

A cognitive-linguistic approach to the translation of metaphor from English into Croatian

Schmidt, Goran

Doctoral thesis / Disertacija

2012

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:805426>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-01-02**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



JOSIP JURAJ STROSSMAYER UNIVERSITY OF OSIJEK
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY

Goran Schmidt

**A COGNITIVE-LINGUISTIC APPROACH
TO THE TRANSLATION OF METAPHOR
FROM ENGLISH INTO CROATIAN**

DOCTORAL THESIS

Osijek, 2012

JOSIP JURAJ STROSSMAYER UNIVERSITY OF OSIJEK
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY

GORAN SCHMIDT

**A COGNITIVE-LINGUISTIC APPROACH
TO THE TRANSLATION OF METAPHOR
FROM ENGLISH INTO CROATIAN**

DOCTORAL THESIS

Supervisor:

Marija Omazić, Ph.D., Associate Professor

Osijek, 2012

SVEUČILIŠTE JOSIPA JURJA STROSSMAYERA U
OSIJEKU
FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

GORAN SCHMIDT

**KOGNITIVNO-LINGVISTIČKI PRISTUP
PREVOĐENJU METAFORE
S ENGLESKOG NA HRVATSKI JEZIK**

DOKTORSKI RAD

Mentor:

izv. prof. dr. sc. Marija Omazić

Osijek, 2012.

MOTTO

But metaphors are not merely things to be seen beyond.

In fact, one can see beyond them only by using other metaphors.

It is as though the ability to comprehend experience through metaphor were a sense, like seeing or touching or hearing, with metaphors providing the only ways to perceive and experience much of the world. Metaphor is as much a part of our functioning as our sense of touch, and as precious.¹

The truth is rarely pure and never simple.²

¹ Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 239).

² Oscar Wilde, *The Importance of Being Earnest*, 1985, Act I, Part 1.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Prof. Marija Omazić, for her selfless counsel and guidance in preparing this thesis. I would also like to thank the Department of English Language and Literature of the Faculty of Philosophy in Osijek, for providing me with a pleasant and motivating working environment. I am also indebted to the staff of the doctoral study program “*Jezikoslovlje*”, for introducing me to linguistic research. I am grateful also to all the staff and students at CETRA 2011, for their invaluable feedback and suggestions at the last stage of writing.

Abstract

The main objective of the thesis was to apply the Conceptual Metaphor Theory to a research on metaphor translation. A comparative analysis of three target texts of the same source text was carried out. The corpus consists of Oscar Wilde's novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and three different Croatian translations, done by three different translators in three different time periods (1920, 1953, and 1987). ST metaphoric expressions were identified and copied into a database, where they were aligned with the corresponding TT1, TT2, and TT3 translation solutions. The translation solutions were classified according to a new typology, which combines CMT with the existing typologies in TS. In order to account for the motivation for the different translational solutions, as well as for the effects of using particular procedures, the identified metaphorical expressions and the translational solutions were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively, taking into account different parameters, such as universality and conventionality of metaphor among others.

The proposed typology of metaphor translation procedures was found to be adequate and sufficient for a complete description of the procedures. In the analysis of the corpus the total of 10 translation procedures were identified, which are contained in 4 major categories. The motivation for using a particular translation procedure is very complex, consisting of a number of objective and subjective reasons. The universality of metaphor proved to be a relevant factor for the choice of translation procedure. Different procedures are used to produce different effects, such as making the text more expressive or less expressive, making elements of meaning explicit or implicit etc. Most of the metaphors were preserved (77% same domain, 5% different domain), while some of the metaphors were paraphrased (17%). Deletion was, on average, very uncommon (<1%). The most frequently used procedure was literal translation, while deletion was the least frequently used.

Key words: cognitive linguistics, translation studies, Conceptual Metaphor Theory, comparative analysis, typology of procedures, motivation

Sažetak

Ciljevi i hipoteza

Glavni je cilj ove disertacije bila primjena teorije konceptualne metafore (Lakoff i Johnson, 1980.) na istraživanje prevođenja metafora. Ostali ciljevi uključuju razvijanje precizne i točne tipologije prevoditeljskih postupaka u prevođenju metafora kombiniranjem teorije konceptualne metafore i postojećih tipologija u znanosti o prevođenju, objašnjenje (jezične i izvanjezične) motiviranosti i implikacija različitih prevoditeljskih postupaka u prevođenju metafora, opis eventualnih kulturoloških razlika između angloameričke i hrvatske kulture koje proizlaze iz razlika u konceptualnim sustavima tih dvaju jezika, tj. kultura, ispitivanje uloge i značaja teorije konceptualne metafore u obrazovanju prevoditelja i opis mogućih postupaka za prevođenje metafora. Osnovna hipoteza jest da primjena teorije konceptualne metafore u istraživanju prevođenja metafora omogućava potpuniji uvid u problematiku prevođenja metafora kao i identifikaciju problema u prevođenju metafora i pronalaženje adekvatnih rješenja.

Metode

Metodološki pristup ovom istraživanju je deskriptivan (eng. *descriptive translation studies* ili DTS) te usmjeren na proizvod (eng. *product-oriented approach*). Prema Holmesu (usp. Munday, 2001: 11), istraživanje prijevoda može biti usmjereno na (1) proizvod, (2) funkciju (3) proces prevođenja. Deskriptivna znanost o prevođenju koja je usmjerena na proizvod istražuje postojeće prijevode. To može biti opis ili analiza pojedinačnih parova IT-CT ili komparativna analiza nekoliko CT-ova istog IT-a (na jednom ili više ciljnih jezika). Te studije manjih razmjera mogu se objediniti u veći korpus analiziranih prijevoda prema određenom vremenskom periodu, jeziku ili tipu teksta/diskursa. Studije većih razmjera mogu biti dijakronijske ili sinkronijske i, prema Holmesovim predviđanjima, „jedan od konačnih ciljeva DTS-a usmjerenog na proizvod mogla bi biti opća povijest prevođenja – kako god ambiciozno takav cilj izgledao u ovom trenutku“. Za razliku od usmjerenosti na proizvod, usmjerenost na funkciju podrazumijeva opis funkcije prijevoda u ciljnoj sociokulturi. Usmjerenost na proces

pak podrazumijeva istraživanja psihologije prevođenja, tj. onoga što se događa u glavi prevoditelja tijekom procesa prevođenja.

Metodologija ovog rada se temelji na komparativnoj analizi nekoliko ciljnih tekstova istog izvornog teksta. Korpus se sastoji od:

(IT) izvornika romana Oscara Wildea *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, prvi put objavljenoga 1891. godine, i tri različita hrvatska prijevoda:

(CT1) Oscar Wilde, *Dorian Gray*, preveo dr. Artur Schneider, objavljen 1920.,

(CT2) Oscar Wilde, *Slika Doriana Graya*, preveo Zlatko Gorjan, objavljen 1953., i

(CT3) Oscar Wilde, *Slika Doriana Graya*, preveo Zdenko Novački, objavljen 1987. godine.

Pored usporedbe pojedinačnih prijevoda s originalom (CT1 : IT, CT2 : IT, CT3 : IT) rad s više različitih prijevoda omogućava nam i njihovu međusobnu usporedbu (CT1 : CT2 : CT3). Budući da su tri prijevoda koja smo analizirali nastala u trima različitim vremenskim razdobljima (u razmacima od oko 35 godina), njihovom međusobnom usporedbom dobivamo naznake dijakronijske slike koja odražava promjene prevoditeljske norme tijekom vremena.

Svi tekstovi su poravnani na razini rečenice koristeći kompjutorski „software“ *Wordsmith Tools*. U izvornom tekstu smo identificirali metaforičke izraze te ih usporedili s prevoditeljskim rješenjima u CT1, CT2 i CT3. Nakon toga smo klasificirali različita prevoditeljska rješenja koristeći tipologiju koja je kombinacija Touryjeve (vidi Prunč, 2002: 244) i Kövecsesove (2004) tipologije. Prednost naše tipologije u odnosu na Touryjevu je u tome što naša uključuje i kognitivni element, tj. primjenjuje teoriju konceptualne metafore.

Kako bismo objasnili motiviranost različitih prevoditeljskih postupaka u prevođenju metafora, kao i učinke pojedinih postupaka, analizirali smo identificirane metaforičke izraze u izvorniku i prevoditeljska rješenja s obzirom na parametre poput univerzalnosti i konvencionalnosti metafore, uloge individualnog stila prevoditelja u izboru određene prijevodne procedure itd. Rezultati su obrađeni i kvalitativno i kvantitativno.

Rezultati i zaključci

Predložena tipologija postupaka za prevođenje metafora pokazala se adekvatnom i dostatnom za potpuni opis postupaka. Analizom korpusa identificirali smo 10 tipova prevoditeljskih postupaka, koje možemo svrstati u 4 glavne kategorije. Konceptualna metafora može se prevesti istom konceptualnom metaforom, različitom konceptualnom metaforom, nemetaforičkom parafrazom ili brisanjem (ispuštanjem) metafore. Motivacija za upotrebu pojedinačnih prevoditeljskih postupaka vrlo je kompleksna i sastoji se od niza objektivnih i subjektivnih razloga, poput konvencionalnosti ciljnog jezika, jezične asimetrije, opće usmjerenosti na izvorni tekst ili na čitatelja, raznih stilskih elemenata kao što su eksplicitacija ili implicitacija, pojačavanje intenziteta izraza, pojačavanje izražajnosti teksta, izbjegavanje redundancije, individualne osobitosti prevoditelja, utjecaj literarnog diskursa ciljne kulture i tradicije itd. Jedan od važnih faktora koji utječu na izbor prevoditeljskog postupka je univerzalnost metafore, tj. je li konceptualna metafora ili metaforički izraz zajednički izvornoj i ciljnoj kulturi. Upotreba različitih postupaka ima i različite učinke, npr. određeni postupci mogu učiniti tekst izražajnijim ili manje izražajnim, mogu istaknuti ili sakriti određene značenjske elemente itd. Iz distribucije prevoditeljskih postupaka u našem korpusu proizlazi da je većina metafora ostala očuvana (77% ista izvorišna domena, 5% različita domena), dok su neke metafore parafrazirane nemetaforičkim jezikom (17%). Brisanje metafore je vrlo rijedak postupak (manje od 1% slučajeva u korpusu). Najčešći postupak je doslovan prijevod, a najmanje je slučajeva brisanja.

Rezultati ove studije mogu se, osim u daljnjim istraživanjima prevođenja metafora, primijeniti i praktično, npr. u kritici prijevoda (evaluacija, kontrola kvalitete, pogreške), kao i u didaktici obrazovanja prevoditelja (kompetencija, kurikulum, poduka / obuka / vježbe).

Ključne riječi: kognitivna lingvistika, znanost o prevođenju, teorija konceptualne metafore, komparativna analiza, tipologija postupaka, motivacija

List of Tables

Table 1. Steps of research design.....	81
Table 2. Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT1.....	163
Table 3. Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT2.....	166
Table 4. Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT3.....	169
Table 5. A parallel distribution of translation procedures used in the selected examples from the corpus.....	177
Table 6. Influence of the categories of metaphor universality on the choice of translation procedure.....	180

List of Figures

Figure 1. Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT1 (pie chart).....	165
Figure 2. Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT2 (pie chart).....	168
Figure 3. Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT3 (pie chart).....	171
Figure 4. Comparative distribution of metaphor translation procedures for the TT1, TT2 and TT3 (stacked columns).....	172
Figure 5. A clustered column chart comparing values across categories TT1, TT2 and TT3.....	175

List of Pictures

Picture 1. A screenshot of the ST – TT1 database in MS Word.....	87 and 92
Picture 2. A screenshot of the initially planned database in MS Word.....	94
Picture 3. A screenshot of the parallel database in MS Word.....	95
Picture 4: A screenshot of the main screen of ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition.....	99

Picture 5: A screenshot of the scanning settings window in ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition.....	100
Picture 6: A screenshot of the scanning window in ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition.....	101
Picture 7: A screenshot of the text in MS Word after being scanned and processed with ABBYY FineReader 9.0.....	102
Picture 8: A screenshot of the text in Word after editing.....	103
Picture 9: A screenshot of the text in Notepad in the plain text format.....	104
Picture 10: A screenshot of the text in Viewer and Aligner Utility of WordSmith Tools 5.0.....	105
Picture 11: A series of screenshots of Viewer and Aligner showing one sentence that was automatically broken in three parts and the procedure of joining the fragments into one sentence.....	106-107
Picture 12: A screenshot of the aligned multiple text in Viewer and Aligner Utility of WordSmith Tools.....	108

List of Abbreviations:

- CM – conceptual metaphor
- CMT – Conceptual Metaphor Theory
- lit. – literally
- ME – metaphoric expression
- SC – source culture
- SL – source language
- ST – source text
- TC – target culture
- TL – target language
- TT – target text
- TS – translation studies

Table of Contents

<i>Motto</i>	1
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	2
<i>Abstract</i>	3
<i>Sažetak</i>	4
<i>List of tables</i>	7
<i>List of figures</i>	7
<i>List of pictures</i>	7
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	8
1. Introduction	
1.1. The subject matter.....	11
1.2. Dissertation structure.....	13
2. Theoretical background	
1.3. Translation Studies and linguistics.....	15
1.4. Metaphor.....	22
1.4.1. Traditional views.....	23
1.4.1.1. Classical tradition.....	23
1.4.1.2. The twentieth century.....	27
1.4.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory.....	31
1.4.3. Conceptual Metaphor Theory vs. traditional views.....	41
1.5. Metaphor translation: the state of the art.....	46
2. Methodology.....	79
2.1. The rationale.....	79
2.2. Research design.....	81
2.3. Corpus.....	97

2.4. Tools.....	99
2.5. Research questions.....	109
3. Research findings and discussion	
4.1. Qualitative analysis.....	110
4.1.1. CM -> CM (conceptual metaphor -> (same) conceptual metaphor).....	111
4.1.1.1. Same expression of the same CM (1a).....	111
4.1.1.2. Same expression of the same CM, with an addition (1a+).....	117
4.1.1.3. Same expression of the same CM, with an omission (1a-).....	130
4.1.1.4. Different expression of the same CM (1b)	134
4.1.1.5. Different expression of the same CM, with an addition (1b+).....	140
4.1.1.6. Simile (1c).....	146
4.1.1.7. Simile, with an addition (1c+).....	147
4.1.2. CM -> CM1 (conceptual metaphor -> different conceptual metaphor, with a similar meaning)	147
4.1.3. CM-> non-M (conceptual metaphor -> non-metaphor; paraphrase).....	150
4.1.4. CM -> 0 (deletion)	158
4.1.5. non-M -> CM (non-metaphor into conceptual metaphor).....	160
4.2. Quantitative analysis.....	163
4. Conclusion.....	186
4.1. Conclusions.....	186
4.2. Review of the objectives and research questions.....	188
4.3. Strengths, weaknesses and limitations.....	194
4.4. Practical application of research findings.....	195
4.5. Recommendations for future research.....	197
<i>References</i>	200
<i>Curriculum vitae</i>	205

1. Introduction

1.1. Subject matter

Metaphor translation has been researched in translation studies for at least thirty-five years. One of the first papers dealing with the subject was Dagut's „Can metaphor be translated?“ from 1976³. Main areas of interest have been translatability of metaphor and transfer methods. Translation researchers have pointed out that when translating metaphor from one language into another language, i.e. from one culture into another culture, problems may occur due to linguistic as well as cultural differences between languages. A number of procedures for translating metaphor has been proposed, approaching the problem of metaphor translation both normatively, addressing the question of how to translate metaphor (cf. Newmark, 1988), and descriptively, pertaining to the question of how metaphor is translated in actual translations (cf. van der Broeck, 1981; Kj ar, 1988; Kurth, 1995; Toury, 1995)⁴.

In translation studies, metaphor has mainly been understood in the traditional way, as a rhetorical device used for ornamenting a text. Most of the terminology used is that of semantic theories, going as far back as Richards (1936)⁵: 'image' or 'vehicle' for conventional referent, 'object' or 'topic' for actual referent, 'sense', 'ground' or 'tenor' for similarities i.e. analogies between them⁶. Among others, van der Broeck (1981) has pointed out factors like conventionality and cultural dependence of metaphor.

In 1980, Lakoff and Johnson put forward a new view of metaphor, called Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). According to their view, metaphorical expressions are not just ornamental figures of speech, but manifestations of human cognitive processes, i.e. of the way

³ In Sch affner, 2004.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ In van der Broeck, 1981.

⁶ In Sch affner, 2004.

we think. Metaphorical expressions are products of human cognitive mechanisms called conceptual metaphors. Already van der Broeck (1981) correctly stated that, for a complete description of metaphor, translation studies lacked a usable definition of metaphor. However, the CMT has been applied in translation studies only recently. This could be explained by the fact that translation studies has recently been increasingly distancing itself from linguistics, and getting ever closer to cultural studies, social science and ethics.

However, CMT has gradually found its application in translation studies (Stienstra, 1993; Schäffner, 1997, 1998, 2004; Cristofoli et al., 1998; Al-Harrasi, 2000)⁷, with impulses coming also from cognitive linguists, in particular from the work of Zóltan Kövecses (2003, 2004, 2006).

The analysis of the way metaphoric expressions are translated provides us with an insight into differences and similarities between languages and cultures. Sometimes even small differences in the expression of a metaphor can point to much larger differences in culture. Thus Kövecses (2004) rightly concludes that metaphors are not just cognitive but cultural entities as well, i.e. the cognitive and cultural aspects are united in one conceptual complex. An analysis of metaphor translation can be equally useful to linguistics, translation studies and culture studies. Furthermore, the cognitive-linguistic approach to metaphor allows for a different answer to the question of translatability of metaphor. Translatability is no longer a question of individual metaphoric expressions, but it is linked to the level of conceptual systems of the ST and TT, which brings us to the question of translatability in general (Schäffner, 2004).

This dissertation's main objective is to test the applicability of Conceptual Metaphor Theory in a research project on metaphor translation. The following specific objectives are pursued:

⁷ Ibid.

- setting up a typology of metaphor translation procedures by combining CMT and existing typologies in TS;
- identifying the procedures for translating metaphors used in the corpus - testing the typology on the corpus;
- adapting the typology according to the findings;
- accounting for the motivation for using a particular procedure (Why is a particular procedure used in a particular context?) and the effect of using it;
- calculating the distribution of the procedures in the corpus;
- identifying the tendencies in metaphor translation;
- describing possible cultural differences between English culture and Croatian culture that are manifested through different conceptual systems of those two cultures, i.e. their respective languages;
- showing the range of possibilities for translating metaphors.

The following argument is proposed:

- Applying CMT to research on metaphor translation allows for a better understanding of the issue of metaphor translation.

1.2. Dissertation structure

The introductory chapter briefly presents the subject matter of the dissertation, namely the translation of metaphors. It gives an overview of the most important issues, scholars and theories connected to the subject matter. It also sets the direction in which the dissertation will unfold by listing the objectives and the hypothesis of the research.

The second chapter provides the theoretical background for the dissertation. The nature of the subject matter calls for an interdisciplinary approach, encompassing at least two

disciplines, namely translation studies and linguistics. Therefore, the multifaceted relationship between translation studies and linguistics is first briefly described. Although the focus of the dissertation is not metaphor *per se*, but the translation of metaphor, it is necessary to get acquainted with the different views on metaphor, as well as with the mechanics of metaphor, before proceeding with the research. That is why a fairly detailed account of the various theories of metaphor is given, proceeding from the classical (ancient Greece and Rome: Aristotle, Plato, Demetrius, Quintilian, Cicero) theory of metaphor to the traditional views until the late twentieth century (I.A. Richards, Max Black, Roman Jakobson), concluding with Conceptual Metaphor Theory by Lakoff and Johnson, which serves as the theoretical underpinning of this dissertation. The last part of the second chapter is a précis of the current state of research on the translation of metaphor, since this research draws from and builds on the results of the latest relevant studies on the topic.

The third chapter is dedicated to the methodological matters. It offers a clear outline of the research design, research questions, and the rationale of the research. The corpus is also presented, along with the reasons why this particular corpus is used (its relative advantages and drawbacks). The rest of the chapter is committed to the tools used in the research (i.e. the computer software).

The fourth chapter contains the analysis of research findings. The research findings are analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. First, the selected examples are analyzed in detail and discussed in a qualitative manner. Then, the findings are presented in the form of tables, quantitative data and generalizations.

The concluding chapter sums up the results of the research, evaluates their scientific contribution, discusses their potential for application, points to the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of the research, and gives recommendations for future research.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Translation Studies and linguistics

As has already been stated, the subject of this dissertation is the translation of metaphor. The adopted analytical framework is Conceptual Metaphor Theory. CMT is a part of cognitive linguistics, one of the youngest branches of linguistics. Therefore, the subject matter is on the crossroads of translation studies and linguistics, which makes this research interdisciplinary. It is thus necessary to write a few words about the complex relationship between those two disciplines, in order to get a clearer picture of what this research is trying to do, and how that fits into the long tradition of linguistically oriented translation research.

Some contemporary critics point to the fact that translation studies and linguistics have lately been growing apart. Bell (1991: xv) claims that translation theorists and linguists are going their own separate ways, and Pergnier (1993: 9) warns that there are those who would like to liberate translation completely from linguistics⁸. In order to evaluate those claims, we need to make ourselves acquainted with the history of the relationship between linguistics and translation.

The relationship between linguistics and translation is twofold⁹. You can either apply the findings of linguistics to translation or have a linguistic theory of translation (as opposed to, say, literary theory of translation). The current disenchantment of translation theorists with linguistics stems partly from the disappointment in American structural linguistics and the way they dealt with the problem of meaning in language. For American structural linguists, meaning was something scarcely structured (because it did not fit neatly into their understanding of language as a structured system) and unobservable. And since meaning is in

⁸ In Fawcett, 1998: 120.

⁹ Ibid. p.120ff.

the focus of translation it is no wonder that translation theorists turned away from linguistics. Translation theory has to draw upon a theory of meaning, as Catford (1965: 1)¹⁰ stated.

But, linguistics had not always been structurally oriented. Linguistics (then called philology) started to emerge as a discipline in its own right in the second half of the eighteenth century.¹¹ In 1786 Sir William Jones put forward his thesis about the common Indo-European origin of Sanskrit, Greek and Latin languages, which sparked off research in comparative and historical linguistics. By comparing different languages to one another, they identified the similarities and differences between them, which allowed them to make generalizations about language genealogy, to group the languages together into families, such as the Germanic group of languages, the Romance or the Slavonic group. After the discovery of the common historical origin of the Indo-European languages, linguistic focused on the historical development of languages. Some hundred years later, the Junggrammatiker (the ‘neo-grammarians’), a group of German linguists centered round the university of Leipzig, voiced criticism against the preoccupation with the past and the analytical methods employed in linguistic analysis. The Junggrammatiker were concerned more with the spoken language insisting on a more systematic approach to the study of language.

Out of this tradition sprung Ferdinand de Saussure (1857 - 1913), who is considered as ‘the father of modern linguistics’. He also stressed the importance of the synchronic approach, and he introduced many theoretical concepts such as ‘langue’ and ‘parole’, and ‘the linguistic sign’ made of ‘the signifier’ (= a mental image of the physical sound) and ‘the signified’ (= a mental concept referred to by the signifier). The most important implication for translation is de Saussure’s claim that the relationship between the signifier and the signified is not inherent but an arbitrary social construct. For example, we call ‘house’ a ‘house’ because we choose to call it that, and there is an agreement in the society upon that matter. The word ‘house’ is not inherently linked to the concept of house; we might label that concept in a different way, e.g.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ For references in this section, if not otherwise indicated, see Anderman (2007) and Fawcett (1998).

‘kuća’. Moreover, not only is the signifier (the word) arbitrary, but also the signified, i.e. what we mean by the word ‘house’. As a consequence, no two words in two different languages can ever mean quite the same. Even though the English word ‘house’ and the Croatian ‘kuća’ are considered to be equivalent, they have different sets of associations and connotations.

In the first half of the 20th century, the link between translation and linguistics got stronger with the rise of anthropologically-based linguistics. The anthropological linguists, such as Bronislaw Malinowski (1884 - 1942) were empirically confronted with the limits of translation. In order to describe the culture and religion of the Trobriand islanders of New Guinea, Malinowski had to systematically apply translation in the statement of his ethnographic texts. Especially problematic was the translation of the key concepts of the foreign culture, for which there were no English terms available. In the United States, scholars such as Franz Boas (1858 - 1942), Edward Sapir (1884 - 1939) and Benjamin Whorf (1897 - 1944) focused on Native American languages, which were rapidly facing extinction. Whorf’s hypothesis (1956) about disparity in world view between speakers of vastly different languages, in its ‘stronger’ version, makes translation a near impossibility. The study of linguistics in the USA during the 1930s and 1940s was dominated by Leonard Bloomfield (1887 - 1949). Influenced by behaviorist, mechanistic psychology, Bloomfield put strong emphasis on methodology and was concerned with the structure of language to the exclusion of meaning. Because of that exclusion of meaning, the American structuralism was not a particularly fruitful ground for translation theory.

One of the first linguists to deal with linguistic aspects of translation was the Czech-born American structuralist Roman Jakobson. In his 1959 paper entitled ‘On linguistic aspects of translation’ Jakobson proposed a division of translation into three types: interlingual translation (transfer of content and form from one language to another), intralingual translation (rewording in one and the same language for the purpose of clarification), and intersemiotic translation (translation between different sign systems, e.g. when a written text is transferred to another medium such as film or music).

The middle of the 20th century was marked by the work of Noam Chomsky. Chomsky ended the behaviorist stronghold on American linguistics and shifted the emphasis to the intuitive knowledge that speakers possess about their language; instead of highlighting the differences, he looked for universality in languages. Although Chomsky himself was not optimistic about the implications of his transformational-generative (TG) grammar for translation, the tenets of his theory provided a linguistic framework for a theory of translation in the work of Eugene Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964), and, co-authored with C. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translating* (1969). Nida applied the principles of TG grammar to translation, providing for the first time the translation theory with a 'scientific' foundation. Nida operates with the concepts such as 'transformations' and 'kernel sentences' and 'componential analysis', which makes his findings formalized within a linguistic framework. Nida's work set the course for the further advancement of the relationship between translation and linguistics.

