

KAZGUU LIBERAL ARTS DIGEST

VOLUME 03
MAY 2022



“KLAD” is a student journal first published at M. Narikbayev Kazguu University School of liberal arts. This journal is aimed at enhancing students’ involvement into science and research.



INFORMATION ABOUT THE JOURNAL

“KLAD” is a student journal first published at M. Narikbayev Kazguu University School of liberal arts. This journal is aimed at enhancing students’ involvement into science and research.

«KLAD” journal admits for publication various types of articles: original research, review articles, short reports or essays, reflections, case studies, methodologies and cases in english; containing the results of fundamental and applied research in the field of philosophy and identity, history of kazakhstan, pedagogy, linguistics and methods of teaching languages, translation, and tourism.

CONTENTS


WHAT ARE THE EXPERIENCES OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN TERMS OF LINGUISTIC ADAPTATION	7
Kussainova Zarina	
HUMOUR IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING: A CASE OF EURASIAN MEDIA FORUM IN KAZAKHSTAN	14
Mukanbednyarova Madina	
TRANSLATION OF EMPHATIC CONSTRUCTIONS FROM ENGLISH INTO RUSSIAN: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATIONS OF JACK LONDON'S NOVEL MARTIN EDEN	25
Khamidullova Mergul	
STRATEGIC DOING: TEN SKILLS FOR AGILE LEADERSHIP	37
Abilkaiyr A.T.	
THE 360 DEGREE LEADER: DEVELOPING YOUR INFLUENCE FROM ANYWHERE IN THE ORGANIZATION BY JOHN MAXWELL	40
Amanzhol R. S., Nurakhmetova A. Zh.	
LEADERSHIP SECRETS OF THE WORLD'S MOST SUCCESSFUL CEOS" BY ERIC YAVERBAUM	43
Muratova Assylzhan	
SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN ACTION: HOW YOU CAN ACHIEVE GREAT RELATIONSHIP AND RESULTS	45
Gazizova Samal, Prmagambetova Diana	

START WITH WHY: HOW GREAT LEADERS INSPIRE EVERYONE TO TAKE ACTION	48
Kudaibergenova R.S., Koigeldiyeva A.A.	
LEADERSHIP IS LANGUAGE: THE HIDDEN POWER OF WHAT YOU SAY - AND WHAT YOU DON'T" BY L. DAVID MARQUET	50
Kurbanova D.G.	
LEADERSHIP STRATEGY AND TACTICS: FIELD MANUAL BY JOCKO WILLINK	53
Serikov Alisher, Temirgali Bakytzhan, Yesbatyrova Zhuldyz	
LEADERSHIP AND SELF-DECEPTION. GETTING OUT OF THE BOX» BY AUTHORS OF ARBINGER INSTITUTE	56
Baltabay D.G	
YOUNG PEOPLE DON'T WORK BY CHOSEN SPECIALTy	61
GRADS UNEMPLOYMENT BY THEIR SPECIALITY	64
HOW TO PREVENT THE HIGH NUMBER OF SUICIDES AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE STRUGGLING WITH THE UNT EXAM FAILURE?	67
Kappassova Dinara	
FAKE NEWS CAUSING ISSUES ON DIFFERENT SOCIAL LEVELS	70
Makhsumova Arina	
Members of Editorial Board	73



PART 01

KAZGUU LIBERAL ARTS DIGEST
RESEARCH
PAPERS



TRANSLATION OF EMPHATIC CONSTRUCTIONS FROM ENGLISH INTO RUSSIAN: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATIONS OF JACK LONDON'S NOVEL MARTIN EDEN

KHAMIDULLOVA MERGUL

Abstract: There is a number of studies which focus on the expressive means of language and their translation. Emphatic constructions are one of those, and they play a pivotal role in accentuating a part of the sentence. However, translating this type of emphasis-putting structures is considered a challenge owing to diverse aspects. Therefore, this study strived for analyzing what translation transformations are used when translating emphatic constructions from English into Russian language. To do that, with the help of purposive sampling, the novel by Jack London *Martin Eden* was chosen. In this novel, the types of emphatic constructions which were found served as pre-established codes in analyzing the gathered data using conceptual content analysis. This way, 215 extracts containing emphatic constructions were detected in the source text together with their Russian counterparts in three target texts by Zayackii (1929), Kalashnikova (1955) and Oblonskaya (1984). The results depicted that although not all, but the greater number of translation transformations from Komissarov and Barkhudarov's categorization were used.

