

Vilnius University  
Faculty of Philology  
Department of English Philology

Dovilė Oganauskaitė

On the Meaning of the Prepositions IN and ON in the EU Legal Documents: A Contrastive  
Study

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of MA in English  
Philology

Supervisor: Dr Ieva Stasiūnaitė

2022

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr Ieva Stasiūnaitė for guiding me during the process of writing this paper through advice, suggestions and raised rhetorical questions, but most importantly for communication and patience.

I also want to thank Assoc. Prof. Inesa Šeškauskienė for the introduction to Cognitive Linguistics and for being an inspiration in the field.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	5
INTRODUCTION .....	6
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	9
1. Prepositional semantics.....	9
1.1 Definition of space .....	9
1.2 Space and prepositions .....	10
1.3 Examples of research on prepositions on one language and across languages.....	12
2. Translation of prepositions .....	12
3. Genre of press releases .....	14
3.1 Process of construction of a press release .....	14
3.2 E-releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union .....	15
METHODOLOGY .....	17
4.1 Data.....	17
4.2 Methods and procedure.....	18
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	20
5. Semantic analysis of the preposition <i>in</i> .....	20
5.1 Physical container .....	22
5.2 Position in space.....	23
5.3 Abstract container .....	25
5.4 Position in time.....	26
5.5 Inclusion in social constructs .....	27
5.6 State or situation.....	27
6. Translation of the preposition <i>in</i> .....	28
7. Semantic analysis of the preposition <i>on</i> .....	32
7.1 Physical support .....	34
7.2 Position in space.....	35

7.3 Abstract support .....	35
7.4 Position in time.....	37
7.5 Effect or the affected.....	37
7.6 Specification or cover.....	38
7.7 Mode or method .....	39
8. Translation of the preposition <i>on</i> .....	40
CONSLUSIONS.....	44
REFERENCES .....	47
DATA SOURCES .....	50
SUMMARY IN LITHUANIAN .....	55

## ABSTRACT

Following the principles of cognitive linguistics applied in studies on prepositional semantics, this paper aims at carrying out a profound analysis of the meanings of two English prepositions, *in* and *on*, focusing on (1) their usage in the legal language of the European Union and (2) their translation from English to Lithuanian. The press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union were chosen as the most appropriate source for this analysis, during which two drawn hypotheses were checked. The first is that in the legal language of the European Union the senses of the chosen prepositions *in* and *on* will be more frequently abstract than concrete due to the abundance and importance of abstract objects or ideas existing in the European Union law. The second is that due to the same reason, regarding translation from English (SL) into Lithuanian (TL), the analysed prepositions will not be rendered by the use of Lithuanian prepositions and other translation patterns will appear. During the present study, based on types of Figure and Ground (Talmy 2000; Ungerer and Schmid 2006), as well as their geometric and/or functional relationships, several concrete and abstract senses of *in* and *on* are identified. Physical container (as the central sense) and Position in space, both being the concrete senses of *in*, and Abstract container, Position in time, Inclusion in social constructs and State or situation, manifesting the abstract senses of the preposition, illustrate the first set of findings. Both Physical support (as the central sense) and Position in space are the concrete senses of *on*, while the senses in a non-spatial domain include Abstract support, Position in time, Effect or the affected, Specification or cover and Mode or method. Finally, during the translation analysis, the translation patterns of both prepositions when rendered from English (as the source language) into Lithuanian (as the target language) are identified, and the congruence of the chosen prepositions between the two aforementioned languages is taken into account. The most frequently applied patterns when translating *in* were the use of Locative and Instrumental cases as well as the formation of a participial construction. The use of such translation patterns as *Dėl* (relating to) + the Genitive case, the Dative case and the Accusative case were the most frequent in the translation of *on*.

**Key words:** cognitive linguistics, prepositions, semantics, polysemy, Figure, Ground, legal language, press releases.

## INTRODUCTION

A preposition is defined as a part of speech which stands for “a word or group of words, such as *in, from, to, out of* and *on behalf of*, used before a noun or pronoun to show place, position, time or method” (OALD). In this definition, three main ways of explaining what a preposition is and what it can do are provided: first of all, several examples of prepositions and how they look like (“*in, from, to...*” etc.); then, their possible grammatical or syntactic qualities (“used before a noun or pronoun”); and finally, their possible functions “to show position, time, or method”. These ways of defining the meaning of prepositions in some dictionaries represent the options how language users should handle prepositions.

However, the question that arises is whether the information provided in dictionaries is sufficient to understand the semantic complexity of a preposition. As situations when a native language user or a second language learner needs a more thorough definition occur, the need to understand the semantic differences between prepositions is crucial due to potential questions, such as which preposition is the most appropriate in a particular case, what is the logic behind their usage, etc. Answers to such questions could rule out the necessity to learn prepositions by heart.

As the users of language may notice lack of information on the semantic nature of prepositions, it becomes a great question to tackle in linguistic works. For instance, some scientists working in this field suggest that a more appropriate and efficient way to study their meaning should be a cognitive approach (Šeškauskienė and Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė, 2015; Stasiūnaitė, 2016; Stasiūnaitė 2018, to name but a few). In order to understand how cognitive linguistics facilitates the analysis of prepositions, some of its terminology, for instance, *Figure* and *Ground*, deriving from Gestalt psychology (Talmy 2000, Majid et al 2004, Ungerer and Schmid 2006) is applied in studies on prepositional semantics, including the analysis presented in this paper. In this way, the researcher is enabled to analyse each preposition more thoroughly, by distinguishing all its different meanings and explaining the rationale behind them in a clearer way.

Studies on the meanings of prepositions of one language, for example Navarro I Ferrando (1999), Coventry et al. (2001), and Feist (2010) analysing different prepositions in the English language, reveal the variety of meanings a preposition can have. The cross-linguistic studies following the principles of cognitive linguistics, on the other hand, were conducted to analyse the meanings of various prepositions and their translations between chosen languages. For

example, Navarro I Ferrando (2006) conducted the analysis of the prepositions *in*, *on* and *at* in English and their Spanish translational equivalents. Two other examples are the research by Šeškauskienė and Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė (2015, 2021) analyzing the Lithuanian preposition “už” and the ways it is translated into English, and the Lithuanian “už” and Latvian “aiz”. Such studies show that the application of the cognitive linguistics framework (including not only the Figure and Ground analysis, but also the theory of Conceptual Metaphors) provides successful and sufficient results.

Current linguistic research on prepositions shows that prepositional semantics is a topic that has been analysed focusing on one or several languages, or choosing a language used for specific purposes (e.g. education). However, to my knowledge, legal language has not been taken into account yet. As it is known that the legal discourse has its own peculiarities, analysing the meanings and translation of some prepositions as reflected in their usage in legal language is a highly interesting topic.

Therefore, the subject of this paper is the semantic nature and translation of the English prepositions *in* and *on* in the legal documents of the European Union. The two aforementioned prepositions were chosen due (1) to their frequent usage in the English language, and (2) the fact that despite having the very different and almost opposing spatial senses (e.g. *in the box* and *on the box*), they can be used to denote similar meanings (e.g. time or place).

It is known that the legal language of the European Union can have many different manifestations, such as the fundamental European Union laws, e.g. the Treaty on the European Union, decisions, case-law, or the transcripts of the public legal proceedings of the European Union courts, etc. However, the press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) were chosen as the most appropriate source for collecting the data for this research because of three main reasons. First, the CJEU is the highest and the most representative legal institution of the European Union. Second, as the CJEU is a transnational court, it provides the majority of information, including its press releases, in all of the official languages of the European Union via its official website. This allows a researcher of legal English and other European Union languages, in this case, legal Lithuanian, to conduct a credible and thorough contrastive analysis of a chosen linguistic topic, a chosen *tertium comparationis*. In addition, press releases, which are not the documents of a stricter legal register, e.g. the decisions of the court, were chosen in hope that the language used, including the prepositions *in* and *on*, are more versatile, i.e. the linguistic structures used are both formal and less formal, situations depicted are both concrete and abstract, etc.

Finally, two main research questions followed by two hypotheses are drawn. The first question focuses on what senses the prepositions *in* and *on* have in the press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union. At this point, the first hypothesis deriving from the first question is formed, claiming that in the legal language of the European Union, the senses of the chosen prepositions will be more frequently abstract than concrete. This situation might appear due to the abundance and importance of abstract objects or ideas existing in the European Union law (e.g. principles of law; procedures existing in European Union law, etc.). The second research question focuses on how the prepositions *in* and *on* are translated from English into the Lithuanian language. Therefore the second hypothesis regarding translation from English (SL) into Lithuanian (TL) is formed, stating that the analysed prepositions will not be rendered by the use of Lithuanian prepositions and other translation patterns will appear.



## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. Prepositional semantics

Prepositions have always caused problems to linguists due to their elusive and complex semantic nature. In the past, this part of speech was regarded as a mere connector that had no meaning at all, in other words, was “semantically null” (Chomsky & Lasnik 1993: 113). Studies from the cognitive linguistics point of view marked a shift from the analysis of linguistic form to the analysis of meaning that prepositions bear (Talmy 2000; Boroditsky 2001). Therefore, the discussion on prepositional semantics started.

#### 1.1 Definition of space

According to Evans (2010: 21), human perception “gives rise to spatial experience” or, in other words, human beings perceive and later on understand their environment in terms of space (Boroditsky 2000; Boroditsky and Casasanto 2003; Majid et al. 2004). It is universally acknowledged that everything surrounding a human being as an observer can be called space (Euclidean space<sup>1</sup>). For example, through their eyes, people see three-dimensional space surrounding them; by looking at a photo, they perceive a captured two-dimensional space. Thus, what humans see or perceive at a particular moment in time can be referred to as a *percept* (Evans 2010: 21), if it is already known and formed in the mind, as a *concept*, or overall, as a particular *image schema* (Ungerer and Schmid 2006: 167), as in the following utterance:

1) *a cat on a table*;

*kat-è            ant    stal-o*;  
cat-NOM.SG    on    table-GEN.SG.

In order to understand a particular image schema as the one in the utterance *a cat on a table*, a perceiver places one object or in this case, a cat, in reference to another object, or in this case, a table, which both appear in a three-dimensional space. At this point, two other notions

---

<sup>1</sup> Euclidean geometry or Euclidean space is defined by the OALD as the system of geometry based on the work of the Greek mathematician Euclid. It is a mathematical, geometrical and topological notion, referring to a two-dimensional, a three-dimensional or an n-dimensional space that is represented by a mapping of coordinate axes (O'Neill 2006).

