpersonal relations, and blends background nationally specific concepts of social order. Together these concepts generate an integrated ethno-cultural space and its values. And these values are in sharp contrast to the attitudes characteristic of the traditional “English language” culture – called by some researchers, including A. Wierzbicka (1997), the Anglo-Saxon culture. Their “un-blending” shows what lies in their background and what kind of entrenched metaphors stand behind. Besides, they reveal why Russian phraseology is so emotionally charged and thus presents additional problems to its translation. All these culture-specific phenomena draw on the background notion of social space whose norms direct interpersonal interaction.

### 3. Social Space in Anglo-Saxon vs. Russian Culture

Social space is conceptualized in the language after physical space. The background structure – merging from experiential practice of the distribution of objects and their physical contact in the source physical space – is recruited to construe the target domain – the distribution and interaction of individuals in the social space. Thus, the crucial element of the space image is the distance between its elements, as there is a correlation between the objects’ physical

distance and the influence they can exert on each other: the closer the counterpart, the more impact – negative or positive – it will produce over it. So social space consists of objects – personalities, social interaction between whom is directed by the social order and the distance between them: the nearer the person is to his partner, the closer is the contact between them, the more influence he can perform: physical, emotional or moral, cf. the conventional metaphor “closeness is strength of effect” in (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 128).

The attitudes towards one’s own personality, towards social interaction and social order may be different in different cultures. Moreover, all these attitudes are interdependent. One’s attitude towards one’s own personality is embodied in the concept of personal space, that towards interpersonal relations in the concept of independence, and that towards social order in the concept of power. All these attitudes reveal themselves in the corresponding culture-specific key concepts. Research results into these culturally specific concepts in Russian and in English may be summarized as follows; for more detail, see (Wierzbicka, 1996; Brosnahan, 1998; Ter-Minasova, 2000; Shmelev, 2000).

Personal “territory”, or personal space, is the most important constituting element in any culture. The attitude towards one’s own and another person’s personal space organizes the culture of social interaction in general. In this respect, the Anglo-Saxon culture is qualified by L. Brosnahan (1998) as “the culture of birds”, while the Russian one as “the culture of seals”. These are determined by different attitudes towards the space that surrounds the person: birds do not like close contact, while seals are fond of lying in close bodily contact, nestling up to each other.

Thus every culture has its own dimensions of personal space. The personal space of Russians is felt to be limited to their own body, while in the Anglo-Saxon culture, a person is conceived as being surrounded by a sort of rather spacious cocoon. Interference into it is considered encroaching on one’s rights. That is why the physical distance between the Anglo-Saxons, speaking to each other, is almost twice as much as between Russians, both in formal and in informal communication (45 vs. 25 cm.). But what is of particular importance is not only physical distance, but social and psychological distance as well.

In English, the distance between social members can be evaluated as optimal, and this fact is reflected in the language by the highly democratic pronoun *you*, which does not differentiate between “close” and “distant” persons, as did the outdated pronoun *thee* in an earlier stage of the development of English. *You* makes all members equal and thus independent; the main “social feeling” here is “being an independent and self-sufficient personality surrounded by one’s own personal space”. It makes the Anglo-Saxon culture a most democratic contact culture: this “democratic” distance between speakers is based on their respect of the other person’s personal – private – space. Privacy has become an individual, social and cultural value, a key cultural concept which is hard to render into Russian where there is no similar culturally marked notion. It commands responsibility for one’s active behavior and makes the person take particular care of one’s own *face* – the main and constituting part of one’s own personality, and results in writing one’s own personal pronoun *I* in capitals. This grammatical rule in English seems quite natural, and even insignificant, but it isn’t. Russians, when asked to imagine such a new grammar rule – prescribing the same convention in Russian, get perplexed and cannot find any rational explanation for it and qualify such an imaginary situation as “immodest, strange, unnatural and alien to Russian”, where only the formal pronoun *you* can be capitalized – to show respect to the other – singular – person: “But you cannot do the same to yourself”, they say.

On the contrary, the very fact that Russian has two pronouns for addressing the other person – formal and informal, has a great impact on interpersonal communication in general. The informal pronoun shows that the communication is intimate, emotional, friendly and sincere, or, in the opposite – rude, aggressive and humiliating. But in both cases it takes place between members of the same community. The mode of address is so significant in the Russian culture, that it was paid particular attention in political studies. There is evidence that

in the Soviet period, western intelligence services made it a special point to inquire into addressing forms used by Soviet leaders towards each other – as showing their sympathies and antipathies.

So the western cultural ideology in general is based on the respect of another person's individuality and rights, and their priorities in social interaction. One of the manifestations of the personal orientation in western cultural ideology is the 20 year-old (and still flourishing) idea of "political correctness" that has already made English more humanized, polite, respectful and de-racialized. It does not have any *second class* tickets, places, goods or services, as Russian has, but instead – business, economy class, etc.