Key words: emphatic constructions, translation transformations, emphasis, translation.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of emphasis has already been examined by many authors (Collins, 1991; Hedberg, 1990; Pushinina, 2009; Volek, 1977). Thus, broadly speaking, it is understood to mean the "special importance that is given to something" (Oxford Learner's Dictionary, n.d.). A more precise linguistic formulation of emphasis which was advanced by Great Soviet Encyclopedia, however, alludes to "highlighting independent elements and shades of meaning of the utterance ... which is reached by various means" (Academic.ru, n.d.). These contain prosodic (changes in intonation) and lexico-semantic means such as intensifying functional words, neutral-distinct word order, repetitions and emphatic constructions (Academic.ru, n.d.).

The current study focused on the latter of the abovementioned means of emphasis, i.e., on emphatic constructions, because, apparently, research in the sphere of their translation is subtle. Moreover, translating these constructions is thought to be problematic (Parshukova and Telitsyna, 2018). Therefore, this work aims at discussing as well as comparing the ways of translation of emphatic constructions. To attain these goals, answering research questions is needed: first, what techniques do translators use to reach adequacy in Russian; and second, to what extent do these techniques vary in Russian translated texts.

In English, emphatic structures fall into several categories: It is ... that clefts, What ... is pseudo-clefts and other types

of clefts, verb do which is placed before the notional verb, inversion as well as inversion with negative adverbs, and double negation (Collins, 1991; Hedberg, 1990; Levitskaya & Fiterman, 1972; Shanaeva, 1989; Sokolova, 2008; Zinatullin & Chibisova, 2009). Whereas in Russian, classification of emphatic constructions includes intensifying particles and adverbs, negation, inversion, using conjunctions and particles, singling-out-constructions (Korovkina, 2016; Kuchkina, 2021; Volek, 1977). I classified the English and Russian emphatic constructions under one unified group presented in table 1 below.

Table 1

English and Russian Emphatic Constructions

Russian Emphatic Constructions	English Emphatic Constructions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> intensifying particles and adverbs negation and double negation inversion conjunctions and particles anteposition singling-out-constructions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clefts pseudo-clefts other types of clefts emphatic do inversion inversion with adverbials double negation

Taking a closer look at each means of emphatic constructions from both groups, it is noticeable that there are three categories of cleft sentences. Basically, each and every of them is made up of similar parts. That is, a sentence being “cleaved” and having two components, namely, the main and the subordinate. In such manner, pronoun it and the verb to be in a particular tense are ordered in the main clause. Following that, the part of the sentence before subordinate clause is termed as the “clefted constituent” or “the focus” (Hedberg, 1990, p. 1). Needless to say, it is this part where

the emphasis is put. On the other hand, the subordinate part is started with that. Nonetheless, wh-words appropriate in meaning are used as well: It is Martin Eden who became a writer and It is Martin Eden that became a writer. Studies have also advanced that diverse parts of the sentence may be put under focus, i.e., Martin Eden, became, and a writer (Gerald, 1984).

Secondly, pseudo-clefts, which are sometimes referred to as wh-clefts, demonstrably, begin with wh-question words. However, what makes these clefts diverse from the aforementioned one is its feature of variability in structure. To be more accurate, these two sentences are correct: What Martin Eden did was becoming a writer or Becoming a writer was what Martin Eden did.

Last but not least, Pushinina (2009) and Collins (1991) presented a supplemental group of cleaved sentences. Namely, The (only) thing and All ... is: The thing he did was becoming a writer and All he did was becoming a writer.

Interestingly, apart from being used in questions and negatives, the verb to do is placed in emphatic contexts as well. Hence, this verb accords an intensifying and highlighted effect to the focused part of the sentence (Hedberg, 1990). By this means, put in proper form and tense, verb to do stands ahead of the notional verb. To illustrate, Martin Eden did become a writer.

It goes without saying that inversion is attributable to permuted word order. Therefore, it results in a sentence having an emphasized part, too (Znamenskaya, 2008). Moreover, this type of emphatic constructions is put subsequent to adverbs with a negative connotation, like never ..., no sooner ... than, hardly ... when, only ... when (Slepovich, 2006; Suleimanova et al., 2010).