*Figure* and *Ground*<sup>2</sup> come into play. Ungerer and Schmid (2006) define the Figure as a more salient object in relation to the Ground. The *perceptual prominence* (ibid., p.164) of the Figure comes from such qualities as having a form, contour, shape, structure and coherence, being in front of the Ground, etc., while the Ground acts as an “unstructured, shapeless and uniform” (ibid.) background in a spatial scene. In addition, Talmy (2000: 184) remarks that the Figure is a “moving or conceptually movable entity whose site, path, or orientation is conceived as a variable”, while the Ground is a “reference entity, one that has a stationary setting [...] with respect to which the Figure's site, path, or orientation is characterized.” Therefore, in the aforementioned example, a cat, as a moving object with its distinct form is the Figure, and a table that the cat is sitting on acting as the background is the Ground. An example of an unacceptable utterance when the Figure and the Ground are mixed up is presented below:

2) *a table under a cat;*

*stal-as            po        kat-e;*  
table-NOM.SG under cat-GEN.SG.

In this case, a cat as a moving object is presented as the Ground, while a table as a stationary object is presented as the Figure; however, such an image schema does not appear logical, as a table with its stationary setting is a more appropriate reference entity than a moving cat. Either way, it is clear that the spatial relationship between the Figure and the Ground or a cat and a table is determined by a preposition.

## 1.2 Space and prepositions

The analysis of the types of Figure and Ground and the nature of their relationship composes the main cognitive linguistics framework when it comes to the study of prepositional semantics (Talmy 2000; Casasanto and Boroditsky 2003; Dirven and Verspoor 2004; Majid et al. 2004; Ungerer and Schmid 2006; Evans and Green 2006, etc.). First of all, the cognitive linguistics framework allows researchers to define whether the sense of a preposition connecting the Figure and the Ground is concrete or abstract. When the relationship between the Figure and the Ground takes place in a concrete, or physical, space, as in the example with a cat on a table, the sense of the preposition used is also concrete, or *spatial* (Evans and Green

---

<sup>2</sup>Also referred to as *Trajector* and *Landmark*, or *Referent* and *Relatum* by other researchers in the field of cognitive linguistics (for more information, see Stasiūnaitė 2016: 195).

2006: 344). In this case, the relationship between the Figure and the Ground is explained in terms of geometry and function as, for example, in the works of Coventry et al. (2001) or Feist (2010).

While a preposition can have several concrete or spatial senses, one of those senses can be referred to as their *primary*, also called *central* or *the most prototypical sense* (Evans and Green 2006: 345-347). Two examples of both cases, when a concrete sense is primary and when it is just an additional concrete sense of the same preposition are presented below:

3) *a cat on a table*;

<i>kat-ė</i>	<i>ant</i>	<i>stal-o</i> ;
cat-NOM.SG	on	table-GEN.SG;

4) *a building on the Swedish territory*;

<i>pastat-as</i>	<i>Švedijos</i>	<i>teritorij-oje</i> ;
building-NOM.SG	Swedish	territory-LOC.SG.

The central sense of the preposition *on* is presented in the aforementioned utterance *a cat on a table* (example 3), in which both objects, the Figure and the Ground are concrete and are placed in a spatial three-dimensional image schema that is perceived by an observer. In the image schema in the following example of *a building on the Swedish territory* (example 4), the Figure and the Ground are also concrete and spatial. However, some additional knowledge of an observer, in this case that *Swedish territory* acting as the Ground refers to a particular geographical location conceptualized as a two-dimensional surface, is required.

However, when a preposition is used in a more abstract or figurative sense, its meaning is more difficult to define. This happens as the so-called *meaning extensions* or *metaphorical extensions* (Ungerer and Schmid 2006: 172) appear, as in example 5 below:

5) *They are non-conformists on principle* → metaphor LAW IS SUPPORT (Navarro I Ferrando 1999: 152).

In such cases, the meaning of a preposition is also derived from the analysis of the types of the Figure and the Ground as well as the geometric or functional nature of the relationship between them. However, at this point, the knowledge of the theory on conceptual metaphors, metonymies, similes, etc. is crucial and has to be applied as well (Navarro I Ferrando 1999; Boroditsky 2000; or Šeškauskienė and Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė 2015).

### 1.3 Examples of research on prepositions on one language and across languages

Previous research in the cognitive linguistics framework gives some clues of the semantic complexity of prepositions (Coventry et al 2001; Navarro I Ferrando 2006). While the cognitive research of prepositional semantics reveals the polysemous nature of prepositions, cross-linguistic or translation studies on prepositions demonstrate that they are usually non-congruent when translated from one language to another.

Both of the aforementioned observations about prepositions, their polysemy and non-congruence between languages, were demonstrated in the following works. Šeškauskienė and Žilinskaite-Šinkūnienė (2015), for example, analysed the polysemy of the Lithuanian preposition *už*. It transpired that the preposition has the primary meaning of being in the back region of something. However, other meanings, involving a function between the Figure and the Ground, e.g. control, obstacle, sequential location, hiding or covering, boundary and border, spatial and temporal distance and several others are also possible. When translated from Lithuanian to English, the meaning of the preposition *už* is rendered by such English prepositions as *behind*, *beyond*, *at*, *by*, *over*, *after*, *past*, etc. or by the conjunction *than*. In addition, Stasiūnaitė (2018) analysing the Lithuanian preposition *žemiau*, with its spatial primary meaning as *below* in English, noted that the preposition has such additional meanings as expressing measurements and value.

## 2. Translation of prepositions

Munday (2008) defines a translation process between two different languages as the changing of the original written text, or the *source text* (ST), in the *source language* (SL) into a written text of a different language, or the *target language* (TL) to produce a *target text* (TT). This process can also be referred to as interlingual translation. In addition, Nida (2003) suggests that the most important aim of the interlingual translation process is to reproduce a message by making both grammatical and lexical changes so that the process of translating a particular SL to a TL or a particular SL to a language of the receptor is successful. According to the author, three main stages of a translation process are the following: analysis, transferring, and restructuring. Therefore, the analysis or the process of taking into consideration “grammatical and semantic aspects of the text” (ibid. p. 99) comes first as the most important. The following is the transferring or the stage of transmitting the results of the analysis from one language to another. Finally, the restructuring stage occurs, understood as the process of changing the transfer into the most acceptable text in terms of style in TL.

At this point, with the emphasis on the understanding of the text, it is clear that the distinction between word-for-word translation and sense-for-sense translation is no longer a problem and the word-for-word, or literal translation, is already behind. Therefore, the equivalence of language forms is no longer considered as crucial in the translation process (Pym 2010), whereas the translated meaning is. Therefore, many other aspects, without equivalence, are taken into consideration. For instance, Newmark (1986) stresses upon such aspects of translation as knowing the SL writer, SL norms, culture, setting and tradition, as well as the relationship with the TL, TL norms, culture and all the aforementioned aspects respectively. The consideration of the individual style or the idiolect of the SL writer, of the topic or the situation, of the typical format of a particular text or a genre, and many other factors is crucial.

However, it is important to add that multiple translation aids help translators in their work and in many cases replace human translation altogether. These might include not only various computer aided translation (CAT) tools, such as machine translation, translation software, online databases, countless corpora, use of internet, etc. but also more classical aids, such as dictionaries and grammars (Munday 2008). Thus, computer aided translation tools may facilitate the translation of more complex linguistic areas, such as prepositions, that cause problems to human translators.

When it comes to the translation of prepositions, technological advancements related to translation as well as the developments of the translation theory, and research of prepositional semantics in cognitive linguistics manifested in the more accurate translation of prepositions (Stasiūnaitė 2016). Due to the aforementioned factors, prepositions are rendered not only by their translational equivalents, which are also called their counterparts, as in the utterance the cat on the table (*katė ant stalo*), but also by other prepositions and other linguistic forms that are appropriate due to their correspondence to the meaning of a preposition (SL) in TL. Therefore, it does not mean that the same translational equivalent should be used to translate central and other meanings of a preposition, as they seem to be non-congruent. For instance, Šeškauskienė and Juknevičienė (2020) demonstrated that the English prepositions *in* and *on* are usually non-congruent with their Lithuanian translations, and are translated by omitting the preposition in general and using an appropriate grammatical case such as Locative, Dative, Instrumental, etc. in Lithuanian (see examples 6 and 7 below).

6) *an apple on a table* (ibid. p. 85);

*obuol-ys ant stal-o;*

apple-NOM.SG on table-GEN.SG;

- 7) *information on the Internet* (ibid.);  
*informacij-a internet-e;*  
information-NOM.SG internet-LOC.SG.

Thus, it is clear that the translational equivalent is not appropriate or necessary in all cases. Interestingly, when it comes to the Lithuanian language and the use of grammatical cases in the translation of prepositions, Luraghi (2009: 137) claims that “grammatical forms are meaningful elements”. Therefore, their meaning can also be explained the same way the meaning of preposition is, through the analysis of geometric and functional relationship between two objects, the Figure and the Ground, usually applying the theory of conceptual metaphors.

Overall, the study of prepositional semantics is beneficial on many levels. Firstly, in a broader sense, it leads to a better understanding of how human beings see and understand the world around them. However, most importantly, it discloses the complex and polysemous nature of the meaning of prepositions, while the knowledge of the different meanings of the same prepositions facilitates their translation processes from one language to another.

### **3. Genre of press releases**

A press release is defined as a pre-formulated statement of a particular institution, which is presented to the media, and then via the media to the public. Linguists claim that because a press release has not only the aim to communicate the words of an institution as precisely as possible, but also a unique construction process, format and prevailing linguistic features, it is considered a separate genre (Catenaccio 2007; Bremner 2014; Sleurs 2015). However, there are also claims that a press release is not a separate genre, but rather a hybrid genre or a media channel (Lassen 2006), as it is addressed for both, the media and the public at the same time.

#### **3.1 Process of construction of a press release**

The construction process of a press release, which is called *preformulation* (Sleurs 2005: 1254) or *participation framework* (Bremner 2014: 2), begins when a particular institution creates and issues the statement itself, transmits it to the media so that the public would be reached through it. Bremner (2014) distinguishes four stages of the process of producing a press release, which are brainstorming, drafting, media-pitching, and finally, the appearance of news articles in the press. Therefore, it is clear that journalists who receive already preformulated material perform intertextual work by taking chunks or quotations from the already constructed document and fitting them to the style of the chosen media channel, so

that the original statements of particular institutions can finally be published in the media as news articles.

