Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo

A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

Abstract

Within functional approaches to translation theory, several models have been developed for describing the pragmatic features of a text in order to derive translation choices from this description. However, the text level does not sufficiently account for pragmatic phenomena tied to specific lexical items or grammatical constructions. For example, a speaker may refer to shared prior knowledge by using expressions such as *wie Sie wissen* ('as you know') or the German adverb *bekanntlich* (roughly 'as is known'). We model this function by means of pragmatic frames, building on the tradition of Fillmorean frame semantics, and assume *bekanntlich* to regularly evoke the pragmatic frame Gemeinsames_Vorwissen ('common ground'). It models a speaker claiming some CONTENT to be prior knowledge shared by the COGNIZERS who are participants of the communication situation, including the addressee(s). In English-German parallel corpora from the EU domain, we find cases where the speaker/writer refers to only themselves as the COGNIZER, indicating awareness of a fact. This usage of *bekanntlich* is motivated semantically rather than pragmatically and evokes the lexical-semantic frame Gewahrsein_Status ('awareness status'). On top of modelling pragmatic meaning, we demonstrate how to use a frame-based approach for differentiating between semantic and pragmatic uses of an expression.

1   Semantic and pragmatic meaning in translation theory

In Translation Studies, it is a widely formulated stance that meaning is the guiding factor in translation (Baker 1992: 10; Halverson 1997; Cronin 2013: 128; Vandevoorde 2020: 1). This raises a number of questions, only two of which we will briefly touch upon here.

First, it begs the question what is entailed by 'meaning'. We believe that this cannot be determined once and for all for each and every approach and/or purpose. While we understand meaning very broadly, including, i. a., conceptual, aesthetic and emotional aspects, in this contribution out of these aspects we focus on the conceptual part, i. e., the kind of meaning that can be recorded in a schematic way describing categories of experience.

Second, a methodological question is how to describe the conceptual meaning – to which we will hitherto refer as semantics – in an accessible and operationalizable way. We will make use of frame semantics (Fillmore 1982, 1985) to describe this notion of

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
*A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation*

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 131

meaning (see Section 2). We also subscribe to basic assumptions of frame semantics such as that our categories of experience will mostly be prototypical.

As for the first question raised above, a broad view of meaning may include the pragmatic level. Pragmatics indeed is a factor that has received wide attention in Translation Studies, under the umbrella of functional translation theories.

Within functional approaches to translation theory, the text is considered the primary unit of translation. Several models developed for describing the pragmatically relevant features of a text and its situational setting (House 1997; Nord 2009) propose to derive individual translation choices from the functional characterisation of the text and the communication situation as a whole. As a simple example: The distance between sender and receiver of a message will determine the address to be chosen in the target language, where source and target language may have different systems of expressing, e. g., politeness. In some cases, these pragmatic textual factors may even motivate additions or deletions: In the English version of a shareholder letter, for instance, emotive expressions such as "No way!" may be acceptable, whereas in German these might be left out or replaced by a more neutral expression (Čulo 2011: 82).

However, not all pragmatic phenomena can be fully accounted for by textual factors. Instead, they may be rather independent of the overall text and may be tied to specific lexical items or grammatical constructions. A case in point is the phenomenon of a speaker referring to shared prior knowledge of the participants of the communication situation. This pragmatic function can be realised by expressions such as *wie Sie wissen* ('as you know'; cf. Staffeldt 2011) or the German adverb *bekanntlich* (roughly: 'as is known').[1]

(1) a. EU citizens, as we know, are travelling more than ever, not least as tourists.
    b. Die EU-Bürger reisen bekanntlich mehr denn je, nicht zuletzt als Touristen.
       lit.: The EU citizens travel, as is known, more than ever, not least as tourists.

In some cases, however, the use of *bekanntlich* relates to the underlying semantics of the expression, deviating from the expected pragmatic use:

(2) a. It is known that that nomenclature does not cover all special export refund cases but the Commission does not require that kind of detail.
    b. In diesem Verzeichnis sind bekanntlich nicht alle Sonderfälle bei den Ausfuhrerstattungen abgedeckt, die Kommission benötigt diese Details jedoch nicht.
       lit. In this index, as is known, not all special export refund cases are covered, the Commission does not need these details, though.

While in example (1) "bekanntlich" refers to some information that is (presumably) shared between the participants in the communication situation, in example (2) the adverb serves to denote some information that is known to the writer of the utterance. We

---

[1] In the translation examples, the source will be given first, then the translation. A literal translation of German sentences into English is given in italics.

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
*A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation*

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 132

classify the latter use as semantic use of *bekanntlich*, expressing the awareness status of a sender with respect to some information.

Using parallel corpora, we investigate the pragmatics and semantics of *bekanntlich* and its use in relation to functionally similar expressions in English-German translation. The translation-related characterizations of non-text-centric pragmatic phenomena are not quite as well evolved as the text-centric methods; studies such as Čulo (2016), Menzel, Lapshinova-Koltunski and Kunz (2017) and Kranich and Pankova (2018) serve as contributions in this vein for the language pair English-German. With this contribution, we add to this line of research. We follow a frame-based approach to modelling pragmatic function (see e. g. Czulo/Ziem/Torrent 2020), facilitating structured description and comparative analyses. In addition to this aspect, we will discuss potential translation-related factors to what we assume to be an uncommon use of the word, which do not seem to fall under the category of neither shining-through nor normalization, but rather seem to come from a sort of compensation strategy filling a (perceived) lexical gap by means of target language meaning extension.