Finally, double negation is considered a type of emphatic construction where a negation not is paired with a negative prefix

in adverbs or adjectives (un-, in-, ir-, etc.). From this perspective, the meaning of the sentence convert into affirmative (Andreeva & Pushkin, 2016).

Indisputably, any language is in possession of evocative instruments which are conducive to strengthening the language making it more colorful. However, as a matter of fact, each language does it in their own special way. Although the translator is in control of conveying the meaning of a source text thoroughly and to the fullest extent, of course, it brings about peculiar obstacles in the translation process (Parshukova & Telitsyna, 2018; Sokolova, 2008; Zinatullin & Chibisova, 2009). As Parshukova and Telitsyna (2018) presented in their work, the problems include lexicosemantic (which concern terminological alternation), grammatical, syntax (which emerge in inversion, for instance), rhetoric (figures), pragmatic (differentiating between official and unofficial language styles) and intercultural. The reason for confronting those problems is that English and Russian are composed of diverse language systems and rules (Parshukova and Telitsyna, 2018). This, in turn, accounts for distinction in conveying meaning not to mention emphasis-making structures. Thus, with the purpose of addressing translation process constraints, there is a need for translators to put forward the relevant strategies. In this vein, the present work is designed to come up with the translation techniques which are applicable in the translation of emphatic constructions. In an attempt to do this, Jack London's 1909 novel *Martin Eden* was adopted as a source text (ST) and translations by Zayaickii (1929), Kalshnikova (1955) and Oblonskaya (1984) as target texts (TZ, TK, TO respectively). Moreover, bearing in mind the aforementioned necessity, Komissarov (1990) and Barkhudarov's (1975) translation transformations were also instrumental in conducting this research. These include semantic (lexical), grammatical and lexicogrammatical (complex) translation transformations. To recall, semantic transformations are

transcription and transliteration, calque translation, specification and generalization, modulation, omission, and lexical additions. Grammatical transformations consist of literal translation, sentence portioning and integration, as well as grammar compensations. Lastly, antonymic and descriptive translation, and compensation are unified as complex translation transformations.

METHODOLOGY

Sampling strategy applied in the current study was purposive, so as to "help the researcher understand ... the research question" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, as cited in Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p. 262). Thus, *Martin Eden* was chosen to examine the ways of translation of emphatic constructions from English into Russian. This qualitative research has also used conceptual content analysis for analyzing the gathered data. Furthermore, to collect data taking note of emphasis-specific structures, extracts were first gathered via keyboard search shortcut. This way, approximately 60% of all emphatic constructions were found. However, this strategy came down to ethical problem of incompleteness of emphatic constructions exploration. Thus, scanning the whole book allowed for full data gathering. In this regard, 215 sentences with entire types of emphatic constructions presented before were put together on the list. Moreover, as this study is comparative, three translations were then contrasted with each other to identify the differences in translators' transformation choices.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

Analysis of emphatic constructions and their Russian equivalents depicts that most frequent means of expressing emphasis were cleft sentences and inversion .

EMPHATIC CONSTRUCTIONS BY FREQUENCY

Furthermore, when collecting the translated data, it was found that 66%, i.e., 142, TZs and TKs were done with a hundred-percent similarity. That is why, transformations used for translation in those cases are identical, and this will be seen in some examples below.

WAYS OF TRANSLATION OF EMPHATIC CONSTRUCTIONS

Cleft sentences totaled for 64 examples which are structured with the use of present and past tense forms. To translate this type of emphatic constructions, translators utilized grammar compensations for the most part. These compensations include parts of speech as conjunctions, particles *именно*, *вот*, *как раз*, *ведь* and prepositions. Moreover, word order and sentence type changes were detected as well. Another often used transformation was lexical addition of intensifying particles, pronoun *такой*, and conjunctions.

To illustrate:

ST: Yet it was right here, in his reticence, that the strength of his wooing lay. It was because of this reticence that he never alarmed her.

TZ: Но именно сознание этой невозможности и сдержанность, им обусловленная, незаметно для самого Мартина, вели его к цели. Благодаря этой сдержанности он ни разу не возбудил в Руфи тревоги. (grammar compensation with particle *именно*; in the second sentence, cleft part was omitted)

TK: Но именно сдержанность незаметно для самого Мартина вела его к цели. Благодаря своей сдержанности он ни разу не возбудил в Руфи тревоги. (cleft is translated in the same way as in TZ)

TO: Однако именно в этой сдержанности и таилась сила его обаяния. Имен-

но благодаря своей сдержанности он и не отпугивал Руфь. (in both sentences, grammar compensation with particle *именно* and lexical addition of conjunction *и* were used)

As it is seen from the example, this result is consistent with Levitskaya and Fiterman's (1972) work who stated that not only *именно* is utilized in translation of clefts.