Russian is, in contrast, a close-contact culture. The main "social feeling" experienced in it, is "being a community member" surrounded by one's peers, whose personal interests are subordinate to the interests of the whole community – the collective. *Collectivity* has become an individual, social and cultural value, a key cultural concept which is hard to render into English where there is no similar culturally marked notion. It gives people the "natural sense" of another person's *shoulder* and makes them feel safe. Foreigners, visiting Russia, testify that Russians are quite used to overcrowded buses and other public places, to communal flats and long queues, where they may even find themselves in a natural, close, though temporary, community, to which they readily adapt and where they start discussing all types of problems: personal, political, economic, etc. They mostly ignore when touched by other persons in such situations, as touching is much less meaningful in the Russian culture than in the Anglo-Saxon one, where there are only three main types of situation presupposing physical contact: shaking hands, love, and fighting.

The priority of community interests over individual ones in the Russian culture had as its roots the Orthodoxy traditions, and had formed in peasantry life long before the communist revolution, was used and stimulated by it, and has become so deeply embedded in the Russian mentality that the spirit of corporal solidarity, mutual aid and guarantee are considered to be inherent to Russians. The Russian language reflects this fact in various forms, one of them being that the notion of *shoulder* has become a symbol and bearer of the idea of the community members' close contact, help and support, cf. the meaning of the English and Russian expressions with the word *shoulder*: Eng. *shoulder to shoulder* "working together to achieve the same thing" (Longman, 1995: 1325), *stand shoulder to shoulder with* "to completely share someone's opinions about something" (Ibid.) vs. Russ. *plechom k plechu* lit. 'shoulder to shoulder' – "in tight unity" (Ozhegov, 1981: 462), *chuvstvo plecha* lit. 'the feeling of (other person's) shoulder' – "the sense of friendliness and mutual support" (Ibid.).

The attitude towards social order is also dependent on the attitude towards personal space. In democratic countries, social order is conceptualized as being controlled by the law that protects the personality. Hence, most citizens respect the law and realize its usefulness in controlling order and protecting their personal sphere from intervention. Thus, in English, the law and its power is a habitual concept assimilated into everyday practical life, like the notions of one's will, intention and belief. Their connections are evident in such expressions as *to have the law of smb* (BrE), *to give the law to smb* (BrE), *to take the law into one's own hands*, *to lay down the law*, etc., cf. *to be a law into himself/ herself* 'behave in an independent way...' (Longman, 1995).

Russians' attitude towards social order is directed by their communal psychology which opposes the law to justice, morals and good will. They subconsciously consider laws as a hindrance imposed by those outside their community to limit its freedom. Laws do not protect rank-and-file community members who thus feel free in surpassing, evading or circumventing rules, prohibitions, and interdictions: they would not keep off grass if crossing a lawn makes their way shorter. They display a passive resistance rather than an active cooperation with the law. The main attitude towards one's outer social life here is resignation, resistance, submission, and subjection – to circumstances, to ruling and more powerful personalities, or some higher or unknown forces. Social life, Russians believe, is organized,



controlled and directed by those who have power: God, communist leaders (in the past), the president (at present), bureaucracy, etc., to whom they can appeal for protection and justice. The distance between the personality and the law is much longer in Russian – it is far outside one's personal sphere and is mediated by community rules based on their own morals, ethics, norms of behavior and customs, cf. (Cienki, 1999). As Alexander Solzhenyzyin, an outstanding Russian writer, noted in his *Russia in a Collapse*:

*In contrast to western peoples, the attitude of Russians towards the law has always been distrustful and ironic: how can an introduction of a general formal law prefigure all particular real cases? [...] But instead of legal consciousness, Russians have always had a propensity for live justice.*

Most social dispositions, including emotional and moral attitudes towards other people, are interdependent and linked with the leading one – a personal space. A person feels other people close to himself when they are members of the same community; in such a position you cannot be indifferent to them and are supposed to display involvement in their affairs, to show emotional response to their problems and to feel responsibility for the community moral climate. In such situations, Russians are not only psychologically ready to enter into a speech contact with new people, but emotionally and morally as well, being quite open, sincere and frank even with whom they are not acquainted. These dispositions can be traced, for example, in the widely spread and highly colloquial expressions describing emotions and ethics, particularly with the word “soul”, which do not have stylistically and semantically parallel or equivalent expressions in English; for detail, see (Wierzbicka, 1992: 395–441). Cf. the interpretation of the widely used Russian expression *dusha bolit (za kogo-libo)* lit. ‘my soul is aching for smb’ in (Kuzmin, 2001: 177): “be very much emotionally concerned about someone”.

The main “personal” concept in the Russian culture is thus the emotional and conscientious soul as opposed to the English rational and matter-of-fact mind. The very existence of the word *mind* in English and its linguistic properties, particularly the absence of its exact equivalent in Russian, expose great differences in the attitude toward rationality in the corresponding cultures.