In the United Kingdom, linguistics, based on Malinowski's legacy, took a different course. J. R. Firth (1890 - 1960) turned Malinowski's concept of 'context of culture' into 'meaning as function in context'. That theory was further developed by Michael Halliday into a full-scale linguistic theory, known as *Scale and Category Grammar* or *Systemic Grammar*. This theory was applied to translation by J. C. Catford in *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965). A key notion in early, linguistically-based, translation theories was the notion of 'equivalence'. It was taken from natural sciences, where it meant a quality of being interchangeable, of equal value. Applied to translation, equivalence means a relation between an ST language unit and a TT language unit such that one can replace another in translation (they are believed to have the same meaning). Nida used the concept in his dichotomy between formal and dynamic equivalence. Other translation theorists of the 1950s and 1960s also attempted to define the concept of equivalence and place it in translation theory. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) in their detailed contrastive analysis of English and French proposed a set of translation procedures, which included a number of 'indirect' procedures involving instances when equivalence in the target language could not be achieved.

The translation theories of the 1970s were based on contrastive analysis. Languages were contrasted with one another, and on the word and phrase levels equivalents were identified. In the cases where two cultures, i.e. languages were incompatible, so-called ‘gaps’ were identified. One task of a linguistic translation theory was defining translation techniques required to deal with these mismatches and the relations they set up between languages.¹² Various word and phrase level taxonomies of translation equivalence were developed, including Nida (1969), Koller (1972), Retsker (1974), Newmark (1981), Shveitser (1987), and Malone (1988). However, soon it became clear that word and phrase level taxonomies are inadequate for dealing with all the problems faced by translators. The scope had to be broadened beyond the sentence boundary, and this is where text linguistics comes into the picture. Katarina Reiß (1976) tries to link text types to translation strategies, relying on the Bühler's model of the three functions of the linguistic sign (informative, expressive and operative). Other translation theorists drawing upon text linguistics include A. Neubert (1981), J. House (1977, 1981), Hönig & Kussmaul (1982)¹³. The importance of the function of the translated text is further emphasized in Hans Vermeer's *skopos* theory of translation (Reiß & Vermeer, 1984)¹⁴. According to this theory, the aim of translation (Greek *skopos* means ‘aim’) determines the translation strategy. Following this tradition, Justa Holz-Mänttari (1984)¹⁵ develops her translational action model. Christiane Nord (1989, 1991, etc.)¹⁶ further emphasizes the functionalist approach. Crossing the sentence boundaries called for an inclusion of text linguistics into the analysis of translation, and it also allowed for other branches of linguistics to influence translation studies.

Some of the linguistic disciplines that have since been applied in translation studies include discourse analysis, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, corpus linguistics, and, finally, cognitive linguistics. Sociolinguistics is the study of the influence of social variables on

¹² Cf. Fawcett, 1998: 122.

¹³ More on Hönig & Kussmaul in Prunč, 2007: 137ff.

¹⁴ Ibid. p.142ff.

¹⁵ Ibid. p157ff.

¹⁶ Ibid p. 165ff.

language use. The pioneers of sociolinguistics in the 1970s were William Labov in the USA and Peter Trudgill in the UK. They initiated a number of research projects with the aim to reveal the causes of language variation according to variables such as geographical origin (dialect) and social class membership of speakers (sociolect). The study of phonetics is the study of speech sounds. Two of the pioneers of phonetics in Britain were Henry Sweet (1845 - 1912), and his student Daniel Jones (1881 - 1967). However, the distinction between written and spoken, standard and dialect has not been emphasized enough in translation studies, and the problems of vernacular and dialect translation have frequently not been reflected. One further area of linguistics that has been incorporated into translation theory is pragmatics. Pragmatics examines the purposes for which sentences are used and the real-world conditions under which they are appropriately uttered. Gutt (1991) attempted to incorporate translation into a general theory of human communication, using the principle of 'relevance'. Other translation theorists, such as House & Kasper (1981), Brown & Levinson (1987), Ohlstein (1983), Hönig & Kussmaul (1984)¹⁷ have applied the theory of speech acts, which goes back to John L. Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969). Corpus linguistics is another fast-growing area of linguistics that has provided translation studies with valuable tools for research. This is the study of language on the basis of large, computerized text corpora. It goes back to around 1960, when the first machine-readable corpus was compiled at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island. Translation theorists began to use the benefits of the corpus as a source of systematically retrievable data and a test bed for hypotheses in the late 1980s. M. Gellerstam (1986, 1996, and 2005) worked with the language pair Swedish - English and has systematically compared original texts with texts in translation. His studies showed the influence in translation of the ST on the TT and revealed some cross-linguistic differences between the two languages. Jakobsen's (1986) corpus study confirmed that result, showing the influence of English on lexical selection in Danish. Nowadays corpora are used widely by translation scholars to investigate every possible aspect of the relationship between the ST and the TT, in a wide variety of languages. Parallel corpora have been compiled for many language pairs, such as English / French, English / Italian, English / Norwegian, and English /

¹⁷ For the latter see Prunč, 2007: 138-139.

German. Where such corpora do not exist, as is the case for the language pair English / Croatian, we now have the possibility to compile small corpora for the purpose of individual case studies using the available software tools, the way it was done for the purposes of this research. The latest development in linguistics is the branch called cognitive linguistics, which too has gradually found its way into translation studies.¹⁸ This dissertation reinforces the recently founded relationship between cognitive linguistics and translation studies by applying CMT to translation research.

Having sketched the outline of the historical development of the complex relationship between linguistics and translation, we are now in the position to answer the critics who are lamenting about translation studies and linguistics going their own separate ways. Based on the evidence, it is only fair to conclude that the critics are wrong. The link between these two disciplines is as strong as it had been in the 1960s, when Nida and Catford put forward the first linguistically-based translation theories. If anything, the link is even stronger now, with the development of corpus linguistics and cognitive linguistics, which both proved to be fruitful grounds for translation research. The fact that some areas of translation studies, such as sociology of translation, cultural studies in translation, or translation ethics diverge from linguistics can testify only of the ever-growing interdisciplinarity of translation studies, with linguistics still being a vital part of it.

¹⁸ See Section 1.1.

2.2. Metaphor

It is not possible to do a research on metaphor translation before one is acquainted with the term metaphor itself, with its multiple meanings and interpretations through history of human thought about language. This section gives an overview of many different views on metaphor, from Aristotle to Lakoff and Johnson.

Regarding the origin of the word metaphor in English, the *Online Etymology Dictionary* states that the word was imported into the English language in 1530s via Old French *metaphore* and Latin *metaphora*. The word originates from Greek *metaphora*, ‘a transfer,’ especially of the sense of one word to a different word, literally ‘a carrying over,’ from *metapherein*, ‘transfer, carry over,’ from *meta-* ‘over, across’ + *pherein* ‘to carry, bear’. So, originally ‘metaphor’ meant a transfer of the sense of one word over to another word.

Over the past two thousand years metaphor has been studied by thousands of people including philosophers, rhetoricians, literary critics, psychologists, and linguists, such as Aristotle, Hume, Locke, Vico, Herder, Cassirer, Bühler, I. A. Richards, Whorf, Goodman, Max Black, to mention just a few names.¹⁹ With all those scholars studying metaphor, it is no wonder there are many different views on the subject, ranging from the view of metaphor as a mere rhetorical figure used to ornament the speech to the view that metaphor is not just a matter of language, but a vital part of the human conceptual system, with an array of different views in-between those two opposites.

Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity, all the different theories of metaphor are outlined here in just two main streams: (a) the traditional views of metaphor, (b) Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

¹⁹ Cf. Kövecses, 2002: Preface x.

2.2.1. Traditional views

2.2.1.1. Classical tradition

It is well-known that our notion of metaphor is not exactly equivalent to the Greek *metaphora* ('transfer'). Our notion of metaphor goes back to Aristotle's (384 BC – 322 BC) introduction of a distinction between literal and metaphoric language, i.e. terms used metaphorically, in a transferred sense, and those used strictly (Lloyd, 2003: 101ff.). The word *metaphora* is in itself a metaphor. It means 'carrying across' or transference, reflecting the basic idea that a term is transferred from its original context to another (Innes, 2003: 7ff.). The two basic notions in the classical theory of metaphor are similarity and substitution. In terms of extant classical theory, metaphor is a mode of expression, a primarily or exclusively a form of ornamentation, a poetic device. One term is substituted for another term for the sake of setting up a comparison of the two things which are in some respect similar. „This approach to metaphor is in contrast to more modern theory where language and thought are regarded as indissoluble, and the use of metaphor creates an interaction and change of significance in the terms used.“ (Innes, 2003: 8) Aristotle is certainly the most influential theorist of metaphor before the modern age. Aristotle in the *Poetics* sees metaphor as a phenomenon of poetic language, based on the principle of similarity, or analogy. He writes:

Much the most important [feature of poetic language for the composer of poetry to use] is metaphorical [usage]. This alone cannot be learnt from anyone else and is a sign of natural gifts, in that to use metaphors well is to discern similarities. (*Poetics* 22, 1459a5–8; in Lloyd 2003: 116)

Further, Aristotle distinguishes between non-standard and standard usage of words, with *metaphora* as the most important of the non-standard (ib. 116ff.). In his system, metaphor subsumes what will later be distinguished as several different tropes (the theory of tropes is not to be found in Aristotle, it is assumed to be Hellenistic). Aristotle's *metaphora*, then, is

and is not ‘metaphor’; and though it will often be convenient to call it metaphor, the two terms are not strictly interchangeable. Aristotle defines and classifies *metaphora* as follows:

Metaphora is the transfer [to one thing] of a word that belongs to another thing, either from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy. By ‘genus to species’ I mean (e.g.) ‘here stands my ship’ [*Odyssey* 1.185], because lying at anchor is a [kind of] standing. Species to genus, ‘ten thousand fine deeds Odysseus has accomplished’ [*Iliad* 2.272], because ‘ten thousand’ is many, and [Homer] uses it here instead of ‘many’. Species to species, (e.g.) [?Empedocles] ‘skimming off a life with bronze’ [sc. a bronze weapon] . . . because here he has said ‘skimming off’ for ‘cutting’, both being [kinds of] removing. By ‘analogy’ I mean [instances] when *b* is to *a* as *d* is to *c*: [a poet] will say *d* instead of *b*, or *b* instead of *d* . . . Old age is to life as evening is to day; so [a poet] will call evening ‘the day’s old age’ or, like Empedocles, call old age ‘life’s evening’ . . . (*Poetics* 21, 1457b6–24; in Lloyd 2003: 117)

According to this classification, *metaphora* subsumes not only metaphors, but also metonymy (the “ten thousand” example). The use of the verb ‘to stand’ in the cited Homeric usage might be described as a ‘dead metaphor’, or even a straightforward instance of ‘standard’ usage. Here begins the long tradition of distinguishing one-off literary usage of metaphor (often called creative metaphor) from established idioms within a language (often called dead metaphor), or the dead/alive dichotomy. From this same *Poetics* passage we can see that for Aristotle metaphor is essentially a substitution (for example, Homer used “ten thousand” *instead of* “many”; he could have used “many”). This substitution principle has been challenged in twentieth-century philosophical theories of metaphor, as for example in the Max Black’s interaction theory or Lakoff and Johnson’s Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Aristotle had recognized that metaphor can fill a lexical gap, and he exploited it to coin new technical terms (Innes, 2003: 12). For Aristotle, metaphor is especially suited to prose: “Since it aims to persuade and win over an audience, good prose style will combine clarity from the use of ordinary words with some pleasing degree of ornamentation from the unusual” (Innes, 2003: 13). The audience should perceive a likeness between *a* and *b*, which should stir a new

understanding of the relationship between species and genus. However, to perceive a likeness takes skill. What is needed is an understanding of abstract relationships, a cognitive element (Innes, 2003: 14).

Already Aristotle's teacher, Plato (428 / 427 BC – 348 / 347 BC) made some interesting observations on the cognitive role of metaphor. Although he does not explicitly use the term *metafora*, his account of the role of *eikones* and *paradeigmata* —‘images’ and ‘models’— in argument and inquiry anticipate various contemporary ideas on the cognitive significance of metaphors and models (Pender, 2003: 55ff.). For Plato, a model works through recognition of a common element present in two different entities, *x* and *y*, where *x* is an easier and more familiar entity and *y* is a more difficult, unfamiliar entity. In using *x* as a model for *y* the thinker is making a comparison between *x* and *y*, so that the familiar features of *x* become discernible in the unfamiliar context of *y*. So, a model involves comparing two different domains.²⁰ The main idea is that models are needed in order to demonstrate, i.e. illustrate, difficult subjects. Further, there must be a common element —not just hypothesized but objectively there— between the familiar *x* and the unfamiliar *y* which it is used to illustrate or explain in order for a model to work.²¹ As opposed to models, images depend merely upon likeness.²²

Later on, metaphor is often narrowed to Aristotle's fourth type, the analogical metaphor. For example, Demetrius (c. 350 BC - c. 280 BC) states that „[m]etaphors should not be far-fetched but from the same area and based on a true likeness“ (Innes, 2003: 15). More popular is another fourfold classification that defines relationships according to the animate and inanimate. Thus animate may be compared to animate, inanimate to inanimate, inanimate to

²⁰ These ideas are very close to the idea of cross-domain mapping in CMT.

²¹ This is where CMT differs from the classical theory. In CMT the likeness between domains does not have to be real, i.e. preexisting – it can be only a perceived likeness, and in some cases, metaphors can even create likeness. Read more about that issue in the section on CMT.

²² Images correspond roughly to Lakoff's one-shot (or image) metaphors.

animate, and animate to inanimate (personification). The classification expands upon Aristotle, who knows only the fourth type, personification.

Metaphor is used because it is in some way “more effective than the term it ejected” (Quintilian 8.6.18; in Innes, 2003: 16) and this effectiveness is variously subdivided. Details vary in different lists, but vividness, emphasis, and ornamentation are particularly prominent. There is also considerable attention to what is appropriate, with various restrictions on the use of metaphor.

The Roman rhetorician Quintilian (ca. 35 AD - ca. 100 AD) writes about metaphor as one of the tropes. He defines ‘trope’ as „an expression transferred from its natural and principal signification to another, for the sake of embellishing speech.” (Quintilian 9.1.4, cited from Boys-Stones, 2003: 1). As Boys-Stones (2003: 2) points out, the rhetoricians' definition of metaphor as a speech ornament was used only for the purpose of the instruction of orators. Indeed, the rhetoricians were aware that 'tropes' were more than just ornaments! To support that claim, Boys-Stones cites Quintilian 8.6.1–3, where he says that he will ‘omit all arguments [conducted among grammarians and philosophers] which are *irrelevant to the instruction of the orator*’. Conversely, in 9.1.4, Quintilian appends a grammarians’ definition of a ‘trope’ which omits not only the reference to oratory present in his own, but also (significantly) the reference to *ornament*. When reading the rhetoricians we should always bear in mind this vital limitation to the scope of their discussion, otherwise we could get the idea that the classical theory of metaphor is inadequate to the realities of language use. With this, Boys-stones (2003: 5) challenges the rather narrow contemporary interpretation of ancient theory, calling for a more positive dialogue between modern theory and its historical roots.

In the ancient theory, metaphor is connected to allegory. Allegory is the term given to sustained metaphor: „When there have been more metaphors in a continuous stream, another kind of speech clearly arises: and the Greeks call this kind ‘allegory’ (Cicero, *Orator* 94; cited

from Boys-Stones, 2003: 1). Like metaphor, allegory was not thought to be employed solely for the sake of adornment. Moreover, the Platonist commentators on the ancient poets appear to have believed that allegory, far from adorning their meaning, was often the *only* means available for expressing what needed to be said.

Another important question is the status of simile. Aristotle defines simile as a type of metaphor. According to Aristotle, simile is a metaphor²³ modified with some expression to mark likeness, such as the change of ‘he was a lion in his attack’ to ‘he was like a lion in his attack’. (Innes, 2003: 18ff.) Conversely, later critics, like Cicero and Quintilian, look on metaphor as an abbreviated simile.²⁴

In this section we have seen some of the main ideas connected to the discussion on metaphor amongst the philosophers and rhetoricians of the ancient Greece and Rome. The following section addresses various metaphor theories of the twentieth century.

2.2.1.2. The twentieth century

This section outlines the main theories of metaphor in the twentieth century, from I. A. Richards, who was among the first scholars to reject the classical view of metaphor as ornament and appraise its status as a cognitive device, over Max Black’s interaction theory to Roman Jakobson’s (1956, 1960) discussion of the opposition between metaphor and metonymy. Although Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory is also a twentieth century theory, it is covered separately in the next section.

Ivor Armstrong Richards (1873 - 1979) was a literary critic and rhetorician who reopened the philosophical consideration of metaphor. His fresh approach to the subject made at least

²³ This is in line with CMT. See footnote 32.

²⁴ This is still being taught in our schools today, although it was proven to be wrong by CMT some 30 years ago.

three important points. First, he claimed that metaphor is an omnipresent principle of language and not a dispensable ornament of persuasion (Stallman, 1999: 24ff). This view of metaphor will allow us to see that "most sentences in free or fluid discourse turn out to be metaphoric," and that "literal language is rare" (Richards, 1936: 120). His second point is presenting a conceptual basis for understanding metaphor. Richards saw *all* words as taking a large part of their meaning from the words around them and the general sense of the context. Metaphor is, then, just a special case of this general principle. So, for example, in his view, 'my boss' changes its meaning in the context of the word 'dinosaur' (for reference see Resource2). Richards' definition of 'metaphor' reflects this:

In the simplest formulation, when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction. (Richards, 1936: 93)

Richards talked about the internal aspects of metaphor through the distinction between tenor and vehicle. The tenor is the underlying idea or principal subject and the vehicle is the figurative part which provides a description of the tenor. Together the tenor and the vehicle make up what we call metaphor. So, metaphor is seen as a double unit consisting of two elements or components. Thus, Richards' third contribution is that metaphor is a matter of thought more than one of single terms. To describe this relation more adequately, Richards supplements his original schema where we have the following (Johnduff, 2009):

metaphor:

tenor + vehicle

To elucidate the relationship between tenor and vehicle Richards introduced another concept, the 'ground' of the metaphor. The ground of the metaphor is merely the *presence* of a tenor-vehicle relation, which is most "solid" in the form of resemblance. Thus, where we have a

vehicle that relates to the tenor in the form of resemblance, the metaphor has a ground. And where we have a metaphor where the vehicle is controlling the mode in which the tenor forms, but not by bringing out something that resembles the tenor, the metaphor has *less* ground, i.e. the metaphor is more ungrounded (Johnduff, 2009). A modified schema, incorporating Richard's changes would look like this:

metaphor:

tenor ↔ vehicle

-----ground-----

Richard's theory has been labeled as 'tensive view'²⁵ or 'interanimation view'²⁶ and has been developed and modified some 20 years later by the philosopher Max Black as 'interaction theory'.

In 1955 Max Black published an important essay entitled "Metaphor", in which he presented three views of how metaphors function (Stallman, 1999: 26ff). Those were the substitution view, the comparison view, and the interaction view. The first two provide a traditional account of metaphor as a stylistic device, but the third view offers a new perspective, following in the footsteps of I. A. Richards. According to the substitution view, a metaphor is used in the place of a literal statement which would have an equivalent meaning.²⁷ The comparison view is a special case of the substitution view. It goes as far back as Quintilian, who defined metaphor as shortened simile (Kurth, 1995: 91). It presupposes an

²⁵ Richard's theory has been called "tensive" because it emphasized the conceptual incompatibility, the „tension“, between the terms (tenor and vehicle) in a metaphor (Ortony, 1993:3).

²⁶ This is based on Richard's striking image of the „interanimation of words“ (Black, 1993: 28).

²⁷ For example, 'Richard is a lion' serves as a substitution for 'Richard is brave'.

underlying analogy or similarity of the two things being compared.²⁸ Black's preferred view, though, is the interaction view, an alternative model, which states that metaphor works cognitively by providing new ways of seeing and understanding:

A memorable metaphor has the power to *bring two separate domains into cognitive and emotional relation* by using language directly appropriate to the one as a lens for seeing the other; the implications, suggestions, and supporting values entwined with the literal use of the metaphorical expression *enable us to see a new subject matter in a new way . . .* (Black, 1962, cited from Pender, 2003: 74)

Since metaphor provides new insights it is impossible to paraphrase it without a loss in meaning.²⁹ This stands in clear opposition to the traditional views, i.e. the substitution view and the comparison view. Starting with Richards' view, Black went on to describe metaphor as a filter by which certain characteristics of the figurative part of the expression (Richards' 'vehicle') are selected for projection onto the main subject (the 'tenor') (Stallman, 1999: 30). The view is labeled interactive because neither subject remains unchanged. It is a 'two-way' traffic in ideas, a bidirectional process.³⁰ Black clarifies the way in which the two subjects of metaphor interact:

In the context of a particular metaphorical statement, the two subjects "interact" in the following ways: (a) the presence of the primary subject [= the tenor] incites the hearer to select some of the secondary subject's [the vehicle] properties; and (b) invites him to construct a parallel implication-complex that can fit the primary subject; and (c) reciprocally induces parallel changes in the secondary subject. (Black, 1993: 28)

²⁸ Accordingly, 'Richard is a lion' is a shortened form of 'Richard is *like* a lion (in being brave)'.

²⁹ „The loss in such cases is a loss in cognitive content; the relevant weakness of the literal paraphrase is not that it may be tiresomely prolix or boringly explicit (...); it fails to give the insight that the metaphor did“ (Black, 1962, cited from Kurth, 1995: 92).

³⁰ Lakoff and Johnson (1980) discarded bidirectionality in metaphor. Metaphor is unidirectional, since the properties of one domain are projected onto another domain, but not vice versa.

Amongst the first linguists to depart from Aristotelian tradition, besides I. A. Richards and Max Black, was Roman Jakobson, a significant figure in the development of Russian Formalism, who decades later exercised a considerable influence on the first phase of structuralism. In his two celebrated essays entitled “Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances” (1956) and “Linguistics and Poetics” (1960) he defines metaphor in opposition to metonymy: metaphor is based on analogy or similarity, while metonymy is based on association or contiguity. And, perhaps more importantly, metaphor and metonymy are treated not simply as local devices within poetry, or literature more widely, but as typifications of two fundamental modes of discourse as a whole. These two fundamental modes of discourse are verse, which is metaphorical, and prose, which is metonymic. Metaphor, and the same is true for metonymy, had never before been assigned such significance (Silk, 2003: 120ff).

After this brief overview of the different traditional metaphor theories, it is time to turn to Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which serves as the basis for the analysis of metaphor translation in this dissertation.

2.2.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Conceptual Metaphor Theory is a central subdiscipline of the field of cognitive linguistics. CMT provides a new framework for metaphor research. It is just the type of coherent theory that was missing for a complete description of metaphor translation. The theory was formed by Lakoff and Johnson in their book *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). United by their joint interest in metaphor, the linguist George Lakoff and the philosopher Mark Johnson put forward a new theory of meaning. They take the experientialist approach to language, truth, understanding, and meaningfulness of our everyday experience in their effort to prove that there is no objective or absolute truth, rather the human experience and understanding play the central role in our interpretation of meaning. Primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence,

they have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature, which means that metaphors structure the way we perceive, the way we think and what we do.

To illustrate their point they use the concept ARGUMENT and the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. Based on the examples of metaphorical expressions such as:

Your claims are *indefensible*;

He *attacked every weak point* in my argument;

His criticisms were *right on target*; etc.,

they conclude that we do not only talk about arguments in terms of war, but many of the things we *do* in arguing are partially structured by the concept of war (We can actually win or lose arguments, we see the person we are arguing with as our opponent, we defend our positions and attack his etc.). In this sense the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is one we live by, for it structures the actions we perform in arguing. More concisely, they define metaphor as follows: “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 5). Obviously, arguments and wars are different kind of things, but ARGUMENT is partially structured, understood, performed and talked about in terms of WAR. It is important to emphasize that metaphor in this view is not just a matter of language, but of the way we think. ARGUMENT IS WAR is thus not just a metaphor, but a metaphorical concept.

In other words, in the cognitive-linguistic view, metaphor is defined as understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain. (Kövecses, 2002: 4ff.) A convenient shorthand way of capturing this view of metaphor is the following: CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (A) IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (B), which is what is called a conceptual metaphor. It is important to distinguish conceptual metaphors from metaphorical linguistic expressions. For example, ARGUMENT IS WAR is a conceptual metaphor, while expressions like ‘Your claims are *indefensible*’ etc. are metaphorical linguistic expressions. The relationship between

conceptual metaphors and metaphorical linguistic expressions can be defined in the following way: the linguistic expressions are manifestations of the conceptual metaphors. To put it differently, the metaphorical linguistic expressions reveal the existence of the conceptual metaphors. Even more bluntly, the way we talk reveals the way we think. The use of small capital letters for labeling conceptual metaphors indicates that the particular wording does not occur in language as such, but it underlies conceptually all the metaphorical expressions listed underneath it. The two domains that participate in conceptual metaphor have special names. The conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain is called source domain, while the conceptual domain that is understood this way is the target domain. Thus, ARGUMENT is the target domain, while WAR is the source domain. The target domain is the domain that we try to understand through the use of the source domain.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) further claim that metaphorical concepts are systematic, and so is language. To illustrate this point, they use the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY, exemplified by expressions such as:

You are *wasting* my time;
I *don't have* the time *to give* you;
You *don't use* your time *profitably*, etc.

In modern industrialized societies we act as if time was a valuable commodity, a limited resource, even money - we conceive of time in that way, and this is tied to our culture. Thus we understand and experience time as something that can be spent, wasted, invested, saved etc. What is more, there is a system to all this – the metaphorical concepts:

TIME IS MONEY;
TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY; and
TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE

form a single system based on subcategorization. These subcategorization relationships characterize entailment relationships (logical consequence) between the metaphors. TIME IS MONEY entails that TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE, which entails that TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY. The authors adopted the practice of using the most specific metaphorical concept, TIME IS MONEY, to characterize the entire system.

Metaphors are also systematic in highlighting and hiding certain aspects of a concept. Focusing on one aspect of a concept can keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor (e.g. If we focus on the battle aspects of arguing, we lose sight of cooperative aspects). That is why we say that one concept is *partially* structured in terms of another. If the metaphorical structuring were total, then one concept would actually *be* the other, not merely be understood in terms of it.

There are various kinds of metaphor. According to their cognitive function, metaphors are divided into:

- 1) structural;
- 2) ontological; and
- 3) orientational.³¹

(Kövecses, 2002: 33ff.)