The second mostly used emphatic construction was inversion with 62 extracts. Similarly, grammar compensations and lexical additions were of utmost usage in rendering inversion. Nevertheless, let us consider another translation transformations such as sentence integration, specification and modulation, which were the least used in this case. For instance:

ST: He did not play at school. Nor did he study.

TZ and TK translated this sentence similarly: В школе он уже не мог играть, забросил ученье. (sentence integration, modulation of the second part)

TO: В школе он не играл, и не учился тоже. (sentence integration, lexical addition of conjunctions *и* and *тоже*)

Although it was proposed that inversion is typical to both Russian and English, the results did not reveal many cases of translating English inversion using Russian inversion.

The next emphatic construction on the list (32 extracts) is verb to do which again was translated with the help of diverse compensations in grammar: using adverb, particles, adjectives, pronouns and conjunctions; changes in word order, tenses and voice, as well. Apart from those, lexical additions, omissions, compensations, and modulations. Example with specification and omission is:

ST: He found no such statement, but he did find that which made him suddenly wilt.

TZ and ТК: Этого объяснения он не нашел, но зато прочел нечто такое, что внезапно поразило его, как удар грома (lexical addition of conjunction зато, specification of the verb find using прочел).

ТО: Такого объяснения он не нашел, зато нашел нечто, отчего разом сник (omission of emphasis).

Most importantly, intensifying particles and adverbs did show that they are of service in emphasis translations since these data are conforming with what theorists presented in their works (Levitskaya & Fiterman, 1972; Korovkina, 2016).

Showing 23 cases out of 215, pseudo-clefts appear next by frequency. These made use of lexical additions, compensations, grammar compensations, omissions, specifications, and literal translation transformations. The following extract, for example, utilized omission of emphasis in pair with compensation to transfer the meaning:

ST: What he heard was no longer the philosophy of the dry, printed word, written by half-mythical demigods like Kant and Spencer.

TZ and ТК: Это не была сухая философия печатного слова, созданная мифическими полубогами вроде Канта и Спенсера.

ТО: Философия перестала быть сухими печатными строчками из книг легендарных полубогов вроде Канта и Спенсера.

In both cases, the units of emphasis of the source language which were lost in translation were replenished with different structures.

On top of that, inversion with negative adverbs including never, no sooner ... than, only when ... that are considered as emphatic constructions, and they occurred 17 times. This is in line with studies such as by Suleimannova et al. (2010) and

Slepovich's (2006). Besides, Slepovich (2006) presented that this group of emphatic structures is predominantly translated by literal translation transformation, like here:

ST: ...but scarcely had he taken his position on the edge of the sidewalk when the two girls appeared.

TZ: ...но едва он занял свою наблюдательную позицию, как появились те две девушки.

ТК: но едва он занял удобное место на краю тротуара, - появились те две девушки.

ТО: но едва занял место на краю тротуара, как появились обе девушки.

Moreover, lexical additions of particles as *ведь*, *еще*, grammar compensations of word order, specifications and generalizations were of use.

The following empathic construction with 10 cases is double negation which mainly made the most of compensation, grammar compensation, literal translation, as well as specification and lexical addition transformations. By way of an illustration:

ST: His sadness was not untouched with bitterness as he thought it over.

TZ and ТК: Он думал об этом с грустью и с горечью (generalization, i.e., a more general meaning).

ТО: Мартин думал обо всем этом, и печаль его окрасилась горечью (compensation with a metaphor).

Last but not least, All- and The (only) thing-clefts were extracted only seven times from the source text. Therefore, it substantiated ideas of Pushinina (2009) and Collins (1991). These clefts were rendered by means of antonymic translation, lexical additions, grammar compensations by the most part. For instance:

ST: All you have to do is wait and see.

TZ and TK: Ты должна только ждать. А там увидишь! (antonymic translation with using restrictive particle только, sentence portioning)

TO: Вот подожди – и увидишь. (grammar compensation with particle вот and compensation)

To conclude, this section provided information on the ways of translation of each emphatic construction which was presented by frequency of appearing in the source text.