2 A frame-based model of semantics (and pragmatics) in translation

The primacy of frame model of translation (PFM; Czulo 2017) puts meaning front and centre in translation analysis, so far with a focus on semantics based on Fillmorean frame semantics (Fillmore 1982). The main idea behind Fillmore's frame semantics is that human beings understand the meaning of a linguistic expression against the cognitive backdrop of a schematized scene, i. e. a frame. A frame is defined as "any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits" (Petruck 1996: 1).

Berkeley FrameNet (BFN; Ruppenhofer et al. 2016) was the first lexicographic incarnation of frame semantics, building a frame-based lexicon to cover the general vocabulary of English. For each recorded frame that is lexically realizable, the database lists:

(a) Frame elements representing the corresponding participants and objects of a frame. Based on the type of supporting information they contribute, frame elements can be categorized as core and non-core. For the frame `Commerce_buy`,[2] for instance, BUYER and GOODS are core elements while PLACE is non-core;

(b) A list of lexical units (single or multiple words) that can evoke the frame. For the frame `Commerce_buy`, this includes *buyer*, *client* and *purchase*.

---

2   As customary in frame semantic literature, frames will be set in Courier font, frame elements in small caps.

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 133

(c) Frame relations: Each frame is connected to related frames with edges denoting the kind of relation (e. g. precedence, inheritance, etc.) that exists between the interconnected frames. `Commerce_buy` inherits from `Getting` and is a perspective on `Commerce_goods-transfer`.

Currently, there are framenet projects for several languages including German, Japanese and Brazilian Portuguese. A part of these groups forms an initiative for multilingual research in frame semantics, Global FrameNet (n. d.).

Using the lexical-semantic incarnation of frame semantics as a descriptive device, the PFM highlights how a very 'literal' rendering of meaning, as represented by semantic frames, may be overridden by various other factors such as typological or cultural differences in framing events, or changes in framing due to pragmatic considerations. An example for the latter is shown with the sentence pair in example (3) taken from the CroCo corpus (Hansen-Schirra/Neumann/Steiner 2012):

(3) a. Einzelheiten können Sie diesem Bericht entnehmen.
        lit.: Details can you extract from this report.
     b. Additional details are contained in this report.

In both the German source and the English target sentence in (3), we can assume an underlying (underspecified) 'focus construction' with the element in focus in sentence initial position. In German, this element is the direct object which switches its place with the subject, resulting in an O-V-S order. In English, so the hypothesis, the canonical S-V-O order is enforced: While the German "Einzelheiten" is the equivalent to the "Additional details", the syntactic function is shifted from object to subject, making the English equivalent the subject of the sentence. The main verb is accommodated accordingly and the Agent "Sie" from the German original is dropped. As a consequence, there is a motivated semantic divergence for the main verbs between a `Taking` event ("entnehmen") and a `Containment` state ("contained"). What these two different perspectives are linked by are the THEME taken from the SOURCE, which in the `Containment` perspective figure as CONTENT and CONTAINER.

As pointed out before, the PFM relies on frame semantics and the descriptive methods developed at Berkeley FrameNet for semantic representation and analysis. There is, however, no equally well developed formalism for the description of the pragmatics of linguistic expressions. Ohara (2018: 158ff.) and Czulo, Ziem and Torrent (2020) have remarked that BFN-style frames can be applied to the description of interactional (in Ohara's terms) / pragmatic (in Czulo et al.'s terms) phenomena and in fact some of the frames recorded in BFN already are of quite pragmatic nature. We take up these and other remarks, and on their basis, we model the pragmatic content of the expression under investigation by means of what we will refer to as *pragmatic frames* (see Section 3). With respect to the primacy of frame model of translation, a frame-based approach to describing pragmatics should facilitate a better modelling of the interaction of semantics and pragmatics in translation, re-adjusting the notion of 'frame primacy' to also include pragmatic frames.

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 134

3 Pragmatic frames

3.1 Modelling pragmatic frames

It is the relevance of the communicative context that serves to distinguish two types of frames:

> The structures I have mentioned so far can be thought of as motivating the categories speakers wish to bring into play when describing situations that might be independent of the actual speech situation, the conversational context. A second and equally important kind of framing is the framing of the actual communication situation. When we understand a piece of language, we bring to the task both our ability to assign schematizations of the phases or components of the 'world' that the text somehow characterizes, and our ability to schematize the situation in which this piece of language is being produced. We have both 'cognitive frames' and 'interactional frames', the latter having to do with how we conceptualize what is going on between the speaker and the hearer, or between the author and the reader.
>
> (Fillmore 1982: 117)

While the "cognitive frames" can be said to have grown into the lexical-semantic frames documented in framenet projects to date, the interactional type of frames has not yet received much attention with some exceptions such as Matsumoto (2010) and Ohara (2018), and have not been systematically developed in a similar fashion. With the communicative context being key for this type of frames, Czulo et al. (2020) propose a number of aspects that pragmatic frames may relate to, including circumstances licensing the use of target expressions and further situational factors, text- and socio-linguistic affordances and sociolinguistically relevant factors such as relations between those involved in the communication situation.

Although some of these factors clearly differ from the to date typical frame elements likened to "participants and props" (Ruppenhofer et al. 2016: 7) that make up 'traditional' BFN frames, they can be integrated into a frame structure. Applying a BFN-based approach to pragmatic frames allows them to be recorded in framenet resources and used in the range of applications building on their data.