Such construction process results in the use of the so-called linguistic *preformulating features*, or *meta-pragmatic features*, which include the use of newspaper-like headlines, comprehensive introductory paragraphs or leads, pseudo-quotations (Sleurs 2015), as well as third-person self-reference and semi-performatives (Catenaccio 2007). All of these features are used so that the statements would be objectified, while the pro-active role of a particular institution in drafting and constructing a press release would be diminished.

When it comes to the structure of a press release, Lassen (2006) suggests that the move-structure of a press release consists of a genre label, a summary of central information, elaboration of central information, and finally, contact information. Catenaccio (2007) discriminates between core and peripheral press release features; the latter include “contact details, company logo, “press/news release” and “for immediate release” writings” (ibid., p.160) and the former entail a headline, a lead and article-like contents. Finally, the description of the company, usually provided at the end of a press release is considered a typical press release feature. Overall, both the unique construction process and linguistic features used signify that a press release is a complex genre.

### **3.2 E-releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union**

It is clear that the technologic advancement changed the way people interact with the media, and vice versa, and the printed media had to adjust and be transposed online. According to Skorzynska (2020), this change also affected the genre of press releases and resulted in the appearance of *e-releases*. These documents are usually published on the website of the issuing institution and are addressed to the media and the public at the same time, without the need to alter the document by journalists before it reaches the public. Therefore, as the need to be modified by journalists diminishes, the more direct discourse features, such as the use of superlatives, direct reader address or imperative mood with the aforementioned preformulating features are used (ibid.). This way, e-releases become more direct with the purpose to reach the public with their own original message.

When it comes to the *press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union* (the CJEU), which are published on the official website of this institution, it is noted that the “press releases are unofficial documents for media use and are not binding on the Court of Justice”. In addition, each press release of the CJEU also contains information that although the contents of a particular press release are related to the legal process, facts of law or

matters of a particular case in general, each press release is an unofficial document for media use and again, it is not binding on the Court of Justice. Therefore, despite the fact that they are issued by a legal institution, and cover legal information, press releases of the CJEU are regarded as legal documents that have the main aim to communicate with the media.

Overall, it is clear that an attempt to conduct the semantic analysis of the two chosen English prepositions *in* and *on*, including their translation from English (SL) to the Lithuanian language (TL), as they appear in the language of the press releases of the legal institution of the European Union (the CJEU), could provide useful insight into prepositional semantics, translation of prepositions and legal language.



## METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 Data

As the subject of this paper is the meaning analysis of the chosen prepositions *in* and *on* in the legal language of the European Union, the sources for data collection were the press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). Since the translation analysis of prepositions *in* and *on* is one of the objectives of this research, not only the press releases in English as their original language (SL) but also their translations in Lithuanian (TL) were collected. The criteria for the collection process were the following: firstly, the press releases had to be published on the official CJEU website in 2020, as a closed period of time, and secondly, they had to be translated into Lithuanian, as not all of the press releases are. Out of all 173 press releases that were published by the CJEU throughout the year 2020, 68 (or 39%) of all had their translations into Lithuanian. Therefore, these 68 press releases in English, as well as their translations into Lithuanian were collected, resulting in a total number of 136 legal texts that constituted the corpus for this research (Table 1).

**Table 1. Corpus of the present study**

Contents of the corpus	Number of press releases	Number of words
Press releases in English (SL)	68	82,139
Press releases in Lithuanian (TL)	68	59,252
In total	136	141,391

As shown by the table above, the size of the compiled corpus was 141,391 words in total, of which 82,139 constituted the English part of the corpus, while the remaining 59,252 words were the Lithuanian translations.

At this point, it is important to specify which parts of a press release were considered as important and relevant to this research, and therefore, were taken into the corpus, and which were not. The former was the title and the subtitle of each press release, followed by the most important part, which is the body of each press release and finally, the notes section appearing at the end of the document. The latter was contact information (identical in all cases, containing no prepositions); the information provided in the footnotes (usually references to other legal documents); and other additional information, which was attached to a press

release, but was not presented as a part of it (e.g. the biography of a recently appointed judge, who is mentioned in a press release, etc.).

The original press releases in English and their official Lithuanian translations were, first of all, paralleled and numbered, sentence by sentence, in a Microsoft Excel (2016) sheet. Then, the English part of the corpus was analysed with the help of AntConc (3.5.8) Software (Anthony 2019) in order to extract the usage cases of the prepositions *in* and *on*, whereas the Lithuanian part of the corpus was used mainly to analyse how the chosen prepositions were rendered into the Lithuanian language.

**Table 2. Frequencies of the prepositions *in* and *on* in the corpus**

Preposition	Number of tokens in total	Normalised frequency*	Number of cases extracted
<i>In</i>	2,283	27.794	500
<i>On</i>	756	9.203	500

\* normalised frequency per 1,000 words

As presented in Table 2, during the analysis of the English part of the corpus, 2,283 cases of the preposition *in* and 756 cases of the preposition *on* were found. However, as the cases of both prepositions *in* and *on* were either repetitive or the senses of the prepositions were the same, but only the linguistic expressions differed, 500 of usage cases of the preposition *in* and the same number of usage cases of the preposition *on* were extracted for the analysis.

#### **4.2 Methods and procedure**

The aforementioned 500 usage cases of each preposition *in* and *on* (Table 2) were, first of all, analysed in terms of the types of Figure and Ground to determine whether the sense of the preposition is concrete or abstract. Then, the sense of a preposition in each particular case was defined regarding both the geometric and functional relationships between the entities. Finally, the translation analysis was conducted, during which the linguistic forms or the grammatical patterns used in Lithuanian (as the target language) to translate English prepositions (as the source language) were identified.

Overall, a contrastive study of the meaning of *in* and *on* employed both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Firstly, the qualitative method was applied in the analysis of each usage case of the preposition. It was needed to distinguish their concrete and abstract senses (whether the image schema is in a concrete or abstract domain), to determine the type

of relationship between the Figure and the Ground (geometric, functional), and, finally, to analyse the way *in* and *on* were translated into the Lithuanian language. In addition, as each case of the preposition usage was analysed and then categorized, the quantitative research method manifested itself in order to present the findings statistically and carry out the comparative part of the analysis.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 5. Semantic analysis of the preposition *in*

The 500 extracted cases of the usage of *in* from the press releases of the CJEU in the English language (SL), first of all, were analysed in order to determine the senses of the preposition and in terms of what other linguistic structures they appear in (fixed structures, such as phrasal verbs, idioms, etc.). By doing so, all usage cases of *in* were categorized into the following groups: the preposition used in a concrete sense; the preposition used in an abstract sense; the preposition as part of phrasal verbs; and the prepositions as part of highly idiomatic expressions (Table 3).

**Table 3. Usage of the preposition *in***

Usage of <i>in</i>	Number of cases	Percentage
Concrete sense	36	7.2%
Abstract sense	303	60.6%
Phrasal verb*	3	0.6%
Idiomatic expression (fixed discourse markers, etc.)*	158	31.6%
In total	500	100%

*\*not subjected to the Figure and Ground analysis*

158 idiomatic expressions, or the 31.6% of the usage cases of the preposition *in*, including fixed discourse markers, and other idiomatic expressions, such as *in conclusion*; *in addition*; *in a manner*; *in a way*; *in accordance with*; *in compliance with*; etc. were not subjected to the Figure and Ground analysis. Moreover, two examples of phrasal verbs (3 cases, or 0.6%) containing the preposition that were not subjected to the further Figure and Ground analysis, either, were *result in* and *engage in*. The remaining 339 cases (concrete sense and abstract sense in Table 3) of the usage of *in* were regarded as relevant to the analysis of its meaning.

As shown by Table 4 below, out of the 339 cases subjected to the further analysis of types of Figure and Ground and the relationship between them, the majority of them, or 303 cases (89%), had the preposition used in an abstract sense, while the other 36 cases (11%) illustrated *in* in a concrete sense.

**Table 4. Ratio of concrete and abstract senses of *in***

Sense of <i>in</i>	Number of cases	Percentage
Concrete sense**	36	11%
Abstract sense**	303	89%
In total	339	100%

*\*\*the remaining cases after dismissing phrasal verbs and idiomatic expressions*

An illustrative example of when the preposition *in* was used in a concrete sense, meaning that the situation was happening in a physical domain and both the Figure and the Ground were also physical is provided below (example 8).

- 8) *On account of the lack of available accommodation in a humanitarian reception centre, that court ordered that VL be detained in a detention centre for foreign nationals, where his application for international protection was to be processed.*

↓

VL (F) *in* a detention centre for foreign nationals (G);

F is concrete, alive and moving; G is concrete and stationary.

While the usage of *in* in a concrete sense was rare, the utterances when the preposition was used in an abstract sense were numerous. Several examples of such a case are presented below (examples 9 and 10).

- 9) *Further, in the judgment in Case C-75/18, a question was referred to the Court on the compatibility of the introduction of the special tax on the turnover of telecommunications operators with the VAT Directive.*

↓

Judgment (F) *in* Case C-75/18 (G);

F is abstract; G is abstract.

- 10) *Further, where a legislative act has already co-ordinated the legislation of the Member States in a given EU policy area, the EU legislature cannot be denied the possibility of adapting that act to any change in circumstances or advances in knowledge.*

↓

The legislation of the Member States (F) *in* a given EU policy area (G);

F is abstract; G is abstract.

Both categories, when the prepositions *in* is used in concrete and abstract contexts, were then analysed in terms of the types of Figure and Ground and the geometric and functional relationships between them. During this part of the analysis, such senses of the preposition *in* were identified: Physical container (concrete); Position in space (concrete); Abstract container (abstract); Position in time (abstract); Inclusion in social constructs (abstract); State or situation (abstract) (see Table 5).

**Table 5. Identified senses of the preposition *in***

Senses of the preposition <i>in</i>		Number of cases	Percentage
Physical container	Concrete	6	1.8%
Position in space		43	12.7%
Abstract container	Abstract	194	57.2%
Position in time		23	6.8%
Inclusion in social constructs		32	9.4%
State or situation		41	12.1%
In total		339	100%

As shown in the table above, abstract senses of the preposition *in* are notably more frequent than concrete senses in the language of the press releases of the CJEU. This situation might appear due to the abundance and importance of abstract objects or ideas existing in the European Union law (e.g. principles of law; procedures existing in European Union law, etc.).