CASES WITH DOUBLE EMPHATIC CONSTRUCTIONS

Findings gathered from the data have put on view that there are extracts which contain two types of emphatic constructions. These entirely were searched out in emphatic do type. To show:

ST: What I do ask of you is to love me and have faith in love. (emphatic do together with pseudo-cleft)

TZ and TK: Единственное, о чем я вас прошу, - это верить в мою любовь и любить меня по-прежнему. (grammar compensation with The only thing-cleft)

TO: Об одном прошу: люби меня и верь в любовь (omission of pseudo-cleft, grammar compensation using preposition and number)

As it can be distinguishable, Zayaickii and Kalashnikova attempted to translate the ST example compensating it with another type of cleft sentence. It is worth mentioning that samples with emphatic construction being translated with the use of another emphatic constructions were also identified. These will be subject to an examination in the following section.

Yet another ST example with double emphasis is: All that he did know was that a climacteric in his life had been attained.

TZ: Он знал только: в жизни его наступил перелом. (grammar compensation with the use of particle только)

TK: Он знал только одно: какой-то этап в его жизни пришел к концу и нужно было закруглить фразу, прежде чем поставить точку. (grammar compensation using particle только, lexical addition of a number одно)

TO: Знал только, что в жизни его наступил перелом. (grammar compensation using particle только)

In short, results revealed that within the types of emphatic constructions presented earlier, extracts have one more type of construction in it. Thus, this section presented the ways of translating double emphatic constructions.

EMPHATIC CONSTRUCTIONS IN TRANSLATIONS

As far as translation is concerned, to translate a slight share of emphatic constructions, translators applied grammar compensations other than changes in part of speech or word order and so forth, but grammatical substitutions with other types of emphasis. For instance, in the example below, pseudo-cleft was rendered by means of All-cleft:

ST: What I want to know is whether or not you will put a thousand dollars in on this deal?

TZ and TK: Все, что я хочу знать – это вложите вы тысячу долларов в мое предприятие или нет? (this Russian emphatic sentence is translated literally from English All-cleft)

Furthermore, the ST example with inversion was translated by compensation with inversion plus negative adverb: Nor did she waste time in coming to the point, upbraiding him sorrowfully for what he had done.

TK: Едва успела она войти, как начала

горько упрекать его за неуместный поступок.

Meanwhile, in this ST, negation was applied to translate inversion: ... but not one hint did they breathe of intention to pay him for it.

TZ: Но ни один не высказал ни малейшего желанья выразить свой восторг более существенным способом.

TK: Но ни один из троих не выказал ни малейшего намерения заплатить ему причитающиеся деньги.

In short, this section showed a small fraction of examples found from the data which have been translated using emphatic construction distinct from that in the original sentence.

COMPARISON OF TRANSLATIONS

Taking into consideration the transformations for translation of each type of emphatic constructions by different translators, it is observable from the data that there are only slight distinctions between their choices. Firstly, for example, in translation of emphatic do, all three translators used these transformations by frequency as follows: grammar compensations, lexical addition, omission, compensation, modulation. However, Zayaickii and Kalashnikova depicted using two cases of one more transformation which is specification.

As for clefts, translation choices are grammar compensation, omission, lexical addition, compensation, generalization and specification, literal translation, sentence portioning and modulation. What differentiates three translations is that Oblonskaya did not make use of specification and generalization strategies. For example, in the next sample, she rather used grammar compensation with the use of именно and lexical addition of conjunction и, whereas TZ and TK omitted translating focused constituent:

ST: It was his old spirit of humor and

badinage that had made him a favorite in his own class, ...

TZ and TK: Это сказывался его природный юмор, за который его всегда любили товарищи, ... (omission of emphasis, specification of was using сказывался)

TO: Именно веселые шутки, способность добродушно подтрунивать и сделали его любимцем в своем кругу, ...

All- and The (only) thing-clefts were translated by lexical additions and antonymic translations mostly, then literal translation and compensation in all three works. Besides, Kalashnikova and Zayaickii utilized omission, whereas in contrast, Oblonskaya translated with grammar compensation:

ST: But the thing I'm after is I liked it.

TZ and TK: И мне понравилось (omission of emphasis).