In structural metaphor (1), the source domain provides a relatively rich knowledge structure for the target concept. In other words, the cognitive function of these metaphors is to enable speakers to understand target A by means of the structure of source B. This understanding takes place by means of conceptual mappings between elements of A and elements of B. Examples of structural metaphors include:

³¹ Interestingly, Lakoff and Johnson in the Afterword to *Metaphors We Live By*, published in 2003, reject the division: „The division of metaphors into three types—orientational, ontological, and structural—was artificial. All metaphors are structural (in that they map structures to structures); all are ontological (in that they create target domain entities); and many are orientational (in that they map orientational image-schemas).”

ARGUMENT IS WAR;
TIME IS MONEY;
TIME IS MOTION;
LOVE IS A JOURNEY;
THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS;
IDEAS ARE FOOD;
SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE PLANTS etc.

Ontological metaphors (2) give an ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts. This means that we conceive of our experiences in terms of objects, substances, and containers, in general, without specifying exactly what kind of object, substance, or container is meant. Examples of ontological metaphors include:

THE MIND IS AN ENTITY (*'I have a lot of things on my mind'*);
TIME IS SUBSTANCE (*'Time is slipping through our hands'*);
VISUAL FIELDS ARE CONTAINERS (*'The ship is coming into view.'*), etc.

Ontological metaphors serve a very limited range of purposes, but they may be further elaborated, e.g.:

THE MIND IS AN ENTITY => THE MIND IS A MACHINE (*'I'm a bit rusty today.'*); or
THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT (*'He is sharp'*).

Personification is perhaps the most obvious form of ontological metaphor. Here, the physical object is further specified as being a person:

Life *has cheated* me;
The computer *went dead* on me; etc.

Oriental metaphors (3) make a set of target concepts coherent in our conceptual system. They are called orientational because most of them have to do with spatial orientation: up-down, in-out, front-back, center-periphery etc. Kövecses thinks that “It would perhaps be more appropriate to call this type of conceptual metaphor ‘coherence metaphor,’ which would be more in line with the cognitive function these metaphors perform.” (2002: 36). Examples of orientational metaphors include:

HAPPY IS UP (‘I’m feeling *up* today’);

SAD IS DOWN (‘I’m feeling *low*’);

MORE IS UP (‘The sales are *up* on last month’);

LESS IS DOWN (‘Keep your voice *down*, please.’); etc.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 35ff.) also talk about metonymy. Using the example ‘The *ham sandwich* is waiting for his check’, they make it clear that although similar to metaphor, metonymy is still a different kind of process. While metaphor’s primary function is understanding, metonymy has primarily a referential function, that is, it allows us to use one entity to *stand for* another. Thus, ‘the ham sandwich’ is a convenient way to refer to the actual person who ordered the ham sandwich. But, metonymy is not just a referential device. Like metaphor, it also serves the purpose of understanding. It is also like metaphor in that it is not just a poetic device, nor just a matter of language. Metonymic concepts are also part of the way we think and act, and they are also systematic.³² Some representative metonymic concepts include:

³² In the *Afterword* (2003) to *Metaphors We Live By* the authors distinguish between metaphor and metonymy in the following way: “In a *metaphor*, there are two domains: the target domain, which is constituted by the immediate subject matter, and the source domain, in which important metaphorical reasoning takes place and that provides the source concepts used in that reasoning. Metaphorical language has literal meaning in the source domain. In addition, a metaphoric mapping is multiple, that is, two or more elements are mapped to two or more other elements. Image-schema structure is preserved in the mapping—interiors of containers map to interiors, exteriors map to exteriors; sources of motion to sources, goals to goals, and so on. In a *metonymy*, there is only one domain: the immediate subject matter. There is only one mapping; typically the metonymic source maps to the metonymic target (the referent) so that one item in the domain can stand for the other.”

THE PART FOR THE WHOLE (traditionally called synecdoche: ‘There are a lot of *good heads* in the university’, ‘I’ve got a new *set of wheels*’ etc.);

PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT (‘He bought a *Ford*’);

OBJECT USED FOR USER (‘The *sax* has the flu today’);

CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED (‘*Napoleon* lost at Waterloo’);

INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE (‘I don’t approve of the *government’s* actions’);

THE PLACE FOR INSTITUTION (‘The *White House* isn’t saying anything’);

THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT (‘Remember the *Alamo*’).

Metonymic concepts are grounded in our experience, and in general it is more obvious than metaphors because it involves direct physical and causal associations. For example, the PART FOR THE WHOLE metonymy emerges from our experience of the way parts in general are related to wholes, the PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT metonymy is based on causal (and typically physical) relationship between the producer and the product. Cultural and religious symbolism are special cases of metonymy, e.g. DOVE FOR HOLY SPIRIT.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 139 ff.) also distinguish between conventional metaphors and imaginative or creative metaphors. New, creative, metaphors can give us a new understanding of our experience. For example, the new metaphor LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART gives love a new meaning. Like conventional metaphors, they also have entailments (which can be metaphorical or not, e.g. ‘Love is work’, ‘Love requires dedication’ etc.). The new idea proposed here is that metaphors can *create* realities, not just describe the existing ones. This view runs counter to the classical comparison theory of metaphor, which claims that metaphor can only describe preexisting similarities. This is because in the comparison theory, which arose from objectivist philosophy, all similarities are objective. Lakoff and Johnson point out that many similarities are not objective, but experiential. This is a consequence of the authors’ general position that conceptual metaphors are grounded in correlations within our experience. There are two kinds of experiential correlations:

- 1) experiential co-occurrence (e.g. MORE IS UP- no experiential similarity; grounded in the co-occurrence of two types of experiences: adding more of a substance and seeing the level of the substance rise); and
- 2) experiential similarity (e.g. LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME, where one experiences actions in life as gamble, with the consequences of such actions being perceived as winning or losing).

In the 2003 Afterword to the book *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson point out that since the time the book was published, it has had far-reaching implications in many fields: linguistics, cognitive science, and philosophy but also literary studies, politics, law, clinical psychology, religion, and even mathematics and the philosophy of science. They also point to the fact that after twenty years of research by hundreds of investigators, vast bodies of empirical evidence for conceptual metaphor have been gathered from studies in a wide range of fields within the cognitive sciences, proving that metaphor lies at the heart of abstract thought and symbolic expression. Also, over the years, the theory of metaphor has developed and deepened considerably, for example in the early 1980s, Lakoff and Kövecses showed that metaphors are grounded in bodily experience, and by the early 1990s a whole new level of metaphor analysis was discovered that is called deep analysis. In *More Than Cool Reason* (1989), Lakoff and Turner applied deep analysis to metaphors in complex poetic and literary texts. The analysis revealed that new metaphorical ideas arise from the combination of simpler conceptual metaphors to form complex ones.

Metaphors for metaphor have also changed since 1980. Lakoff and Johnson first saw conceptual metaphors as mappings in the mathematical sense, that is, as mappings across conceptual domains. Then, they needed a way to think about metaphors so that they could not just be mappings but also could add elements to a domain. They accordingly adopted the Projection Metaphor, based on the image of an overhead projector. According to the Projection metaphor, all of the source domain should be projected onto the target; however, some parts of the source domain are not mapped. Thus, they needed to add to the Projection metaphor the idea of target domain over-rides. The principle behind this term is "Don't map

an element if it would give rise to a contradiction in the target domain" (Lakoff, 1993)³³. By 1997 the Projection metaphor was abandoned in favor of a neural theory. That theory came out of the Neural Theory of Language project directed by Jerome Feldman and George Lakoff at the International Computer Science Institute at Berkeley.

The neural theory was developed by Srinivas Narayanan in 1997. He used the results of Joseph Grady's research on primary metaphors, which showed that complex metaphors arise from primary metaphors, that are directly grounded in the everyday experience that links our sensory-motor experience to the domain of our subjective judgments (an example of primary metaphor is AFFECTION IS WARMTH- our earliest experiences with affection correspond to the physical experience of the warmth of being held closely), and Christopher Johnson's research, who has argued that children learn primary metaphors on the basis of the conflation of conceptual domains in everyday life. Using computational techniques for neural modeling, Narayanan developed a theory in which conceptual metaphors are computed neurally via neural maps—neural circuitry linking the sensory-motor system with higher cortical areas. In other words, mappings are physical links: neural circuitry linking neuronal clusters called nodes. The domains are highly structured neural ensembles in different regions of the brain. Neural maps constitute the neural mechanism that naturally, and inevitably, recruits sensory-motor inference for use in abstract thought. Primary metaphors arise spontaneously and automatically without our being aware of them. There are hundreds of such primary conceptual metaphors, most of them learned unconsciously and automatically in childhood simply by functioning in the everyday world with a human body and brain. Therefore, many primary metaphors are universal. Complex metaphors are composed of primary metaphors and they make use of culturally based conceptual frames. So, they may differ significantly from culture to culture.

³³ Cf. Afterword (2003) to Lakoff & Johnson (1980).

The Neural Theory of Language provides a neural underpinning for the theory of conceptual blends.³⁴ The theory of conceptual blends or blending theory was developed by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (2002). This theory is concerned with conceptual integration: how conceptual structures are combined for use in particular cases, especially in imaginative cases. Elements from at least two different mental spaces³⁵, called input spaces, combine together in a blended space, producing a new conceptual product called conceptual blend. Conceptual blend contains elements from both input spaces plus some new elements created in the so-called generic space. The main difference between this theory and conceptual metaphor theory is that conceptual blends does not have to be metaphorical, they can also be literal.

We stated previously that CMT is a central subdiscipline in the field of cognitive linguistics. In order to draw the boundaries of CMT and to delimit its scope in relation to the neighboring subdisciplines, consider the following list of other central developments in cognitive linguistics:

1. the semantics of closed-class elements such as spatial relations (Talmy, 2000);
2. studies of category structure, including basic-level categories, prototypes, and radial categories (Lakoff, 1987);
3. mental spaces (Fauconnier, 1985; Fauconnier and Sweetser, 1996);
4. frame semantics (Fillmore, 1982, 1985; Sweetser, 1990);
5. blended spaces (Fauconnier and Turner, 1998, 2002);
6. cognitive grammar (Langacker, 1986, 1990, 1991);
7. cognitive construction grammar (Goldberg, 1995; Lakoff, 1987, Case Study 3).³⁶

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ According to Fauconnier, 'mental spaces' are relatively small mental models of particular situations that have been structured by the concepts in our conceptual systems.

³⁶ See *Afterword* (2003) to Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

Section 2.2.2 outlined the basic tenets of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. The following section presents the reasons why Conceptual Metaphor Theory is more adequate than the traditional views on metaphor.

2.2.3. Conceptual Metaphor Theory vs. the traditional views

Lakoff and Turner in their 1989 book *More Than Cool Reason* provide an overview of the traditional views of metaphor (pp. 110-136). Since all of these views are conflicting with their view of metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon, they point out the differences and give evidence in favor of their view. Lakoff and Turner start from the position that all traditional views of metaphor are false. They further identify two major sources of failures in traditional theories:

- 1) literal meaning theory;
- 2) not looking for generalizations at the conceptual level.

In connection with (1) they write:

The general thrust of the [literal meaning] theory is to claim that *all* ordinary, conventional language (called "literal language") is semantically autonomous, that it forms the basis for metaphor, and that metaphor stands outside of it." (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 114)

The literal meaning theory rests on two implicit claims: the autonomy claim and the objectivist claim. "The autonomy claim is that conventional, ordinary language is semantically autonomous and that therefore it is not metaphoric." (ibid. p.116) Lakoff and Turner showed that this is false by presenting evidence that metaphor is characteristic of ordinary, everyday language just as it is of poetic language. The objectivist claim is that objective, mind-free reality exists independently of human conceptualization or

understanding. Accordingly, a statement must be either true or false, depending on whether it accords with the objective world. On that view, conceptual metaphor is not possible, since it is not mind-free. Lakoff and Turner reject the objectivist claim, since in their view truth and falsity are not absolutes, but they are relative to human conceptual frameworks, of which many are metaphorical in nature.

In opposition to the literal meaning theory, Lakoff and Turner offer 'the grounding hypothesis', which claims that only some concepts are semantically autonomous (= can be understood without reference to other concepts). Further, semantically autonomous concepts do not refer to objective, mind-free reality, but are grounded in our bodily and social experience. The literal meaning theory had a great influence and has led to many other positions about metaphor:

- i) the paraphrase position;
- ii) the decoding position;
- iii) the similarity position;
- iv) the reason-versus-imagination position;
- v) the naming position;
- vi) the deviance position;
- vii) the fallback position;
- viii) the pragmatics position;
- ix) the no-concepts position.

Since all these positions are consequences of the literal meaning theory, they are also false. The paraphrase position (i) claims that a metaphorical expression is meaningful only if it can be paraphrased in literal language. This is wrong, since literal language cannot replace metaphor without loss in cognitive content, as Black pointed out (see footnote 28). The decoding position (ii) maintains that metaphor is merely part of a code to be broken, in order to reveal the non-metaphoric concepts that the author is trying indirectly to express. The false

assumption here is that concepts in the target domain are understood independently of the metaphor. The similarity position (iii) assumes that metaphor highlights the preexisting similarities between two non-metaphorical concepts. This is false, since if there is similarity, it is not objective; it is similarity of image-schema structure between the target domain and the source domain of the metaphor, which is in part introduced by the metaphor itself. The reason-versus-imagination position (iv) is based on a belief that reason and imagination are mutually exclusive. On the contrary, many of our inferences are metaphoric, much of our reason is metaphoric, which leads us to the conclusion that reason is mostly imaginative in character. The naming position (v) claims that words in their 'proper use' are just names for literal concepts. On this view, metaphor is the use of a word to mean something it doesn't 'properly' mean, an improper use of words. Therefore, metaphor cannot have a conceptual role. This is false, since metaphor is not an improper use of words, but a means of understanding one thing in terms of another. The deviance position (vi) maintains that metaphors are deviating from normal, conventional usage. This is false, since ordinary, everyday language is full of metaphors; conventional metaphorical thought and language are normal. The fallback position (vii) rests on the assumption that we look first for the literal meaning of a sentence, and seek a metaphorical meaning only as a fallback, when we are not content with primary literal meaning. This is false, since our concepts are often primarily metaphorical (e.g. DEATH). The pragmatics position (viii) claims that metaphor is a matter of pragmatics, not semantics. Semantics in the traditional sense includes only conventional language that can be true or false; pragmatics includes aspects of interpretation that arise from language use. On this view, conventional metaphor is not a metaphor at all, it is only novel metaphors that count. This is false, since the underlying traditional pragmatics-semantics distinction is false. Nevertheless, pragmatic principles do apply, often combined with conceptual metaphor. The no-concepts position (ix) claims that meaning is independent of human cognition; it resides only in the relation between words and the world. Language is not based on any conceptual system. Conventional expressions cannot be metaphorical. Metaphors are outside of conventional language. Metaphor can enter the literal language, if it

ceases to be a metaphor, i.e. as a 'dead metaphor'. This is false, since it rests on the assumption of objective meaning.

Lakoff and Turner further identify two major sources of the literal meaning theory:

- a) failure to generalize;
- b) the dead metaphor theory.

Re (a): Throughout the history, scholars had always looked at individual metaphorical expressions, and it never occurred to them that those individual expressions may be systematic, may be parts of a system. As we know today, generalizations about metaphor can be stated as systematic mappings at the conceptual level.

Re (b): All metaphors that are conventional have often been called „dead“. Conventional metaphors might have been alive once, but now they are dead, they are no longer metaphors. Lakoff and Turner consider the dead/alive distinction unproductive, since, on the one hand many conventional metaphors are still 'alive', and, on the other hand this distinction is not always clear-cut, e.g. a metaphor can be alive on one level and dead on another level.³⁷

To Lakoff and Turner's knowledge, there is only one mistake in various metaphor theories independent of the literal meaning theory, and this is known as the interaction theory. This theory starts from a correct observation: speaking about source domain alone may bring to mind the target domain. But, this correct observation is analyzed incorrectly: the target domain is described as „suffusing“ the source domain, and it is claimed that metaphor is bidirectional, from target to source as well as from source to target. As a consequence, the source/target distinction becomes irrelevant. There is no source or target, only a connection

³⁷ For example, the word 'comprehend' meant originally in Latin *to grasp*. Today, we use the word 'comprehend' only in its metaphoric sense, to mean 'understand'; its former central sense is dead for us. But the old conceptual metaphor UNDERSTANDING IS GRASPING is still alive, though it is not used in this word.

across domains, with one concept seen through the filter of the other. In essence, the interaction theory claims that we are comparing the domains in both directions and picking out similarities. Lakoff and Turner say that there is no evidence for that claim. Metaphor is not bidirectional. The target domain is commonly not mapped onto the source domain, and even when it is, the mappings are different, there is no single bidirectional mapping.³⁸

Before reaching a conclusion, Lakoff and Turner consider two further positions:

- x) the linguistic-expressions-only position; and
- xi) the it's-all-metaphor position.

Re (x): This position claims that metaphor is a matter of linguistic expressions and not of conceptual structure. „This is the assumption behind the grammar-school distinction between metaphor and simile: given that A is not literally B, a metaphor is a statement of the form ‘A is B’, while a simile is a statement of the form ‘A is like B’“ (ibid., p.133). In other words, this position attempts to define metaphor in terms of syntactic form, while missing entirely what metaphor is about: understanding one thing in terms of another. In fact, both these forms can employ conceptual metaphor; simile simply states a weaker claim – in both cases one concept is understood in terms of another.³⁹

Re (xi): There is a strong and a weak version of this position. The strong version claims that every aspect of every concept is completely understood via metaphor. To Lakoff and Turner this seems false, since there must be some grounding, some concepts that are not

³⁸ For example, with domains like MACHINES and PEOPLE, it might seem that metaphor goes both ways, since we can have both (e.g. ‘I need to recharge my batteries’) and (e.g. ‘The computer is punishing me by wiping out my buffer’). But these are two different metaphors, because different things get mapped. In MACHINES ARE PEOPLE the will and desire of a person are attributed to machines, while in PEOPLE ARE MACHINES there is no mention of will and desire. What gets mapped here is that machines have different parts that function in certain ways, they are automated and brainless, they break down and need to be fixed and so on.

³⁹ For example, „[t]o say ‘An atom is like a small solar system’ uses essentially the same conceptual metaphor as ‘An atom is a small solar system,’ only the simile hedges its bets - it makes a weaker claim. But in both cases, one concept (atom) is being understood in terms of another (solar system)“ (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 133).

completely understood via metaphor, to serve as source domains. The weak version claims that every linguistic expression expresses a concept that is, at least in some aspect, understood via metaphor. Lakoff and Turner agree that the weak version may be correct, stating that at least some aspects of a great many concepts and conventional linguistic expressions are metaphorical. In conclusion, Lakoff and Turner restate two major sources of failures in traditional theories: (1) the literal meaning theory, (2) not looking for generalizations at the conceptual level.

After the brief historical overview of different metaphor theories in the previous section, it is time to turn to the research that has been done on the subject of metaphor translation.

2.3. Metaphor translation: the state of the art

This section presents the research that has been done so far on the subject of metaphor translation. In the chronological order, summaries of articles and books on the subject are given, along with a critical reflection on the issues raised and a consideration on the possible links to our research.

Literature on metaphor translation is relatively scarce. Some of the relevant contributions are Dagut (1976), van der Broeck (1981), Newmark (1981), Kurth (1995), Goatly (1997)⁴⁰, Kövecses (2004) and Schäffner (2004). Although metaphor has long been recognized as a translation problem, for a long time it had been neglected in translation studies. As Kurth (1995: 106ff) points out, the translation studies' interest in metaphor is linked to the growing linguistic interest in metaphor, especially with the emergence of text semantics and cognitive linguistics. Some of the older authors, such as Nida, Kloepfer and Reiß did not pay much attention to the subject.

⁴⁰ Cf. Schäffner, 2004.

One of the first impulses to deal with the problem of metaphor translation came from Menachem Dagut, who in his paper „Can Metaphor be translated?“ (1976) points to the lack of theoretic knowledge on metaphor translation.⁴¹ One of the objectives of our research is eliciting knowledge about that matter. Hopefully, CMT will provide a good starting point for approaching the issue. For the purpose of eliciting knowledge on metaphor translation, we take the so-called bottom-up approach, where we start from a set of real, naturally occurring, data and by induction try to arrive at generalizations about the process.

Sigrid Kupsch-Losereit in her paper „*Zum Problem der Übersetzbarkeit von Metaphern*“ (1977)⁴² investigates the semantic incompatibility of metaphors with the help of componential analysis. In our research we do not use the method of componential analysis, because it is not compatible with the methods of cognitive semantics. The notion that meaning can be fully analyzed into components rests on the Aristotelian categorization, where each category has clear-cut boundaries. Accordingly, something is either inside or outside a category. Cognitive semantics adopts another type of categorization, based on prototypes, basic-level categories and radial categories. On this view, there are prototypical representatives of a category and there are less prototypical representatives. A thing can belong to more than one category at the same time. The components of meaning are also not clear-cut, but graded. Members of the same category do not have to share a set of common defining properties, but can be radially linked to each other by a shared property etc. In short, componential analysis as a method is inadequate for describing the meaning of metaphorical expressions.

In his analysis of five different translations of Shakespeare's Hamlet, Norbert Hoffmann (1980)⁴³ claims that the translator's first task is to reflect upon the metalinguistic meaning of a metaphor. A translator must take into account the possibility of diachronic change of connotations and outdated socio-cultural references as well as the fact that metaphors besides

⁴¹ See Kurth (1995: 106).

⁴² Ibid. p.106ff.

⁴³ Ibid. p.107.

their cognitive content have an affective charge. Hoffmann formally differentiates between three types of equivalence in metaphor translation:

1. the equivalence type 1 : many, that in metaphor translation occurs rarely or never;
2. the equivalence type 1 : 1. Here, the ST metaphor is retained in the TT;
3. the equivalence type 1 : 0, which means deletion of the ST metaphor in the TT.

This division is crude, because if we exclude type 1, which is rare or non-existent, and type 3, which represents a translation gap, we end up with only one category to cover all possible modes of metaphor translation. Although his differentiation between three types of equivalence is not helpful, Hoffman's insights about the possibility of diachronic change of connotations and socio-cultural references, as well as affective charge of metaphors, have to be taken on board when attempting to analyze the way metaphors are translated.

Van der Broeck's article „Limits of translatability“ (1981) discusses the question of translatability of metaphor, depending on:

- a) conventionality of metaphor;
- b) use of metaphor;
- c) function of metaphor; and
- d) translational norms.

Considering the conventionality of metaphor (a), he differentiates between:

- i) lexicalized metaphors (they range from 'formators' such as *in the face of, everybody* etc. to single lexical items such as *to 'harbour' evil thoughts* and idioms such as *lay bare, lay a finger on* etc.);
- ii) conventional metaphors (more or less 'institutionalized' in that they are common to a literary school or generation, e.g. *mere-hengest* [sea-steed] (as a metaphor for 'ship') in

Old English poetry; Homer's *rosy-fingered dawn*; the Elizabethan's *pearly teeth*; the Augustan's *watery plain* etc.); and

iii) private metaphors (the so-called 'bold', innovating creations of individual poets).

As for the use of metaphor (b), according to van der Broeck, metaphors in a text can be either:

i) functionally relevant; or

ii) functionally irrelevant.

The use of metaphor is closely related to its function (c), and here a distinction is made between:

i) creative; and

ii) 'decorative' function.

Translatability of metaphor also depends on the translational norms (d). In this connection, van der Broeck finds the concept of 'initial norm'⁴⁴ as developed by Gideon Toury (1976) to be a potentially useful tool for the distinction between 'basic' attitudes. Van der Broeck does not try to divide metaphors according to different levels of lexicalization, but he states that every conventionalized metaphor goes through a shift from 'performance' to 'competence', and the notion of 'deadness' may give insight into that process. According to modern semantics, various stages can be distinguished in the process: the first stage of 'petrification' is that the reference and ground of the comparison becomes limited by convention. A further stage is reached when the transferred definition loses its analogical feeling, so that the metaphor is felt to be virtually synonymous to its referent. The stage of absolute 'deadness' is reached only

⁴⁴ Toury's 'initial norm' refers to the orientation of the translator towards either ST or TT. The initial norms form a continuum between the postulates of 'adequacy' and 'acceptability'. Toury defines adequacy as orientation towards the norms and textual functions of ST. An adequate translation departs from ST only insofar as the structural differences between the two languages demand it. Under 'acceptability' Toury understands a possibility of adapting the ST to the target culture norms. Cf. Prunč, 2007: 235.

when the literal meaning has died out entirely. Van der Broeck also proposed three theoretical possibilities for metaphor translation:

- 1) translation 'sensu stricto';
- 2) substitution;
- 3) paraphrase.

In defining those procedures, he uses Richard's (1936) terminology: 'tenor' (= sense) and 'vehicle' (= image). Translation 'sensu stricto' (1) means keeping both the SL tenor and SL vehicle in the TL, in other words retaining both the sense and the image. Substitution (2) means replacing the SL vehicle by a different TL vehicle, i.e. substitution by another image, with more or less the same tenor. In this case the corresponding vehicles may be considered translational equivalents. Paraphrase (3) means rendering by a non-metaphorical expression. Van der Broeck recognized the fact that in order to make generalizations about metaphor translation, we need a suitable, operational definition of metaphor. He was probably not aware of conceptual metaphor theory, which would most certainly have provided him with a definition he looked for. Instead, he looked at metaphor as a mere figure of speech, a poetic device, which can be seen as a downside to his otherwise insightful article. Another problematic point is the very issue of translatability. Translatability implies that some metaphors can be translated, while others cannot. Experience teaches us that every metaphor can be translated; it is just a matter of the way it is done. Another big issue is conventionality of metaphor. While it is possible to theoretically distinguish between lexical, conventional and private metaphors, in practice it is often impossible to do so, because conventionality is also a matter of gradient. The question of functional relevance of the metaphor seems to be important, but, I would like to argue, not in literary discourse, where every mode of expression is functionally relevant. This particular distinction, however, may become crucial when analyzing journalistic or scientific texts. The notion of translational norms is very interesting, but it is also very difficult to operationalize. If we want to apply the notion of translational norms to metaphor translation, we first have to decide what counts as ST-

orientation (adequacy) and what counts as TT-orientation (acceptability) when it comes to the types of procedures used. For example, if a metaphor is translated literally, does that imply an ST-orientation? If a metaphor is translated by a non-metaphoric paraphrase does that imply a TT-orientation? The criteria for calling a particular procedure ST-oriented or TT-oriented need to be clearly defined. Besides, the same procedure can serve one or the other purpose, depending on the context. Nevertheless, Toury's initial norm can be used to explain the motivation for using a particular type of procedure, and it is used in this research. Further, Van der Broeck's three theoretical possibilities for metaphor translation seem to cover all possibilities, except for the possibility of non-translation (deletion or omission). But, these possibilities have to be further refined from the aspect of CMT. The most valuable thing about this article is arguably its descriptive approach to the subject, the fact that the author is concerned with discovering regularities, and not creating them by imposing rules or norms on translational practice, and the latter is exactly what Peter Newmark was doing.