### 5.1 Physical container

The most concrete sense of *in* identified was the physical container, which refers to a concrete situation or a concrete image schema, in which the Figure is inside the Ground. In this case, both the Figure and the Ground are concrete, so the sense of the preposition is purely concrete and, thus, can be considered its central or primary meaning. In the press releases of the CJEU, six (1.8%) cases of the physical container sense of *in* were found (example 11).

- 11) *On account of the lack of available accommodation in a humanitarian reception centre, that court ordered that VL be detained in a detention centre for foreign nationals, where his application for international protection was to be processed.*



*Accommodation (F) in a humanitarian reception centre (G);*

F is concrete and stationary; G is concrete and stationary; F is smaller than G; F is a part of G.

It is noticeable that in this case (*accommodation in a humanitarian reception centre*), both the Figure and the Ground are concrete and stationary, the Figure is inside the Ground, and can be considered its part. Other cases when the sense of a physical container was identified looked like the following:

12) *Place (F) in a humanitarian reception centre (G)* (both F and G are concrete and stationary; F is smaller than G; F is a part of G);

13) *Person (F) in a detention centre (G)* (F is concrete, alive and moving; G is concrete and stationary; F is smaller than G);

14) *Pipes (F) in concrete (G)* (F is concrete, stationary and linear; G is concrete and stationary; F is smaller than G that surrounds it).

From the examples provided above, some variety of the physical container sense of *in* is formed. Example 12, for instance, illustrates the case when both the Figure (*a place*) and the Ground (*a reception centre*) are concrete and stationary objects, Figure is inside the Ground and can also be considered as part of it. In example 13, on the other hand, the Figure (*a person*) is concrete, but also alive and moving, while the Ground (*detention centre*) is the same, which is concrete and stationary. In the utterance *pipes in concrete* (example 14), the Figure (*pipes*) is linear, concrete and stationary, the Ground (*concrete*) is also concrete and stationary; however the quality of the Ground surrounding the Figure appears. Moreover, in the same example (14), *pipes* as a concrete Figure can be considered as having a path or orientation that an observer does not know about. Finally, it can be noticed that in all of the provided examples (11-14) the Figure is smaller than the Ground containing it. Overall, regarding the Physical container sense of *in*, relationship between the Figure and the Ground is both geometric, as one object is placed inside the other, and functional, as one object contains and/or surrounds the other.

## **5.2 Position in space**

Another concrete sense of *in*, which is significantly related to the central sense of the preposition, is the position in space. It was used more frequently than the first sense, as 43 cases (12.7%, see Table 5) were identified. This sense refers to a particular geographical place, e.g. a country or its part with its borders, or any other open area with its bounds,

conceptualized as a two-dimensional surface (e.g. as it appears on a map) acting as the Ground (example 15).

15) *The capture and relocation of a wolf found in a village can therefore be justified only where they form the subject of a derogation adopted by the competent national authority.*

↓

*Wolf (F) in a village (G);*

F is concrete, alive and moving; G is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional; F is smaller than G.

In this case, just like in the central meaning of *in*, both the Figure (*a wolf*) and the Ground (*a village*) are concrete, the Figure is alive and moving and it is placed somewhere on the bigger, two-dimensional Ground. Other examples illustrating the Ground conceptualized as a two-dimensional surface were similar, only their linguistic expressions differed (example 16); however, cases where the Figure was concrete and stationary appeared (*An office* in example 17; *a refinery* in example 18).

16) *Person (F) in a Member State (G)* (F is concrete, alive and moving; G is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional).

17) *Registered office (F) in Cyprus (G)* (F is concrete and stationary. G is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional; F is smaller than G);

18) *Refinery (F) in Bugeniai (G)* (F is concrete and stationary; G is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional; F is smaller than G);

In addition, this sense also encompasses cases when the Ground is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional (referring to a particular geographical place with its borders), but the Figure appears to be an abstract object, such as *a service* (example 19), *a limit* (20) or *offences* (21) in examples below.

19) *Service (F) in a Member State (G)*(F is abstract; G is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional);

20) *Limit (F) in a certain number of zones in Italy (G)* (F is abstract; G is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional);

21) *Offences (F) in a Third State (G)* (F is abstract; G is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional).

Thus, the sense of Position in space refers to both concrete and abstract types of the Figure, while the Ground is always concrete. It is noticeable that in this sense, the Figure can vary



from being concrete and stationary, to concrete but alive and moving and, finally, to an abstract object. The Ground, on the other hand, always appeared concrete, but varied in terms of size (from *a village* to *a state*) still remaining bigger than the Figure. In any case, the Figure as a particular object was placed somewhere on the Ground as a two-dimensional surface, therefore, the relationship between the Figure and the Ground in this sense of *in* is geometric.

### 5.3 Abstract container

In addition to the aforementioned senses of *in*, which were the physical container sense and the position in space sense, the sense of an abstract container for usage cases when both the Figure and the Ground were abstract was also distinguished. It appeared to be the most frequent sense of *in* in the press releases, as it was identified in 194 instances (57.2% in Table 5). All of the cases that fell into this category dealt with legal areas, legal documents or their parts that acted as an abstract entity in the position of the Ground, while the Figure appeared as an abstract object, presented as a part of the Ground (example 22).

22) *Thus, a measure must be regarded as ‘required’ where the legal basis of the power to adopt the **measure** is found **in a particular provision**, even if the adoption of that measure is not, strictly speaking, compulsory.*

↓

*Measure (F) in a particular provision (G);*

F is abstract; G is abstract; F is inside or a part of G.

As seen in the example above, both the Figure and the Ground are abstract objects, the former (*measure*) is inside or is a part of the latter (*provision*). Despite the fact that this sense of *in* was the most frequent, other examples illustrating it were similar, only the linguistic expressions representing them differed (examples 23-26).

23) *Legislation (F) in a given EU policy area (G) (F and G are abstract, F is inside or a part of G);*

24) *Judgment (F) in Commission v Italy (G) (F and G are abstract; F is inside or a part of G);*

25) *Judgment (F) in Case C-75/18 (G) (F and G are abstract; F is inside or a part of G);*

26) *Requirements (F) in Article 8(5) and (6) (G) (F and G are abstract; F is inside or a part of G).*

In all of the examples of the abstract container sense of *in*, the Ground as an area or a branch of law (*a EU policy area* in example 23) or as a particular legal document (*a case* in examples 24 and 25, and *an article* in 26) can be considered as a *container object* (Lakoff and Johnson 1984: 11). Therefore, a conceptual metaphor LAW IS A CONTAINER is applied. Finally, as both objects, the Figure (e.g. *legislation, judgment, etc.*) and the Ground (e.g. *case, article, etc.*) are abstract, with the Ground containing the Figure, the relationship between the two appears to be functional.

#### 5.4 Position in time

Another sense of *in* was showing a position in time. In all 23 cases (6.8% in Table 5) that fell into this category, both the Figure and the Ground were abstract. The conceptual metaphor TIME IS A CONTAINER (Lakoff and Johnson 1984: 59) is employed to conceptualize the Ground as a particular closed period of time (e.g. *a month* or *a year*) with its beginning and its ending as bounds, as a container. The Figure, referring to some kind of event or a legal process, is conceptualized as a point in that period of time. Therefore, the Figure is somewhere inside the Ground, or is a part of the Ground as in example 27 below.

27) *In December 2017, AZ was arrested in the Netherlands and surrendered to the Belgian authorities pursuant to a decision of the rechtbank Amsterdam (District Court, Amsterdam, Netherlands).*

↓

[Arrest of AZ] (F) *in* December 2017 (G);

Figure is abstract; Ground is abstract and temporal; Figure is inside the Ground.

All of the collected cases of the temporal sense of *in* were similar; however, the linguistic expressions slightly differed:

28) *Adoption of criteria* (F) *in* 2015 (G) (F and G are abstract; F is inside of G);

29) *Authorisation* (F) *in* 2010 (G) (F and G are abstract; F is inside of G);

30) *Insertion of implants* (F) *in* 2006 (G) (F and G are abstract; F is inside of G).

All of the usage examples of the temporal sense of *in* (27-30) show that the relationship between an abstract Figure and an abstract Ground in the temporal sense of the preposition is understood by the help of a metaphorical extension (the conceptual metaphor TIME IS A CONTAINER). Therefore, as the Ground contains the Figure, the relationship between the two objects is functional.

## 5.5 Inclusion in social constructs

In addition to the last four senses of *in*, the fifth one, meaning inclusion into social constructs was identified. Despite the fact that this sense of *in* is similar to an abstract container, and according to Lakoff and Johnson (1984: 60) SOCIAL GROUPS ARE CONTAINERS, a separate sense was distinguished, because in this sense, the Figure is always a concrete, alive and moving object or a concrete and personified object. As in the example below (31) the Figure refers to a particular person (*XC*), while the Ground is an abstract object referring to a social construct (*custody*).

31) *XC was remanded in custody in Germany from 23 July 2019 to 11 February 2020 pursuant to the national arrest warrant.*

↓

*XC (F) in custody (G);*

*F is concrete, alive and moving; G is abstract; F is a part of G.*

Other examples of Figure and Ground pairs representing this sense of *in* looked like the following:

32) *Persons (F) in court proceedings (G)* (F is concrete, alive and moving; G is abstract; F is a part of G);

33) *Skater (F) in an unauthorised competition (G)* (F is concrete, alive and moving; G is abstract; F is a part of G);

34) *Entity engaging (F) in an economic activity (G)* (F is abstract and personified; G is abstract; F is a part of G).

Therefore, as shown in the examples above, with this sense of *in*, the Figure is either a living person itself (*persons* in example 32; *a skater* in 33), or a personified object (*entity engaging in...in* 34). The Ground is an abstract object referring to a social construct, group, or an activity that the Figure is being a part of or engaging in. Therefore, the relationship between the Figure and the Ground is functional.

## 5.6 State or situation

The last sense of *in* identified, was a sense referring to an emotional, social, legal, etc. situation or state. In this case, a human being or a particular group of people acted as the Figure, while a particular state or situation was the Ground, as in example 35 below:

35) *The General Court took the view that the existence of those discretionary aspects was such as to favour the beneficiaries over other taxpayers in a comparable factual and legal situation.*

↓

Taxpayers (F) in a comparable factual and legal situation (G);

F is concrete, living and moving; G is abstract; F is in G.

Other similar cases illustrating the sense of state or situation of *in* were represented by different linguistic expressions and looked like the following:

36) *Virtual operators (F) in a weaker negotiating position (G)* (F is concrete, living and moving; G is abstract; F is in G);

37) *Manufacturers (F) in a position to enter the market (G)* (F is concrete, living and moving; G is abstract; F is in G);

38) *Average consumer (F) in a position to understand the specific functioning [...] (G)* (F is concrete, living and moving; G is abstract; F is in G).