As a basic structure of pragmatic frames, the frame definition centres on the function associated with a (set of) linguistic item(s), assuming a conventionalized understanding of what a particular expression conveys on a pragmatic level. Within a lexical-semantic approach, we would expect frame elements to be realized linguistically in corpus data, even if infrequently. However, the contextual factors of the speech situation including the speaker, the addressee/hearer, the place, time and medium of the utterance, may not be instantiated at all for pragmatic expressions. To account for their relevance despite the potentially missing realization, a non-lexical frame coined `Communicative_Context` is assumed that includes these factors as frame elements (C. Baker and M. Ellsworth, personal communication), drawing on the concept of the "Basic Communicative Spaces Network" proposed by Sanders, Sanders and Sweetser (2009). A linguistic item relating

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
*A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation*

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 135

to the speech situation by virtue of its conventional function is considered to evoke both a specific pragmatic frame and the general-level `Communicative_Context`[3] frame.

3.2   The `Common_ground` frame and its realization

We assume *bekanntlich* to regularly evoke the pragmatic frame `Gemeinsames_Vorwissen` ('common ground'). The frame models a speaker claiming some content to be prior knowledge shared by some or all participants of the communication situation, necessarily including the utterance's addressee(s). In the German FrameNet it is defined as follows:

> Ein Sprecher signalisiert, dass er einen INHALT als bestimmten oder allen an der Kommunikationssituation beteiligten KOGNIZIERENDEN bekannt ansieht. Der Inhalt wird damit als Teil des Common Ground markiert. Die BEKANNTHEIT des Inhalts kann durch einen DESKRIPTOR näher bestimmt werden, typischerweise in Bezug auf ihre zeitliche Gültigkeit, den Grad der Gewissheit des Sprechers oder den Umfang des Personenkreises der Kognizierenden. Die Kognizierenden werden i.d.R. nur mit konstruktionellen FEEs lexikalisch realisiert. Implizit gehören stets sowohl der Sprecher als auch (mind. ein Teil der) Adressaten zu den Kognizierenden.[4]

> 'A speaker signals that they consider some CONTENT to be prior knowledge shared by a group of COGNIZERS who are participants of the communication situation in question. The CONTENT is thus marked to be part of the common ground. The degree of FAMILIARITY can be further specified by a DESCRIPTOR, typically with regard to temporal or epistemic factors or the size or identity of the group of COGNIZERS. Both the SPEAKER and the ADRESSEE of the current `Communicative_Context` are implicitly included in the group of COGNIZERS.'

> (our translation)

The expressions evoking this frame differ with respect to which of these frame elements are realized in the text: most importantly, the COGNIZERS may be lexically specified, commonly by deictic person reference as in *wie wir/Sie/alle wissen* ('as we/you/everybody know(s)'), or left to be inferred from the communicative context as is the case with the adverbs *bekanntlich*, *bekanntermaßen* and the particle *ja*.

(4) a. [[CONTENT EU citizens], as [COGNIZER we] [FAMILIARITY know], [CONTENT are travelling more than ever]*Target*], not least as tourists.
    b. [CONTENT Die EU-Bürger reisen] [FAMILIARITY bekanntlich*Target*] [CONTENT mehr denn je], nicht zuletzt als Touristen.

(5) a. [As [COGNIZER you] [FAMILIARITY know], [CONTENT the dam will limit the supply of freshwater to Syria and to Iraq in particular]*Target*].

    b. [Wie [COGNIZER Sie] [FAMILIARITY wissen], [CONTENT wird der Damm die Süßwasserzufuhr nach Syrien und insbesondere nach Irak einschränken]*Target*].

The phrasal unit "wie Sie wissen" ('as you know') can be described as an instance of a grammatical construction with a pragmatic function, as proposed by Staffeldt (2011: 109–

---

3   Online access to the German frame definition: https://gsw.phil.hhu.de/framenet/frame?id=2267
4   Online access to the German frame definition: https://gsw.phil.hhu.de/framenet/frame?id=1569

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 136

110) and as listed in the German constructicon (*Verweis_Vorwissen:wie_N_V*).[5] Looking at possible variations of "wie Sie wissen", Staffeldt (2011: 101) finds first person plural or second person formal pronouns in the vast majority of instances in the German reference corpus. Instances of this construction qualify as evoking the pragmatic frame only if the NP's referent (mapped onto the frame element COGNIZER) includes the utterance's addressee(s). This is realized mainly by second person pronouns, first person plural pronouns in an inclusive reading, and pronouns with generic personal reference like *man* ('you, one') or *jeder* ('everybody'). The adverbs and particles evoking this frame have the same reading. By default, the persons to whom the content is claimed to be known are the general public or the addressee, as reflected in standard dictionary entries, e. g. for *bekanntlich* in DWDS (2023: *bekanntlich*), paraphrasing it as "wie jeder weiß" ('as everybody knows'). With *bekanntlich,* a typical kind of content is proverbial phrases expressing perceived general truths. The adverb helps to link these general statements to the more specific situation at hand described in the co-text. The function of *bekanntlich* and similarly *wie Sie wissen* can be to introduce a situation as given and obvious, and on this basis a consequence or second state of affairs can be presented as logically necessary or justified (Staffeldt 2011: 107).

4 Data and method

4.1 Corpora

The English-German parallel corpora used to explore *bekanntlich* for this study are DGT-TM (Steinberger et al. 2012) and EuroParl UdS (short: EUdS; Karakanta/Vela/Teich 2018). They both contain German translations of primarily or exclusively English original EU texts, but differ in register and size.