To give but one more example. The English word *face* has become a symbol of self-control and a carrier of an active rational attitude towards one's life, cf. expressions which cannot be paired by analogous Russian phrases: *to keep one's face* (BrE), *to save/ not to lose face*, *to have the face to do smt*, *to set one's face/ to make face against smt* (BrE), *to fly in the face of smt*, *to meet smt in the face*, *to put a bold/ good/ brave face*, *to open one's face* (BrE), *to show/ shut one's face*, *to put a new face on smt*, *to put one's best face*, *to run one's face* (BrE), *to set one's face to smt* (BrE), *to face out*, *to face facts/ the truth*, *to face the music*, *to face smb down*, *to face smb with smt*, *to face up to reality*, etc.

Russian and English phraseologies metaphorically picture and thus “visualize” diametrically opposed attitudes of their speakers toward many other cultural, social, psychological and personal phenomena, which are also derivable from the concept of personal space; for detail, see (Wierzbicka, 1992; 1996; 1999; Stepanov, 1997; Bulygina & Shmelev, 1997; Arutiunova, 1999; (Levontina & Shmelev, 2000).

In sum, the Russian mentality is oriented towards *collectivity* – where people feel *dependent* on each other as relying on community effort and community members' *shoulder*, are ready to display *emotions* and involvement of their *soul* in the affairs and morals of the community and its members, *passively* submit to the law and believe in *justice* of those who have *power*. The English language exposes priority of an *independent individuality* who *actively faces* reality, highly appreciates *privacy*, relies on *rationality* and *mind*, and trusts the *law* in defending one's *rights*.

Thus, the social space domain matrix is structured by its central concept of *personal space* and constitutes culture-specific background knowledge shared by all society members. It participates in the framing of mental spaces that blend in the metaphorical depiction of deception only implicitly, in a form of presuppositions – “ethnotheries”, or cultural models, which, according to anthropologist B. Shore (1996), constitute an intrinsic component of the human mind and behavior; cf. (D’Andrade, 1987; Holland & Quinn, 1987: vii; Keesing, 1987): “Ethnotheory is used as implicit assumptions in daily discourse and understanding” (Lutz, 1987: 292).

#### **4. Conceptual Blending of General and Culture-Specific Information in the Metaphorical Depiction of Interpersonal Interaction**

The integration network of deception metaphors presented in Table 1 involves the source mental space of visual perception and the target mental space of interpersonal interaction. It is obvious that this short-term integrated construct represents a particular scenario of interpersonal interaction informed by background implicit knowledge about the distance between persons in the social space. What is important here is that in Russian, the blended space inherits and activates the role of “personal space” of the scenario as well as culturally specific patterns and models of interpersonal behavior associated with it. That is, background implicit knowledge about the short “physical” distance between persons in interpersonal interaction, characteristic of the Russian culture, is projected from the blend back to the visual perception input space, which is thus modified by creating a possibility of “easily reaching the other person’s body part and manipulating it”, thus inventing a new, perhaps, specifically Russian way of affecting the other person’s “visual perception”, distracting his attention and thus directing his behavior so as to gain profit of it.

The distance between persons in the Russian culture is not only physically and socially shorter, but psychologically as well. Highly emotional behavior, characteristic to the Russian culture, gives rise to the emotional mode of interpersonal communication and hence generates special linguistic means of its demonstration. Besides various highly colloquial, very expressive and emotional grammatical and lexical speech patterns – especially diminutive and diminutive-hypocoristic, cf. (Riabtseva, 2001a), researchers have stressed a particularly imagery, vivid, evasive and even “intimate” and thus very emotional way of metaphorizing interpersonal relations in Russian, which contrasts with rather pragmatically oriented English expressions, e.g. (Uzilevsky & Minakova, 2001). Note in this respect the picturesque images, fixed in the Russian idioms given in Table 1 and their stylistically marked and highly emotional character. As another instance, compare the English set phrase, pragmatic and matter-of fact: *Among friends all things are common*, and its Russian counterpart, intimate and highly emotional: *Dlya milogo druzhka i serezhku iz ushka* lit. ‘Just anything for my sweet friend [diminutive-hypocoristic] – even the ear-ring from my ear [diminutive-hypocoristic] (I will give)’, which, in addition, should, and cannot help to be pronounced with a special – intimate and hearty – intonation. In addition, besides ordinary names for a liar – *lgun*, *lzhez*, *obmancshik*, Russian has several very expressive derivatives – *lgunishka*, *vrun*, *vrunishka*, *vral’*, *vrusha*, *brexun*, whose emotional coloring cannot be rendered into English, and whose communicative burden – together with their metaphorical and thus indirect analogues from Table 1 – is to express a certain degree of moral reproach – a very important cultural illocutionary connotation of their usage in Russian.