Peter Newmark must have considered metaphor translation an important issue to dedicate an entire chapter to the subject in his book *Approaches to translation* (1988)⁴⁵. Actually, for the most part, in the book he reproduced the contents of his earlier paper „The Translation of Metaphor“, written in 1980⁴⁶. Considering the translation of metaphor, he divides metaphor into five types: dead, cliché, stock, recent and original and proposes the terms 'object', 'image', 'sense', 'metaphor', and 'metonym' to refer to various aspects of metaphor. It has to be noted here that those terms had been previously used in semantic theories, although they had different names: 'object' had been called 'topic', 'image' had been called 'vehicle', 'sense' had been called 'tenor', which Newmark is fair to acknowledge, but that does not change the fact that the content of these terms stayed the same. Newmark (1988: 85) explains those terms on the example of the metaphoric expression *rooting out the faults*. The object is *faults*, the image is *rooting up weeds*, the metaphor is *rooting out*, and the sense is 'to eliminate with tremendous personal effort'. Newmark further states normatively that it is not satisfying to

⁴⁵ First published 1982 by Pergamon Press, Oxford.

⁴⁶ Cf. Kurth, 1995: 107ff.

translate that metaphor with a verb such as 'eliminate', unless the phrase has a marginal importance in the text. Whether a phrase has a marginal importance in the text is up to the translator to decide. A 'metonym' is a one-word image which replaces the object, which may later become a 'dead metaphor', e.g. the 'fin' of a motor cycle. The choice of the term 'metonym' in this context is probably not the luckiest one because metaphor and metonymy are, as explained in the section on CMT, two different kinds of processes. Considering so-called 'dead metaphors' Newmark states that they are no part of translation theory, but he deals with them regardless, since they can represent a problem for the translator. He divides dead metaphors into three types. The first type includes words like 'reflect' as 'think', where the image as well as the sense is retained in some second languages: e.g. Fr. *réfléchir*. The second type includes words that Newmark calls metonyms or one-word metaphors, that cannot normally be converted to figurative meaning, if the denotative meaning is retained. Examples from motor-cycle technology are: 'fin', 'frame', 'port', 'skirt', etc. The last group of dead transparent metaphors are non-technical words such as 'head', 'foot', 'bottom' etc., which potentially have both concrete and figurative senses, i.e. they can be 'brought to life' (e.g. 'kill' instead of 'remove') and become a translation-theory problem. Desirably, the polysemy is transferred, if the TL slang will take it, but in other cases the translator may have to look for an alternative. Newmark further distinguishes between 'cliché' and 'stock metaphors'. He considers cliché to be a murky area between dead and stock metaphor. He further states that many stock metaphors are clichés, so it appears that the division between 'cliché' and 'stock metaphors' is somewhat arbitrary. In discussing the translation of stock metaphors, Newmark lists seven main procedures for translating metaphor. He recognizes the fact that stock metaphors may have cultural, universal and subjective aspects. Here is the list of procedures, in order of preference:

1. Reproducing the same image in the TL, provided the image has comparable frequency and currency in the appropriate register. (,ray of hope' -> *Hoffnungsstrahl*; ,cast a shadow over' -> *einen Schatten über etwas werfen*);

2. The translator may replace the image in the TL with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture. ('if you can't beat them, join them' -> *man muß mit den Wölfen heulen*);
3. Translation of metaphor by simile, retaining the image. (*La fenice è Dorabella* -> 'Dorabella is like the Phoenix of Arabia');
4. Translation of metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense (or occasionally a metaphor plus sense). (*La fenice è Dorabella* -> 'Dorabella is a model of faith, like the Phoenix of Arabia');
5. Conversion of metaphor to sense. ('he's crummy': the translator would choose from the components 'unpleasantness', 'decay', 'incapacity', 'small-mindedness' etc.);
6. Deletion. If a metaphor is redundant or otiose;
7. Same metaphor combined with sense. ('The tongue is a fire' + add a gloss like 'A fire ruins things; what we say also ruins things').

In the rest of the chapter, Newmark discusses the translation of recent and original metaphors, again giving recommendations as to how they should be translated. Discussing original metaphors, Newmark partly agrees with Kloepfer's suggestion that the bolder and freer the metaphor, the more easily it is translated (Newmark, 1988: 93). According to Newmark, Kloepfer is ignoring the symbolic content of any original metaphor, but in principle he is right because an original metaphor is likely to have fewer local cultural associations than an idiom, and therefore can be transferred more easily. Although Newmark's chapter on the translation of metaphor offers some good observations on the subject, several things should be pointed out. First, the general approach he takes is prescriptive, which means he is trying to establish rules and regulations on how to translate metaphor. He is being authoritative when he claims that one procedure is superior or „preferred“ to another, which I think he has no right to do because translation is in most cases a product of choice and not coercion.⁴⁷ That is why it is better to look on these rules as mere recommendations, as guidelines or as a check-list of possible procedures. Secondly, his division of metaphor into dead, cliché, stock, recent and

⁴⁷ This is especially true of literary translation.

original appears rather arbitrary, since in too many cases it is impossible to say whether a given metaphor belongs to one type or the other. Besides, this division seems to be resting more upon value judgments than objective criteria.

The latter may well be the reason why Menachem Dagut's paper „More about the Translatability of Metaphor“ (1987)⁴⁸ rejects Newmark's division of metaphors into live and dead. Dagut suggests that these types are not clear-cut; rather there is a cline, a continuum between those two extremes. Still, Dagut maintains that there is a qualitative difference between metaphor as „individual creative flash of imagination“ and its derivatives, polysemes, idioms and proverbs, for these have lost their creative semantic anomalies in the process of lexicalization. Dagut's rejection of the live / dead dichotomy is in line with CMT, which claims that the dichotomy is unproductive (see section 2.2.3). His distinction between creative metaphors and its derivatives is completely compatible with the distinction in CMT between conventional and creative metaphors. Only one thing has to be pointed out in this context: in CMT a creative metaphorical expression does not imply that the CM it is based on is also creative. On the contrary, most of the creative metaphorical expressions are sanctioned by conventional CMs.

The dissertation by Wolfgang Walther (1983)⁴⁹ deals with problems of translating metaphor from English into German. The focus of research is on the political journalistic texts, viewing metaphor as a carrier of implicit world view. This is in line with CMT, which claims that metaphor not only reflects reality, but can also create reality. Metaphor reflects the way we think, the way we perceive things. Since metaphor does not necessarily rest on preexisting, objective, similarities, but often on perceived or experiential similarities, it implicitly shows the way we see the world around us.

⁴⁸ Cf. Kurth, 1995: 108.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

Mary Snell-Hornby in „Dimension and Perspective in Literary Translation“ (1984)⁵⁰ takes the contradictory tension between similarity and dissimilarity of a metaphor as a starting point for the analysis of metaphor translation. According to the author, this tension is crucial for the translation. The translator has to understand the sense of the metaphor and be ready to face the problem of losing that sense if s/he is to translate the SL metaphor word for word. An interesting issue has been raised here, and it is the issue of whether literal translation of metaphor ensures that its sense will be carried over. That can be especially problematic if the metaphor is not shared between the two languages / cultures. In those cases, a literal rendering of the foreign metaphor could be misunderstood or not understood at all.

On the language pair English - Chinese, Mary Fung and K.L. Kiu (1987)⁵¹ deal with the question of how particular poetic metaphors behave when transferred into a culturally and lingually very different context. Besides the specific lingual associations, the differences in cultural and historic development also play a significant role. Thus it may be impossible for a TT reader to understand the ST metaphors that are strongly rooted in culture. In such case the translator cannot retain the image of the metaphor, but must try to find a TL metaphor with a similar sense. For example, the Chinese reader would find it hard to understand metaphors based on Christian symbols because s/he lacks the Western cultural frame of reference. This article addresses the important issue of cultural specificity of metaphors resulting in a need to adapt the metaphors in translation to another culture. It would be interesting to juxtapose this idea with the Toury's notions of ST- or TT-orientation. In the case of a culturally specific metaphor, a TT-orientation seems to be obligatory if we want the translation to make sense. On the other hand, a translator could try to impose an ST-orientation by using a literal translation of a culturally specific metaphor, and so run the risk of not being understood.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Cf. Kurth, 1995: 109.

In a paper entitled „The Unfamiliar image: Metaphor as a Problem in Translation“, Mary Snell-Hornby (1988)⁵² also emphasizes the status of metaphor as a cultural phenomenon, which had been overlooked by the linguistically-oriented translation research. On the one hand, metaphor is a general cognitive and linguistic phenomenon; on the other hand, its associative potential is entirely culturally dependent, which causes difficulties for the translator. The issue of metaphor translation must not be approached prescriptively⁵³, in the form of abstract rules; rather it depends on individual texts. Two dichotomies are crucial in this context: 'informative' vs. 'expressive text', and 'lexicalized' vs. 'creative metaphor'. Snell-Hornby doubts the plausibility of Newmark's scale of lexicalization: 'cliché', 'stock', and 'recent', because, firstly, the position of a metaphor on that scale changes with cultural development, and secondly, the reader's understanding of a metaphor depends on her/his knowledge and experience. Snell-Hornby's claim that metaphor's associative potential is entirely culturally dependent is exaggerated, because some metaphors (e.g. primary metaphors like AFFECTION IS WARMTH) are not culturally dependent, but more or less universal. The dichotomy between informative and expressive texts is also problematic, because not a single text is entirely informative or expressive. Some parts of a text can be informative, while other parts can be expressive, and it is not clear what the criteria are for distinguishing between the two types.

Uwe Kjär's (1988)⁵⁴ dissertation deals with the frequency of verbal metaphors and the general possibilities of their transfer. He worked with a corpus of eleven German and six Swedish post-war novels and their respective translations in the other language. The most interesting is his statistical evaluation of the researched texts which shows that two thirds of the ST verbal metaphors were reproduced in the TT, while the rest appear as non-metaphoric expressions in the TT or are omitted entirely. It is worth mentioning that there are a number of metaphors in the TT that have no metaphoric correspondent in the ST. Kjär takes these as

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ As, for example, Newmark (1988) approached it.

⁵⁴ Cf. Kurth, 1995: 109ff.

indications of the spreading of metaphorical process in the text. Kjær's research seems to be very well focused and structured. He takes only verbal metaphors as his object of research, which allows him to use a computerized search of an electronic corpus and to make a statistical evaluation of the texts. As for the metaphors that have no metaphoric correspondent in the ST, I would like to argue that these occur as a result of compensation – the translator trying to compensate for the loss of metaphoricity in other places.

Frank Königs' paper „*Die Seefahrt an den Nagel hängen?': Metaphern beim Übersetzen und in der Übersetzungswissenschaft*“ (1990)⁵⁵ deals with the cognitive and communication science foundations of reception and the process of understanding. Königs concludes that the complex processes of metaphor translation and reception are still mostly unknown. We should collect more data on the cognitive dimension of creation and reception of metaphor. Interestingly, Königs, as opposed to Kjær, does not attach much importance to the statistical data about the particular types of translation. Instead, he believes that actual translational solutions should be a source of data for the translation studies research on metaphor. We agree with that claim because we think statistical data can be misleading in the sense that they can make us overgeneralize and oversimplify the problem. By looking at actual translations in detail we can get a better insight into the problem, which allows us to make more plausible generalizations about the translation of metaphor. Still, looking at actual translations will not tell us much about creation and reception of metaphor. Research of those issues requires different methodologies, such as TAPs and other psycholinguistic techniques, for eliciting data on the creation of metaphor, and questionnaires, interviews, comprehensibility tests for eliciting data on the reception of metaphor. In my research, my primary interest is not the process of creation or reception of metaphors, it is rather the translation itself – which procedures are used and why.

⁵⁵ Cf. Kurth, 1995: 110.

In his article „*Faktoren für die Übersetzung von Metaphern*“, Wolfgang Walther (1990)⁵⁶ points to the fact that uncertainties in translating metaphor arise from the lack of knowledge about the essence of metaphor. The translator is often not certain about what s/he should transfer into the TT: the image, the metaphorical expression or the metaphorical meaning. It should be added at this point that Conceptual Metaphor Theory might help translators in answering that question. For this reason, we argue that CMT should be included in the translator training curriculum. Besides, it is not possible to separate metaphorical meaning from the image and the metaphorical expression. One can only transfer the metaphorical meaning if one transfers the same image. The only element that is variable in this respect is the metaphorical expression itself.

Alvarez's article „On translating metaphor“ (1993) discusses metaphorical language in literary translation. She calls metaphor an essential element in translation process and one of the main difficulties a literary translator has to face. Surprisingly, Alvarez (1993: 482) seems to support the common fallacy that metaphor occurs mostly in literature. Using Angela Carter's text *The Passion of New Eve* and its Spanish translation as material for analysis, Alvarez is trying to make some generalizations on the subject of translating metaphor. She identified four different modes of metaphor translation, as occurring in the analyzed text:

1. transferring the same image into the target language, which is found in more than fifty percent of all cases because of the proximity of the two systems. In the case of complex metaphors the first mode includes some minor changes, e.g. modulation from more specific to more general and vice versa, metonymic transfer WHOLE -> PART, as well as some other structural changes;
2. adaptation of the same image that appears in the SL, in about ten percent of cases, demanded by differences in language structure. The same structural changes observed from transferring an image from SL to TL are evident when it is necessary to adapt this image;

⁵⁶ Cf. Kurth, 1995: 110.

3. re-creation of a different metaphor in the TL, in twenty percent of cases, this derives from the “cultural voids” between languages that have no possible word-for-word equivalent. This procedure is used when translating culturally specific metaphors. Alvarez reinforces Dagut’s claim that “culturally specific metaphors are untranslatable”, and that the only appropriate way of translating them is to recreate an entirely new metaphor in the TL;
4. translating metaphors or similes by their sense. According to Alvarez, since in metaphor meaning is interwoven with form, translating metaphor with a non-metaphor would have to result in a bad translation.

The most important contribution of Alvarez’s paper is arguably the proposed explanations for why a particular procedure is used and a detailed account of structural changes that occur in modes (1) and (2). On the other hand, Alvarez’s paper is somewhat lacking in structure. One of the reasons is mixed terminology: ‘vehicle’ and ‘tenor’ by Richards, ‘image’ and ‘sense’ by Newmark, ‘modulation’, ‘transposition’ ‘adaptation’ etc. by Vinay and Darbelnet. It is hard to see how all these different elements can possibly be compatible, since these are bits and pieces of very different theories. Further, many of the procedures identified obviously come from Newmark, along with the explanations for their use. It seems that Alvarez was more concerned with finding examples to support existing theories than with the actual description of her analyzed text. Besides, the difference between mode (1) and mode (2) is not clearly defined. What separates adaptation of the same image from the transfer of the same image, if the same kinds of structural changes are observed? And finally, although Alvarez commits herself to “discovering regularities” and not to “creat[ing] them by imposing rules or norms on translational practice”, she seems to be doing just the opposite.

Teresa Dobrzyńska in her insightful article called “Translating metaphor: Problems of meaning” (1995) uses metaphor as a case study for the problem of the interaction of participants in the communicative act. She defines metaphor as a linguistic sign used in the predicative function outside its normal usage as determined by the code. I find this

problematic because metaphor is not abnormal usage, it is perfectly normal and common, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) showed on a number of examples. According to the author, the interpretation of metaphor is strongly culturally conditioned, which is especially the case with translated metaphor. While the latter may be true of complex metaphors, it is not true of primary metaphors, which are often not culturally conditioned. She identified three strategies for translating metaphor:

- 1) using the exact equivalent of the original metaphor (M → M procedure);
- 2) using another metaphorical phrase with a similar sense (M1 → M2 procedure); and
- 3) replacing the untranslatable metaphor of the original with its approximate literal paraphrase (M → P procedure).

In the paper Dobrzyńska develops the three above strategies, discussing them in semantic, pragmatic and communicative terms. These strategies roughly cover the possibilities, but they are not fine-grained enough. Since the author is not using CMT, her typology lacks the distinction between conceptual metaphor, as a higher-level abstraction, and metaphorical linguistic expressions, as concrete instantiations of the CM. She also distinguishes between ‘dead’ and ‘live’ metaphors. In her words, ‘dead’ metaphors are part of the code, while ‘live’ metaphors are unprecedented metaphorical use of an expression. This is the same distinction that we came across earlier as lexical vs. creative metaphor. But, it implies a dangerous assumption that all lexicalized metaphors are dead, which contradicts the evidence presented by CMT. According to Dobrzyńska, metaphorical sense may sometimes make use of a part of the code meaning [literal meaning]; however, it emerges most often through the exploitation of some set of associations that accompany some linguistic elements in the consciousness of the code users. These ‘sets of associations’ in the speakers’ heads make metaphorical communication always extremely sensitive to communicational context. The success of communicating a sense of the metaphor will depend on ‘the common knowledge’ of the two participants in the communication. Such stereotyped associations are generally shared in a cultural community. As a device in analyzing such stereotyped associations, the author

proposes the then-recent concept of 'lexical connotation'. The problems in interpreting a metaphor arise when a metaphorical utterance is to be translated into another language, with different cultural background and, thereby, different experience:

[T]he scope of the presumed 'common knowledge' gets narrower, when the speaker or writer and the listener or reader live in different environments, have different experiences, or come from different epochs, their 'common world' shrinks to the extent of becoming merely hypothetical for both of them, and this makes metaphorical communication very difficult indeed. (Dobrzyńska, 1995: 598)

The problem is that a text is usually written for the speakers of your own language, with no intent of adjusting it to another cultural consciousness, and the translation of a text is functioning outside the communicative context of the original text. Lexical connotations and stereotyped associations in two different languages may be very dissimilar, which often prevents direct metaphorical rendering of many common expressions. As an example thereof the author considers a Polish sentence *Ale leje wodę!* (literally: 'Isn't he pouring water!'), metaphorically referring to an utterance that lacks substance. According to the author, in this case the lexeme *woda* ('water') is used, and such a metaphorical phrase is untranslatable by the unchanged form into any language from a region where water is a valuable substance, available in too small quantities.⁵⁷ In translation, the principle of faithfulness requires in every individual case a specific adaptation. The choice of procedure should depend on the type of text to be translated and the function it is supposed to fulfill for its new audience in its new communicative context. Such decisions are conditioned by various factors and made under the pressure of various poetics. The author concludes that it is not always possible to adhere to the principle of faithfulness, M → M, without risking that a metaphorical utterance will become

⁵⁷ This is not a good example because the lexeme 'water' is not used, as the author claims, with the lexical connotation 'thin', 'unsubstantial', rather the connotation here is a container that is thin and unsubstantial, i.e. it leaks water. If a container leaks water, it 'lacks substance', it has got holes in it, is not complete, is not functional etc. English has a perfect equivalent of this saying: sth. doesn't hold water, and so does Croatian: *nešto ne drži vodu*.

incomprehensible or will lead to an interpretation incompatible with the one intended in the original. The same conclusion was made by Snell-Hornby in her 1984 article (see above).

Pertaining to the ongoing discourse on metaphor translation, Toury (1995)⁵⁸ adds that an analysis focusing on source text only is incomplete. A complete analysis should also involve the inverse situation, i.e. identification of metaphoric expressions in the translated text and aligning them with the corresponding structures of the ST. That gives us two further possibilities:

- 1) a metaphoric expression in the TT standing for a non-metaphoric expression in the ST;
- 2) a metaphoric expression in the TT with no linguistic motivation in the ST (,zero into metaphor‘).

Toury has a point, when he claims that these two further possibilities have to be taken into account. However, this is true only if one considers not solely the translation of metaphor but also the translation by metaphor, which is not the same. For this reason, in our research we keep those two kinds of translation apart, focusing mainly on the first type, i.e. the translation of metaphors. Nevertheless, if we consider and accept the fact that often in translation a non-metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphor, we have evidence that metaphoric language is not special or unusual in any way and that it is common in ordinary speech. This is a kind of indirect evidence supporting the claim made in CMT that metaphors are pervasive in language.

In their paper “Mapping Image-Schemas and Translating Metaphors“ (1999), Kathleen Ahrens and Alicia L.T. Say from National Taiwan University demonstrate that identifying the mappings between the source and target domains for a conceptual metaphor allows for both a better understanding of a conceptual basis of metaphors and more effective translation. To

⁵⁸ Cf. Schäffner, 2004.

support their idea, they consider the Animal Metaphor in English and Chinese. They show that the Animal Metaphor in the respective languages differ in that it maps different information from the source to the target domain. The authors first make a distinction between conceptual metaphors, that map one conceptual domain (e.g. MONEY) onto another conceptual domain (e.g. TIME), and image metaphors, which map only one visual image onto another visual image (e.g. *'Her waist is an hour-glass.'*). Conceptual metaphors allow many concepts in the source domain to be mapped onto corresponding concepts in the target domain. These concepts are called image-schemas. Image-schemas that map in the Animal Metaphor in English are the appearance of the animal, the behavior of the animal and the sounds of the animal, to indicate that the person thus referred to embodies the characteristics of that animal. Mapping the image-schema is not a meaning-neutral process; in all cases it maps the feature of [-human], and in many cases invokes negative connotations. In Mandarin Chinese the mapping is somewhat different. First, there is no mapping of sounds. Second, appearance is mapped but only when referring to body parts. Third, behavior is mapped in the lexical categories of nouns and stative verbs. Ahrens and Say then propose several principles to aid in the translation of metaphors, using the animal metaphor as an example:

1. If a CM does not exist in the T:
 - a. translate literally + explanation
 - b. translate the meaning
2. If a similar CM exists in the TL:
 - a. If a similar image-schema mapping exists, and the information mapped is the same, then use an exact translation.
 - b. If a similar image-schema exists, but there is a different mapping for a particular instance in the TL either (i) use an explanatory simile or (ii) substitute with another instance in the target language that carries the same meaning (from the same conceptual metaphor).
3. If the image-schema mapping does not exist in L2, either:
 - a. translate directly with an attached explanation; or

b. use an explanatory simile.⁵⁹

The authors hope that these principles will generate discussion as to the best way to deal with conceptual metaphors in translation. After this set of principles has been tested on a range of cross-linguistic conceptual metaphors, and when similar conceptual metaphors have been more extensively analyzed in a variety of languages, the authors think it will even be possible to create algorithms for machine translation. One of the weak points in this article are the principles to aid in the translation of metaphors, which leave out some of the possibilities. For example, under (1) we could add a possibility of translating a non-existing CM in the TL by another CM with a similar meaning. Furthermore, there is no reference to the possibility of omitting or deleting the metaphor. In addition, the principles in this form are too prescriptive, imposing an order of preference as to the kinds of procedures that should be used in a particular situation. While this may be helpful to a machine, it is not very helpful to a human translator, who will create her / his own order of preference according to a concrete situation. However, this research is important because it shows that even if a CM is shared between two languages, the image-schemas that are mapped from the source to the target domain can be different, and this will necessarily affect the translation of such metaphors. Another useful insight is the distinction made between conceptual metaphors and image metaphors, which could also potentially influence the translation. More specifically, in the case of image metaphors, if only one image is mapped onto another image, as opposed to mapping one conceptual domain to another, then the potential for translation in the case of image metaphors must be diminished in contrast to conceptual metaphors.