The DGT-TM corpus is a parallel multilingual corpus of the European Union's legislative documents in 24 EU languages, comprising treaties, regulations and directives adopted by the EU. The drafting language is English for most documents (Steinberger et al. 2012: 455), with which the other language versions are aligned. The latest corpus release, accessed via SketchEngine for this study, contains more than three million translation units for English and German each (English: about 74.4 m tokens or 3.9 m translation units; German: 58.3 m tokens or 3.6 m translation units). The translations, produced by highly qualified translators, are subject to a multi-step revision process (Steinberger et al. 2012: 455).

EUdS contains proceedings of the European Parliament, mostly speeches given in parliament, filtered for original language and translation direction. Comparable and parallel subsets were created for the language pairs English–German and English–Spanish. The English–German subset used for this study comprises just over three

---

[5] Online access to the German construction entry:
https://gsw.phil.hhu.de/constructicon/construction?id=565 (20.09.2023)

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
*A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation*

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 137

million tokens per language, making it much smaller than the large multilingual EuroParl corpus (Koehn 2005). However, it is better suited for translation research than EuroParl as the source texts are verified to have been produced by native speakers and are aligned with their respective professional translations from this source language.

In order to contrast the use of *bekanntlich* in original German language, we used the GeLeCo corpus (Wiesmann 2022) compiled and provided by the Department of Interpreting and Translation of the University of Bologna for research, teaching and translation purposes. It contains the complete collection of federal laws, administrative regulations and court decisions published on three online databases by the German Federal Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection and the Federal Office of Justice, amounting to more than 60 000 documents and a corpus size of 196 m tokens.

4.2 Criteria

We aggregated all instances of *bekanntlich* and categorized them according to whether the information referred to is known to cognizers encompassing other participants in the communication situation, crucially the addressee, and thus evoking the pragmatic `Common_ground` frame such as in sentence pair (1), or whether the information is understood to be known only to the speaker (or potentially even only a third party), which we see as indicative of evoking the semantic frame `Gewahrsein_Status`[6] (`Awareness_status`[7] in BFN) as in sentence pair (2).

The `Gewahrsein_Status` frame is about the epistemic status that a CONTENT has in the mental model of a COGNIZER. It is evoked by lexical units such as *known, presumed, suspected* in English and *bekannt, mutmaßlich, verdächtig* in German. The COGNIZER is a peripheral frame element and often backgrounded, in fact it is not instantiated in any of the annotated sentences in BFN. There is no indication that participants of the communication situation other than the speaker are to be counted as COGNIZER; for the most part, the COGNIZER can be identified as a third party that may be relevant in the co-text.

(6) In April 2004, six truck drivers working for Halliburton Co. were killed , and [Content a seventh] is missing and [presumed*Target*] [Content dead].

(7) [Content The names of the injured firefighters] are not [known*Target*].

Sometimes, context beyond the sentence was needed to best as possible distinguish pragmatic from semantic use of *bekanntlich*. As we will see in 5.2 however, the distinction between pragmatic and semantic use is not always a binary decision.

---

[6] Online access to the German FrameNet frame entry: https://gsw.phil.hhu.de/framenet/frame?id=728 (20.09.2023)

[7] Online access to the BFN entry: https://framenet2.icsi.berkeley.edu/fnReports/data/frameIndex.xml?frame=Awareness_status (20.09.2023)

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 138

5 Analysis

5.1 Lexical and phrasal equivalents

Tables 1 and 2 show the English source equivalents of *bekanntlich* in the EUdS and the DGT-TM corpora, given as the search patterns which yield the results. The attribute 'word' refers to a concrete word form, the attribute 'lemma' to the lemma, i. e. inflected forms are comprised. As an example, the pattern (B) licenses the following sequence: one element out of the list of word forms, zero or one element of any type and a form of the lemma *know*. It thus matches expressions like "You all know", "We know", "everybody here knows" etc.; in fact, 18 out of the 25 occurrences of pattern (B) are preceded by "as", yielding phrases like "as we know".

	lemma="bekanntlich"	41	fpm: 11.69
	English equivalents		
(A)	[lemma="be"]{0,1}[word="known"]	5	12 %
(B)	[word="we|We|you|You|everybody|Everybody|every-one|Everyone|House"] [] {0,1} [lemma="know"]	25	61 %
(C)	other	11	27 %

Table 1: Frequencies of *bekanntlich* and its source equivalents in Europarl UdS

	lemma="bekanntlich"	352	fpm: 6.04
	English equivalents		
(D)	[lemma="be"][word="recalled"]	282	80 %
(E)	[lemma="be"]{0,1}[word="known"]	40	11 %
(F)	other	30	9 %

Table 2: Frequencies of *bekanntlich* and its source equivalents in DGT-TM

The differences in distribution could be explained by the different communication situations. EUdS contains speeches that are directed at an audience, so it does not surprise that phrases which contain a person or institution as referent are frequent. The DGT-TM corpus contains more impersonal texts from regulations, laws, etc., making personal pronouns in first or second person less likely.

Following Marco (2021), the strength of the relationship between the translation equivalents can be measured by the Unidirectional Translation Correspondence (UTC). This value reflects the proportion of a target item translating a source item in relation to all occurrences of both items. The UTC values for *bekanntlich* and its English source equivalents in our two corpora given in table 3 reveal correspondences that are characteristic of one corpus each. In DGT, the source expression "it is recalled that" has a strong correspondence to *bekanntlich*, while this source item does not occur in EUdS at all (H). For EUdS, on the other hand, the source pattern "as X know(s)" shows the strongest correspondence with again no occurrences of the source item in the other

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 139

corpus (I). Taking other possible source and target items into consideration, the pair (L) emerges as the one with the highest correspondence value. "It is known that" is found in both corpora and shows a similar correspondence value across corpora and across two target items (G, K).