Besides the situation of deception, the image of a short distance between persons in an interpersonal interaction can be traced in Russian in very many other idioms metaphorically describing interpersonal contacts, particularly intentional. Most of them concern affecting the other person’s opinion, intentions, will, and behavior: when one person forces the other to act or think in a desirable way, makes him change his mind, subjects him to one’s will, etc. Such an impact is also pictured in Russian as using physical force to the other person’s body parts. In contrast to English, where in most cases such situations are figuratively described as

applying force to the other person's neck or back, in Russian they are pictured as applying force to all other body parts as well: *veins, guts, nerves, sides, head, hands, ears, nose*, and particularly – to his *brain* and *soul* – the most important for a human being. It should be stressed once more, that in Russian, the soul is the most important constituent part of a person, conceptualized as a container of his feelings, life, and even thinking; cf.:

Soul – *dusha*: *vynut' / vytriasi / vymotat' / travit' dushu* – lit. 'to take off/ shake off/ twist/ torture smb's soul' = "to vex to the point where smb is exhausted (physically or mentally)" ~ *to wore smb out, to annoy to the utmost, to make miserable*; *beredit' dushu* – lit. 'to screw/ pick smb's soul' ~ *to evoke painful memories*; *perevernut' dushu* – lit. 'to turn smb's soul upside down' ~ *to disturb deeply*; *vlezt' v dushu* – lit. 'to get inside smb's soul' = "to inquire into close details about smb's life" ~ *to pry into smb's feelings*: "to search someone's heart against one's consent, and, hence, annoy, irritate the person" (Kuzmin, 2001: 187), cf. (Ibid: 185): "*stojat' nad dushoj* – to bother, harass by controlling or closely watching someone's actions".

Brains – *mozgi*: *davat' po mozgam* – lit. 'to hit smb's brains' = "to curse rudely" ~ *to lash out to smb*; *poluchit' po mozgam* – lit. 'to be hit on one's brains' = "to be rudely reprimanded" ~ *to get it good*; *vpravit' mozgi* – lit. 'to set smb's brains in their place' = "to make smb behave more prudently by using severe measures"; *kapat' na mozgi* – lit. 'to drip drops on smb's brains' = "to repeat endlessly" ~ *to bug smb*.

Subordinating: *vziat' za boka* – lit. 'to take/ grip smb by his sides' = "to blame smb to be responsible for smt he has done wrong" ~ *to take to account*; *vziat' za gorlo/ glotku/ zhabry* – lit. 'to grip smb by this throat/ gullet/ gills' = "to force to act in a certain fashion"; *gnut' / skrutit' v baraniy rog* – lit. 'to bend smb into a sheep's horn' = "to force/ submit to one's will by means of coercion" ~ *to knuckle smb down*; *vit' verevki* – lit. 'to twist smb into a rope' = "to subject smb to one's will" ~ *to have smb jumping through hoops*; *tianut' / vymatyvat' zhily/ kishki/ nervy* – lit. 'to pull/ wind round smb's veins/ guts/ nerves' = "to exhaust smb by making excessive demands on him, or exploiting with hard work" ~ *to plague life out of smb*; *byt' pod bashmakom u zheny* – lit. 'to be under one's wife's shoe' = "to be completely dependent".

Note a very expressive way of warning a person not to trust smb, by saying *palets v rot ne kladi* – lit. 'do not put your finger into this man's mouth' – "so that he would not bite it". Could a social distance be shorter than that?

Thus there is an obvious harmony between a national character and a national language. The language creates and provides its users with grammatical, lexical and idiomatic –metaphorical, figurative – means of verbalizing their intentions, attitudes, priorities, dispositions and values, while the latter are generating, activating and developing linguistic means necessary for their embodiment. And this harmony is most transparently seen in phraseology whose ability to integrate an image and one's intention, general and culture-specific background knowledge, stylistic and personally charged information make them a most expressive means of indirect evaluation of what is going on.

## 5. Translational Implications

Difficulties in translating culture-specific deception idioms from Russian into English, as well as many others, metaphorically describing interpersonal relations, are twofold, pertaining to their metaphoric meaning and stylistics. Though their culturally colored metaphoric meaning and inner form make them untranslatable, they still can be paired with analogous English idioms which can successfully substitute them in speech. This is confirmed by lexicographic practice and literary translations, e.g. by Sophia Lubensky's (1995) *Russian-English Dictionary of Idioms*, where most set phrases from Table 1 have the English expression *to pull the wool over smb's eyes* as a possible equivalent. But their stylistics is culturally colored

either, as they are highly emotionally charged being motivated by the communicative burden of ethical reproach and marked by highly colloquial character.

In fact, the burden of any phraseology, as well as of all other super-segmental language devices – intonation, intensification, metaphorization, modality, evaluation, style, etc. – is to express and convey some additional extra-linguistic information: personal, interpersonal, cultural, social, etc., cf. (Nikolaeva, 1999: 259). But every phraseology has its own preferences in choosing what and how to convey. In this respect, Russian phraseology is not only expressive, as phraseologies of most languages are, but very emotional and highly colloquial as well. This is because Russian oral speech in general is very emotional, open and “sincere” in exposing the speaker’s inner states and attitudes, and thus abounds with specifically colloquial speech patterns formed exclusively in and for informal communication. All this is in accord with the Russian speech culture and mentality, in contrast to the English language, where there are no analogous “emotional” means and where less emotional expressive patterns and idioms are used. That is why the stylistic coloring of most Russian colloquial speech patterns and idioms cannot be fully transferred into English, as the latter has no corresponding stylistically marked means. But perhaps, it needn’t, as an adequate translation should not reproduce all and everything, and, perhaps, some neutralization will be more authentic than complete “re-dressing” of what has no direct grammatical, lexical or idiomatic equivalents in another language. And though “Whatever can be meant can be said” (Searle, 1969: 47), sometimes it should not.