Edwin Gentzler in his article „Metaphor and Translation“, published in *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English* (2000), offers a comprehensive overview of literature on metaphor and translation. He starts by revealing to us the incestuous relationship between the

⁵⁹ These principles show how beneficial it can be for translators to be acquainted with CMT, which once again stresses out the importance of including CMT in the translator education. Even if we do not take these principles as rules, they can be helpful as checklists in concrete situations where the translator has to deal with metaphor translation.

etymologies of the terms metaphor and translation. ‘Metaphor’ derives from the Greek word *metapherein* (*meta* refers to ‘over’ and *pherein* to ‘to bear’ or ‘to carry’) and means ‘the carrying of a meaning of one word over to another word’. ‘Translation’, very similarly, derives from the Latin term *translatus* (the past participle form of *transfere*; *trans* refers to ‘across’ and *ferre* again to ‘to bear’ or ‘to carry’), meaning ‘the carrying of a meaning across [a border] from one language to another’. Then he points to the widespread pattern of neglect concerning metaphor in translation studies, especially in its early stages, until 1980s. This is followed by a brief list of literature on the subject, starting with Dagut (1976) and ending with Schäffner (1996). Hereafter, Gentzler points out that in literary translation metaphor is primarily considered a figurative expression – a figure of speech or a trope, which Aristotle called „mark of genius“. In Gentzler’s words, translation is generally concerned with bringing one meaning across cultures, and the complexity of carrying double meanings or new creative usages across linguistic boundaries has been especially troublesome. Empirical studies of metaphor in translation have shown that: translators do tend to reduce the polyvalence and resonance of metaphors to more common usages, sometimes even omitting metaphors entirely.⁶⁰ Although we may intuitively agree with the latter claim, a critical observer will notice that Gentzler makes no reference to any particular empirical study which has shown that. In the next part of his article, Gentzler presents scholars’ opinions on how to translate metaphors, ranging from the idea that translation of metaphor is impossible to the notion of there being no problem present at all. Nida (1964) thinks that metaphors must be translated as non-metaphors; in other words, it is best to use a paraphrase. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) agree, basing their conclusion on the structural incompatibility of the receiving language. Contrary to them, Kloepfer (1967) argues that the more original metaphor is, the easier it is to translate, because „structures of fantasy“ are the same for all humans. Katarina Reiss (1971) has taken up Kloepfer's thesis. Broeck (1981) is sympathetic to Kloepfer, claiming that it is easier to translate ‘live’ than ‘dead’ metaphors, but his conclusions are based on empirical research. Difficulty or ease of translating, according to Broeck, is based on cross-cultural connections rather than abstract universals. Mary Snell-Hornby (1988) further explores the

⁶⁰ Our empirical study gives us a chance to test this claim.

cultural complexities of translating metaphors. Maria Tymoczko (1995) deals with translation of the metonymic references of oral tales – embedding her insights into cultural theory framework that juxtaposes the entire literary tradition of SC to TC. Gentzler carries on with presenting some prominent theories of metaphor. Romantic poets of 18th and 19th century, and symbolist poets of 19th century, among others, advocated the notion that all literary language is metonymic/ metaphorical. The literary critic I.A. Richards in his book *The philosophy of Rhetoric* (1936) views metaphor as a fundamental property of human thought in general. Metaphors, according to Richards, thus create meanings, or provide a means for thinking, thereby shaping our very lives.⁶¹ Russian formalists also considered metaphor very important. Roman Jakobson (1956) divides all language into either metaphor (based on similarity) or metonymy (based on contiguity). The next part of Gentzler's article is dedicated to the work of cognitive linguists on metaphors of everyday speech. Lakoff & Johnson, for example, in *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) demonstrate that metaphors are pervasive in everyday life, not just in language, but also in thought and action. They hold the view that our conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. As Lakoff's work progressed, he has begun comparing metaphors in cross-cultural fashion. In *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind* (1987) he shows how metaphorical mappings are motivated by cultural factors. He gives the example of the term *balan* (from the aboriginal Australian language Dyrbal) a category that includes women, water, fire, fighting, and other dangerous things. Lakoff challenged the view that metaphors are abstract and universal, instead they tend to be linked to physical and cultural experience. Hereafter, Gentzler returns to literary investigations. The New Critics (Ransom, Warren, Tate) echoed the view of the formalists that the poem itself is a kind of original metaphor. Octavio Paz, Mexican poet and translator (1971) criticizes the view that metaphor is impossible to translate, or falls only into the realm of the poetic and thus is no part of TS proper. Paz claims that translation of metaphor is possible if the verbal situation and the context (connotative meaning) in which the metaphor occurs is reproduced. For Paz, literary translation is less a

⁶¹ Here we can clearly see a connection with Lakoff & Johnson's „metaphors we live by“.

copying, and more transformation, transmutation, or reproduction. Drawing on Jakobson, many post-structuralists view metaphor as something always present even in the most common words. They tend to argue that culture's view of 'reality' is dependent on the metaphorical process. Paul Ricoeur (1979) states that metaphors both refer and create. When we use metaphors, we are aware of the normative usage yet at the same time we violate these norms. It follows that metaphors by nature have split referents. The understanding of metaphor depends on the receiver's knowledge of the field. Derrida (1972) points to the double constitution of metaphor: every word functions as a metaphor of a metaphor, involving the reader/translator in the unlimited semiotic chain. Some postcolonial critics (Cheyfitz; Niranjana) argue that metaphor is part of the system of mimesis and a means of knowledge that reinforces Western metaphysical thinking. In response, a new, postcolonial strategy is emerging: resisting translating metaphor. Eric Cheyfitz in *The Poetics of Imperialism* (1991) writes about „The foreign policy of metaphor“. Translation is based on a certain "foreign policy" that often takes language away from the colonized people and turns it into the "proper" language of the colonizer. He argues that one of the signs of a dispossessed people is their use of figurative language, a language that often escapes an overseer's translation.⁶² Niranjana in *Siting Translation* (1992) argues that translations of metaphors are overdetermined by religious, racial, sexual and economic discourses and tend to fall into acceptable religious and racial fields of association. Using Benjamin's „The Task of the Translator“ (1923) as a guide, Niranjana keeps the foreign proper names of the colonized, avoids reducing and simplifying verbs and questions metaphors that tend toward overdetermined Western concepts. Modernist literary translators from Brazil - e.g. Haroldo and Augusto de Campos have articulated a translation strategy that will not reduce metaphor to simpler terms, but emphasize difference and divergence from the norm. The goal is to translate not literally but metaphorically, with the aim of producing analogous effects by different means. The Latin American translation scholar Else Vieira (1992; 1994) proposed an

⁶² A perfect example of such dispossessed people and their use of figurative language is the language of Rastafari. For a detailed account see: Pollard, Velma (2000). *Dread Talk: the language of Rastafari, rev.ed.* Canoe Press/McGill-Queen's.

idea that metaphors function differently in Latin America than in North America, which leads to the need of retranslating Latin America. Concluding his article, Gentzler points out that linguists and translation scholars are rediscovering what many literary translators already know. Research in the area of metaphor translation will underscore the importance of literary translation to fields like philosophy of language, cultural studies, and postcolonial studies. A re-evaluation of the vocabulary in TS is needed in order to break the stereotyped thinking about the relationship of sign to the referent. In addition, a focus on metaphors will give insight into the nature of translation and connection of translation to identity and cultural formation.

Zoltán Kövecses's paper „Language, Figurative Thought, and Cross-Cultural Comparison“ (2003) deals with the issue of cross-cultural comparison of metaphors. This field of research is sometimes called 'applied cognitive linguistics' (Kövecses, 2003: 311). What Kövecses is interested in is not the actual translation of metaphor, but contrastive analysis of metaphor in different languages. The main question is: How can we express the same figurative meaning in different languages? According to Kövecses, a metaphorical expression in one language can have the following equivalents in another language⁶³:

1. the same expression of the same CM;
2. a different expression of the same CM;
3. a different expression of a different CM, with the same figurative meaning;
4. a different expression of a different CM, with a different figurative meaning;
5. a non-metaphoric expression.

By using this list, a very systematic comparison of the expression of a conceptual metaphor in different languages can be made. Particularly interesting are cases where a metaphoric expression cannot be translated literally, when changes are necessary, because such cases reveal linguistic and cultural differences between languages. As the author put it, conceptual

⁶³ The original Kövecses's list has here been simplified for the sake of clarity.

metaphor is not just cognitive but also a cultural entity. Discussing the relation between metaphor and culture, Kövecses notes:

Two languages may share a conceptual metaphor and the conceptual metaphor may be expressed by largely overlapping metaphorical expressions, but the expressions can reveal subtle differences in the cultural-ideological background in which the conceptual metaphor functions. (Kövecses, 2003: 315)

To prove his point, the author analyzes one of the best-known conceptual metaphors in the cognitive linguistic literature: LOVE IS A JOURNEY. His case study of the expression of this metaphor in English and Hungarian shows that although this conceptual metaphor is shared between the two cultures, there are differences in the expression of the metaphor, and they can be linked to differences in culture. Although Kövecses's focus is not on the translation of metaphor but on the cross-cultural comparison of shared metaphors, his methodology can be applied to the analysis of metaphor translation in general, which is one of the arguments of our research.

Christina Schäffner was one of the first authors to deal with the translation of metaphor from the cognitive-linguistic point of view. In her paper „Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach“ (2004) she analyzed examples of metaphors from political texts in German and English. Her topic is similar to the topic of Wolfgang Walther's dissertation from 1983 (see above in this section). In her description she is not interested in the process of translation, but in the product (product-oriented description vs. process-oriented). That means that her focus is on description and explanation of identified translational solutions. She approaches metaphor as an intertextual phenomenon, taking into account historical context, function, as well as addressees (effects on them). Realizing that metaphor is not decorative but conceptually based, that it is a tool or resource for thought processes, Schäffner concludes that translatability of metaphor is not isolated but linked to

translatability in general, e.g. the level of conceptual systems of SL and TL. Based on the analyzed examples, Schäffner identified the following translation solutions:

1. A conceptual metaphor is identical in ST and TT at the macro-level without each individual manifestation having been accounted for at the micro-level;
2. Structural components of the base conceptual schema in the ST are replaced in the TT by expressions that make entailments explicit;
3. A metaphor is more elaborate in the TT;
4. ST and TT employ different metaphorical expressions which can be combined under a more abstract conceptual metaphor;
5. The expression in the TT reflects a different aspect of the conceptual metaphor.

Schäffner points out that traditional translation procedures need to be reconsidered, but she explicitly makes clear that:

These five cases are not meant to be turned into translation procedures to be offered to translators as ready-made solutions, telling them how to translate a specific, in this case conceptual, metaphor in a text. They are observational data, resulting from a comparative analysis of STs and TTs and from subsequent developments in intercultural political discourse. They might be candidates for potential translation strategies, but it will take more in-depth analyses based on a larger corpus before any proper hypotheses can be formulated. (Schäffner, 2004: 1267)

In addition, Schäffner found out that cultural differences also play a role in translating metaphors, which lead her to the conclusion that translation studies can contribute to the study of cultural aspects of metaphor. Our research is similar to Schäffner's, but it employs a slightly different methodology. While she looked for metaphors in the text to see what kind of translation solutions there are (inductive approach), we start from a typology, test it on a corpus, and if we come across a procedure that our typology did not anticipate, we adapt our

typology accordingly (a combination of deductive and inductive approaches). Schäffner also does not attempt to systematically present the identified translation solutions, which is what we are trying to do because we believe, and try to show, that there is a system in which all the different procedures can be placed. However, Schäffner's insights about the different translation solutions are very valuable, and they have to be taken into account.

James Dickins's paper "Two models for metaphor translation" (2005) deals with the issues of textual analysis of metaphor and metaphor translation. He develops two models for metaphor translation: the full model and the simplified model. He further suggests that the full model is adequate for metaphor analysis, theoretical academic investigations of metaphor and metaphor translations, while the simplified model might be used particularly in translation teaching. On the one hand, having a full and a simplified model is a good idea because some models tend to be too complicated for the purposes of teaching. On the other hand, the question is to what extent can a model be simplified and at the same time keep its explanatory power. Dickins adopts the traditional definition of metaphor as a figure of speech, in which a word or phrase is used in a non-basic sense, this non-basic sense suggesting a likeness or analogy (whether real or not). He cites Newmark's statement that the most important particular problem of translation is the translation of metaphor. The reasons for that are:

- 1) metaphor is a pervasive feature of texts;
- 2) metaphor has important referential and stylistic implications.

Dickins adopts Goatly's comparison theory of metaphor, with the three central notions being topic, vehicle, and grounds. Dickins emphasizes the distinction between lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors. While lexicalized metaphors have a relatively fixed meaning (e.g. 'rat' in the sense 'a person who deserts his friends or associates'), the meaning of non-lexicalized metaphors is not clearly fixed, but varies from context to context (e.g. 'A man is a tree'). This is not entirely true, because the context in both cases determines the meaning. The meaning of 'rat' depends on the context in the same measure as 'a man is a tree'; there is no meaning

without context. Dickins further divides the purposes of metaphor into two types: denotative-oriented and connotative-oriented.⁶⁴ Dickins focuses on the metaphor typology established by Newmark (1988), since he believes this remains the most practical and wide-ranging account in respect of translation analysis. He attempts a revision of Newmark's typology, in the sense of integrating the lexicalized vs. non-lexicalized distinction with Newmark's categories. Dickins also extends his typology with the notion of schematicity. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), many metaphors are schematic in nature, i.e. they fit into coherent metaphorical patterns (e.g. the widely spread metaphor in English: ARGUMENT IS WAR). However, Dickins claims that metaphorical schemata in translational practice, and particularly from the point of view of classroom translation analysis, are important only when it comes to original metaphors, which we believe cannot be justified because there is no difference in schematicity of conventional and creative metaphors. Dickins applies his simplified model to the analysis of Arabic-to-English translations. He finds that in English translations of Arabic text there is a tendency towards toning down of metaphors (perhaps as a result of the tendency of translators towards caution), and also that „Arabic seems to tolerate a greater degree of metaphorical exuberance and density than English, at least in certain types of writing, and is perhaps also more tolerant of metaphorical mixing“ (Dickins, 2005: 264). In his analysis, Dickins has considered some ways in which metaphors interact in text, while purposely leaving out intertextual features such as quotation (e.g. John Donne's 'No man is an island') or textual features like register, which apply to all aspects of language and are not metaphor-specific. This seems rather arbitrary, because although intertextual features and register are not-metaphor specific, that does not mean they have no influence on how metaphors are translated. For instance, one can easily imagine that metaphors in a journalistic text and metaphors in a literary text would not be treated in the same way by the translator.

Ali Al-Hasnawi in “A Cognitive Approach to Translating Metaphor” (2007) also applies the cognitive framework to metaphor translation. His framework builds on 'Cognitive Translation Hypothesis' by Mandelblit from 1995. With the help of examples from translation

⁶⁴ Newmark (1988: 104) in this context talks about 'referential purpose', and 'pragmatic purpose', respectively.

between English and Arabic, he discusses the translation of metaphors with references to two cognitive schemes, called 'similar mapping conditions' and 'different mapping conditions'. Al-Hasnawi's hypothesis is that the more two cultures conceptualize experience in a similar way, the more the first strategy applies and the easier the task of translation is; otherwise the second strategy applies, and the task is more difficult. Stating that “[t]he study of the metaphoric expressions of a given culture would, hopefully, give us a chance to see how the members of that culture structure or map their experience of the world and record it into their native language” Al-Hasnawi (2007: no p.) realizes that culture influences metaphor, and that metaphor is indeed a cultural object. He quotes Lakoff and Johnson, saying that culture provides a pool of available metaphors for making sense of reality. A culture structures its reality according to its metaphors, i.e. it lives by its metaphors. Since metaphors are cognitive constructs, i.e. represent instances of how people conceptualize their experience and record it, when translating metaphors, the translator should strive for 'cognitive equivalence' – metaphor should be translated with a minimum degree of loss.⁶⁵ Universal metaphors are those shared by all cultures (e.g. metaphors of the human body). Those metaphors, according to Al-Hasnawi, are easier to translate. However, many metaphors are culture-specific, because different cultures conceptualize the world in different ways. According to Mandelblit's 'Cognitive Translation Hypothesis', metaphors take more time and are more difficult to translate if they exploit a cognitive domain different from the TL equivalent. The reason for this is that the translator has to search for another conceptual mapping. Mandelblit postulates two mapping conditions:

- 1) SMC = similar mapping condition; and
- 2) DMC = different mapping condition.

Al-Hasnawi claims that the first case will result in a translation by an equivalent TL metaphor or simile, and the second case will result in a translation by simile, paraphrase, footnote,

⁶⁵ However, as we may witness in the postcolonial context, the translator may purposely employ an opposite strategy, i.e. translating a metaphor by a non-metaphor or omitting it entirely, in order to stop reinforcing the conceptual system of the colonizers.

explanation, or omission as the last resort. Our research shows that this claim is only partially true. In some of the cases we identified, there are similar mapping conditions, and the translator nevertheless uses paraphrase, which indicates that there are also some other factors influencing the choice of translation procedure, other than the question whether a conceptual mapping is shared between SL and TL. Al-Hasnawi divides metaphors in:

- a. metaphors of similar mapping conditions;
- b. metaphors of similar mapping conditions but lexically realized differently; and
- c. metaphors of different mapping conditions.

In (a) we are dealing with the case of two cultures sharing the same ideas, which anthropologists call 'cultural universals', and which Al-Hasnawi labeled as 'pancultural metaphorical expressions'. They are reflections of the same human experience. Sometimes, though, there are small differences in the expressions that reflect values and beliefs peculiar to each particular culture, e.g. use of numbers, superiority values, and religious affiliations. In (b) there is variation because users of each language map the particular conceptual domain of their own world differently. In addition, the ethical system in the TL or SL leads to major differences in lexical choice. Type (c) refers to culture-bound SL-metaphors. Al-Hasnawi (2007: no p.) quotes Wierzbicka's statement that "languages are the best mirror of human cultures", and metaphors are the prime example of that. Culture-bound metaphors are typically metaphors of religious and political domains, called root metaphors. They are called root metaphors because they influence a whole range of other metaphors. When dealing with this type of metaphors, usually the SL-image cannot be reproduced in the TL, so the solution is to replace the SL- image with a TL-image that doesn't clash with the TL culture. In search for cognitive equivalents, the strategy of different cognitive mapping is employed. An example thereof is The Holy Qur'an, which is a rich source of such metaphors. As the attempts to maintain these metaphors in English communicatively fail, the translators resort to footnotes or a brief explanation in the text. Al-Hasnawi concludes that there is a cline or a continuum between these three mapping conditions. Furthermore, since metaphor is a cultural

object translators must not be just bilingual but bicultural as well. Lastly, he recommends training of translators in coping with metaphor not just in foreign-language programs but also in the native language, because in the first place it is important to comprehend the figurative meaning in your own language.

In „A Comparative Study of the Translation of Image Metaphors of Color in the *Shahnameh* of Ferdowsi“ Anousheh Shabani (2008) focuses on image metaphors of color in the *Shahnameh* of Ferdowsi. The study set out to determine how metaphors of color are rendered in two English translations of the work. The framework of the study was Newmark's (1988) seven suggested procedures for translating metaphors. Besides determining which of these procedures have been applied in the two translations, the study also aimed at discovering whether any new procedures had been applied. The study also attempted to find out whether any exclusive patterns were observed in each translator's rendering of the discussed items. Our study employs similar methodology, starting from a typology of procedures, then identifying which procedures were used and whether there are any procedures not anticipated by the typology. Talking about the classifications of metaphors, Shabani presents Black's (1962) classification by which he sought to “replac[e] the dead and alive contrast by a set of finer discriminations” (Shabani, 2008: no p.); he divides metaphors into:

- a) extinct;
- b) dormant; and
- c) active.

He further discriminates between two types of active metaphor: emphatic metaphor and resonant metaphor. This is just another classification reinforcing the distinction between dead and live metaphors. In that matter, we agree with Lakoff and Johnson (1980) who claim that dead/alive distinction is unproductive, and therefore it should be discarded. This distinction should be replaced by lexicalized / non-lexicalized, or conventional / creative, which again

doesn't imply that lexicalized or conventional is dead and non-lexicalized or creative is alive. Lexicalization or conventionality is merely another aspect of metaphor – one that seems plausible and important, as opposed to the aspect of being alive or dead. Regarding the question of conventionality, we would like to argue that if a metaphor is conventional it doesn't mean that the translator is necessarily familiar with it or that such a metaphor will be interpreted in the same way by all speakers of a language. In other words, conventionality is arguably a matter of the frequency of use, and not so much a matter of meaning. Discussing the identification of metaphor, Shabani states that the recognition of a metaphor in a certain text or speech may be a challenge, especially for non-native speakers. After examining several strategies for the identification of metaphor, such as looking for words with false literal interpretations or looking for the form 'x is y', she concludes that there is no reliable method for identifying a metaphor. To make things more difficult, metaphor has no consistent syntactic form (e.g. it can be a statement, a question or an exclamation) and its focus can be of any part of speech (a verb, a noun or a participle). Shabani's study showed that out of the seven procedures proposed by Newmark for translating metaphors, Warner & Warner (the first English translation) applied five procedures and Davis (the second English translation) applied all seven of the procedures in the translation of image metaphors of color. No new procedure was observed in their translations, which is taken as an indication that Newmark's proposed procedures are feasible and sufficient for translating image metaphors of color in particular. At this point I would like to stress again that Newmark's procedures are not wrong *per se*, but they are inadequate for analysis of metaphor translation because, firstly, they do not take into consideration the cognitive element of metaphor, and, secondly, they are imposing an order of preference, a prescriptive aspect, which is inadequate for descriptive purposes. The translators' choices of procedures for translating these specific items showed a tendency towards the first procedure resulted in a literal translation of the particular metaphor, whereas a tendency towards the other six procedures led to explicitation, simplification and the production of a reader-oriented text.

Grace Crerar-Bromelow's article „Can an Awareness of Conceptual Metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) Aid the Translator in His/Her Task?“ (2008) investigates the ways in which an awareness of CMT can help translators to translate more efficiently. She starts by criticizing Newmark's metaphor-hostile standpoint, and suggesting instead that Lakoff and Johnson's approach is potentially very useful to the translator. Following Lakoff and Johnson, she calls conceptual metaphors „the umbrella ideas which are rarely explicitly expressed, but nonetheless are accepted and shared by the whole community of language users. Thanks to its universality, this shared and shareable thought process can pass over interlingual barriers, and metonymy functions in that same way. While it is certainly true that metaphor as a thought process is universal and shared between all humans, Crerar-Bromelow seems to overlook the fact that some metaphors are not universal, but culturally specific. An awareness of CMT opens a whole new avenue of possibilities for the translator in dealing with the translation of metaphor:

Once the translator goes beyond merely identifying a metaphor's static stylistic category and examines the structure which informs it, s/he is in an empowered position to investigate the nature of the idiom; the strength of the image invoked; what relationship it might have to an extended metaphor in the text's discourse or, indeed, to the larger culture. And, in turn, when considering the TL conventions and genre expectations, the search for a TL solution is no longer limited to a matching TL idiom. The translator may allow him/herself a greater flexibility and even reasonably consider translation by explanation/paraphrase; or translation PLUS explanation, if the ST author's intentions and motivations are accessible. (Crerar-Bromelow, 2008: 78/79)

She further adds that an awareness of conceptual metaphors also allows us to investigate terminology because words that are established in a culture delimiting their signifieds (Saussure) are often essentially metaphorical in origin. As an example she gives the metaphor 'Adam's apple' (taken from Nida, 1964), which in Uduk becomes 'the thing that wants beer'. Considering conceptual metaphor's wider relevance to translation, Crerar-Bromelow states

that in order to minimize translation loss one may be able to employ the *tertium comparationis*; a conceptual non-linguistic invariant⁶⁶ by way of conceptual metaphor analysis. For example, we are now in the position boldly to consider translating a ST literal phrase by a TT metaphor if it is more suitable to the TT context and *skopos*.⁶⁷ Crerar-Bromelow concludes that armed by conceptual metaphor we can intelligently increase what Venuti calls the translation's visibility - by embracing foreign expressions. Furthermore, there is a cline rather than a gap between literal and metaphorical usage, and Newmark's "metaphorical web" of language is not designed to entrap us but can be a flexible, useful material. Although we can intuitively agree with Crerar-Bromelow's hypothesis that an awareness of conceptual metaphor can indeed aid the translator in his/her task, it still remains to be tested empirically. This dissertation does not focus on that question, but, considering its immense importance and implications for translator training, we hope to get back to it in one of the future research projects.

⁶⁶ This is the same as Al-Hasnawi's (2007) 'cognitive equivalence'.

⁶⁷ *Skopos* is Greek for 'goal, purpose'. In *Skopos Theory* by Reiß and Vermeer, 'skopos' is the goal or purpose of translation, which determines the choice of translation strategies. For a detailed account of Skopos Theory, see Prunč (2002, 2007).

3. Methodology

Having explained the subject matter of the dissertation and key theoretical issues, such as the relationship between translation studies and linguistics, the various views on metaphor, spanning from the traditional views of classical tradition to a contemporary view of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, and having elaborated on the current state of research in metaphor translation, let us turn to empirical matters, i.e. our own research of the subject. This chapter presents the methodology of our research, while the following chapters deal with research findings, as well as the analysis and discussion thereof. In section 3.1 an explanation is given of the reasons why this research is important. Section 3.2 deals with the details of research design, where the methodology of the present research is outlined in a step-by-step fashion. Sections 3.3 and 3.4 deal with the corpus and the tools used in the making of the corpus and data analysis. Section 3.5 presents the research questions.

3.1. The rationale

There are many good reasons why this research should be done. One of them is definitely a lack of research in this very important area of translation. Since metaphors are omnipresent in language, it is impossible to do any kind of translation without having to deal with the translation of metaphors. The scarcity of research on metaphor translation can be attributed to the lack of understanding about metaphor and its importance. Up to the 1980s, when Conceptual Metaphor Theory came to light, metaphor was, for the most part, considered to be nothing more than an ornament, a figure of speech. Its only function, so it was thought, was to make language more vivid and poetic. But, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) made perfectly clear, metaphor is not just an ornament, a figure of speech, but an essential cognitive mechanism helping us to understand and communicate our experience more effectively. The essence of metaphor is not comparing one concept to another, but thinking about one concept

in terms of another, thinking about one concept as it *were* another. In fact, metaphor is not only a more effective, but often the only possible way of thinking about the world and communicating our thoughts through the medium of language. However, a large part of the academic community and almost all ‘ordinary’ people still think of metaphor as just a figure of speech and nothing more, which is by large a result of not being informed about the latest developments of linguistics. But, if we accept the proposition that metaphor is an essential part of how we think and talk, then it is our duty to investigate all aspects of its use, including the way it is translated. We further feel that CMT is a tool than can help us understand not just the functioning of metaphor but also the translation of metaphor. The translation of metaphor is not a new subject in translation studies, but the present research is new in that it combines some of the older approaches, e.g. Toury⁶⁸, with some of the newer approaches, e.g. Kövecses (2004), resulting in a blend that seems to be shedding some new light on the subject. This is, of course, not the first research that applies CMT to metaphor translation (see, for example, Schäffner, 2004), and certainly not the last, but it will hopefully contribute something new to the general understanding of the subject of metaphor translation.

⁶⁸ Cf. Prunč, 2002: 244.

3.2. Research design

Table 1: *Steps of research design*

<i>no.</i>	<i>step description</i>
1	Establishing the field
2	Critically reviewing the literature
3	Setting up objectives
4	Formulating initial research questions
5	Designing a corpus
6	Conducting a pilot study
7	Refining the research questions
8	Identifying metaphorical expressions in ST
9	Matching the identified ST metaphorical expressions with the corresponding translation solutions
10	Setting up a typology of translation solutions for translating metaphors
11	Analyzing and labeling the ST metaphoric expressions and translation solutions
12	Qualitative analysis of the findings
13	Quantitative analysis of the findings
14	Evaluation of the results
15	Drawing conclusions

- Step1: Establishing the field

At the very beginning of the research it was necessary to identify the broad problem and to think about its importance and the feasibility of doing a research with the view to solving or elucidating that problem. We decided that the main problem we were going to tackle is the

translation of metaphor, and, after careful consideration, we concluded that the problem is important and that it is possible to do a research into this problem.

- Step 2: Critically reviewing the literature

Reading the studies that have dealt with the topic of the translation of metaphors helped us to identify specific problems in relation to our main problem. We tried to cover all the most important books and articles published so far on the topic of metaphor translation. In summarizing the previous research, we tried to extract what is significant in what has already been written, as well as to create our own research space by identifying the gaps in the existing research literature.

- Step 3: Setting up objectives

As a next step, we set ourselves some concrete goals; we worked out what exactly we were going to do. Starting from a proposition that applying Conceptual Metaphor Theory to research on metaphor translation will allow for a better understanding of the issue of metaphor translation, we arrived at our main objective: to test the applicability of CMT in a research project on metaphor translation. A number of specific objectives were pursued:

- setting up a typology of metaphor translation procedures
- identifying the procedures used in the corpus
- adapting the typology according to the findings;
- accounting for the motivation for using a particular procedure and the effects of using it;
- calculating the distribution of the procedures in the corpus;
- identifying the tendencies in metaphor translation;
- showing the range of possibilities for translating metaphors.