However, cases when both the Figure and the Ground were abstract, but still referred to some kind of state or situation were also present as in the example (39) below:

39) *Judicial activities (F) in a situation of widespread remote working (G)* (F and G are abstract; F is in G);

Again, with this sense of *in*, it is clear that the Figure is either a concrete, alive and moving object referring to a living person or a group of people, an abstract object referring to an action, event or an activity that is placed or happening in a particular state or situation, acting as the Ground. Therefore, in such cases, the Ground can be regarded as a CONTAINER OBJECT (Lakoff and Johnson 1984: 30) and the relationship between the Figure and the Ground is functional.

Overall, the six identified senses of *in*, which are the sense of Physical container, Position in space, Abstract container, Position in time, Inclusion in social constructs and State or situation, represent a wide variety of types of Figures and Grounds, both concrete and abstract, movable or moving and stationary, alive and not alive, different in size, etc.

## 6. Translation of the preposition *in*

The cases of the usage of *in* that were analysed in terms of the types of Figure and Ground and the relationship between them, both concrete and abstract, were then subjected to the

analysis of translation from English (SL) to Lithuanian (TL). Such translation analysis revealed the following translation patterns of the preposition from English into Lithuanian: *in* is translated by the use of Dative, Accusative, *Pagal* (according to) + Accusative, Instrumental, and Locative cases; by forming an adjectival phrase, a participial construction and by changing the sentence pattern or omitting the part that contained the preposition completely (Table 6).

**Table 6. Translation patterns of the preposition *in* into Lithuanian (TL)**

Translation pattern of <i>in</i>	Number of cases	Percentage
Dative case	2	0.6%
Accusative case	4	1.2%
<i>Pagal</i> (according to)+ Accusative case	3	0.9%
Instrumental case	28	8.3%
Locative case	209	61.6%
Adjectival phrase	4	1.2%
Participial construction	69	20.3%
Changed structure/omitted	20	5.9%
In total	339	100%

It is clear that the preposition *in* in both concrete (example 40) and abstract (example 41) senses was most frequently translated by the use of the Locative case in the Lithuanian language (209 instances, 61.6% in Table 6).

40) *The fact that **BY** acquired the nationality of a Member State only at a time when **he** was already residing in a Member State other than that of which he subsequently became a national has no effect in that respect.*

*Tai, kad **BY** įgijo valstybės narės pilietybę tik tuo metu, kai jau gyveno **kitoje valstybėje narėje** nei ta, kurios pilietybę jis vėliau įgijo, šiuo atžvilgiu neturi reikšmės.*

↓

*BY (F) in a Member State (G);*

*BY valstyb-ėje narėje;*

*BY-NOM.SG State-LOC.SG Member.*

41) *If that were the case, that position would allow it to treat as an ‘important competitive force’ any **undertaking in an oligopolistic market** exerting competitive pressure.*

*Jei tai būtų tiesa, tokia pozicija jai leistų bet kurią **oligopolinėje rinkoje** veikiančią konkurencinį spaudimą darančią **įmonę** kvalifikuoti kaip „svarbią konkurencinę jėgą“.*

↓

*Undertaking (F) in a market (G);*

*Įmon-ė rink-oje;*

Undertaking-NOM.SG market-LOC.SG.

Another frequently employed translation pattern, identified in 69 cases (20.3% in Table 6) was forming a participial construction in the TT. Such translation pattern was formed when *in* connecting a particular pair of Figure and Ground in ST was replaced by a participial construction in the Lithuanian translation (example 42).

42) *In the judgment **Ruska Federacija (Case C-897/19 PPU)**, delivered on 2 April 2020 **in an urgent preliminary reference procedure...***

*2020 m. balandžio 2 d. Sprendime **Ruska Federacija (C-897/19 PPU)**, priimtame taikant **prejudicinio sprendimo priėmimo skubos tvarka procedūrą (PPU)...***

↓

*Judgment (F) in a [...] procedure (G);*

*Sprendim-e taikant [...] procedūr-q;*

Judgment-LOC.SG applying procedure-ACC.SG.

Two other translation patterns, such as employing the Instrumental case (28 cases, 8.3%, Table 6) as in example 43 or omitting a part containing *in* in the TT (20 cases, 5.9%, Table 6) as in example 44 below were also common.

43) *When **GSK’s principal patent expired in 1999**, a number of manufacturers of generic medicines contemplated introducing generic paroxetine on the UK market.*

*Kai **1999 m. baigė galioti** šios sudedamosios dalies pagrindinis **patentas**, keli generinių vaistų gamintojai ketino į Jungtinės Karalystės rinką pateikti generinį paroksetiną.*

↓

*[Patent’s expiry] (F) in 1999 (G);*

*[patento galiojimo laiko pabaiga] 1999 m. [metais];*

44) *It thus adopted the contested regulation in order to include the name 'Teran' in **the list in Annex XV** to Regulation No 607/2009.*

*Taigi ji priėmė ginčijamą reglamentą, kad pavadinimas „Teran” būtų įtrauktas į Reglamentą Nr. 607/2009.*

↓

*The list (F) in Annex (G);*

*Omitted in the target text.*

In addition, other, less frequently used translation patterns were identified, such as the use of the Dative case (2 instances, 0.6%, see Table 6), the Accusative case (4 instances, 1.2%, see Table 4), *Pagal* (according to) + the Accusative case (3 instances, 0.9%, see Table 6; example 45) and the use of an adjectival phrase (4 instances, 1.2%, Table 6; example 46).

45) *Last, the Court emphasised that the fact – assuming it were established – that the situation involving the public authorities' **late payments in commercial transactions** covered by Directive 2011/7 [...]*

*Galiausiai Teisingumo Teismas pabrėžė, kad aplinkybė (darant prielaidą, kad ji įrodyta), jog situacija dėl viešosios valdžios institucijų atliekamų **pavėluotų mokėjimų pagal komercinius sandorius**, kuriems taikoma Direktyva 2011/7, [...]*

↓

*Payments (F) in commercial transactions (G);*

*Mokėjim-ų pagal komercinius sandor-ius;*

*Payments-GEN.PL (according to) commercial transactions-ACC.PL.*

46) *The action having been successful at first instance and that ruling having been upheld on appeal, the **lawyer appealed in cassation**, against the judgment delivered in the appeal, [...]*

*Kadangi ieškinys buvo patenkintas pirmojoje instancijoje, be to, sprendimą patvirtino apeliacinės instancijos teismas, **advokatas dėl pastarojo teismo sprendimo pateikė kasacinį skundą** [...]*

↓

*[Appeal] (F) in cassation (G);*

*Kasacin-į skund-q;*

*Cassation-ACC.SG Appeal-ACC.SG.*

Overall, the translation analysis of the usage of *in* in the press releases of the CJEU shows that more than half (61.6%; see Table 6) of the cases, in which the Locative case is used, are congruent when translated into Lithuanian. In other words, the sense conveyed by translation (TT) when the Locative case is employed and the sense of the original text (ST) correspond semantically.

## 7. Semantic analysis of the preposition *on*

The 500 extracted cases of the usage of *on* from the press releases of the CJEU in the English language (SL) were analysed in the analogous way as *in* was. Therefore, first of all, all the utterances with *on* were categorized into the following groups: the preposition used in a concrete sense; the preposition used in an abstract sense; the preposition as part of phrasal verbs; and the preposition as part of highly idiomatic expressions (Table 7).

**Table 7. Usage of the preposition *on***

Use of <i>on</i>	Number of cases	Percentage
Concrete sense	8	1.6%
Abstract sense	347	69.4%
Phrasal verb*	61	12.2%
Idiomatic expression (fixed discourse markers, etc.)*	84	16.8%
In total	500	100%

*\*not subjected to the Figure and Ground analysis*

As shown in the table above (7), the idiomatic expressions and phrasal verbs containing the preposition *on* were noticeably frequent. The former constitute 84 (16.8 %) of all cases, while the latter 61 (12.2%). The idiomatic expressions including fixed discourse markers were *on account of*; *on behalf of*; *on grounds of*; *on the basis of*; etc. and a phrase that was left untranslated in the target text (example 47 below).

47) *In addition, the rudder steering servo is a so-called ‘on condition’ part, which is only replaced by a new part when it becomes defective.*

*Be to, vairo stiprintuvas yra „on condition“ dalis, kurią nauja dalimi galima pakeisti tik dėl naudojamos dalies trūkumo.*

The types of phrasal verbs containing *on*, on the other hand, were more varied and in general more frequent in comparison to the ones with *in*. Such phrasal verbs as *base on*; *rely on*; *impinge on*; *carry on*; *pass on*; *feed on*; *focus on*; *decide on*; and *depend on* were identified.



**Table 8. Ratio of concrete and abstract senses of *on***

Sense of <i>in</i>	Number of cases	Percentage
Concrete sense**	8	2.3%
Abstract sense**	347	97.7%
In total	355	100%

\*\*the remaining cases after dismissing phrasal verbs and idiomatic expressions

As shown in Table 8, the usage of *in* in a concrete sense was significantly rare, as just eight (2.3%) such cases were identified; while, the cases when *in* was used in an abstract sense were plenty (347 or 97.7%). Two utterances, one with *in* used in a concrete sense (example 48) and the other in an abstract sense (example 49) are presented below.

48) *By reason of a deformation of the track along several dozens of metres on the Short Route, LG, on 2 September 2008, in its capacity as railway infrastructure manager, suspended traffic on a 19 km long section of that route ('the Track in dispute').*

↓

*Traffic (F) on a section of a route (G);*

F is concrete; G is concrete.

49) *Rather, the Transparency Law is founded on a **presumption made on principle** and indiscriminately that any financial support of civil organisations that is sent from abroad is intrinsically suspect.*

↓

*A presumption (F) on principle (G).*

F is abstract; G is abstract.

All of the aforementioned 355 cases (Table 8) were then analysed in terms of the types of Figure and Ground and the geometric and functional relationships between them. This part of the analysis resulted in distinguishing seven senses of the preposition *on*: Physical support (concrete); Position in space (concrete); Abstract support (abstract); Position in time (abstract); Effect or the affected (abstract); Specification or cover (abstract) and Mode or method (abstract) (see Table 9).