Further extensive linguistic evidence illustrates that the translation problems pointed above extend far beyond the metaphoric expressions describing deception. For example, the fact that Russians are more biased towards an emotional apprehension of a problem (in one’s soul) than towards its rational consideration (in one’s mind), is congruent with a long list of “emotional” verbs which are used in Russian as if they are “action verbs”, that is, describing a conscious, purposeful and voluntary action (Wierzbicka, 1988: 254) – *bespokoit’sa*, *trevozhit’sa*, *gorevat’*, *toskovat’*, *skuchat’*, *grustit’*, *pechalit’sa*, *volnovat’sa*, *unyvat’*, *uzhasat’sa*, *negodovat’*, etc., – while modern English has only one such verb – *to worry* which is used similarly. In addition, each such Russian verb, very widely used in everyday speech, has a number of derivatives describing its various aspectual correlations, cf. *nervnichat’*: *raznervnichat’sa*, *iznervnichat’sa*, *perenervnichat’*, etc., most of them having a causative form as well: *bespokoit’*, *trevozhit’*, *volnovat’*, etc. In contrast, almost all their English counterparts describe inner involuntary passive states, but not “emotional actions”, and thus cannot be considered as their exact translations, cf. *radovat’sa* vs. *to be happy*; *gordit’sa* vs. *to be proud*; *stydit’sa* vs. *to be ashamed*; *zlit’sa* vs. *to be angry*, *gnevat’sa* vs. *to be outraged*, etc.

There is a number of key notions in Russian which reflect this national disposition and related nationally specific attitudes, in particular, towards other people, one’s life and the outer world, for example, of readiness for displaying such feelings as concern, compassion, sympathy, resignation and submission, cf. *sud’ba* ‘destiny’, *vera* ‘belief’, *zhalost’* ‘pity’, *toska* ‘yearning’, *beda* ‘grief’, *gore* ‘misfortune’; *terpenie* ‘patience’, *bol’* ‘suffering’. These concepts are also connected with nationally relevant inclinations toward collectivity, with readiness to be patient and to rely and hope on outer external and higher forces and one’s destiny, to follow one’s feelings rather than mind or reason, cf. *kak Bog na dushu polozhit* ‘as God will put it on one’s soul: “as God knows alone” (Kuzmin, 2001: 20)’ vs. *any old way*; *Pobojsa Boga!* ‘Be afraid of God!’ vs. *be reasonable*, etc. (Bulygina & Shmelev, 1997). In Russian, even time is “submissive”: *vremja terpit* ‘the time bears it’ ~ *there is no rush*, to say nothing of the man, cf. *sam Bog velel (terpet’)* ‘God himself suffered and told us to suffer’ vs. *Its only natural to do smt.*

That is why it is easy to explain why Russians make an extensive use of the word *bol’no* (~ ‘painfully’) as an intensifier, cf. *bol’no* ‘painfully’ *xitryj/ umnyj/ dorogoj* ~ *too cunning/ clever/ expensive*, as well as of the word *beda* (‘misfortune’) – to mean “very/ too

much”, cf. *Ludej tam beda skol’ko!* Their usage displays and confirms a highly emotional, involved and readily expressed attitude of Russians towards unordinary things which they conceptualize as causing pain or suffering. Further, in Russian, the notion *beda* is closely connected with the no less emotional notion *gore* “grief”. They both denote a deep and intensive feeling – “being upset to the utmost” and enter into a large number of set expressions which are widely and actively used in speech, cf. *beda-to kakaja, dolgo li do bedy, bedovaja golova, bedolaga; bedstvovat’, sem’ bed odin otvet; gorevat’, prigorunit’sa; goremyka, goremychnyj, goresti i napasti; ubityj gorem, xlebnut’/ xvatit’ gorja, pomoch’ gorju, s gorja, gore lukovoe; jemu i gorja malo, gore mne s toboj, s gorem popolam, gorushko-gore*, and which cannot be fully rendered into English, cf. *Ne beda* ‘it is not a misfortune’ vs. *It doesn’t matter*; *Ne velika beda* ‘the misfortune is not very big’ vs. *Its not the end of the world*; *Chto za beda!* ‘It is not a real misfortune’ vs. *What harm is there in that?*; *Lixa beda nachalo* ‘It is not an extreme misfortune to start’ vs. *A good start is half the race*; *na bedu/ na moje gore* ‘it’s my misfortune/ grief’ vs. *unluckily/ unfortunately*. There is only one word in English which has a similar function and plays an analogous role in the English phraseology. It is the word *trouble*. But it differs greatly from *beda, gore* in that it is quite rational, matter of fact and commonsensical. It means a difficulty, inconvenience, that is, “an obstacle; smt. preventing”. That is why derivatives, set phrases and idioms connected in Russian with *beda, gore* are more emotional than their more rational English equivalents, including their most direct counterpart *trouble*, cf. *to give smb trouble, to put smt to trouble, to take the trouble, to be in/ to get into trouble, to make trouble for smb, to look for trouble*.