For a more detailed list of objectives, refer to section 1.1.

- Step 4: Formulating initial research questions

Once the objectives were set up, our next task was to operationalize them by formulating concrete research questions. Here are some of the initial questions:

1. What are the possible translation procedures for the translation of metaphors?
2. What motivates the use of a particular translation procedure?
3. What are the effects of using a particular procedure?
4. What is the distribution of the different translation procedures?
5. Are there any tendencies in choosing a particular translation procedure?

- Step 5: Designing a corpus

In the next step, we looked for a corpus that would enable us to attain our objectives and answer our research questions. The kind of corpus we needed to fulfill that purpose was a parallel corpus of English texts and their Croatian translations, since we work with the language pair English – Croatian. Since such a corpus was not available, we were left with one option – to design one for ourselves. For more details on the corpus design, refer to the following section (3.3). Although we had formulated some research questions before, the formulation of the research questions and the corpus design were not done entirely in a linear manner. The procedure was to an extent circular: first some of the research questions were formulated, then we looked for a corpus that was suitable for answering these questions, and then some other research questions emerged from the nature of the corpus itself.

- Step 6: Conducting a pilot study

After the corpus had been designed, we decided to conduct a pilot study, with the purpose of better guidance, identifying research gaps and making a better set of research questions. The pilot study was of a limited scope, and it was a kind of test to show us whether our corpus would be suitable for the purposes of the planned research. In the pilot study we focused on a specific type of metaphoric expressions, namely those with the target domain LOVE, e.g.:

TO FEEL LOVE SUDDENLY FOR SOMEONE IS TO FALL INTO A HOLE: I wish you would *fall in love*;

LOVE IS A LIVING BEING: There was something fascinating in this *son of love* and death;

LOVE IS INSANITY: His sudden *mad love* for Sibyl Vane;

LOVE IS A COMMODITY: He had dreamed of her as a great artist, *had given his love to her*;

LOVE IS A PHYSICAL BOND: I don't want to see Dorian *tied* to some vile creature;

THE OBJECT OF LOVE IS A DEITY: Sibyl Vane is *sacred*;

LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE: I think it was that which first *attracted* me to her;

LOVE IS FIRE: I might mimic a passion that I do not feel, but I cannot mimic one that *burns me like fire*, etc.

By conducting the pilot study we developed a model of identifying the metaphoric expressions in the ST, aligning them with the corresponding translational solutions, and classifying the solutions according to the proposed typology. For example, we saw that for this type of study, the one focusing on metaphorical expressions connected to one target domain, we can make good use of a computerized search; by looking for the keywords such as “love”, we were able to extract more or less all the expressions with the target domain LOVE. Of course, some of the hits were “noise”, because they were not metaphorical (e.g. ‘I love her very much’), but they were eliminated in the manual post-editing of the hits. On the other hand, we realized that, for the purpose of our main research, a computerized search would not be possible, because we aimed at analyzing all the metaphoric expressions in the

ST, and not just any specific type of them. Even if we used extensive keyword lists of metaphors, it is likely that we would not be able to extract them all. Thus, in order to identify all the metaphoric expressions, we will have to manually search the corpus. In the pilot study, we also tested the feasibility of analyzing the different parameters, such as conventionality of metaphorical expression, conventionality of conceptual metaphor, cognitive function (structural, ontological, or orientational), the nature of metaphor (proposition-based, image-schematic, or image-based) and generality of metaphor (generic to specific), as well as other factors. In other words, we needed to see which of these parameters are relevant, or might be relevant, for the purposes of our study. After doing the pilot study, we decided to focus in the main study on only some of the above parameters and to postpone the analysis of other parameters for future research. We realized that it is not feasible to label each metaphorical expression according to the conceptual metaphor it belongs to. This would take too much time, and besides, we are not interested in the specific types of metaphors. Our interests lie more in the translation procedures than in the metaphors themselves; we are concerned with the specifics of the metaphors only insofar as they affect the choice of procedure. Further, the cognitive function of the metaphor, the nature of metaphor, the generality of metaphor were shown in the pilot study to have little or no influence on the choice of a translation procedure, so they were given less attention in the main study. Although the cognitive function and the nature of the metaphor would not be labeled for each metaphoric expression, we would bear in mind their potential relevance. Based on the experience gathered in the pilot study, it was decided that in the main study we would analyze the translation solutions according to their type, and the ST metaphors according to their universality (shared between SL and TL or not). The pilot study also gave us an opportunity to test, supplement and refine the typology of translation procedures.

- Step 7: Refining the research questions

After the pilot study was conducted, the initial research questions were reviewed and refined, and we ended up with a final set of research questions, which are listed separately in section 3.5.

- Step 8: Identifying metaphorical expressions in the source text

The main goal of this research was to see how metaphors in general are translated. For that reason the scope of the research was not restricted to just one type of metaphor (e.g. orientational metaphors or personification or one-shot metaphors etc.) or any particular metaphorical domain (e.g. target domains LOVE, LIFE, MAN etc.); instead, all metaphors in the source text were looked for, which has turned out to be not so trivial as one may think. The recognition of a metaphor in a certain text or speech, as Shabani (2008) states when discussing the identification of metaphor, may be a challenge, especially for non-native speakers. There are several reasons making the identification of metaphor difficult. First and foremost, metaphor is primarily a cognitive mechanism, and not a linguistic device. As a consequence, metaphor has no consistent syntactic form (e.g. it can be a statement, a question or an exclamation) and its focus can be of any part of speech (a verb, a noun, an adjective or a participle). After examining several strategies for the identification of metaphor, such as looking for words with false literal interpretations or looking for the form 'x is y', Shabani (2008) concludes that there is no reliable method for identifying a metaphor. Further, there is no way to identify all metaphoric expressions in a text by a computerized search. What a computer can do, as far as metaphor identification is concerned, is to look for metaphors from a certain domain, e.g. it can find metaphoric expressions with a target domain LOVE, if you search for vocabulary related to that particular domain. Or the computer can look for patterns, such as 'x is y'. But even then all the solutions that are not metaphorical have to be manually eliminated. The only available option to us was to examine the text 'manually', sentence by sentence, and try to find metaphoric expressions. Following Lakoff and Johnson (1980), we

believe that there are no dead metaphors, so we tried to include all metaphoric expressions, including everyday expressions like ‘He said it in a *low* voice’, since voice is not literally low (or high; it has nothing to do with height), it can only have a lower or higher frequency and/or volume. However, since most of the language is metaphorical, we found it necessary to draw the line somewhere, in order to keep our task manageable. For that reason, to an extent arbitrarily, some of the metaphorical expressions, such as phrasal verbs (e.g. “I believe she has *made up* her mind“, „I never can *make out* what you are talking about“ etc.) and metaphorically used prepositions (e.g. „*through* the medium of an art“, “*at* the time“, “She never gets confused *over* her dates” etc.) were systematically left out. All the identified metaphorical expressions in the source text were entered into a database (see Picture 1 below).

	ST sentence	TT1 (Artur Schneider 1920)	translation procedure	shared?
	The Preface	Predgovor		
1	The critic is he who can translate into another manner or a new material his impression of beautiful things.	Kritik je onaj, koji može da izrazi svoj dojam o lijepu djelu drugim načinom ili novim materijalom.	2	1
2	The highest as the lowest form of criticism	Najviši je i najniži oblik kritizma	1	1
3	ugly meanings	gadnu namjeru	1	1
4	beautiful meanings	lijep smisao	1	1
5	The nineteenth century dislike of realism is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass.	Nemilost je... kao bijes Calibanov, kad ugleda u staklu svoju obrazinu.	3	1
6	The nineteenth century dislike of romanticism is the rage of Caliban not seeing his own face in a glass.	Nemilost je... kao bijes Calibanov, kad ne ugleda u staklu svoju obrazinu.	3	1
7	Thought and language are to the artist instruments of an art.	Misli i jezik su za umjetnika orudje njegove umjetnosti.	1	1
8	Vice and virtue are to the artist materials for an art.	Grijet i krepost su umjetnikova gradja.	1	1
9	All art is at once surface	Svaka je umjetnost u isto	2	1

Picture 1: A screenshot of the ST – TT1 database in MS Word

- Step 9: Matching the identified ST metaphorical expressions with the corresponding translation solutions

Having identified all the metaphoric expressions in the ST that we could (except for phrasal verbs and metaphorically used prepositions), they were matched with the corresponding translational solutions in the TT1, TT2 and TT3. Again, we had to search the TTs manually, sentence by sentence, since no automatic matching was possible. All the translation solutions were entered into the database, next to the corresponding ST metaphorical expressions (see Picture 1 above).

- Step 10: Setting up a typology of translation solutions for translating metaphors

For classification of the translation solutions, a new typology was used, which combines Toury's⁶⁹ and Kövecses's (2004) typologies. Toury identifies 6 types of procedures for translating metaphors:

1. metaphor -> metaphor
2. metaphor -> different metaphor
3. metaphor -> non-metaphor
4. metaphor -> 0 (deletion)
5. non-metaphor -> metaphor
6. 0 -> metaphor

Procedures 5 and 6 refer to the possibility of using metaphor in the TT in a place where there was no metaphor in the ST. In order to identify such cases, it would be necessary to start the analysis from a perspective of a TT, which is the opposite of what we have done. Although an analysis from the perspective of the TT would complete the picture, it is not feasible to both an analysis from the perspective of the ST and from the perspective of the TT, especially

⁶⁹ In Prunč, 2002: 244.

when one is dealing with three TTs, and each TT has to be analyzed manually. For that reason, in the present research, we leave aside procedures 5 and 6, focusing on the first four. Toury's typology was used as a starting point for our typology, because it seemed to cover all the theoretical possibilities. However, Toury overlooked the cognitive element, a very important distinction between conceptual metaphor (CM) and a metaphorical linguistic expression. In order to refine Toury's typology, we looked for a typology in cognitive linguistics. We found the work by Kövecses (2004) perfectly suitable for our purposes.

Kövecses (2004) uses the following parameters for analysis of shared conceptual metaphors:

1. the linguistic form used (same or different, S or D)⁷⁰;
2. literal meaning of the expressions used (same or different, S or D);
3. figurative meaning of the expressions used (same or different, S or D);
4. the conceptual metaphor which is the basis (same or different, S or D).

Each of these parameters can be same (S) or different (D) in the two languages. A combination of the parameters gives the following patterns:

- a. DSSS – (deciphered from right to left) same CM, same figurative meaning, same literal meaning, e.g. 'ace up my sleeve' -> *as u rukavu* (literally 'in my sleeve');
- b. DDSS – same CM, same figurative meaning, different literal meaning, e.g. 'odds are against me' -> *šanse su mi male* (lit. 'my chances are small');
- c. DDS D – different CM, same figurative meaning, different literal meaning, e.g. 'ace in the hole' -> *skriveno oružje* (lit. 'a hidden weapon') (LIFE IS A GAMBLE -> LIFE IS WAR);
- d. DDDD – different CM, different figurative meaning, different literal meaning.

⁷⁰ The linguistic form is almost invariably different, especially when we are dealing with two non-cognate languages such as English and Croatian.

Kövecses (2004) used these parameters and patterns to examine the cross-cultural variation, i.e. universality of shared conceptual metaphors between Hungarian and English. Although he did not use it to examine the translation of metaphor, we would like to suggest that this classification can be also successfully applied to the analysis of metaphor translation. According to Kövecses (2004: 155ff), the metaphorical expressions can reveal subtle differences in the cultural-ideological background in which the conceptual metaphor functions. For example, the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor shows subtle differences between the American and Hungarian culture. Kövecses (2005: 158) proposes that these differences (at least in the case of the LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor in English and Hungarian) are systematic, motivated, and of significance in the study of metaphorical thought in culture.

Combining elements of Toury's and Kövecses's typologies, a new typology is proposed:

1. CM -> CM (conceptual metaphor -> (same) conceptual metaphor)
 - a. same expression of the same CM (+/-)⁷¹
 - b. different expression of the same CM (+)
 - c. simile (+)
2. CM -> CM1 (conceptual metaphor -> different conceptual metaphor, with a similar meaning)
3. CM -> non-M (conceptual metaphor -> non-metaphor; paraphrase)
4. CM -> 0 (deletion)
5. non-M -> CM (non-metaphor -> conceptual metaphor)
6. 0 -> CM (conceptual metaphor with no formal correspondent in ST)

The 6 basic procedures look the same as in Toury, but they are refined with the cognitive patterns as proposed by Kövecses (2004). Toury's typology does not include the conceptual element. For example, his procedure 'metaphor -> different metaphor' does not imply that

⁷¹ The + and – signs indicate that something can be added or omitted. This is explained and exemplified in the next chapter.

there is a different CM involved in the translation; it just means that the translation uses a different metaphorical expression (be it from the same CM or from a different CM). In CMT, a distinction between a conceptual metaphor and a metaphorical linguistic expression is absolutely crucial, which has been explained in detail in section 2.2.2. For this reason, to avoid confusion, we replaced the Toury's symbol M with CM.

- Step 11: Analyzing and labeling the ST metaphoric expressions and translation solutions

The ST metaphoric expressions were analyzed and labeled according to their universality, and the translation solutions according to their type. The labels were entered into the database. An illustration of how the database is organized is shown in Picture 1, which is reproduced once more and explained in detail on the next page:

	ST sentence	TT1 (Artur Schneider 1920)	translation procedure	shared?
	The Preface	Predgovor		
1	The critic is he who can translate into another manner or a new material his impression of beautiful things.	Kritik je onaj, koji može da izrazi svoj dojam o lijepu djelu drugim načinom ili novim materijalom.	2	1
2	The highest as the lowest form of criticism	Najviši je i najniži oblik kritizma	1	1
3	ugly meanings	gadnu namjeru	1	1
4	beautiful meanings	lijep smisao	1	1
5	The nineteenth century dislike of realism is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass.	Nemilost je... kao bijes Calibanov, kad ugleda u staklu svoju obrazinu.	3	1
6	The nineteenth century dislike of romanticism is the rage of Caliban not seeing his own face in a glass.	Nemilost je... kao bijes Calibanov, kad ne ugleda u staklu svoju obrazinu.	3	1
7	Thought and language are to the artist instruments of an art.	Misli i jezik su za umjetnika orudje njegove umjetnosti.	1	1
8	Vice and virtue are to the artist materials for an art.	Grijech i krepost su umjetnikova gradja.	1	1
9	All art is at once surface	Svaka je umjetnost u isto	2	1

Picture 1: A screenshot of the ST – TT1 database in MS Word

As can be seen in Picture 1, the database has the form of a table. There was one database for each of the target texts. The database consists of five columns. Looking from left to right, the first column contains numbers of metaphorical expressions. In the second column we entered the ST sentences which contain metaphoric expressions. The third column lists the corresponding translation solutions for each of the ST metaphoric expressions (in this example, for TT1). In the fourth column from the left we entered the labels for the translation


solutions. For the sake of simplicity, we used numbers 1- 4 to label the translation solutions. Each number in this column refers to a different type of procedure, which will be explained later. The fifth, and last, column from the left contains data about the sharedness of the ST metaphorical expressions between SL and TL.

The initial database, before the pilot study, contained a lot more parameters (see Picture 2 on the next page), like conventionality of metaphoric expressions, conventionality of conceptual metaphor, cognitive function, proposed translation etc. After the pilot study, we realized that it would not be feasible to examine each example for all these parameters, so we eliminated most of the parameters. That does not mean that we are not aware of the potential relevance of some of these parameters, such as conventionality of metaphor; we only did it to make the number of parameters manageable. Although the parameters such as conventionality were not entered into the database, they were considered, especially in the qualitative analysis of individual examples.

ST sentence	conventionality of met. expression	conceptual metaphor	conventionality of conceptual metaphor	cognitive function +/- orientational	nature of the met	TT1 (Arthur Schneider 1920)	conventional metaphor (if different than ST)	translation procedure	proposed translation	shared ? +/-
The Preface						Predgovor	+/- convent			
1 The critic is he who can translate into another manner or a new material his impression of beautiful things.	-	?	-	-	proposition-based	Kritik je onaj, koji može da izrazi svoj dojam o lijepu djelu drugim načinom ili novim materijalom.	+ conventional	2	? dojam lijepog prevestu drugi oblik ili materijal	1
2 The highest as the lowest form of criticism	+	UP-DOWN GOOD IS HIGH, BAD IS LOW	+	+	image-schematic	Najviši je i najniži oblik kritičizma		1		1
3 ugly meanings	-	?meaning personified	-	-	prop	gadnu namjeru		1		1
4 beautiful meanings	-	meaning personified	-	-	prop	lijep smisao		1		1
5 The nineteenth century dislike of realism is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass.	-		-	-	image-based	Nemilost je... kao bijes Calibanov kad ugleda u staklu svoju obrazinu		3		1
6 The nineteenth century dislike	-		-	-	image-based	Nemilost je... kad bijes Calibanov		3		1

Picture 2: A screenshot of the initially planned database in MS Word

For the purpose of comparing the TTs to one another, we also had a database with the parallel representation of ST metaphorical expressions and the corresponding translation solutions in the TTs. The parallel database is shown in Picture 3 below:



	ST	TT1 (Artur Schneider 1920)	TT2 (Zlatko Gorjan 1953)	TT3 (Zdenko Novački 1987)
	<u>The Preface</u>	Predgovor	Uvodna riječ	
1	The critic is he who can translate into another manner or a new material his impression of beautiful things.	Kritik je onaj, koji može da izrazi svoj dojam o lijepu djelu drugim načinom ili novim materijalom.	Kritičar je čovjek kojemu uspijeva dojam lijepog izraziti u nekom drugom obliku ili oblikovati s pomoću neke nove materije.	...dojam lijepog pretvoriti u kakav drugi oblik ili novi materijal
2	The highest as the lowest form of criticism	Najviši je i najniži oblik kritizma	najviši i najniži oblik kritike	=
3	ugly meanings	gadnu namjeru	ružan smisao	=
4	beautiful meanings	lijep smisao	=	=
5	The nineteenth century dislike of realism is the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass.	Nemilost je... kao bijes Calibanov , kad ugleda u staklu svoju obrazinu.	nevoljkost...jest bijes kojim kipti Caliban kad gleda svoj nakazni lik u ogledalu	Odbojnost...je Calibanov bijes kad gleda svoje lice u ogledalu
6	The nineteenth century dislike of romanticism is the rage of Caliban not seeing his own face in a glass.	Nemilost je... kao bijes Calibanov , kad ne ugleda u staklu svoju obrazinu.	nevoljkost...jest bijes što ga osjeća Caliban kad u ogledalu ne vidi svoga lika	Odbojnost...je Calibanov bijes kad ne gleda svoje lice u ogledalu
7	Thought and language are to the artist instruments of an art.	Misli i jezik su za umjetnika orudje njegove umjetnosti.	Misao i jezik umjetnikovo su oruđe	Umjetnikov su alat misao i jezik.
8	Vice and virtue are to the artist materials for an art.	Grijeih i krepost su umjetnikova gradja.	Poroci i vrline umjetnikova su građa.	Porok i vrlina umjetnikovi su materijali

Picture 3: A screenshot of the parallel database in MS Word

- Step 12: Qualitative analysis of the findings

In this step we try to account for the data in a qualitative manner. Examples of the different procedures are analyzed into detail, looking for the motivation behind each of the translation procedures. That includes answering questions like: why and under which circumstances is a particular translation procedure used, why is one translation procedure in a particular situation preferred to another translation procedure etc. Another thing we want to do is to see whether it is possible to apply the concept of norms, as defined by Toury, regarding the translation of metaphors in Croatian culture of literary translation. We also want to check whether there are any problems regarding the translation of metaphors, whether there are types of metaphor presenting a problem or a special challenge for the translator, and whether there are ways to overcome the possible problems.

- Step 13: Quantitative analysis of the findings

The quantitative analysis includes counting the number of occurrences of each individual translation, converting the numbers into raw frequencies, presenting the results in the form of tables and charts, and comparing the results for the TT1, TT2 and TT3. We want to answer the following questions about the resulting numbers and frequencies: What do they represent? How can they be interpreted? How can they be used to form the basis of future research? How reliable are they?

- Step 14: Evaluation of the results

After the analysis is done, we will be in a good position to evaluate the results of our study. The main questions we have to answer are whether the objectives have been attained and whether research questions have been answered. In that way we will be able to decide whether the study has been successful or not, and to what extent.

- Step 15: Drawing conclusions

At the very end of the study, we will hopefully be able to draw some conclusions. This is arguably the most important step. It is our belief that every research is done for the sake of conclusions; they are often the most important as well as the most interesting part of a study.

3.3 Corpus

The corpus consists of one English ST and three Croatian TTs. The ST is Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, first published in 1891. The TTs are as follows:

TT1 = Oscar Wilde: *Dorian Gray*, translated by Dr. Artur Schneider, 1920

TT2 = Oscar Wilde: *Slika Dorian Gray*, translated by Zlatko Gorjan, 1953

TT3 = Oscar Wilde: *Slika Dorian Gray*, translated by Zdenko Novački, 1987

In addition to comparing each individual translation with the original text (TT1: ST, TT2: ST, TT3: ST), working with several different TTs allows for their mutual comparison (TT1: TT2: TT3). Since the TTs in our corpus are written in three different time periods (each text about 35 years apart, spanning a period of 67 years), by comparing them to one another we hope to get a diachronic picture reflecting the change of tendencies in metaphor translation. One of the drawbacks of the diachronic approach is what Hoffman (in Kurth, 1995: 107) calls diachronic change of connotations and outdated socio-cultural references.

The corpus is restricted to the genre of literary translation because it is impossible to do an analysis of all types of discourse and all kinds of translation at the same time. The choice of literary translation as subject of research (as opposed to, say, scientific translation) is by large accidental, and it is partly motivated by the accessibility of material for analysis. This particular book, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, was chosen after careful search through the


catalogue of National and University Library in Zagreb. Since the idea was to do a diachronic study, the main search parameter was books with multiple translations. Oscar Wilde's *The picture of Dorian Gray* was an ideal match because it was translated into Croatian four times. Unfortunately, the last translation turned out to be just an adaptation of one of the former translations, so it had to be excluded from the corpus. This still left us with a fairly satisfying number of three TTs of the same ST.

Restricting the scope of the research to literary translation makes some parameters, such as functional relevance of metaphorical expression (cf. van der Broeck, 1981) irrelevant, because we assume that in the literary discourse everything is functionally relevant. Restricting the scope of research to just one novel has a number of advantages as well as some drawbacks. One major advantage of dealing with just one novel is that it is possible to do a really thorough analysis, which, because of the necessity of manual search, would not be possible if the corpus were larger. Another advantage is that the number of variables is limited, which is very suitable for all kinds of statistical investigations. The greatest drawback is that statistical data cannot be generalized, because they refer to a single novel. But, the statistical data thus obtained can give us indications about tendencies, which can be set up as hypotheses and tested subsequently on a larger corpus.


The whole corpus was converted into an electronic format (for detailed description of this process refer to section 3.4. below), and is searchable by computer. The size of the corpus is almost 300,000 words (293,463). It consists of 1,698,500 characters, i.e. bytes, or 6330 lines (each line corresponding in most cases to one sentence) for each of the TTs, which amounts to the total of 25,320 lines. More details about the tools used and the steps taken in designing the corpus are presented in the following section.

3.4. Tools


To convert printed text into electronic text (plain text format), a scanner was used and an excellent OCR (Optical Character Recognition) program called ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition (see Pictures 4, 5 and 6). This had to be done for all three TTs, while the ST was already available as electronic text.



Picture 4: A screenshot of the main screen of ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition




Picture 5: A screenshot of the scanning settings window in ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition



Picture 6: A screenshot of the scanning window in ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition


After the text is scanned and the OCR is performed using ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition, we get a text in MS Word such as the example shown in Picture 7 below.



Picture 7: A screenshot of the text in Word after being scanned and processed in ABBYY


FineReader 9.0

The text clearly needs some editing; it is full of misspellings (highlighted in yellow in Picture 7) and it has to be formatted. Obviously, the OCR is not 100% accurate; it cannot recognize and reproduce all the characters from the printed source text. In addition, all unwanted data, such as page numbers (also highlighted in yellow in Picture 7), headers, footers, publishing data, forewords and afterwords, had to be eliminated from the text. After careful editing, the text looks like in Picture 8 below:




Picture 8: A screenshot of the text in Word after editing

After that, each text was to be processed and edited with WordSmith Tools 5.0, Viewer and Aligner utility. But, before the text could be processed, it had to be converted into the “plain text” format (a text without any formatting, the file gets the extension .txt) because this is required by the WordSmith Tools. The conversion is easily done in Word, and the end result looks like in Picture 9 below:



Picture 9: A screenshot of the text in Notepad in the plain text format

After all four texts had been prepared in the above described way, they were ready to be read, one by one, into WordSmith. An example of a text in WordSmith Viewer and Aligner is shown as Picture 10 below.



Picture 10: A screenshot of the text in Viewer and Aligner utility of WordSmith Tools 5.0

As can be seen in Picture 10, Viewer and Aligner breaks the text into lines. The column on the left shows the number of the line (N), and the text is shown in the main window. The numbered lines should correspond to sentences in the text, but they do not always do so. The problem is that the program cannot reliably separate sentences in the text. For example, if

there is a sentence like *“Is that his name?” asked Lord Henry, walking across the studio towards Basil Hallward*, the program will break it into two sentences because it recognizes the question mark as a sentence boundary. Another example is when there is an abbreviated form like Mr. in the sentence: *You are not going to run away so soon, Mr. Hallward*. The program will break the sentence after Mr. because it uses a full stop as a sentence-boundary indicator. For this reason, the text has to be edited after reading it into the program. The editing in the program can be done in the way that you join the line to the one above it, or you can break one line in two (If there is more than one sentence in the line). The editing in Viewer and Aligner is shown in Picture 11 below. This has to be done for each text separately, making sure that the lines in text 1 (ST) correspond to text 2 (TT1), text 3 (TT2), and text (4), because they are to be aligned on the sentence level, and if they do not match exactly, the aligned text will also not match. In other words, after editing, our ST had 6330 lines (sentences), and that meant that the TTs had to have the same number of lines and that the lines had to match one another exactly.