TO: Ну, и, стало быть, нравится мне это (lexical addition of interjection ну and parenthesis, стало быть, grammar compensation of word order and verb tense)

The succeeding cleft type to take into account is pseudo-clefts. In this case, TO only partially share the same transformations by frequency. If TZ and TK utilized specifications more than omissions, Oblonskaya did it contrariwise:

ST: What I want is to be paid for what I do.

TO: Я желаю получить что положено за свою работу. (omission of emphasis, and compensation)

TZ and TK: Я требую, чтобы вы мне заплатили за мою работу, и больше ничего. (lexical addition of больше ничего, and specification of want using требую)

Transformations involved in inversions translation in each of works are grammar compensation, lexical addition, literal translation, omission, generalization, sentence integration, and modulation.

Withal, differences are (a) in the use of compensation, i.e., TO made less use of this transformation; (b) in specification and antonymic translation. Thus, so as to give substance to (a), the following example is to be explained:

ST: Not alone did it give him the same dark and murky aspect of the Silva house, inside and out, but it seemed to emphasize that animal-like strength of his which she detested.

TZ and TK: От щетины на подбородке и щеках оно казалось таким же мрачным и грязным, как все жилище Сильвы, и в нем еще усиливалось ненавистное Руфи выражение животной силы. (compensation of the lost emphatic colour)

TO: Это не только делало его таким же мрачным, нечистым, как домишко Сильва снаружи и изнутри, но, казалось, подчеркивало в нем животную силу, так ненавистную Руфи. (literal translation)

In addition, the next example is to attest (b):

ST: ... nor did he dream that in the world there were few pale spirits of women ...

TZ and TK: ... ему не приходило в голову, что на свете не так уж много нашлось бы женщин (omission and compensation)

TO: ему и в мысль не пришло, что немного найдется на свете бледноликих фей ... (grammar compensation of emphasis using conjunction и and changes in word order)

In essence, along with previous emphatic constructions, inversion in pair with negative adverbs was translated with the aid of literal translation, lexical addition, specification, and, lastly, grammar compensation. However, unlike TO, TZ and TK used antonymic translation like in this example:

ST: Never had she seen him so angry...

TZ and TK: Она впервые видела его в таком неистовстве ... (antonymic translation)

TO: Никогда еще не видела она его в такой ярости ... (literal translation, lexical addition of particle еще)

As a final point, TZ and TK utilized less grammar compensations and literal translations in comparison with TO, which is contradictory to the usage of compensation transformation. That is, seven and five cases in TZ and TK respectively alongside only three cases in TO. To illustrate:

ST: "Yes, I ain't no invalid," he said

TZ and TK: Да, я вообще здоров, как бык. (compensation of the meaning with a metaphor)

TO: Верно, я не хилый, – сказал он. (literal translation)

Moreover, contrasting with Oblonskaya, TZ and TK generalized the sentence to render the example which was listed in the previous section.

In conclusion, this section shed light on some similarities and differences in translated works.

CONCLUSION

To answer what techniques were used by translators and how do they differ from one another, the current research aimed at delving into the means of translation of emphatic constructions from English into Russian based on the material of Jack London's 1909 novel *Martin Eden*. For that purpose, lexical, grammatical and complex translation transformations provided by Komissarov and Barkhudarov were made use of. Following that, the results indicated that translation transformations from all three groups are used. To be more precise, lexical transformations were specification and generalization, lexical additions, modulation as well as omission. Whereas grammatical ones comprised literal translation, sentence portioning and integration, and grammar compensations. Lastly, lexica-grammatical transformations were antonymic translation

and compensation. On top of that, the data depicted two more points to touch upon. First is that there is a possibility for using one emphatic construction along with the other.

Secondly, a small group of emphatic constructions was translated by employing a spare type of those. These results answer research question number one. However, to answer the second question, in comparison of translations, the similarities and discrepancies are provided.

As a consequence, the conclusions drawn from the present study may contribute to many areas. Firstly, apparently, there were no studies concerning the analysis of translations of emphatic constructions. Thus, this study was an attempt to fulfil the gap. Secondly, the unified classification of English emphatic constructions may be applicable in teaching or in researching this topic. Moreover, the results of the study may help translators practice professional skills in literary translation.

To put in a nutshell, the section above attempted to present the recapitulation of the study along with a number of possible contributions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I count it honor to extend my thanks and gratitude to my supervisor, senior lecturer, Olga Yuryevna Bainova for her kind encouragement and invaluable advice. Her feedback throughout the research process has truly inspired me.