The frequency data and UTC values indicate that apart from a small convergence for one source item, the profile of *bekanntlich* based on the source item it corresponds to differs across the corpora: For the political speeches, it refers to cognizers that are present in the communication situation, as seen in their explicit mentioning in the English original. In texts of the legal domain, however, it is used in a more impersonal way and as one of several translation equivalents for a standard phrase in the original. Without considering the source texts, these profiles and the subtle differences between uses of *bekanntlich* would not emerge as clearly.

	Target expression (DE)	Source expression (EN)	DGT	EUdS
(G)	bekanntlich	it is known that	7.1	4.4
(H)	bekanntlich	it is recalled that	38.2	0
(I)	bekanntlich	as X know(s)	0	30.9
(J)	bekanntlich	as we (X) know	0	18.9
(K)	bekannt	it is known that	7.9	6.5
(L)	sei (X) daran erinnert	it (X) recalled that	42.8	0

Table 3: Unidirectional Translation Correspondence values for DGT and EUdS corpora

5.2 Realization and scope of cognizers

Comparing the English source language equivalents of *bekanntlich* across the two corpora, it appears that in EUdS, the participants of the communication situation are more often than not lexically realized as shown by rows (I) and (J) in table 3 and exemplified in sentence pairs (8) and (9):

(8) a. As we all know, sovereignty cannot be transferred and competences cannot be conferred without the full agreement of 27 Member States.
   b. Souveränität kann bekanntlich nicht übertragen werden und Zuständigkeiten können ohne die geschlossene Zustimmung aller 27 Mitgliedstaaten nicht übertragen werden.
   lit.: Sovereignty can, as is known, not be transferred and competences cannot without the full agreement of all 27 Member States be transferred.

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
*A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation*

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 140

(9) a. Eventually they will be competing directly with the US for ever-diminishing supplies, which is a forbidding thought and, as we know, fossil fuels are running out very quickly.

b. Irgendwann wird sich China mit Amerika um die immer knapper werdenden Vorräte streiten, was nicht gerade ein beruhigender Gedanke ist, zumal die fossilen Brennstoffe bekanntlich rasch zur Neige gehen.
lit.: At some point will China and America quarrel over the ever-diminishing supplies, which is not exactly a calming thought, especially since fossil fuels, as is known, are running out quickly.

The use of the first person plural pronoun *we* is most frequent, (18 out of 25 instances), in an inclusive reading indicating that both the SPEAKER and the ADRESSEE belong to the COGNIZERS.

In DGT-TM and the minority of cases in EUdS; however, the COGNIZERS remain implicit, and, what is most interesting, do not seem to include the addressee ((10)–(12); in (12), example (2) from above is repeated).

Europarl UdS:

(10) a. I know certain Member States feel that a far longer transition period will be necessary.

b. Einige Mitgliedstaaten halten bekanntlich eine weitaus längere Übergangszeit für notwendig.
lit.: Some Member States deem, as is known, a far longer transition period necessary.

DGT-TM:

(11) a. It is recalled that the authorities in Laos as well as potential producers/ exporters in this country were informed of the ongoing investigation

b. Bekanntlich wurden die laotischen Behörden sowie potenzielle Hersteller/ Ausführer in Laos von der laufenden Untersuchung in Kenntnis gesetzt.
lit.: As is known, Laotian authorities as well as potential producers/exporters were informed of the ongoing investigation.

(12) a. It is known that that nomenclature does not cover all special export refund cases but the Commission does not require that kind of detail.

b. In diesem Verzeichnis sind bekanntlich nicht alle Sonderfälle bei den Ausfuhrerstattungen abgedeckt, die Kommission benötigt diese Details jedoch nicht.
lit.: In this index, as is known, not all special export refund cases are covered, the Commission does not need these details, though.

Indeed, the speaker/writer can refer to themselves as the only COGNIZER explicitly, as in (10), or implicitly by passive voice ((11)and (12)). This can; however, only be clearly seen in the English original phrasal rendering, and is hidden behind the German adverb *bekanntlich*. And while for (12) it is clearer that the cognizer referred to by "It is known" is the writing institution themselves, for (11) it is hard to determine whether the

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 141

information that is "recalled" is assumed to be part of the common ground or whether the 'recollection' is of rhetorical nature, pointing to information known to the speaker (i. e. highlighting the awareness status of this COGNIZER) but not confidently available to the addressee, adding another pragmatic dimension of building a common ground where necessary. As is the case for the source phrase in English, the use of the German "bekanntlich" in this case is rather somewhere along the semantic-pragmatic spectrum than a case of a binary categorization. The translation pair *it is recalled that – bekanntlich* as found in (11) appears; however, to be a feature of recitals in EU legislative acts in particular (cf. row (H) in table 3).