Besides, there are a lot of catch-phrases that reveal the predominance of a rather passive and awaiting attitude of Russians towards the future and one’s possibilities, “unreadiness” to face difficulties and troubles, cf. *vyshe golovy ne prygnesh’* ‘you cannot jump higher than your head’, *plet’u obuxa ne pereshibesh’* ‘a lash would never break a butt’ ~ *you cannot chop wood with a penknife, avos’ proneset* ‘perhaps everything will be all right’, *ne sud’ba* ‘the destiny does not want it’, *ne dano* ‘it is not given to me to do this’, for detail, see (Riabtseva, 1997), cf. *kuda krivaja vyvedet* “to wait and see how the situation will develop”; *zhdat’ u morja pogody* “to wait for an opportunity to come; to do nothing but wait”. Thus, “Comprehension of the fact that you can’t do more than you can, that you cannot surmount the obstacles in your way impacts your entire way of thinking, impacts your way of life” (Kuzmin, 2001: 111, 287; 355).

## 6. Conclusion

It has become common knowledge that learning a foreign language should be accompanied by acquiring the corresponding foreign culture. But yet there is no such textbook as “An introduction into Russian/ English/ French/ Tunisian, etc. culture”. If there were, its burden should be to present behavior patterns, which are culture specific from some external or contrastive point of view. The problem here is that such patterns are but only implicitly present in a foreign culture and are so deeply embedded in it that they are considered by their owners as absolutely natural rather than predominantly cultural or culture-specific and thus cannot be easily explicated. But the national and cultural biases of native speakers are linguistically relevant. They are captured in linguistics by the notion of the worldview incorporated into a national language. The worldview is revealed through its key cultural concepts and their manifestations in various lexical and grammatical phenomena.

The notion of the world view is based on the fact that language can communicate knowledge not only discursively, that is, by verbalizing it, but non-discursively as well, that is, implicitly, indirectly, “tacitly”. This non-discursive knowledge is conveyed through presuppositions, implications, connotations, categorization, metaphorization, or the modality of lexical and grammatical items, as well as through their combinatory possibilities, usage restrictions, stylistic qualities, inner form, etc. The tendency here is that the most common, customary, and habitual cultural patterns and values are grammaticalized. Besides, this non-

discursive knowledge is of a background character and thus includes culture-specific, nationally bound and ethnically colored attitudes, preferences and inclinations. They do not only constitute native speakers' mentality but also motivate culture-specific metaphors.

Culture-specific metaphors are best represented in phraseology. Native language idioms and set phrases can blend together ethno-specific concepts pertaining to the worldview of its speakers, to their national character, as well as to their traditional social relations, thus becoming an embodiment of national dispositions and spiritual values. They are presented metaphorically – indirectly and figuratively, which is why culture-specific metaphors produce idioms that have no corresponding counterparts in another language and are difficult for non-native speakers to understand, use, and translate, as their motivation is not transparent for them. Their cognitive description can make learning and understanding a foreign language easier by explaining why it is natural for foreign language native speakers to describe this or that cultural phenomenon in this particular way – by blending these particular mental spaces or image schemes to convey this particular idea.

A contrastive comparison of Russian and English idioms describing deception – a socially, mentally and ethically marked behavior – testifies to the effect that they are coached in their own cultural concepts that form and reflect an integrated ethno-cultural space and its values. In particular, in contrast to the English language, Russian is rich in idiomatic expressions, which metaphorically – figuratively, symbolically, and in a stylistically marked manner – picture deception as manipulating the other person's body parts. As many other Russian phraseological units, they compress over and conceptually blend together Russian speakers' culture-specific attitudes towards one's own personal space, towards interpersonal relations, community norms of behavior and the mode of interpersonal communication – all these being diametrically opposed to the attitudes, norms and modes implicitly present in the English language.