176	Conscience is the trade-name of the firm.
177	That is all."
178	"I don't believe that, Harry, and I don't believe you do eit
179	However, whatever was my motive--and it may have bec
180	There, of course, I stumbled against Lady Brandon.
181	"You are not going to run away so soon, Mr.
182	Hallward?"
183	she screamed out.
184	You know her curiously shrill voice?"
185	"Yes; she is a peacock in everything but beauty," said
186	"I could not get rid of her.
187	She brought me up to royalties, and people with stars a
188	She spoke of me as her dearest friend.
189	I had only met her once before, but she took it into her

N	Text
168	I have always been my own master; had at least
169	Then--but I don't know how to explain it to you
170	Something seemed to tell me that I was on the
171	I had a strange feeling that fate had in store for
172	I grew afraid and turned to quit the room.
173	It was not conscience that made me do so: it
174	I take no credit to myself for trying to escape."
175	"Conscience and cowardice are really the same
176	Conscience is the trade-name of the firm.
177	That is all."
178	"I don't believe that, Harry, and I don't believe you
179	However, whatever was my motive--and it may
180	There, of course, I stumbled against Lady Brandon.
181	"You are not going to run away so soon, Mr.
182	Hallward?"
183	she screamed out

174	I take no credit to myself for trying to escape."
175	"Conscience and cowardice are really the same things, Basil.
176	Conscience is the trade-name of the firm.
177	That is all."
178	"I don't believe that, Harry, and I don't believe you do either.
179	However, whatever was my motive--and it may have been pride, for I used to be w
180	There, of course, I stumbled against Lady Brandon.
181	"You are not going to run away so soon, Mr. Hallward?" she screamed out.
182	You know her curiously shrill voice?"
183	"Yes; she is a peacock in everything but beauty," said Lord Henry, pulling the da
184	"I could not get rid of her.
185	She brought me up to royalties, and people with stars and garters, and elderly la
186	She spoke of me as her dearest friend.
187	I had only met her once before, but she took it into her head to lionize me.
188	I believe some picture of mine had made a great success at the time at least ha

Picture 11: A series of *screenshots* of Viewer and Aligner showing one sentence that was automatically broken in three parts and the procedure of joining the fragments into one sentence.

Finally, using the Viewer and Aligner utility of WordSmith Tools 5.0, each TT was aligned on sentence level with the ST and then all the texts were combined into one file containing parallel texts, ready to be analyzed (see Picture 12 below).



Picture 12: A screenshot of the aligned multiple text in *Viewer and Aligner Utility* of *WordSmith Tools*

Now we had a corpus of aligned text, ready to be analyzed. During the analysis, ST sentences containing metaphorical expressions and the corresponding translation solutions in the TTs were copied from WordSmith Tools into MS Word files, where they were further analyzed (Pictures 1 - 3).

3.5. Research questions

The final set of research questions contains the following:

1. What translation procedures for the translation of metaphoric expressions can be found in the TT1, TT2 and TT3?
2. Why is a particular translation procedure used in a particular context? (motivation)
3. Which parameters (conventionality of metaphor, universality of metaphor, cognitive function, nature of metaphor) are relevant for the choice of translation procedure?
4. What are the effects of using a particular procedure? (function)
5. What is the distribution of the different translation procedures in the TT1, TT2 and TT3?
6. What are the tendencies in choosing a particular translation procedure?
7. Can we predict what procedure is going to be used in a particular situation?

4. Research findings and discussion

4.1. Qualitative analysis

In the analysis of the corpus the total of 10 translation procedures for the translation of metaphoric expressions were identified (TT1: 8, TT2: 9, TT3: 9) :

1. same expression of the same CM
 2. same expression of the same CM +
 3. same expression of the same CM -
 4. different expression of same CM
 5. different expression of same CM +
 6. simile
 7. simile +
 8. different expression of a different CM, with a similar meaning
 9. non-metaphoric paraphrase
 10. deletion
- } 1a)
- } 1b)
- } 1c)
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)

Not all of the procedures were used in all of the TTs. In the TT1 only eight of the above procedures were used, TT2 used all ten, while TT3 used nine different procedures. The numbers on the right-hand side indicate the types of procedures as presented in our typology. As can be seen, all of the procedures from the typology were used, and no new procedures were found, which can be taken as evidence that our typology is functional and adequate for the analysis of metaphor translation.

In the following text, each of the identified translation procedures is exemplified and discussed in the order established by our typology.

4.1.1. CM -> CM (conceptual metaphor -> (same) conceptual metaphor)

4.1.1.1. Same expression of the same CM (1a)

This is the most straightforward procedure. Metaphoric expressions are translated literally, word for word.

Examples:

- (1) ST: Sibyl, you are *mad about him*⁷².
TT3: *Sibyl, ti si luda za njim.* (literal translation)

TT1: *Sibyl, on te je zaludio.*
(‘he has infatuated you’)
TT2: *Sibyl, obmanuo te pa luduješ za njim.*
(‘he has deluded you so you are acting crazily about him’)
- (2) ST: The *highest* as the *lowest* form of criticism
TT1: *Najviši je i najniži oblik kriticizma* (literal translation)
(TT2 and TT3: same)
- (3) ST: Yes; she is a *peacock* in everything but beauty
TT3: *Znam; po svemu je paun osim po ljepoti* (literal translation)

TT2: *Da, paunica je ona po svemu, samo ne po ljepoti*
(lit. ‘peahen’, a female peafowl)
TT1: *ona je osim ljepotom u svemu kao paun*
(‘like a peacock’)

⁷² The italics in ST examples are for emphasis; they were not present in the ST.

The shift in TT2 is not obligatory, but it is very common, e.g. *Ona je tigrica/lavica* ('She is a tigress/lioness') instead of *Ona je tigar/lav* ('She is a tiger/lion'). But, in the case of TT2 above we may wonder whether the solution is appropriate because it is well known that only male peafowl, as a part of courtship, spreads out his long tail feathers showing beautiful colors and patterns, while the female is far less extravagant in appearance. So, there is a change of connotation here which the translator probably overlooked.

(4) ST: I might mimic a passion that I do not feel, but I cannot mimic one that *burns me like fire*.

TT3: *Mogu oponašati strast koju ne osjećam, no ne mogu oponašati onu koja me pali poput vatre.* (literal translation)

TT1: *Mogla sam prikazati strast, koja u meni plamsa kao vatra.*
(‘burns in me like fire’)

TT2: *Možda bih mogla glumiti strast koju ne osjećam, ali ne mogu glumiti osjećaj u kojem izgaram kao u vatri.*
(‘a feeling in which I am burning up like in a fire’)

(5) ST: the gracious and comely form he had so skilfully *mirrored in his art*

TT2: *dražesni i umilni lik što ga je tako vješto odrazio u svojoj umjetnosti*
(literal transl.)

(TT3: same as TT2)

TT1: *dražesni i ljubežljivi lik, koji se tako divno odsijeva iz njegova umijeća*
(‘the ... form, which mirrors itself so beautifully in his art’)

The procedure 1a is used when both the CM and the particular metaphoric mapping are shared between the SL and TL. The TT expression is in most cases conventional in the TL. In some cases a literal translation may be less conventional in the TL (ex. 4, TT3). The reason for using this procedure in such cases, instead of opting for a more conventional translation, may

be a conscious breaking of literary and linguistic conventions or the desire to stay close to the ST, or both.

Sometimes CMs that are not shared between SL and TL may with time become acceptable in the TL, especially in an informal context. A good example of the point are CMs TO FEEL LOVE SUDDENLY FOR SOMEONE IS TO FALL INTO A HOLE, and TO BE IN THE STATE OF LOVE IS TO BE IN A CONTAINER, which are typical of the English language but not of Croatian, i.e. are not shared between English and Croatian. Evidence of their growing acceptability in Croatian can be found in newspaper headings and articles, Internet forums and blogs:

(TO FEEL LOVE SUDDENLY FOR SOMEONE IS TO FALL INTO A HOLE)

(6) *pala sam u ljubav. posve.*⁷³

(‘I ‘ve fallen [femininum] in love.’)

(7) 22.11.'04.

«Blažen čas i hip RMX»

pao sam u ljubav, kažem, (‘I ‘ve fallen [masculinum] in love’)

pitaju me s kojom,

ja kažem s njim,

dok se svi čude ja pricam o njemu,

ne mogu više ni sekunde,

*bez njega, [...]*⁷⁴

⁷³ Source: <http://www.index.hr/forum/default.aspx?q=t&idf=7&idt=136856&p=5>, retrieved on 2011-07-05.

⁷⁴ Source: <http://cesta55.blog.hr>, retrieved on 2011-07-05.

(TO BE IN THE STATE OF LOVE IS TO BE IN A CONTAINER)

(8) Juvenile

02-08-2004, 12:29

A ito sto kazes..

Auto je auto... :smile15:

Ali opet..

Im in love.. :smile20:

(Sto znaci kasti?)

:smile10: :)

activa

02-08-2004, 12:30

....kazati !! :) ...reci !!

..i ja sam u ljubavi , ali auto je na prvom mjestu !!?? ;) :))⁷⁵

(‘I am also in love’)

(9) *Realnost je da većina pisaca nije nikada voljela. Oni su u ljubavi sa idejom o ljubavi, zato pišu prelijepu pjesmu, prelijepu novelu.⁷⁶ (‘They are in love with the idea of love’)*

(10) *Do prije nekoliko godina bili su u ljubavi, zajedno imaju brojnu djecu, a sada se ne mogu smisliti i Francuzima obećavaju izvrsnu sapunicu na političkoj sceni.⁷⁷*

(,they had been in love‘)

⁷⁵ <http://forum.vidi.hr/archive/index.php/t-11226.html>, retrieved on 2011-07-05

⁷⁶ <http://tupatup.blog.hr/2007/11/1623637338/ljubomora.html>, retrieved on 2011-07-05

⁷⁷ <http://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/imaju-cetvero-djece-a-danas-su-smrtni-politicki-neprijatelji-clanak-272110>, retrieved on 2011-07-05

- (11) *"Ja nisam bila ni u braku ni u izvanbračnoj zajednici", govori Josipa Lisac, "ja sam bila u ljubavi i dandanas živim u toj ljubavi."*⁷⁸

(‘I was in love and today I am still living in that love’ - a nationally well-known Croatian singer Josipa Lisac in an interview)

- (12) *Istina, duže sam u ljubavi s televizijom, a radijska avantura traje tri mjeseca.*⁷⁹

(‘I’ve been longer in love with television, and the affair with the radio has been on for three months’ - Mia Kovačić, known as anchor for Nova TV, in an interview)

In some cases there is a shift (extension) in meaning:

- (13) *ja sam vss i bila sam u ljubavi s vss, i nije uspjelo. ipak smatram, da postoje i divni inteligentni ljudi s kojima ima puno tema bez obzira na obrazovanje*⁸⁰

(literally ‘I was in love with’, but the meaning is ‘I was in a love relationship with’)

- (14) *Moj prvi nastup u Sarajevu bio je još u prošlom stoljeću, oni znaju koja sam ja sorta izvođača, mi smo u ljubavi.*⁸¹

(literally ‘we are in love’, meaning ‘we are on good terms with each other’ - a well-known singer and songwriter Gibonni, in an interview)

- (15) *Mesić: S Jadrankom sam u ljubavi, sve mi je oprostila*⁸²

(literally, ‘With Jadranka I am in love’, meaning ‘I’m on good terms with Jadranka’ - a newspaper headline)

⁷⁸ <http://www.nacional.hr/clanak/50857/volim-te-i-bez-braka>, retrieved on 2011-07-05

⁷⁹ http://www.glas-slavonije.hr/mvijest.asp?rub=4&ID_VIJESTI=9595, retrieved on 2011-07-05

⁸⁰ <http://www.forum.hr/archive/index.php/t-347509.html>, retrieved on 2011-07-05

⁸¹ <http://www.showbizmag.com/Intervju/Gibonni.aspx?page=4>, retrieved on 2011-07-05

⁸² <http://www.24sata.hr/politika/mesic-s-jadrankom-sam-u-ljubavi-sve-mi-je-oprostila-164601>, retrieved on 2011-07-05

These unconventional usages are most certainly due to the ever-growing influence of the English language as a global world language. It is also not surprising that the individuals spreading these unconventional usages are often celebrities, singers, TV-stars, politicians. These people, on the one hand, live from the unconventional, and, on the other hand, they are using English a lot in their everyday communication. Shifts in meaning (ex. 13-15), however, indicate that the process of adopting foreign metaphors is not purely mechanical, but can also be a creative process resulting in new meanings. It should be added that in our corpus we have not found any example of a similar unconventional usage resulting from a literal translation, which shows that this indeed is a recent phenomenon, caused by the supremacy of English in this age of globalization.

Same expression of the same CM (1a) should be the first option for translating metaphors, under the conditions that the CM in question is shared between SL and TL and that the particular metaphoric mapping is also shared. When one or both of these conditions is not met, we may use literal translation to consciously stretch or break the literary and linguistic conventions, for a variety of reasons: to stay close to the source language and culture, to provoke, to shock, to test the limits of the language and understanding, to enrich the language with new ways of expression etc. The examples from our corpus show that there are also many cases where literal translation could have been used, but was not used, in favor of a different translation procedure. As it is shown throughout the analysis, those cases are due to the preference of the translator, who often conforms to the prevailing literary and language conventions or wants to express himself in ways different than the original author did, sometimes emphasizing or explicating a point, sometimes implying a part of the meaning or changing an aspect.

4.1.1.2. Same expression of the same CM, with an addition (1a+)

This procedure is almost the same as the above, but there is an added element. What exactly is added is shown by the following examples:

- (16) ST: he is *a Narcissus*
TT2: *to je pravi Narcis*
(‘he is a *real Narcissus*’)
(TT1 and TT3: 1a)

The word *pravi* (‘real’, ‘complete’ or ‘great’) is used to add force to the expression *Narcissus*. Thus, in TT2 the subject of the sentence (Dorian Gray) is not just *a Narcissus*, but he is *a complete Narcissus*, with all his being. Exaggeration, adding force or intensity, is said to be one of translation universals:

In addition to weakening the finest esthetic factors in a literary work, translation exhibits a seemingly opposite tendency toward *intensifying* the crudest stylistic features, above all those that calculate on a strong effect. (Levi 1982: 144, my own translation)

The following examples (17-20) reinforce the above Levi’s claim, showing the same tendency towards intensification:

- (17) ST: Was the soul *a shadow* seated in the house of sin?
TT3: *Da li je duša tek sjena smještena u kući grijeha?*
(‘Was the soul *but a shadow*’ ...)
(TT1 and TT2: 1a)

- (18) ST: "They [the American women as racing horses] *don't last*, I am told," muttered his uncle.
 TT2: - *Ljudi govore da nisu nimalo izdržljive* - *promumlja njegov ujak.*
 ('don't last a bit')
 (TT1 and TT3: 1a)
- (19) ST: (the consciousness that amongst his audience there was one whose temperament he wished to fascinate) seemed to give his wit *keenness*
 TT2: *davala je još više oštrine* *njegovoj domišljatosti*
 ('to give his wit *even more keenness*')
 (TT1 and TT3: 1a)
- (20) ST: It was a *poisonous* book.
 TT2: *Bila je to doista otrovna knjiga.*
 ('It was a *truly/genuinely poisonous* book.')
- (21) ST: (The ugly and the stupid have the best of it in this world. They can sit at their ease) and gape at *the play*.
 TT1: *i zjati na igru oko sebe* ('gape at *the play around them*')
 TT2: *i dokono promatraju raspomamljenu igru života.* ('the riotous play of life')
 TT3: *Dokono promatrati igru života* ('the play of life')

Example 21 above is a clear example of explicitation, i.e. elements of meaning that are implied in ST are made explicit in TT1 and TT3. TT2 is slightly different and it will be taken up again as ex. 31. The ST example implies the CM LIFE IS A PLAY, but only the source domain (PLAY) is mentioned explicitly, while the target domain (LIFE) is left implicit. TT1 and TT3 make the target domain explicit, the latter directly and the former indirectly. The following group of examples (ex. 22 - 29) all exhibit explicitation:

- (22) ST: *in the eyes of many*
TT1: *u očima mnogih ljudi*
(‘in the eyes of many people’)
(TT2 and TT3: 1a)

In the original text the word 'many' was used as a pronoun (for 'many persons'), while TT1 turns it into a determiner of the noun 'people'. There is a case for arguing that not only an element was added ('people'), but also an element was changed ('many' as pronoun into 'many' as determiner). In any case, the word 'people', which is implied in ST, is made explicit in TT1.

- (23) ST: elderly ladies with gigantic tiaras and *parrot noses*
TT2: *nekih vremešnih dama s golemim dijademama i papagajskim nosinama*
(Cr. *nosina* = 'a large nose'; augmentative form)
(TT1 and TT3: 1a)

Parrot noses are curved and usually large, which was made explicit in TT2 by adding an augmentative suffix *-ina* to the noun *nos* ('nose').

- (24) ST: [time] *wars against your lilies and your roses*
TT2: *ratuje s ljiljanima i ružama vaše ljepote*
(‘wars with the lilies and roses of your beauty’)
(TT1 and TT3: 1a)

In the ST, 'lilies and roses' is a metaphor for beauty, which was made explicit in TT2 by adding the postmodifying prepositional phrase 'of your beauty'.

(25) ST: It would be absurd for him to marry so much *beneath him*.

TT2: *Bilo bi upravo ludo oženiti djevojku koja je toliko ispod njegove društvene razine.* ('beneath his social level')

(TT1 and TT3: 1a)

The metaphor implied in the ST is the metaphor of the 'social ladder'. Those people who are above you on the social ladder are more successful than you; those who are beneath you are less successful. The ST simply states that the girl Dorian Gray was going to marry was 'beneath him', and TT2 makes the meaning explicit by adding the reference to the 'social level'.

(26) ST: (I had buried my romance in a bed of asphodel.) She *dragged it out* again.

TT2: (*A ja sam tu svoju ljubav bio sahranio u lijehi zlatoglava.*) *No ona ju je izvukla iz groba.* ('she dragged it out of the grave')

(TT1 and TT3: 1a)

When Oscar Wilde writes that she 'dragged it out', we know from the preceding sentence what is implied. However, the translator of TT2 adds explicit reference to 'the grave'. At the same time, 'again' is left out in translation.

(27) ST: Nothing that he could do would *cleanse him* till he had told his own sin.

TT2: *Što god on činio, ništa ga ne može očistiti od grijeha dok sam ne prizna svoj grijeh.* ('cleanse him from sin')

(TT1 and TT2: 1a)

The implied metaphor in ST is SIN IS FILTH and it entails that the way to get rid of sin is by cleansing oneself from it. Wilde probably did not consider it necessary to say 'cleanse him from sin' because he already had a reference to sin at the end of the sentence. The translator of

the TT2 obviously did not share that opinion, so he made the reference to sin explicit both times.

(28) ST: (a week ago, at Lady Hampshire's, I found myself seated at dinner next the lady in question, and she insisted on going over the whole thing again, and digging up the past, and raking up the future.) I had *buried my romance in a bed of asphodel*. (She dragged it out again.)

TT3: (*prije tjedan dana kod lady Hampshire sjedio sam za večerom pokraj dame o kojoj je riječ, i ona je inzistirala da se cijela stvar ponovi, da se kopa po prošlosti i pretražuje budućnost.*) *Ja sam pokopao tu svoju romancu u gredici zlatoglava.* (*No ona ju je ponovno izvukla...*)

('buried *that* romance of mine...')

(TT1 and TT2: 1a)

TT3 explicitly specifies the reference of 'my romance', although the reference is clear from the context.

(29) ST: (Knowledge would be fatal. It is the uncertainty that charms one. A mist makes things wonderful.) One may *lose one's way*.

TT3: (*To znati bilo bi kobno. Nesigurnost nas očarava. Magla čini stvari prekrasnim.*) *No čovjek u njoj može izgubiti svoj put.*

('in it one may lose one's way')

TT1: *Ali se u njoj gubi pravi put.*

('in it one loses the right track')

TT2: *U magli čovjek lako siđe s pravoga puta.*

('In a mist a man easily gets off the right track')

By adding 'in it', the adverbial of place, TT3 makes the place of the event explicit. Interestingly, TT1 and TT3 exhibit the same kind of explicitation.

In the above examples (21 - 29) it is relatively easy to see what is implied in an utterance. By contrast, there are cases where the implications are only supposed. The translator in many cases invents things, thus making explicit the implications he supposes to be there, but for which there is actually no evidence. We will call this procedure a 'quasi-explicitation'. The following set of examples (30 - 32) illustrates the point:

- 30) ST: (The ugly and the stupid have the best of it in this world. They can sit at their ease) and gape at *the play*.
TT2: *Oni samo mirno sjede i dokono promatraju raspomamljenu igru života.*
(‘the riotous play of life’)
(TT1 and TT3: see ex. 21)
- 31) ST: Quick breath parted *the petals of her lips*.
TT1: *Brzo dahtanje rastvori ružične latice njenih usana.*
(‘the rose petals of her lips’)
TT2: *Kao dvije ružine latice usne joj se rastaviše.*
(‘like two rose petals her lips parted’)
TT3: *Ubrzan dah razdvoji latice njezinih usana.* (1a)
- 32) ST: Talking to him was *like playing upon an exquisite violin*.
TT2: *Govoriti s njim bila je prava milina, kao svirati na predivnoj violini.*
(‘a real pleasure, like playing upon an exquisite violin’)
TT1: *Razgovaranje s njim bilo je slično gudjenju na prekrasnoj violini.*
(‘similar to fiddling upon a beautiful violin’ - procedure 1b, discussed below)
TT3: *Razgovarati s njime, bilo je isto kao i svirati na nekoj izvanrednoj violini.*
(‘same as playing upon an extraordinary violin’ – 1b)

A special case of explicitation is the addition of a footnote. Consider the following example:

(33) ST: The nineteenth century dislike of realism is *the rage of Caliban seeing his own face in a glass*.

TT3: *Odbojnost devetnaestog stoljeća prema realizmu je **Calibanov* bijes kad gleda svoje lice u ogledalu***.

(literal translation + footnote)

[*footnote: *Caliban - Nakaza iz Shakespearove Oluje* ('Caliban – A monster from Shakespeare's *The Tempest*')]]

TT2: *Nevoljkost što je devetnaesto stoljeće osjeća prema realizmu jest **bijes kojim kipti Caliban* kad gleda svoj nakazni lik u ogledalu***.

('The dislike which the nineteenth century feels for realism is *the rage with which Caliban seethes seeing his monstrous face in a glass*.')

[*footnote: *Caliban – Zlobna nakaza iz Shakespearove Oluje* ('Caliban – An evil monster from Shakespeare's *The Tempest*')]]

TT1: *Nemilost je devetnaestoga vijeka prema realizmu **kao bijes Calibanov, kad ugleda u staklu svoju obrazinu***.

(simile: 'like the rage of Caliban...')

TT3 uses a literal translation (same expression of the same CM) plus a footnote, in which the translator explains the reference of Caliban. This can be seen as a kind of explicitation, although footnotes are usually not considered as belonging to the text itself but rather as a kind of paratext. TT2 also uses an explanatory footnote, but in contrast to TT3 it exhibits a lot of explicitation in the text itself, including the fact that Caliban's face was 'monstrous', which by itself is enough to help the readers understand the metaphor. TT1 does not use a footnote or any kind of explicitation, probably relying on the reader's familiarity with the

Shakespeare's play. The only thing TT1 does to facilitate the understanding is turning the metaphor into a simile (a procedure which is discussed later on).

An interesting thing about TT1 is that the entire text does not have a single footnote, which might have been a translation norm at that time. Of course, this has yet to be supported by more evidence. By contrast, TT2 contains 73 footnotes, and TT3 as many as 94 footnotes. Seeing that the number of footnotes increases in proportion to the time passed from the day the ST was published, it is reasonable to assume that this has to do with the diachronic change of connotations and the fact that socio-cultural references as the time passes are becoming more and more outdated (cf. Hoffman, 1980). The change of connotations and the outdated socio-cultural references mean that more and more things have to be explained to the reader, hence the growing number of explanatory footnotes. Another interesting thing about TT1 is that it doesn't contain any paratexts – such as preface or afterword. This could also be attributed to the prevailing norm at the time TT1 was published (1920), but it has to be further investigated. On the other hand, TT2 (reprint from 2000) and TT3 (1987) both contain an afterword and the author's biography. TT2, which is the most recent publication, even contains a note on the translator, which might be due to the recent recognition of the translator as an author, or at least a co-author of the book. Consider some more examples of explicitation by a footnote:

(34) ST: In the long cedar chests that lined the west gallery of his house, he had stored away many rare and beautiful specimens of what is really *the raiment of the Bride of Christ*, who must wear purple and jewels and fine linen that she may hide the pallid macerated body that is worn by the suffering that she seeks for and wounded by self-inflicted pain.

TT2: [...] *ruha Kristove vjerenice**, koja se morala odijevati u grimiz i najfinije platno i krasiti draguljima kako bi pokrila svoje blijedo, sparušeno tijelo

izmoždjeno patnjama što ih je sama tražila, izranjeno bolovima što si ih je sama zadala. (literal transl. + footnote)

[*footnote: *Kristova vjerenica – katolička crkva* ('the Bride of Christ – the Catholic Church')]

TT3: [...] *odjeće Kristove vjerenice**, koja je morala nositi grimiz, dragulje i fino rublje kako bi mogla sakriti blijedo i izmučeno tijelo, uništeno patnjom koju je sama tražila i ranjeno bolom koji je sama sebi zadavala.

(literal transl. + footnote)

[*italicized + footnote: *katolička crkva* ('the Catholic Church')]

TT1: [...] *odijela »Kristove vjerenice«*, (koja se mora odijevati grimizom, biserjem i finim platnom, da zastre blijedo, omršavjelo tijelo, iznemoglo od bolova, što ih traži, i izranjeno od rana, što ih je sebi sama zadala.) (1a)

Wilde in this excerpt brilliantly uses the metaphor CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE BRIDE OF CHRIST, by clothing the 'Bride of Christ' (= the Church) into the raiment of the priests (metonymy THE CHURCH FOR PRIESTS or ORGANIZATION FOR PEOPLE), and elaborating on the sharp contrast between her „pallid macerated body“, „worn by [...] suffering“ and „wounded by self-inflicted pain“ (referring to the body of Christ or to the self-image that the Church projects) and the fancy clothes and jewelry that she has to wear (symbolizing the immense wealth of the Church) to hide her miserable body. All three TTs translate the metaphor of 'the Bride of Christ', as well as the brilliantly woven threads of metaphor and metonymy literally, but TT2 and TT3 contain explanatory footnotes in which they explain the reference (target domain) of the metaphor. TT3 in addition puts the metaphoric expression *Kristova vjerenica* in italics, which points to the fact that this is not to be read literally but as a metaphor. TT1 again doesn't make a footnote, but it puts the metaphor into quotation marks, thus signaling a figurative reading.