There are also cases where the COGNIZER does not appear to belong to the communication situation at all and where instead a third party can be assumed, as in (13) from DGT-TM:

(13) a. Such training shall include: improving the security and quality of travel documents; recognizing and detecting fraudulent travel or identity documents; Gathering criminal intelligence, relating in particular to the identification of organised criminal groups known to be or suspected of being engaged in conduct set forth in article 6 of this Protocol […].

b. Diese Ausbildung umfasst die Verbesserung der Sicherheit und der Qualität von Reisedokumenten, das Erkennen und Entdecken gefälschter Reise- oder Identitätsdokumente, die kriminalistische Nachrichtenbeschaffung, insbesondere in Bezug auf die Identifizierung organisierter krimineller Gruppen, die bekanntlich oder mutmaßlich die in Artikel 6 genannten Handlungen begehen, […]

The parallelism "known to be or suspected of being", translated as "bekanntlich oder mutmaßlich" evokes the `Awareness_Status` frame. The backgrounded COGNIZER and the status of the information are relevant in a situation relating to the training, rather than to the current communication situation.

As the examples illustrate, the COGNIZERS to whom *bekanntlich* implicitly refers, can have different roles in- and outside the communication situation and they are the crucial factor in deciding whether the pragmatic or the semantic frame is evoked.

5.3   *bekanntlich* in a monolingual German legal corpus

In order to assess whether any of the uses of *bekanntlich* in the translated text might underlie a translational influence, we turned to GeLeCo (see Section 4.1). It is similar in register to DGT-TM, containing German laws, administrative regulations and court decisions.

The search for *bekanntlich* yields 89 instances that were analysed manually. With a frequency of 0.45 per million tokens, in contrast to 6.04 in DGT-TM, it appears to be much less common in original German legal texts compared to EU legal texts translated into German.

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
*A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation*

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 142

After removing duplicates from the data set, the remaining 79 instances were categorized as examples of either a pragmatic or a semantic use of *bekanntlich.* In the vast majority of instances (92,4 %), the adverb is clearly used in the pragmatic sense that includes participants of the communication situation beyond the speaker in the group of COGNIZERS. In six instances, this is less clearly the case; however, we do not find unambiguous examples of a semantic use. In more than one in four instances, *bekanntlich* is part of a direct quote or paraphrase, which adds to the complexity of the communication situation under consideration.

The CONTENT is highly specific in all instances of *bekanntlich* in this corpus, making it challenging to infer, even from the wider context, the group of people that can be expected to be familiar with the CONTENT. The domain of patent law is strongly represented in the data set, with *bekanntlich* being used in text passages that explain, e. g., scientific or technological facts or terminology, or that comment on the interpretation of product names by the general public, all pertaining to the respective invention in question. These passages often have an argumentative structure and invoking the common ground serves to strengthen the conclusions presented.

In the ambiguous cases, it is the specialised nature of both the CONTENT, including, e. g., remarks on the chemical structure of a substance, and the communication situation that leave the categorization unresolved. DGT-TM contains similarly specialized material, of course, but there, the translation analysis disambiguates, where in the monolingual corpus we cannot always clearly decide.

6 Discussion

The analysis has unveiled that in all three corpora, *bekanntlich* is used to evoke the pragmatic frame `Gemeinsames_Vorwissen` ('common ground'). In the translations into German in the DGT-TM corpus; however, it is sometimes used in a way which rather relates it to a semantic frame, namely `Gewahrsein_Status` ('awareness status'). The bearers of information do not include a broader audience, but only the speaker of the utterance, meaning to convey that there is awareness of a piece of information on the side of the speaker. In the German comparable corpus of original legal texts, we do not find a use that points to that direction: While there are uses which do not seem to presuppose that all participants in the communication situation share the common ground, the group of cognizers does seem to extend beyond the speaker only. The difference in some of the uses in translated legal text vs. that in original legal text may stem from the strong link of *bekanntlich* in DGT-TM German to such English source expressions as *it is recalled that*, and may thus be an institutionally bound use.

We can neither ascribe this, so far, idiosyncratic use of *bekanntlich* to a type of normalization, i. e. adhering conservatively to target language norms, nor to a sort of shining through, i. e. an influence from the source language. Indeed, we assume this use to be a third option: a compensation strategy filling a perceived lexical or phrasal gap. In

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 143

this case, we speak of a perceived gap, as a more literal translation of the English source phrases in the examples we found would have been plausible translation options – if not even more plausible – in German. We hypothesize that, for convenience or brevity, translators picked a target language lexeme and extended its usage pattern, relating to a semantic frame that could be seen as underlying the pragmatic use of *bekanntlich*: The `Gemeinsames_Vorwissen` frame presupposes a common awareness status (`Gewahrsein_Status`), but unlike in the semantic use, it will (ideally) comprise all involved parties in a communication situation, beyond the speaker.

7 Conclusion

Our contribution has demonstrated how pragmatic meaning can be described using a frame-based approach. The analysis of uses of *bekanntlich* uncovered that in certain translations from English to German in the DGT-TM corpus, a semantic use of the adverb can be found besides the default pragmatic use. While somewhat idiosyncratic, it also highlights a phenomenon that, in our perception, does not fall under the oft-studied phenomena like shining through or normalization, but rather filling a (assumed) lexical gap through meaning extension in the target language. Of course, given the so far (seemingly) very limited semantic use of *bekanntlich*, this bears potential for misunderstanding. It was possible, however, to pinpoint the source for potential misunderstanding, namely the scope of cognizers included in the different realizations of *bekanntlich*. We want to stress that a classical valency approach to this type of analysis could not have yielded this result, as *bekanntlich* does not, technically, bear valency from a (syntactic-) structural point of view.