**Table 9. Identified senses of the preposition *on***

Sense of the preposition <i>on</i>		Number of cases	Percentage
Physical support	Concrete	7	1.9%

Position in space		1	0.3%
Abstract support	Abstract	43	12.1%
Position in time		71	20%
Effect or the affected		113	31.8%
Specification or cover		92	25.9%
Mode or method		28	7.9%
In total		355	100%

Therefore, as shown in Table 9, the two concrete and four abstract senses of *on*, with the latter being the significantly more frequent ones, were distinguished. Each of the senses of *on* were then analysed in a more thorough and detailed manner.

### 7.1 Physical support

Starting with the first identified meaning of the preposition *on*, which was already illustrated by the aforementioned image schema in the utterance of *a cat on a table*, it is clear that the Figure is placed on top of the Ground and is then physically supported by it. Due to the fact that such an image schema is purely concrete or spatial, as one object (Figure) is on top of the other object (Ground), this sense can be considered as central or primary meaning of *on*. However, as shown in Table 9 the sense of physical support of *on* was rare in the press releases of the CJEU, as only seven such cases (1.9%) were found. In all of the cases identified, both the Figure and the Ground are concrete, as in example 50 below.

50) *That may be the case in particular where the air carrier has taken **on board a passenger** already displaying behavioural problems before or even during boarding.*

↓

*Passenger (F) on board [of a plane] (G);*

F is concrete, alive and moving; G is concrete, movable; F is placed on the surface of G; F is supported by the G.

Other examples illustrating this sense were similar (example 51), however in several cases, despite the sense of physical support between them, the Figure appeared to be a part of the Ground (example 52).

51) *Crew (F) on board of an aircraft (G) (F is concrete, alive and moving; G is concrete and movable, F is on the surface of G; F is supported by G);*

52) *Rudder steering servo (F) on the aircraft (G)* (F is concrete and movable, G is concrete and movable; F is on the surface of G, but it is also its part, F is supported By G).

Therefore, as shown in the examples above (50-52) with sense of the physical support of *on*, the Figure varies from being concrete and movable (*a rudder*), concrete, alive and moving (*a passenger*), while the Ground is always concrete. Due to the quality of physical support (as one object is physically supported or held by another) and the geometric placement (one object is on top or on the surface of another object), the relationship between the Figure and the Ground is both geometric and functional.

## 7.2 Position in space

Another concrete sense of *on*, meaning position in space or a particular place on the surface of a particular geographical entity acting as a Ground was distinguished. Although, only one case of the usage of this sense of *on*, in which Figure appeared to be abstract and referred to a process, and the Ground was concrete and referred to the territory of a particular country, was identified (0.3%, see Table 9):

53) *In the second place, the Court verified whether the Commission had led Slovenian wine producers to entertain well-founded expectations that no derogation with retroactive effect would be granted to Croatia concerning the use of the name 'Teran' on the labels of wines produced on its territory.*

↓

*Production of wine (F) on its territory [Croatia] (G).*

F is abstract; G is concrete, stationary and two-dimensional.

It can be seen that in this sense of *on*, just like with the same sense of *in*, the Ground as a geographic entity with its bounds is conceptualized as a two-dimensional surface (*territory of Croatia*), while the Figure, as an abstract object (*production of wine*) is placed somewhere on that surface. Therefore, in such a concrete image schema, in which one object is placed on the surface of another, the relationship between the Figure and the Ground appears to be geometric.

## 7.3 Abstract support

In addition to the two previous senses of *on*, the sense of the abstract support was also identified for usage cases when both objects the Figure and the Ground can be considered abstract. In this case, the Figure appeared to be an abstract object (e.g. *electronic document*,

news, etc.) and was supported either by a virtual space conceptualized as a virtual surface (e.g. *a laptop, a website*, etc.) or by a concept (e.g. *solid facts*). In any case, the Ground is an intelligibly abstract space or a concept, as in the case with *a computer* (example 54 below), which primarily is a concrete and tangible object, but here is treated as an abstract object, and understood more as an operating system or a data platform conceptualized as a surface.

54) *The documents seized by those authorities included all communications sent through the email account of the Governor at that time, all **the electronic documents** on his workspace computer and **on his laptop** concerning the period between 2012 and 2014, irrespective of their content, and documents relating to that period that were in the Governor's office.*

↓

*Electronic documents (F) on his laptop (G);*

F is abstract, virtual; G is abstract, virtual, conceptualized as a surface. F is placed somewhere on the surface of G.

Other examples illustrating the abstract support sense of *on* looked like the following:

55) *Broadcast (F) on the site (G)* (both F and G are abstract and virtual; G is conceptualized as a surface; F is placed on the G);

56) *News (F) on the CVRIA website (G)* (both F and G are abstract and virtual; G is conceptualized as a surface; F is placed on the G);

57) *Decision (F) on sufficiently solid facts (G)* (both F and G are abstract);

While utterances *broadcast on the site* and *news on the website* are almost identical to the sense of *on* in example 54, as only their linguistic expressions differ, example 57, on the other hand, presents a different illustration of the sense of abstract support. In the utterance *decision on solid facts*, the sense of *on* connecting the Figure (*decision*) and the Ground (*solid facts*) can be understood through a meaning extension, or in this case the conceptual metaphor that “REASONS ARE SUPPORT (for a decision, a certain policy,” etc. (Navarro I Ferrando 1999: 151).

Therefore, as illustrated by the examples provided above (54-57), in this sense of *on* both the Figure and the Ground are abstract or should be regarded as abstract objects. The relationship between the Figure and the Ground derives from both geometric (one object is placed on the surface of another) and functional relationships between the two objects (one object is supported by another).

#### 7.4 Position in time

In addition, just like the preposition *in*, *on* appeared to have a temporal sense, referring to a particular event happening in a particular position in time. The conceptual metaphor TIME IS SPACE (Boroditsky 2000) is applied to conceptualize time as an axis and then to place the Figure on the Ground, conceptualized as a point in the time axis. In all such cases (23; 6.8%, in Table 9) both the Figure and the Ground were abstract, as in example 58 below:

58) *On 6 August 2019, the Croatian authorities received an extradition request from Russia.*

↓

*[Receival of an extradition request] (F) on 6 August 2019 (G).*

F is abstract; G is abstract and temporal; F is placed on the G.

Many cases representing the temporal sense of *on* had a particular date, as a particular point in time acting as the Ground (examples 59 and 60). However, several cases in which the Ground was a particular event, marking the occurrence or the start of the Figure, were identified (examples 61).

59) *Interception (F) on 12 December 2019 (G)* (both F and G are abstract; G is temporal; F is placed on the G);

60) *Adoption of legislature (F) on 16 December 2015 (G)* (both F and G are abstract; G is temporal; F is placed on the G);

61) *Adoption of measures (F) on the expiry of the period set (G)* (both F and G are abstract; G is temporal; F is placed on the G).

As illustrated by the examples, both the Figure (e.g. *adoption of legislature*) and the Ground (e.g. *16 December 2015*) are abstract objects. While by applying the conceptual metaphor TIME IS SPACE the focus is on the Ground as a particular point in time, and not a particular period in time as in case with the temporal sense of *in*, the relationship between the Figure and the Ground in the temporal sense of *on* is geometric.

#### 7.5 Effect or the affected

A sense, when a particular effect acts as the Figure and the affected is the Ground, is identified as another sense of *on*. Just as in the example below (62), in which both the Figure (*harmful effects*) and the Ground (*human health*) are abstract, the Figure is the effect itself and the Ground acts as a recipient or the affected. This sense of *on* was the most frequent one and appeared in 113 cases (31.8%, in Table 9).

62) *Indeed, according to the very definition of ‘limit value’ in the Air Quality Directive, that value must, in order to avoid, prevent or reduce **harmful effects on human health** and/or the environment as a whole, be attained within a given period and not be exceeded once attained.*

↓

*Harmful effects (F) on human health (G);*

F is abstract; G is abstract; F affects G.

In is noticeable, that while both the Figure and the Ground were always abstract, some variety of the Figure, as a particular effect appeared, or the negative and positive types of effect were found. Negative effect was presented by *limits* (example 63), *restrictions* (64), and *negative impact* (65); while positive effect manifested by *powers* given (66).

63) *Limits (F) on the exercise of the discretion (G) (F and G are abstract; F affects G);*

64) *Restriction (F) on the free movement of capital (G) (F and G are abstract; F affects G);*

65) *Negative impact (F) on the ability to compete (G) (F and G are abstract; F affects G);*

66) *Powers (F) conferred on the Commission (G) (F and G are abstract; F affects G).*

Finally, as can be seen in the usage examples provided (62-66), in the cases collected from the press releases of the CJEU, both the Figure and the Ground were abstract and Figure had either positive or negative effect on the Ground (one object affects the other). Therefore, the relationship between the Figure and the Ground in this sense of *on* appears to be functional.

## 7.6 Specification or cover

The sense of specification or cover of *on* was the second most frequent sense, which appeared in 92 cases (25.9%, see Table 9). This sense, in all identified cases referred to a legal process or a document (the Figure) covering a particular area of law (the Ground). In other words, the Figure specified which area of law was covered or legally regulated by it, as in example 67 below:

67) *The Court notes, next, that, to define the terms ‘drug’ or ‘narcotic drug’, EU law makes reference inter alia to two United Nations conventions: the Convention on Psychotropic Substances and the **Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs**.*

↓

*Convention (F) on Narcotic Drugs (G).*

F is abstract; G is abstract; F covers G.

Other cases illustrating the specification or cover sense of *on* appeared similar; however the linguistic expressions differed and looked like the following:

- 68) *Protocol* (F) *on privileges and immunities* (G) (F and G are abstract; F covers G);
- 69) *Provisions* (F) *on the free movement of goods* (G) (F and G are abstract; F covers G);
- 70) *Measures* (F) *on safety and noise level standards* (G) (F and G are abstract; F covers G);
- 71) *Decision 2016/1250* (F) *on the adequacy of the protection [...]* (G) (F and G are abstract; F covers G).

Overall, it is clear that in this sense of *on* both the Figure (e.g. *protocol, provisions, measures, decision*, etc.) and the Ground (*privileges and immunities, safety and noise level standards*, etc.) always appeared abstract. Due to the specification or covering quality of the Figure, it can be claimed that the sense is derived from the functional relationship between the two objects.

### 7.7 Mode or method

The last sense of *on* identified was mode or method for usage cases when the Ground represents the way another object, a particular event or objective acting as the Figure, is done or achieved. In all 28 cases (7.9%, in Table 9) both the Figure and the Ground were abstract, as in example 72 below:

- 72) *The Court also pointed out that the Commission is not required to state reasons **on a case-by-case basis** for its decision to seek the imposition of a financial penalty under Article 260(3) TFEU.*

↓

*[Stating reasons]* (F) *on a case-by-case basis* (G);

F is abstract; G is abstract; G modifies F.