### References

- Arutiunova, N. D. (1999). *Jazyk & mir cheloveka*. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kultury.
- Brosnahan, L. (1998). *Russian and English Nonverbal Communication*. Moscow: Bilingua.
- Bulygina, T. V. & A. D. Shmelev (1997). *Jazykovaja konceptualizacija mira*. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kultury.
- Cienki, A. (1999). "Metaphors and cultural models as profiles and bases." In: W. Raymond & Jr. Gibbs & Gerard J. Steen (eds.), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 189-203.
- D'Andrade, R. (1987). "A folk theory of the mind." In: D. Holland & N. Quinn (eds.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 112-148.
- Fauconnier G. & M. Turner (1998). "Conceptual integration networks." *Cognitive Science*, 22/2: 133-187.
- Grady, J. & T. Oakley & S. Coulson (1999). "Conceptual blending and metaphor." In: G. Steen & R. Gibbs (eds.), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins; [www.blendaphor.html](http://www.blendaphor.html): 1-27.
- Holland, D & N. Quinn (eds.) (1987). *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keesing, R. (1987). "Models, "folk" and "cultural": paradigms regained?" In: D. Holland & N. Quinn (eds.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 369-394.
- Kuzmin, S. S. (2000). *Translators' Russian-English Phraseological Dictionary*. Moscow: Flinta.
- Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Levontina, I. B. & A. D. Shmelev (2000). "Za spravedlivostju pustoj." In: N. D. Arutiunova (ed.), *Logichesky analiz jazyka: Jazyki etiki*. Moskva: Jazyki russoj kultury, 281-292.
- Longman (1995). *Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Longman dictionaries.
- Lubensky, S. (1995). *Russian-English Dictionary of Idioms*. New York, etc.: Random House.
- Lutz, C. (1987). "Goals, events, and understanding in Ifaluk emotion theory." In: D. Holland & N. Quinn (eds.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 290-312.
- Nikolaeva, T. M. (1999). "O parallelizme v funkcionirovanii rechevyx klishe & nekotoryx supersegmentnyx prosodicheskix modelej." In: V. Telia (ed.), *Phraseologija v kontexte kultury*. Moskva: Jazyki russoj kultury, 250-259.
- Ozhegov, S. I. (1981). *Slovar' Russkogo Jazyka*. Moskva: Russkij Jazyk.
- Riabtseva, N. K. (1997). "Axiologicheskie modeli vremeni." In: N. D. Arutiunova (ed.), *Logicheskij analiz jazyka: Jazyk & vremja*. Moskva: Indrik, 78-95.
- Riabtseva, N. K. (2001a). "Contrastive phraseology in a cross-cultural and cognitive perspective." In: M. Thelen & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.), *Translation and Meaning*. Part 5. Proceedings of the Maastricht – Lodz Duo Colloquium, 2000. Maastricht: Maastricht School of Translation and Interpreting, 365-378.
- Riabtseva, N. K. (2001b). "Mental vocabulary in a cognitive perspective." *Journal of Philology*, 2 (8): 16-25.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shakhovskiy, V. I. & N. N. Panchenko (1999). "Nacional'no-kulturnaja specifika koncepta "obman" vo phraseologicheskom aspekte." In: V. Telia (ed.), *Phraseologija v kontexte kultury*. Moskva: Jazyki russoj kultury, 285-288.
- Shmelev, A. D. (2000). "Pluralizm eticheskix sistem v svete jazykovyx dannyx." In: N. D. Arutiunova (ed.), *Logichesky analiz jazyka: Jazyki etiki*. Moskva: Jazyki russoj kultury, 380-389.
- Shore, B. (1996). *Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture and the Problem of Meaning*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stepanov, Y. S. (1997). *Konstanty: Slovar' russoj kultury*. Moskva: Jazyki russoj kultury.
- Ter-Minasova, S. (2000). "Jazyk, lichnost', intellekt." *Vestnik MGU. Seria 19: Linguistika i mezhkulturnaja kommunikacija*, 4: 35-42.
- Uzilevskiy, G. & M. Minakova (2001). "K probleme osnovanij antropologicheskoy paradigmy jazykoznanija." In: M. Remneva & A. Polikarpov (eds.), *Russian Language: its Historical Destiny and Present State*. The International Congress of Russian Language Researchers. Moscow: Moscow State University, 434-435.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1988). *The Semantics of Grammar*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: Primes and Universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zalizniak A. A. (2000). "O semantike schepetilnosti." In: N. Arutiunova (ed.), *Logichesky analiz jazyka: Jazyki etiki*. Moskva: Jazyki russoj kultury, 101-118.

\* \* \*

(\*\*\*\*\*) N. Riabtseva. COMBINATORY DICTIONARIES IN TEACHING AND PRACTICING TRANSLATION // "Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft": YI Internationale Konferenz, Abstracts. Leipzig, 1996.

Dictionaries have always been an indispensable linguistic support in teaching and practicing translation. Traditional dictionaries are now supplemented by dictionaries of quite a new type - those that are called active. Dictionaries of an active type reproduce the linguistic

competence of a native speaker and thus provide a new perspective in teaching and assisting translation.

The linguistic competence of a native speaker is a composition of two opposite and complementary linguistic abilities: passive understanding of speech plus its active generation. The active linguistic competence means the ability to express one and the same meaning and intention in different/various linguistic ways; and the ability to (subconsciously) combine words idiomatically in discourse. The theory of linguistic competence and its lexicographic application have been developed by Yury Apresjan, Igor Melchuk and their colleagues since 1968. Lexicographically the linguistic competence is simulated (modeled, "reproduced") by two kinds of active dictionaries - of synonymous expressions (cf. *I want to emphasize - It is important*), and in combinatory ones. The most prominent example of the latter is "The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English" [1986].

Combinatory dictionaries represent lexical and grammatical combinatory preferences - which are selective, language specific and ethno specific, as they are motivated by the national mentality and national experience in world conceptualization: national mentality is imprinted in the language and in the way it is used - in words collocations, combinations and co-occurrences in discourse. That is why the idiomatics of discourse collocations is most difficult for a foreigner to acquire.