REFERENCES

Andreeva, E.V., & Pushkin, A.A. (2016). Once Again on The Issue of Double Negation in English and Chuvash. *Gramota*, 8(62), 81-84.

Barkhudarov, L. S. (1975). *Yazyk i perevod* [Language and translation]. International Relations Publisher.

Collins, P.C. (1991). *Cleft and Pseudo-Cleft Constructions in English*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315688510>

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage. Los Angeles.

Gerald, D. (1984). The analysis of English cleft sentences. *Linguistic analysis*, 13(2), 63-113.

Great Soviet Encyclopedia (n.d.). *Emfaza* [Emphasis]. In *Academic.ru*. <https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/bse/154003/%D0%AD%D0%BC%D1%84%D0%B0%D0%B7%D0%B0>

Hedberg N.A. (1990). *Discourse Pragmatics and Cleft Sentences in English* [PhD thesis, University of Minnesota]. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336485505_Discourse_Pragmatics_and_Cleft_Sentences_in_English?channel=doi&linkId=5da2a8dd45851553ff8c2c91&showFulltext=true

Komissarov, V. N. (1990). *Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty)* [Theory of translation (linguistic aspects)]. High School.

Korovkina, M. E. (2016). *Ways of Overcoming Dissimilarities in the Stylistic Devices Used in The English and Russian Languages in the Process of Translation*. *Vestnik of Moscow State Linguistic University*, 11(750), 13-24.

Kuchkina, A. S. (2021). *Osobennosti perevoda russkikh emfaticeskikh konstrukcii na angliiskii yazyk (na materiale pravitelstvennykh saitov)* [Features of Translation of Russian Emphatic Constructions into English (on the material of government websites)]. In Suleimenova, O. A. (Ed.), *V mnogomernom prostranstve sovremennoi lingvistiki* [In the multidimensional space of modern linguistics] (pp. 112-118). Printika.

Kvasova, L., Podvalny, S., & Safonova, O.

(2016). Professional English for Computing. KNORUS.

Levitskaya, T., Fiterman, A. (1972). O nekotorykh sposobakh vyrazheniya emfazy v angliiskom yazyke [On some ways of expressing emphasis in English]. In Barkhudarov, L. S. (Ed.), Tetradi perevodchika [Translator's notebooks] (pp. 34-45). IMO.

Oxford Learner's Dictionary. (n.d.). Emphasis. In Oxford Learner's Dictionary. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/emphasis?q=emphasis>

Parshukova, M. M., & Telitsyna, E. L. (2018). Stylistic Peculiarities of Literary Text Translation (by the Example of the Novels "Martin Eden" By Jack London And "The Master and Margarita" By M. A. Bulgakov). *Philology. Theory & Practice*, 6(84), 144-149.

Pushinina, I.V. (2009). *Rasshcheplennye predlozheniya kak sredstvo vydvizheniya v angloyazychnom diskurse* [Cleft sentences as a means of promotion in English-language discourse] [Doctoral dissertation, Moscow state pedagogic university]. *DissertCat*. <https://www.dissertcat.com/content/rasshcheplennye-predlozheniya-kak-sredstvo-vydvizheniya-v-angloyazychnom-diskurse>

Shanaeva, N. V. (1989). *Osnovnye grammaticheskie trudnosti v angliiskom yazyke* [Basic grammar issues in the English language]. Nauka.

Slepovich, V. S. (2006). *English Translation Handbook*. TetraSystems.

Sokolova, L. A. (2008). *Grammaticheskiye trudnosti perevoda s angliiskogo yazyka na russkii* [Grammatical issues of translation from English into Russian]. *Vyshshaya shkola*.

Suleimanova, O.A., Beklemesheva N.N., & Kardanova K.S. (2010). *Stilisticheskie aspekty perevoda* [Stylistic aspects of translation]. *Akademiya*.

Volek, B. (1977). Certain Emphatic Constructions in Spanish, Czech and Russian. *Folia Linguistica*, 10(1-2), 169-180.

Zinatullin, V. Sh., Chibisova, E. Yu. (2009). *Emphasis in English Scientific Literature: Ways of Expression and Principles of Translation*. *Philology. Theory & Practice*, 2(4), 129-133.

Znamenskaya, T.A. (2008). *Stylistics of the English language*. URSS.