We see further potential in using a frame-based approach to analysing and describing pragmatic function by means of frames. To name one possibility for further studies: A point which we did not elaborate on in our analysis is that in the English material studied here, the participants of a communication situation are more often realized than in German. If confirmed on a broader scale, this could lead to the conclusion that English is more addressee-oriented at least on a pragmatic level than German, as proposed by House (1996). We believe that this and certainly other types of translatological or contrastive studies could greatly benefit from a more structured, non-text-centric, frame-based approach to the study of pragmatics.

References

Baker, Mona (1992): *In other words: A coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge

Cronin, Michael (2013): *Translation in the digital age.* (New perspectives in translation studies.) London: Routledge

Čulo, Oliver (2011): *Automatische Extraktion von bilingualen Valenzwörterbüchern aus deutsch-englischen Parallelkorpora. Eine Pilotstudie*. Saarbrücken: universaar

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

trans-kom 17 [1] (2024): 130–146
Seite 144

Čulo, Oliver (2016): "Translationswissenschaftliche Analyse der Übersetzung des direkten Objekts im Vorfeld ins Englische und Anregungen daraus für die Kontrastive Linguistik." *Deutsche Sprache. Zeitschrift für Theorie, Praxis und Dokumentation* [3]: 214–234

Czulo, Oliver (2017): "Aspects of a primacy of frame model of translation." Silvia Hansen-Schirra, Oliver Czulo, Sascha Hofmann (eds): *Empirical modelling of translation and interpreting.* (Translation and Multilingual Natural Language Processing 6.) Berlin: Language Science Press, 465–490

Czulo, Oliver; Alexander Ziem, Tiago Timponi Torrent (2020): "Beyond lexical semantic frames: Notes on pragmatic frames." Tiago Timponi Torrent, Collin Baker, Oliver Czulo, Kyoko Ohara, Miriam Petruck (eds): *Towards a global, multilingual FrameNet.* (Proceedings of the LREC 2020.) Marseille: Association for Computational Linguistics, 1–7

[DWDS] Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (2023): "bekanntlich" – https://www.dwds.de/wb/bekanntlich (14.09.2023)

Fillmore, Charles J. (1982): "Frame semantics." *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing, 111–137

Fillmore, Charles J (1985): "Frames and the semantics of understanding." *Quaderni di Semantica: Rivista Internazionale di Semantica Teorica e Applicata* 6 [2]: 222–254

Global FrameNet (n. d.) – https://www.globalframenet.org (20.09.2023)

Halverson, Sandra L. (1997): "The concept of equivalence in translation studies: Much ado about something." *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies* 9 [2]: 207–233 – https://doi.org/10.1075/target.9.2.02hal

Hansen-Schirra, Silvia; Stella Neumann, Erich Steiner (2012): *Cross-linguistic corpora for the study of translations. Insights from the language pair English-German*. Berlin: De Gruyter

House, Juliane (1996): "Mißverstehen in interkulturellen Begegnungen." Juliane House (ed.): *Wie lernt man Sprachen – wie lehrt man Sprachen*. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, 154–169

House, Juliane (1997): *Translation quality assessment. A model revisited*. Tübingen: Narr

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann & Oliver Czulo   **trans-kom 17** [1] (2024): 130–146
A frame-based analysis of the pragmatics and semantics   Seite 145
of "bekanntlich" in English-German translation

Karakanta, Alina; Mihaela Vela, Elke Teich (2018): "EuroParl-UdS: Preserving and extending metadata in parliamentary debates." Darja Fišer, Maria Eskevich, Franciska de Jong (eds): *Proceedings of the 2018 LREC Workshop LREC 2018 Workshop "ParlaCLARIN: Creating and Using Parliamentary Corpora",* 33–38

Koehn, Philipp (2005): "Europarl: A parallel corpus for statistical machine translation." *Proceedings of Machine Translation Summit X: Papers*, 79–86

Kranich, Svenja; Veronika Pankova (2018): "'Und dabei stellen sich wichtige Fragen.' Linking constructions in translation." *trans-kom* 11 [2]: 265–294 – https://www.trans-kom.eu/bd11nr02/trans-kom_11_02_07_Kranich_Pankova_Linking.20181220.pdf (17.06.2024)

Marco, Josep (2021): "Testing the Gravitational Pull Hypothesis on modal verbs expressing obligation and necessity in Catalan through the COVALT corpus." Mario Bisiada (ed.): *Empirical studies in translation and discourse.* (Translation and Multilingual Natural Language Processing 14.) Berlin: Language Science Press, 27–52 – https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4450079

Matsumoto, Yoshiko (2010): "Interactional frames and grammatical descriptions: The case of Japanese noun-modifying constructions." *Constructions and Frames* 2 [2]: 135–157 – https://doi.org/10.1075/cf.2.2.01mat

Menzel, Katrin; Ekaterina Lapshinova-Koltunski, Kerstin Kunz (eds) (2017): *New perspectives on cohesion and coherence.* (Translation and Multilingual Natural Language Processing 6.) Berlin: Language Science Press

Nord, Christiane (2009): *Textanalyse und Übersetzen: theoretische Grundlagen, Methode und didaktische Anwendung einer übersetzungsrelevanten Textanalyse*. 4th, revised ed. Tübingen: Groos

Ohara, Kyoko (2018): "Relations between frames and constructions: A proposal from the Japanese FrameNet constructicon." Benjamin Lyngfelt, Lars Borin, Kyoko Ohara, Tiago Timponi Torrent (eds): *Constructicography: Constructicon development across languages*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, 141–164

Petruck, Miriam R. L. (1996): "Frame semantics." Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ole Östman, Jan Blommaert, Chris Bulcaen (eds): *Handbook of pragmatics.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1–8