In the example above (72), the Figure (*stating reasons*) as an abstract object is achieved or done by applying the Ground (*a case-by-case basis*), or in other words the Figure is modified by the Ground. Different linguistic expressions representing the same sense of *on* were (examples 73 and 74):

- 73) *Provision of services*(F) *on a fair basis* (G) (F and G are abstract; G modifies F);
- 74) *Additional services* (F) *on a free of charge basis* (G) (F and G are abstract; G modifies F).

However, other examples, when the Ground refers to a legal procedure or some kind of legal means that are used to achieve something were also identified, as in example 75 below:

75) *Ruling upheld (S) on appeal (G)* (both F and G are abstract; G modifies F).

Finally, in the mode or method sense of *on*, both the Figure and the Ground were abstract objects, the relationship between which was based on the fact that one modifies another in a way that states how the other is achieved or done. Therefore, the relationship appears to be functional.

## 8. Translation of the preposition *on*

The cases of the usage of *on* that were analysed in terms of the types of Figure and Ground and the relationship between them, just like the cases of the usage of *in*, were then analysed regarding their translation from English (SL) to Lithuanian (TL). The translation analysis revealed the following translation patterns of the preposition *on* from English into Lithuanian: by the use of Genitive, *Dėl* (relating to) + Genitive, Dative, Accusative, *Per* (through)/*Apie* (about) + Accusative, Instrumental, and Locative cases; or by the following three patterns, forming an adjectival phrase, changing the sentence pattern or omitting the preposition completely (Table 10).

**Table 10. Translation patterns of the preposition *on* into Lithuanian (TL)**

Translation pattern of <i>on</i>	Number of cases	Percentage
Genitive case	22	6.2%
<i>Dėl</i> (relating to)+ Genitive case	63	17.7%
Dative case	88	24.9%
Accusative case	75	21.1%
<i>Per</i> (through) + Accusative case	2	0.6%
<i>Apie</i> (about) + Accusative case	1	0.2%
Instrumental case	28	7.9%
Locative case	26	7.3%
Adjectival phrase	24	6.8%
Changed structure/omitted	26	7.3%
In total	355	100%





[...] *Cour de cassation (Kasacinis teismas) pateikė Teisingumo Teismui prašymą priimti prejudicinį sprendimą, kad galėtų priimti sprendimą dėl aptariamų nacionalinės teisės nuostatų atitikties **Direktyvai 2006/123 dėl paslaugų vidaus rinkoje.***

↓

*Directive [...] (F) on services [...] (G);*

*Direktyv-a                      dėl                      paslaug-ų;*

Directive-NOM.SG      (relating to)      services-GEN.PL.

Other, however less frequent translation patterns were the use of the Genitive (22 instances, 6.2% in Table 10; example 79), Instrumental (28 instances, 7.9% in Table 10; example 80) and Locative (26 instances, 7.3% in Table 10; example 81) cases in the Lithuanian language, as well as forming an adjectival phrase (24 instances, 6.8% in Table 10; example 82).

79) *In the present case, Google Ireland, a company incorporated under Irish law which carries on an activity subject to the Hungarian **tax on advertising**, failed to comply with its obligation to submit a tax declaration in respect of that tax.*

*Nagrinėjamu atveju pagal Airijos teisę įsteigta bendrovė Google Ireland, vykdanči veiklą, kuriai taikomas Vengrijos **reklamos mokestis**, neįvykdė pareigos deklaruoti, kiek tai susiję su šiuo mokesčiu*

↓

*Tax (F) on advertising (G);*

*Reklam-os                      mokest-is;*

Advertising-GEN.SG      tax-NOM.SG.

80) *An air passenger who is compensated for the cancellation of a flight and who has agreed to **travel on an alternative flight** is entitled to compensation for a delay in the re-routing flight.*

*Oro transporto keleivis, kuris gavo kompensaciją už atšauktą skrydį ir sutiko su pasiūlymu **skristi kitu maršrutu**, turi teisę gauti kompensaciją už skrydžio kitu maršrutu atidėjimą.*

↓

*[Travel] (F) on an alternative flight (G);*

*[Skrydis]                      kit-u                      maršrut-u;*

[Travel]-NOM.SG      alternative-INS.SG      flight-INS.SG.

81) *The Landgericht Kiel concluded that it lacked territorial and international jurisdiction, a finding which was **confirmed on appeal** by the Oberlandesgericht Schleswig (Higher Regional Court, Schleswig, Germany).*

*Landgericht Kiel (Kylio apygardos teismas) nusprendė, kad neturi teritorinės ir tarptautinės jurisdikcijos, o Oberlandesgericht Schleswig (Šlėzvigo žemės aukštesnysis apygardos teismas, Vokietija) tai **patvirtino apeliacinėje instancijoje**.*

↓

[Confirmation] (F) on appeal (G);

[Patvirtinimas] apeliacinėje instancijoje;

[Confirmation]-NOM.SG appeal-LOC.SG.

82) *Rather, the Transparency Law is founded on a **presumption made on principle** and indiscriminately that any financial support of civil organisations that is sent from abroad is intrinsically suspect.*

*Skaidrumo įstatymas veikiau grindžiamas **principine** ir nediferencijuota **prezumpcija**, kad bet koks pilietinių organizacijų finansavimas iš užsienio yra savaime įtartinas.*

↓

Presumption (F) on principle (G);

Principinė prezumpcija;

Principled presumption-NOM.SG.

Several other translational patterns, although the rarest, were the use *Per* + Accusative case (0.6% in Table 10), *Apie* (about) + Accusative case (0.2% in Table 10), or changing the structure or omitting the preposition completely (7.3% in Table 10).

Finally, the translation analysis of *on* shows that all of the identifies senses of the preposition *on* in the language of the press releases of the CJEU are not congruent when translated into Lithuanian, as the translational equivalent *ant* was not used, and other translation patterns, mainly the ones including the use of grammatical cases in the Lithuanian language appear.

## CONSLUSIONS

Cognitive analysis of the meaning of the prepositions *in* and *on* in the press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union, employing the analysis of types of Figure and Ground and the relationship between them, provided an insight into the semantic nature of the prepositions and how they are translated from English into Lithuanian.

Regarding the concrete and abstract usage of *in* and *on*, it is clear that primarily both prepositions are spatial and their central or primary senses are concrete since they are based on a purely spatial image schema (*a person in a humanitarian centre* → *asmuo humanitariniame centr-e* → person-NOM.SG humanitarian-LOC.SG centre-LOC.SG; and *a passenger on board of a plane* → *keleiv-is lėktuv-e* → person-NOM.SG plane-LOC.SG). However, the usage of both prepositions in the legal language of the European Union, or the language of the press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union in particular, is abstract (*in* 89%, see Table 4 and *on* 97.7%, see Table 8) with only several remaining cases being concrete (11% and 2.3% respectively).

The ratio of concrete and abstract senses of *in* and *on* manifested in the identified senses of both prepositions and their frequency. The identified concrete senses of *in* were Physical container (as central, e.g. *place in a humanitarian reception centre*) and Position in space (e.g. *wolf in a village*), whereas the abstract ones were Abstract container (e.g. *requirements in article*), Position in time (e.g. *arrest in 2017*), Inclusion in social constructs (e.g. *skater in competition*) and State or situation (e.g. *judicial activities in widespread remote working*). The Abstract container was the most frequently used (57.2% in Table 5), followed by Position in space (12.7% in Table 5), State or situation (12.1% in Table 5) and the remaining ones (State or situation, Inclusion in social constructs, Position in time and Physical container) being less frequent.

The identified concrete senses of *on* were Physical support (as central, e.g. *passenger on board*) and Position in space (e.g. *production on Croatian territory*), while the abstract senses were Abstract support (e.g. *decision on solid facts*), Position in time (e.g. *adoption of legislature on 16 December 2015*), Effect or the affected (e.g. *harmful effects on human health*), Specification or cover (e.g. *provisions on the free movement of goods*) and Mode or method (e.g. *services on a free of charge basis*). Two abstract senses, Effect or the affected and Specification or cover, were the most frequent, constituting the 31.8% and 25.9% (see Table 9) cases respectively.

With both prepositions *in* and *on*, the types of Figure and Ground were abstract in the majority of cases. This conclusion is formulated based on the correspondence between the ratio of concrete and abstract senses of the chosen prepositions (with *in*, 11% concrete and 89% abstract, see Table 4; with *on*, 2.3% concrete and 97.7% abstract, see Table 8), the number of concrete and abstract senses of the prepositions identified (regarding *in*, 2 concrete and 4 abstract senses in Table 5; regarding *on*, 2 concrete and 5 abstract senses in Table 9) and the fact that the most frequent senses, in both cases were abstract (Abstract container with *in*, 194 instances or 57.2% in Table 5; Effect or the affected with *on*, 113 instances or 31.8% in Table 9).

Regarding the preposition *in*, abstract nouns in the position of Figures were *judgment*, *requirements*, *legislation*, etc. whereas abstract nouns acting as Grounds were *case*, *provision*, or *court proceedings* and many others. However, both were closely related to legal concepts, legal processes, and legal documents. Concrete types of Figure and Ground, on the other hand, were significantly rare and usually encompassed alive and a moving or personified Figure (*person*, *group of people*, *establishment*, etc.) and a stationary Ground (*region*, *country*, *Member state*, etc.)

Regarding the preposition *on*, abstract Figures were represented by such linguistic expressions as *decisions*, *judgment*, *protocol*, *convention*, *adoption of legislation*, etc.; while abstract Grounds were *human health*, *economic activity*, *free movement of goods*, etc. These were also closely related to legal matters. Concrete types of Figure and Ground were similar to the ones with the preposition *in*, as Figure was usually an alive and moving object (*person*, *group of people*, etc.) and the Ground was stationary (e.g. *a country*).

Findings of the translation analysis of *in* provided several translation patterns used in the Lithuanian language. Such patterns were the use of different cases in the Lithuanian language, such as Dative, Accusative, *Pagal* (according to) + Accusative, Instrumental, and Locative cases or the forming of an adjectival phrase, participial construction, or omitting the preposition completely. The two most frequent translation patterns were the use of Locative case (61.6% in Table 6) and forming a participial construction (20.3% in Table 6), while other translation patterns were significantly less frequent. Finally, according to the central spatial sense of *in* (here referred to as Physical Container) and its translational equivalent into the Lithuanian language being the use Locative case, the majority of cases, or the 61.6% appear to be congruent between English (SL) and Lithuanian (TL).