My personal undertaking in this domain is a compilation of a "Combinatory dictionary of English scientific collocations". It registers combinatory - grammatical, lexical and rhetorical - peculiarities of general scientific notions in English and the most typical patterns of academic style, so that to assist scientists in writing their articles in English. It can be used either when generating a scientific paper, translating it, or when teaching how to do it correctly.

\* \* \*

(\*\*\*\*\*) N.Riabtseva. **STUDYING LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE AND TEACHING TRANSLATION // Second International Conference on Current Trends in Studies of Translation and Interpreting. Abstracts. Budapest, 1996, pp. 91–92.**

The theory of translation has its own traditional topics of research and is rather autonomous of general linguistics, often ignoring even its most prominent conceptions. "The theory of linguistic competence" is one of them (cf. Yu. Apresjan, I. Melchuk, A. Zholkovsky).

Linguistic competence is a prominent feature characteristic to subconscious human intelligence. It is a composition of four major linguistic abilities revealing a native speaker, the most intricate of which is the ability to subconsciously combine words idiomatically in discourse. Combinatory preferences are selective and language specific; for example, in English we *follow smb's words*, but in Russian we "follow *after* them". From interlinguistic, translational point of view, most part of word combinations in discourse turn to be idiomatic, as they can't be translated word by word. Combinatory preferences expose how native speakers combine words idiomatically in discourse; but this very task causes main troubles in translating into a foreign language. The main difficulty here is that a native speaker does it subconsciously, while acquiring it by a foreigner needs to consciously realize it first, and only then make it "automated".

Words co-occurrence in discourse has become a matter of lexicographic description since 1986, when "The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English" appeared. Dictionaries of that type are called active as they help to generate speech, in contrast to its passive understanding. Another component of linguistic competence is the ability of a native speaker to express one and the same meaning in different (various) ways. It is simulated by another type of an active dictionary - in a dictionary of synonymous expressions. Two dictionaries of this type have been already published in Russia, under the editorship of Yu. Apresjan. But the lexicographic approach is not the only one, which could benefit from the underlying linguistic conception. Through its assimilation the theory of translation would as well substantially promote and update its practical applications, teaching translation among them.



My personal undertaking in this area is a compilation of “A combinatory dictionary of English scientific collocations”. It registers combinatory - grammatical, lexical and rhetorical - peculiarities of general scientific notions and the most typical patterns of academic style, so that to assist scientists in writing their articles in English. It can be used either when generating a text, translating it, or when teaching how to do it correctly.

\* \* \*

**(\*\*\*\*\*) List of some other publications in English by the same author**

1. *N. Riabtseva*. TRANSLATION AS A SPECIAL TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND ITS THEORETICAL MODEL // Grundlage der Translationstheorie. Abstracts of an Intern. Conf. Leipzig, 1986.
2. *N. Riabtseva*. MACHINE TRANSLATION OUTPUT AND TRANSLATION THEORY // Computers and Translation. 1987, N. 3.
3. *N. Riabtseva*. TRANSLATION AS A SPECIAL TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND ITS THEORETICAL MODEL // Übersetzungswissenschaftliche Beiträge. N.11: Semantik, Kognition und Äquivalenz. Leipzig, 1988.
4. *N. Riabtseva*. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND FOR INTERLINGUISTIC INTERFERENCE // Übersetzungswissenschaftliche Beiträge. 12. Leipzig, 1989.
5. *N. Riabtseva*. ON TRANSLATION OF POLYSEMANTIC GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES // Übersetzungswissenschaft und Sprachmittlerausbildung. Akten der 1 Intern. Conf., Berlin, Mai 1988. Berlin 1990. Band 2.
6. *N. Riabtseva*. SCIENTIFIC COLLOCATIONAL PATTERNS IN COMPUTER SYSTEM "VERSION" // Colloq. Intern. "Phraseologie et Terminologie en traduction et en interprétation". Abstracts. Swiss, Geneva, October, 1991, p. 46.
7. *N. Riabtseva*. ACADEMIC STYLE: TEACHING, TRANSLATING, INVESTIGATING // International Conference "Lingua e Tecnologia". Abstracts. Italy, Florence, December 1991.
8. *N. Riabtseva*. METADISOURSE COLLOCATIONS IN SCIENTIFIC TEXTS AND TRANSLATION PROBLEMS: CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS // Traduction et terminologie. 1992, N. 2-3. LUXEMBURG, 1993, pp. 375-386.
9. *N. Riabtseva*. COMBINATORY DICTIONARIES: COMPUTER ASSISTANCE IN TEACHING AND PRACTICING TRANSLATION // East-West Intern. Conf. "Computer Technologies in Education". Sympheropol, Sept. 1994. Proceedings, v 2, pp. 86-89.
10. *N. Riabtseva*. ENGLISH FOR SCIENTIFIC PURPOSES. GUIDE TO ACADEMIC WRITING. COMBINATORY DICTIONARY OF SCIENTIFIC USAGE. Moscow, Nauka-Flinta, 1999; 2-d ed. 2002; 3-d ed. 2004; 4-th ed. 2006.

\* \* \*