Ruppenhofer, Josef; Michael Ellsworth, Miriam R. L. Petruck, Christopher R. Johnson, Collin F. Baker, Jan Scheffczyk (2016): *FrameNet: Theory and practice*. International Computer Science Institute – https://framenet2.icsi.berkeley.edu/docs/r1.7/book.pdf (17.06.2024)

Sanders, Ted; José Sanders, Eve Sweetser (2009): "Causality, cognition and communication: A mental space analysis of subjectivity in causal connectives." Ted Sanders, Eve Sweetser (eds): *Causal categories in discourse and cognition*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 19–60 – https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110224429.19

Staffeldt, Sven (2011): "Wie Sie wissen: Kleines Plädoyer für mehr Pragmatik und mehr Konstruktionen in Grammatiken." *Sprachwissenschaft* 36 [1]: 85–112

Steinberger, Ralf; Andreas Eisele, Szymon Klocek, Spyridon Pilos, Patrick Schlüter (2012): "DGT-TM: A freely available translation memory in 22 Languages." *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12).* Istanbul: European Language Resources Association (ELRA), 454–459

Vandevoorde, Lore (2020): *Semantic differences in translation: Exploring the field of inchoativity*. Berlin: Language Science Press

Wiesmann, Eva (2022): "Rechtssprachenbezogene Wissensvermittlung. Zum Einsatz von GeLeCo in der Übersetzerausbildung. " *Korpora Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 2 [1]: 42–60 – https://doi.org/10.48694/KORDAF-56

Authors

Susanne Triesch-Herrmann is a doctoral researcher at the Institute of Applied Linguistics and Translatology at Leipzig University. She is currently working on her dissertation on pragmatic frames in translation. Her research focus on frame semantics and pragmatics is rooted in an interest in cognitive linguistics and functional translation studies, which she applies to the languages English, German and Finnish.
E-Mail: s.triesch-herrmann@uni-leipzig.de

Oliver Czulo is a full professor at the Institute for Applied Linguistics and Translatology at Leipzig University. He spent a PostDoc year with the FrameNet research group at ICSI Berkeley and has since been active in research on translation semantics based on the theory of frame semantics.
E-Mail: oliver.czulo@uni-leipzig.de
Website: https://home.uni-leipzig.de/czulo

Empfehlungen

Transüd.
Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens

Herausgegeben von Klaus-Dieter Baumann, Hartwig Kalverkämper, Sylvia Reinart und Klaus Schubert

Christiane Nord: **Titel, Texte, Translationen. Buchtitel und ihre Übersetzung in Theorie und Praxis.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1018-2

Sylvia Reinart: **„Im Original geht viel verloren". Warum Übersetzungen oft besser sind als das Original.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0826-4

Akkad Alhussein: **Vom Zieltext zum Ausgangstext. Das Problem der retroflexen Wirksamkeit der Translation.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0679-6

Sigmund Kvam: **Poesie – Musik – Übersetzung. Varietäten in der Translation von Liedtexten.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1000-7

Sabine Dievenkorn / Shaul Levin (eds.): **[Re]Gained in Translation II: Bibles, Histories, and Struggles for Identity.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0790-8

Christos Karvounis (Hg.): **Bibelübersetzung zwischen Tradition und Moderne. Pluralität, Skepsis, Perspektiven.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0952-0

Belén Lozano Sañudo / Elena Sánchez López / Ferran Robles Sabater (eds.): **Cruzando puentes. Nuevas perspectivas sobre la traducción del alemán y el español.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0743-4

Gesa Büttner: **Dolmetschvorbereitung digital. Professionelles Dolmetschen und DeepL.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0750-2

Anna Wegener: **Karin Michaëlis' Bibi books. Producing, Rewriting, Reading and Continuing a Children's Fiction Series, 1927–1953.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0588-1

Forum für Fachsprachen-Forschung

Herausgegeben von Hartwig Kalverkämper

Ingrid Simonnæs: **Basiswissen deutsches Recht für Übersetzer. Mit Übersetzungsübungen und Verständnisfragen.** 3., völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage. ISBN 978-3-7329-0998-8

Ingrid Simonnæs / Marita Kristiansen (eds.): **Legal Translation. Current Issues and Challenges in Research, Methods and Applications.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0366-5

Stefania Cavagnoli / Laura Mori (eds.): **Gender in legislative languages. From EU to national law in English, French, German, Italian and Spanish.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0349-8

Annikki Liimatainen / Arja Nurmi / Marja Kivilehto / Leena Salmi / Anu Viljanmaa / Melissa Wallace (eds.): **Legal Translation and Court Interpreting: Ethical Values, Quality, Competence Training.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0295-8

Cornelia Griebel: **Rechtsübersetzung und Rechtswissen. Kognitionstranslatologische Überlegungen und empirische Untersuchung des Übersetzungsprozesses.** ISBN 978-3-86596-534-9

Barbara Heinisch / Katia Iacono / Sonja Pöllabauer (Hg.): **Zwischenstationen / Inbetween. Kommunikation mit geflüchteten Menschen / Communicating with Refugees.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0945-2

Stavroula (Stave) Vergopoulou: **Gender Representations in Commercials – Original and Translation.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1073-1

Andreas F. Kelletat: **Wem gehört das übersetzte Gedicht? Studien zur Interpretation und Übersetzung von Lyrik.** (Reihe: Literaturwissenschaft) ISBN 978-3-7329-0843-1

Alle Bücher sind auch als E-Books erhältlich.

ᴛF Frank & Timme