Findings of the translation analysis of *on* also provided a variety of translation patterns. These were the use of different cases in the Lithuanian language, such as Genitive, *Dėl* (relating to) + Genitive, Dative, Accusative, *Per* + Accusative, *Apie* (about) + Accusative, Instrumental and Locative; the construction of an adjectival phrase or omitting the preposition completely. The translation of *on* differed from the translation of *in*, as there was no one dominant translation pattern with *on* (as the use of Locative case with *in*). However, three most frequent translation patterns were the use of the Dative case (24.9%, see Table 10), the use of Accusative case (21.1%, Table 10) and *Dėl* (relating to) + the Genitive case (17.7%, Table 10). When it comes to congruence of *on* between the English and Lithuanian languages, it appeared that the preposition is not congruent, as not one case of its usage was translated by the use of its translational equivalent *ant* (e.g. as in *a cat on the table* – *kat-ė ant stal-o* → cat-NOM.SG on table-GEN.SG).

Overall, this research applying the cognitive linguistics framework provides a thorough analysis of the meaning of the prepositions *in* and *on* as they are used in the press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union and how they are translated from English into the Lithuanian language. Therefore, the findings of this research (the identified senses of *in* and *on* and their translation patterns) might provide some beneficial insights into the studies on prepositional semantics, translation and legal language. However, several limitations of the paper appear, as it does not encompass all of the ways prepositions *in* and *on* were used in the language of the press releases of the CJEU (Table 3 and Table 7) and only a short overview of both highly idiomatic expressions and phrasal verbs is presented. Therefore, the space for future research appears as the semantic analysis of the prepositions *in* and *on* could extent to the analysis of the aforementioned fixed phrases.

## REFERENCES

- Anthony, L. 2019. AntConc (Version 3.5.8) [Computer Software]. Tokyo: Waseda University. Available from: <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Boroditsky, L. 2000. Metaphoric structuring: understanding time through spatial metaphors. *Cognition*, 75: 1-28.
- Boroditsky, L. 2001. Does language shape thought? Mandarin and English speakers' conceptions of time. *Cognitive Psychology*, 43: 1-22.
- Bremner, S. 2014. Genres and processes in the PR industry: behind the scenes with an intern writer. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 51(3): 259-278.
- Casasanto, D. and L. Boroditsky. 2003. Do we think about time in terms of space? In R. Alterman and D. Kirsh (eds) *Proceedings of the 25<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. Austin: Cognitive Science Society. 216-221.
- Catenaccio, P. 2007. Because crisis happens. Analysing the Implicit in Parmalat's crisis press releases. *ILCEA*, 9: 153-170.
- Chomsky, N. A. and H. Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters, in N. A. Chomsky (ed.), *The minimalist program*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press. 13-127.
- Coventry, K. R., M. Prat-Sala, and L. Richards. 2001. The interplay between geometry and function in the comprehension of over, under, above and below, *Journal of Memory and Language*, 44: 376-398.
- Dirven, R. and M. Verspoor. (eds) 2004. *Cognitive Exploration of Language and Linguistics*. Second Revised Edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company. 1-23.
- Evans, V. and M. Green. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics; An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Evans, V. 2010. The perceptual basis of spatial representation, in V. Evans, and P. Chilton (eds) *Language, Cognition and Space: The State of the Art and the New Directions*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 21-48.
- Feist, M. I. 2010. Inside in and on: typological and psycholinguistic perspectives, in V. Evans, and P. Chilton. (eds) *Language, Cognition and Space: The State of the Art and the New Directions*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 95-114.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. 1984. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lassen, I. 2006. Is the press release a genre? A study of form and content. *Discourse Studies*, 8(4): 503-530.

- Luraghi, S. 2009. Case in cognitive grammar, in Malchukov, A. and A. Spencer (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 136-150.
- Majid, A., M. Bowerman, S. Kita, D. B. H. Haun, and S. C. Levinson. 2004. Can language restructure cognition? The case for space. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 8(3): 108-114.
- Munday, J. 2008. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Navarro I Ferrando, I. 1999. The metaphorical use of “on”. *Journal of English Studies*, 1: 145-164.
- Navarro I Ferrando, I. 2006. On the meaning of three English prepositions, in I. Navarro I Ferrando, and M. N. Alberola Crespo. (eds) *In-roads of Language. Essays in English Studies*. Universitat Jaume I. 167-180.
- Newmark, P. 1986. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Nida, E. A. 2003. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Brill: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. 2015. (9<sup>th</sup> edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O’Neill, B. 2006. *Elementary Differential Geometry* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Cambridge: Academic Press.
- Pym, A. 2010. *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.
- Skorczynska, H. 2020. “We are prepared to play our part...”: A case study of the use of first-person references in e-releases from two oil companies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 155: 1-14.
- Sleurs, K. and G. Jacobs. 2005. Beyond preformulation: an ethnographic perspective on press releases. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37: 1251-1273.
- Stasiūnaitė, I. 2016. The semantics of spatial prepositions: the main trends of research. *Taikomojikalbotyra*, 8: 188–212
- Stasiūnaitė, I. 2018. On the motivated polysemy of the Lithuanian ŽEMIAU (*Below*), *Studies about Languages*, 32: 5-20.
- Šeškauskienė, I. and E. Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė. 2015. On the Polysemy of the Lithuanian Už. A Cognitive Perspective, *The Baltic International Yearbook of Cognition, Logic and Communication*, 10: 1-38.
- Šeškauskienė, I. and R. Juknevičienė. 2020. Prepositions in L2 written English, or why on poses more difficulties than in. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 19(1):65-96.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Vol 1. London: The MIT Press.
- Ungerer, F. and H. J. Schmid. 2006. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxfordshire: Routledge. 24-58; 163-175.



Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė, E. and I. Šeškauskienė. 2021. When the search domain is back region in Baltic: The Latvian aiz as compared to the Lithuanian už, in: Arkadiev, P., J. Pakerys, I. Šeškauskienė, V. Žeimantienė (eds.), *Studies in Baltic and other Languages*. (Vilnius University Open Series Vol. 16). Vilnius: Vilnius University Press. 433–466.

## DATA SOURCES

All of the press releases of the Court of Justice of the European Union that are provided hereinafter are available from [https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/jcms/Jo2\\_7052/en/?annee=2020](https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/jcms/Jo2_7052/en/?annee=2020).

Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 1/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.1/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 6/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.6/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 7/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.7/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 8/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.8/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 10/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.10/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 11/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.11/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 12/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.12/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 19/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.19/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 20/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.20/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 21/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.21/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 22/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.22/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 23/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.23/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 26/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.26/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 31/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.31/20.



Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.72/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 73/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.73/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 75/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.75/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 77/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.77/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 84/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.84/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 88/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.88/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 91/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.91/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 92/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.92/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 93/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.93/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 94/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.94/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 101/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.101/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 106/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.106/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 111/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.111/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 112/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.112/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 116/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.116/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 117/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.117/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 118/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.118/20.



Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.162/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 163/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.163/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 167/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.167/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 168/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.168/20.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRESS RELEASE No 173/2020.  
Court of Justice of the European Union. 2020. PRANEŠIMAS SPAUDAI Nr.173/20.

## SUMMARY IN LITHUANIAN

Vadovaujantis kognityvinės lingvistikos principais, kurie dažnai taikomi tiriant prielinksnių semantiką, šiame darbe siekiama atlikti dvejų anglų kalbos prielinksnių *in* ir *on* reikšmių analizę, apimančią (1) minėtų prielinksnių vartoseną Europos Sąjungos teisės kalboje, ir (2) jų vertimą iš anglų kalbos į lietuvių kalbą. Tokie Europos Sąjungos teisinės kalbos tekstai kaip Europos Sąjungos Teisingumo Teismo pranešimai spaudai buvo pasirinkti kaip tinkamiausi šiam tyrimui atlikti, kurio metu siekiama patvirtinti arba paneigti dvi iškeltas hipotezes: (1) kad prielinksnių *in* ir *on* reikšmės vartojamos Europos Sąjungos teisinėje kalboje dažniau yra abstrakčios nei konkrečios, nes tai lemia abstrakčių sąvokų gausa teisinėje Europos Sąjungos kalboje; (2) kad prielinksniai *in* ir *on* vartojami teisinėje kalboje nėra verčiami iš anglų į lietuvių kalbą pasitelkiant vien tik lietuvių kalbos prielinksnius, nes pasitelkiamos ir kitos, Lietuvių kalboje priimtinesnės konstrukcijos. Šio tyrimo metu, remiantis bendraisiais kognityvinės lingvistikos principais (Talmy 2000; Ungerer and Schmid 2006), arba figūros ir fono tipų, bei juos siejančių geometrinių ir/arba funkcinių ryšių analizės būdu, išskirtos konkrečios ir abstrakčios prielinksnių *in* ir *on* reikšmės. Fizinė talpykla, kaip pirminė arba centrinė prielinksnio reikšmė, ir vieta erdvėje buvo išskirtos kaip konkrečios prielinksnio *in* reikšmės, o abstrakti talpykla, vieta laike, priklausymas socialiniams konstruktams ir būsenai ar situacija sudarė išskirtas abstrakčias prielinksnio reikšmes. Prielinksnio *on* analizės metu taip pat nustatytos dvi konkrečios prielinksnio reikšmės: fizinė atrama, kaip pirminė arba centrinė reikšmė, bei vieta erdvėje. Abstrakčios prielinksnio *on* reikšmės buvo abstrakti atrama, vieta laike, poveikis arba paveiktasis, patikslinimas arba apimtis, bei būdas arba metodas. Galiausiai vertimo analizės metu buvo išskirtos minėtų prielinksnių vertimui iš anglų į lietuvių kalbą vartojamos konstrukcijos, atkreipiant dėmesį į šių konstrukcijų (ne)atitikimą abejose kalbose. Pastebėta, kad dažniausiai vartojamos konstrukcijos prielinksniui *in* išversti buvo vietininko ir įnagininko linksniai, bei dalyvinės konstrukcijos sudarymas, o prielinksnio *on* vertimui dažniausiai vartotos prielinksnio *dėl* + kilmininko linksnio konstrukcija, o taip pat ir naudininko bei galininko linksniai.

**Raktiniai žodžiai:** kognityvinė lingvistika, prielinksniai, semantika, polisemija, figūra, fonas, teisinė kalba, pranešimai spaudai.