(35) ST: Mr. Chapman began to talk in a loud voice about the situation in the House of Commons. He guffawed at his *adversaries*. The word *doctrinaire* [original italics – this word only] – word full of *terror* to the British mind – reappeared from time to time between his *explosions*. An alliterative prefix served as an ornament of oratory. He *hoisted the Union Jack on the pinnacles of thought*. The inherited stupidity of the race – sound English common sense he jovially termed it – was shown to be the proper *bulwark* for society.

TT2: [...] *Bučno je ismijavao svoje protivnike. Riječ doctrinaire [italics + footnote] - riječ koja je strah i trepet za britanski duh - izbijala je od vremena do vremena iz njegova grohota. [...] Na kule Misli izvjesio bi Union Jack* [...] pravi bedem Društva.*

[*‘Union Jack’ italicized + footnote: *Union Jack – britanska državna zastava* ('*Union Jack – British national flag*')]]

TT3: [...] *Glasno je ismijavao svoje protivnike. Riječ doctrinaire [italics + footnote] riječ koja je za britanski um puna užasa ponavljala se s vremena na vrijeme između njegovih provala smijeha. [...] Union Jack* je podigao do vrhunca misli. [...] odgovarajući bedem društva.*

[*footnote: *Union Jack – britanska državna zastava* ('*Union Jack – British national flag*')]]

TT1: [...] *Lajao je na svoje protivnike. [...] riječ puna strahota za britski duh [...] u izlivima njegove srdžbe. [...] Union Jack bi po njem razapet na vršcima misli. [...] najzgodnija utvrda Društva.*

Example (35) is a fine example of extended metaphor. The CM ARGUMENT IS WAR underlies the whole excerpt (adversaries, terror, explosions, hoisting of the flag, bulwark). All three translations more or less manage to keep the ST metaphorical expressions and to transfer the

tone of Mr. Chapman's talk. Let us focus on the sentence „He hoisted the Union Jack on the pinnacles of thought.“ This sentence is an example of creatively combining metaphor and metonymy to create a complex new meaning. It is a conceptual blend, consisting of various elements. In war, the side that won the battle usually hoists its flag on a pinnacle (e.g. on a mountain peak or on top of a tower) to symbolize their claim on the land. It is a symbolic act, and in a way based on a metonymy because the flag stands for the country. In this case, the flag is the Union Jack, the British national flag, which stands for Britain and its citizens, and the pinnacles are 'the pinnacles of thought' = the highest points one could reach in thinking, which gives the following interpretation: „He hoisted the Union Jack on the pinnacles of thought.“ entails that 'The British have won battles on the field of thought' which means that 'the British have reached the highest points in thinking' or 'the British are among the smartest nations in the world'. 'Hoisting the flag' is in itself a metonymy for a display of patriotism, implying that Mr. Chapman is a patriot. The sentence was translated pretty literally in all three TTs, but there is a difference. TT2 and TT3 contain footnotes which explain to the reader what Union Jack means. TT1, again, does not make any footnotes, assuming that the reader doesn't need help in understanding the reference. TT2 also makes an additional signal to the reader by italicizing *Union Jack*. This example shows how metaphor and metonymy can be creatively combined to create complex new meaning, and how one cannot understand the metaphor without understanding the metonymy on which the metaphor is based, which of course, has consequences for the translation of such conceptual blends.

Besides intensification and explicitation, there is also a special case of procedure 1a+, where one word is habitually replaced by two words that are conjoined, the so-called binomials (e.g. above and beyond, law and order, rise and shine, etc.). In the following two examples (36, 37) 'shallow' is in TT2 translated by *plitak i površan* ('shallow and superficial'). The repeated use of the phrase *plitak i površan* indicates that it indeed can be considered a binomial phrase. Interestingly, the phrase can be identified only in TT2, so we may consider it idiosyncratic to the translator of TT2:

- (36) ST: Do you think my nature so *shallow*?
 TT2: *Zar moju narav smatrate toliko **plitkom i površnom**?* ('shallow and superficial')
 TT1: *Držite li, da je moja narav tako **plitka**?* ('shallow')
 TT3: *Mislite da je moja priroda tako **površna**?* ('superficial')

TT1 in the above example employs literal translation, while TT3 uses procedure 1b, which is discussed below.

- (37) ST: My dear boy, the people who love only once in their lives are really the *shallow people*.
 TT2: *Dragi dječace, ljudi koji ljube svega jedanput u životu, zapravo su **baš plitki i površni**.* ('just / quite shallow and superficial')
 TT1: *Dragi moj dječace, ljudi koji samo jedamput u svome životu ljube, zacijelo su **plitki ljudi**.* (1a)
 TT3: *Dragi moj mladiću, ljudi koji vole samo jednom u svom životu stvarno su **površni**.* ('are really shallow')

TT2 in the above example has a double addition and an omission: a binomial phrase *plitki i površni* ('shallow and superficial') replaces the single word 'shallow', the intensifier *baš* ('quite/just') is added, and 'people' is omitted because it is implied by the subject of the sentence (the procedure used can be described as a combination of 1a+ and 1a-. The latter is discussed below). As for categorization, cases such as TT2 above could be put into a separate category, e.g. 'same expression of the same CM with an addition and an omission'. Another option, which I prefer, is to consider those cases as belonging to both categories 1a+ and 1a-, which is possible because those categories are not mutually exclusive. In any case, it is not so important to distinguish between 1a+, 1a- and 1a+/- because those are just variants of the same general procedure 'same expression of the same CM'. TT1 renders the ST expression literally, while TT3 uses procedure 1b (discussed below).

To recapitulate, the added part in the translation procedure we labeled '1a+' can have the form of a morpheme, a simple (single-word) phrase or a complex phrase. The added part can have various syntactic functions:

- at phrase level as:
 - determiner (*that* romance of mine);
 - premodifier in an NP (real, mere, frantic; but, indeed; *rose* petals);
 - premodifier in an AdjP (even more);
 - postmodifier in an NP (around them, of life, of your beauty);
 - postmodifier in an AdvP (many *people*);
 - postmodifier in a PP (beneath *his social level*, out of *the grave*);
 - a conjoined part of a binomial AdjP (shallow *and superficial*);

- at clause level as:
 - adverbial (a bit, from sin, in it); or
 - subject complement (Talking to him was *a real pleasure*, like playing...).

Additions at phrase level do not change the syntactic structure of the sentence, while the additions at clause level do change it. There are also special cases like adding an augmentative suffix to a noun (*nos + ina* = 'a very large nose'), or extending an NP into a Subject Clause (silent spirit -> 'the man who was to him the silent spirit').

However, the reason for the addition is not a syntactic but a semantic one; it is either:

- a. to add intensity to an expression (ex. 16 - 20); or
- b. to make real or supposed implicit meaning explicit (explicitation; ex. 21 - 35).

Although the motivation for using the translation procedure 1a+ seems to be transparent, that does not mean that the procedure is always justified. Exaggeration and 'quasi-explicitation' are unnecessary, and so is explicitation in most of the cases (except for the cases where there is a culture-specific reference), while binomials are clichés that can be justified only for special stylistic purposes.

4.1.1.3. Same expression of the same CM, with an omission (1a-)

The procedure 1a- renders the ST metaphorical expression literally in TT, but omitting a part of information. In the examples (38 - 40) a phenomenon called implicitation can be observed. Implicitation means that the translator does not explicitly express everything that is explicitly expressed in the ST, but implies a part of the meaning. The omitted information in such cases can easily be recovered from the context. Implicitation is diametrically opposite to explicitation, and both are considered to be translation universals.

(38) ST: a [...] somewhat *rough-mannered* old bachelor

TT2: *ponešto grubog, starog neženju* ('a somewhat *rough*, old bachelor')

TT3: *ponešto grubog, starog neženju* (same as TT2)

TT1: *malo grubom neženji* ('a somewhat *rough* bachelor')

Since the adjective *grub* ('rough') can refer both to the quality of a surface and to a person's manners, the TTs use it to mean 'rough manners'. We may wonder why implicitation is used here, when it was not used in the original (e.g. rough old bachelor). TT1 goes even further, omitting the adjective 'old', which implies either that a bachelor is usually old or that the age is irrelevant here.

(39) ST: Two days ago I asked Sibyl to marry me. I am not going to *break my word to her*.

TT3: *Prije dva dana zamolio sam Sibyl da se uda za mene. Ne namjeravam **prekršiti riječ**.* ('I am not going to *break* [my] *word*.')

TT1: *Ne ću **prekršiti riječi koju sam joj zadao**.*
(I will not *break the word I've given to her*.)

TT2: *I ja neću **prekršiti zadanu riječ**.*
(And I won't *break the word given*.)

TT3 implies to whom the word was given (indirect object 'to her'), and who gave it (possessive determiner 'my'), while TT1 and TT2 deal with the situation in different ways. TT1 also omits the possessive determiner, and it changes the syntax of the sentence, by changing the prepositional phrase 'to her' into a clause 'I've given to her'. In TT2 there is also both implicitation (indirect object 'to her' and the possessive determiner 'my' are omitted) and explicitation ('the word *given*'). Like TT2 in the ex. 34, TT1 and TT2 in the above example use a combination of procedures 1a+ and 1a-.

(40) ST: He was conscious also of the *shallowness* and vanity of *his mother's nature*

TT3: *Bio je svjestan **površnosti i taštine svoje majke***
(the *shallowness* and vanity of *his mother*'s)

TT2: *Poznavao je i **svu plitkost i taštinu svoje majke***
(all the *shallowness* and vanity of *his mother*'s)

TT1: *On je sebi bio svjestan o **površnosti i taštini majčina bića*** (1a)

TT3 shows implicitation (the word 'nature' is omitted), TT2 shows both implicitation and intensification ('nature' omitted, 'all' added for emphasis; again a procedure combining 1a+ and 1a-), while TT1 uses literal translation (1a). The example of TT1 shows that implicitation in this case is not necessary because literal translation is perfectly adequate.

There are also examples in the corpus of omitting a part of information that cannot be recovered (ex. 41 - 43). We may call this procedure 'quasi-implication':

- (41) ST: -People like you - *the wilful sunbeams of life*—
TT2: -*Ljudi poput vas - prkosni, sunčani zraci* –
(‘People like you - the wilful sunbeams’)
TT1: »*Ljudi kao što ste vi — obijesni sunčani traci života* —
(‘the wanton sunbeams of life’)
TT3: -*Ljudi poput vas - tvrdoglavi sunčevi zraci života*-
(‘the stubborn sunbeams of life’)

We may assume that the translator considered the postmodifying phrase ‘of life’ to be redundant, and that is why he left it out. But if that phrase is redundant in TT2, it is also true for the ST. This is a case of imposing the translator’s own literary style and view on literary esthetics. TT1 and TT3 are not making such an imposition; they employ procedure 1a.

- (42) ST: to find his way through *the sanguine labyrinth of passion* through which he was wandering.
TT2: *kako bi našao svoj put iz labirinta strasti kroz koji je lutao.*
(‘the labyrinth of passion’)
TT1: *da nadje svoj put u krvavom labirintu svoje strasti*
(‘bloody labyrinth of his passion’)
TT3: *naći izlaz iz vatrenog labirinta strasti* (‘fiery labyrinth of passion’)

The above case of TT2 is arguably another case of avoiding 'redundancy', as described in the example (41). TT1 and TT3 are both literal renderings, but they are focusing on different aspects of 'sanguine'. In addition, TT1 exhibits explicitation ('of *his* passion', procedure 1a+).

(43) ST: He answered to *every touch and thrill of the bow...* [D.G. is compared to a violin]

TT3: *Odgovarao je na svaki dodir gudala...* ('every touch of the bow')

TT1: *On je odvrćao svakom potezu, svakom drhtaju lučca...* (1a)

TT2: *Odgovarao je na svaki potez, na svaki srh gudala...* (1a)

TT3 in the above example again exhibits the sort of 'quasi-implication' we have shown in examples (41 - 42). By contrast, both TT1 and TT2 have used the same expression as was used in the original text.

To summarize the above, the omitted part in the translation procedure labeled '1a-' can have the form of a morpheme, a single word or a phrase. Syntactically, the omitted part functions at phrase level as:

- determiner (his, my);
- NP premodifier (sanguine);
- NP postmodifier (of life, my word *to her*);
- part of a conjoined NP (touch *and thrill* of the bow).

In one case a premodifier was transformed into the head of the NP (of his mother's nature -> 'of his mother'). There is not a single case of omission on the level of clause constituents, which points to the conclusion that the omissions are on a smaller scale, they are always parts of phrases, never whole phrases.

The reason for the omission is again, like the reason for the addition in 1a+, not a syntactic but a semantic one: to make elements of the meaning implicit (implication). The (above exemplified) translation procedure 1a- may sometimes be preferred to 1a in the case of implication, but only if the omitted part of information is easily recovered from the context. The motivation for using this procedure may be the translator's wish to make his style

smoother by avoiding redundancy. On the other hand, if the supposed redundancy is a feature of the original writer's style, by using implicitation the translator is imposing his own style and esthetic preferences. The cases where the omitted part is not recoverable (ex. 41 - 43) cannot be justified, and their motivation can only be exaggerated implicitation, which we have labeled as 'quasi-implicitation'.

4.1.1.4. Different expression of the same CM (1b)

In the procedure 1b, an ST metaphorical expression is replaced in the TT by a different expression of the same conceptual metaphor. In other words, the conceptual metaphor stays the same, and only the metaphorical expression changes.

(44) ST: He had dreamed of her as a great artist, had *given his love to her* because he had thought her great.

TT1: *On je o njoj sanjao kao o velikoj umjetnici, on ju je darivao svojom ljubavi jer ju je držao velikom.* ('had made her a gift of his love')

TT2: *poklonio joj svoju ljubav* ('had presented her with his love')

TT3: *dao joj svoju ljubav* ('had given her his love')

Since making a gift is a specific kind of giving, the particular translation solution in TT1 and TT2 is based on the metonymy of the kind SPECIFIC FOR GENERIC. TT1 and TT2 use a more specific CM (LOVE IS A GIFT) than the ST (LOVE IS AN OBJECT). The reason why, in this example, procedure 1b is preferred to 1a seems to be subjective, i.e. an individual preference of the translator. The subjective reason for such a solution may be the desire to increase expressiveness of the text, since more specific is more expressive. The translator could have wanted to emphasize the value of love given, since a gift is usually something valuable. By contrast, TT3 opted for a literal translation (procedure 1a).

- (45) ST: No; she had died for love of him, and love would always be *a sacrament* to him now.
- TT3: *Ne; ona je umrla iz ljubavi prema njemu i ljubav će odsad za njega biti otajstvo.* ('a [holy] mystery')
- TT2: *kao neko sveto otajstvo* ('like a holy mystery' – 1c, discussed below)
- TT1: *a ljubav će odsada za nj zauvijek biti sakrament.* (1a)

The translation solution in the TT3 and TT2 (ex. 45) is linked to the ST via the GENERIC-FOR-SPECIFIC metonymy (LOVE IS A SACRAMENT -> LOVE IS A HOLY MYSTERY). In Christianity, a sacrament is one kind of holy mystery. Sacraments are said to be established by Jesus Christ, and there are seven of them (baptism, confirmation etc.). Besides sacraments there are other holy mysteries, established by the Church, such as the sign of the cross, holy water etc., which are called sacramentals.⁸³ In the TT2 the ST metaphor is turned into a simile, while only the TT1 retains the original metaphorical expression (1a). The reason for replacing the word 'sacrament' with *otajstvo* ('holy mystery') is arguably the purist tendency to replace foreign words with domestic words. Although the domestic word *otajstvo* is not an accurate translation of 'sacrament', it might have been considered close enough to stand for it as its equivalent.

- (46) ST: Carlington was *mad after her*.
- TT3: *Carlington je ludovao za njom.* ('acted crazily about her')
- TT1: *Carlington je za njom mahnitao* (same as TT3)
- TT2: *Carlington je bio lud za njom* (1a)

The difference between the ST and the TT3 in example (46) is a slight one. There is no change in metaphorical mapping; the CM LOVE IS INSANITY is kept in all TTs. The adjective 'mad' in the ST functions as subject complement. In the TT3, a similar meaning is expressed

⁸³ See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sacraments_of_the_Catholic_Church, and http://www.jesus-passion.com/sacramentals_of_the_catholic_chu.htm; both sites visited on 2011-07-04.

by the verb *ludovao* ('[he] acted crazily'). The link is established via metonymy of the type EFFECT FOR CAUSE (CAUSE: he is mad, EFFECT: he acts crazily). So, there is a change of aspect from the cause to the effect. As in the example (44), the reason for such a departure from the ST is a subjective one. However, in contrast to the example (44), the motivation for the variation here remains opaque. In the TT1 the same procedure as in TT3 is confirmed, but in the TT2 we find a literal translation (1a).

(47) ST: It was here I found her, and she *is divine* beyond all living things.

TT2: *Upravo tu sam je našao, i ja je obožavam iznad svega.*

(*'I worship her beyond everything'*)

TT1: *ona je božanska nad svim živim bićima* (1a)

TT3: *ona je božanstvenija od svih živih bića*

(*'she is more divine than all living beings'*)

The link between the ST and TT2 in example (47) is also established via the EFFECT-FOR-CAUSE metonymy (CAUSE: she is divine, EFFECT: I worship her). Again, there is a change of aspect from the cause to the effect. The ST employs a CM THE OBJECT OF LOVE IS A DEITY. It entails that the object of love must be worshipped. So, TT2 makes this entailment explicit. TT1 uses literal translation, while TT3 uses a different construction than ST, but with approximately the same meaning. If there is a change of aspect in TT3, it is from a pure attribution ('she is divine' etc.) to a comparison ('she is *more divine than*' etc.). It can also be seen as a kind of explicitation because the implied comparison in the ST ('divine *beyond* all living things') is made explicit in TT3.

(48) ST: Sibyl, you are *mad about him*.

TT1: *Sibyl, on te je zaludio.* ('he has infatuated you')

TT2: *Sibyl, obmanuo te pa luduješ za njim.*

(*'he has deluded you so you're acting crazily about him'*)

TT3: *Sibyl, ti si luda za njim.* (1a)

In example (48) the departure from the ST in the TT1 is realized again via CAUSE-FOR-EFFECT metonymy (cause: he has infatuated you, effect: you are mad about him). In other words, TT1 changes the aspect from the effect to the cause. Once again, the preference of the procedure 1b over 1a in TT1 seems to be subjectively based. TT2 employs a slightly different kind of procedure (1b+), which is discussed later on, while TT3 prefers literal translation (1a).

(49) ST: I have been right, Basil, haven't I, *to take my love out of poetry* and to find my wife in Shakespeare's plays?

TT1: *Nisam li pravo uradio, Basile, što sam svoju ljubav potražio u poeziji, i što sam našao svoju ženu u Shakespearovim glumama?*

(‘to have looked for my love in poetry’)

TT2: *Zar nisam imao pravo, Basile, što sam svoju dragu tražio u carstvu poezije*

(‘to have looked for my darling in the realm of poetry’)

TT3: *što sam svoju ljubav izvukao iz poezije* (1a)

The link between the ST metaphoric expression and the corresponding TT1 translation solution (ex. 49) is once more established via metonymy: this time of the type PART OF THE SCENARIO FOR ANOTHER PART OF THE SCENARIO. The whole scenario would look something like this: one wants something, one looks for it, one finds it, one takes it. So, in this case one of the initial stages (where you look for the thing you want) is used to stand for the final stage (where you take the thing you want), which is again a change of aspect. TT3 uses the same expression of the same CM (1a), which is perfectly adequate and shows that TT1 and TT2 are subjective departures from ST, taken probably for stylistic reasons. TT2 is an example of a more complex procedure, and is discussed below among the examples of procedure 1b+.

(50) ST: I might mimic a passion that I do not feel, but I cannot mimic one that *burns me like fire*.

TT1: Mogla sam prikazati strast, koja **u meni plamsa kao vatra**.

(‘a passion that *burns in me like fire*’)

TT2: Možda bih mogla glumiti strast koju ne osjećam, ali ne mogu glumiti osjećaj **u kojem izgaram kao u vatri.**

(‘a feeling *in which I am burning up like in a fire*’)

In ex. (50), the ST metaphoric expression of the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS FIRE has been replaced in the TT1 with an expression that combines two conceptual metaphors: LOVE IS FIRE + BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS. There is a change of aspect involved: in ST the place where fire comes from is not specified –whether it comes from outside or from within the body- while TT1 specifies that the fire is coming from within the body. In the TT2 the fire is definitely outside and around the body, which burns in it, and the emphasis shifts from the agent (ST: *fire burns me*) to the patient (TT2: *I am burning*). In contrast to TT1 and TT2, TT3 applies translation by the same expression of the same CM (1a):

TT3: *Mogu oponašati strast koju ne osjećam, no ne mogu oponašati onu koja me pali poput vatre.* (1a)

The reason for the departure from literal translation in the TT1 and TT2 is probably that, like in the TT3, literal translation is felt to be less conventional in the TL than the solutions offered in the TT1 and TT2. Since TT2 uses the same CM as ST (LOVE IS FIRE), but also adds another CM to combine it with (BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS) we could consider it a separate procedure. On the other hand, we may argue that the other CM (BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS) was already implied in ST, and that TT2 only made it explicit. By combining those two CMs, TT1 creates a more specific CM LOVE IS FIRE BURNING WITHIN THE BODY. The latter explanation is more appropriate, since it eliminates the need for yet another category.

Having discussed some examples of the translation procedure we labeled as ‘different expression of the same CM’ (1b), we may try to answer the following two questions:

1. In what way are the ST metaphorical expression and the TT metaphorical expression different and how does the TT metaphorical expression relate to the ST metaphorical expression?

2. Why is procedure 1b sometimes preferred to procedure 1a (same expression of the same CM)?

Re 1: We defined '1b' as a translation procedure of replacing an ST metaphorical expression by a different metaphorical expression of the same CM in the TT. The question here is how does the translator arrive from the ST metaphorical expression to the different TT metaphorical expression? Both expressions are sanctioned by the same CM. Target domain referent remains always unchanged, while the change affects only the source domain. Since we are dealing with shifts inside the same domain, metonymic mappings play a crucial role. The TT metaphoric expression thus metonymically represents (stands for) the ST metaphoric expression. TT metaphorical expressions can:

1. instantiate a more specific CM (e.g. LOVE IS A THING -> LOVE IS A GIFT, LOVE IS FIRE -> LOVE IS FIRE INSIDE THE BODY) by using the metonymy SPECIFIC FOR GENERIC;
2. instantiate a more general CM (e.g. LOVE IS A SACRAMENT -> LOVE IS A HOLY MYSTERY) by using the metonymy GENERIC FOR SPECIFIC;
3. make entailments explicit (e.g. OBJECT OF LOVE IS A DEITY entails that object of love has to be worshipped) by using the EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymy;

4. highlight a different aspect of the same CM, using the following metonymic mappings:

EFFECT FOR CAUSE, CAUSE FOR EFFECT, PART OF THE
SCENARIO FOR ANOTHER PART OF THE SCENARIO.

Re 2: The fact that the procedure 1b (different expression of the same CM) is in a number of cases preferred to the procedure 1a (same expression of the same CM) can be accounted for with at least two factors. One factor is conventionality of the TL, and the other factor is individual preference of the translator. In some cases (ex. 50, TT1 and TT2), the TT expression used is more conventional in the TL than the literal translation is. In most cases, however, procedure 1b is used although the literal translation (1a) is perfectly adequate and conventional, which is supported by the fact that literal translation is used in the parallel translations. The reasons are arguably subjective, i.e. individual preferences of the translator. Sometimes, a more specific expression is used, which points to the tendency to increase the expressiveness of the text. In one case (ex. 45), a more general term is used (*sveto otajstvo* = 'holy mystery' instead of *sakrament* = 'sacrament'), which is arguably due to the purist tendency to replace foreign words in the TL with domestic ones. There may also be any number of other subjective reasons why '1b' is sometimes preferred to '1a' (e.g. explicitation or a change of aspect due to a different interpretation of the text).

4.1.1.5. Different expression of the same CM, with an addition (1b+)

In the procedure 1b+, the ST metaphorical expression is replaced by a different expression of the same CM, and an element is added.

(51) ST: Sibyl, you are *mad about him*.

TT2: *Sibyl, obmanuo te pa luduješ za njim.*

(‘he has deluded you so you're acting crazily about him’)

(TT1: 1b, TT3: 1a; see ex. 48)

The link between the TT2 and the ST is established via metonymy EFFECT FOR CAUSE (cause: you are mad, effect: you're acting crazily about him). So, there is a change of aspect from the cause to the effect. There is also an addition that explicates the cause of the subject's behavior ('he has deluded you'). In relation to ST, this is actually the cause of the cause (he has deluded you -> you are mad -> you are acting crazily about him).

(52) ST: I have been right, Basil, haven't I, *to take my love out of poetry* and to find my wife in Shakespeare's plays?

TT2: *Zar nisam imao pravo, Basile, što sam svoju dragu tražio u carstvu poezije*
(*'to have looked for my darling in the realm of poetry'*)

(TT1: 1b, TT3: 1a; see ex. 49)

Similar to TT1 in ex. (49), TT2 highlights another aspect of the scenario ('looked for' instead of 'take out of'), but there is also an addition ('poetry' becomes 'the *realm* of poetry'). We can attribute this addition to the translator's elevated style. There is another change involved here: the translator interpreted the phrase 'my love' as metonym for 'my darling'.

(53) ST: Harry! Sibyl Vane is *sacred!*

TT2: *Harry, Sibyl Vane je za me svetinja!* ('is to me a sacred thing')

TT3: *Harry, Sibyl Vane je svetinja za mene!* ('is a sacred thing to me')

TT1: *Harry! Sibyl je sveta!!* (1a)

In TT2 and TT3 the adjectival subject complement 'sacred' is replaced by the nominal subject complement *svetinja* ('a sacred thing'), and an adjunct *za me(ne)* ('to me') is added, restricting the meaning of the predicate. By contrast, TT1 renders the ST sentence literally.

(54) ST: Facts *fled* before her *like frightened forest things*.

TT2: *Ispred nje prhnule su u bijeg sve Činjenice poput ustrašenih šumskih bića.*
(*'Before her took to flight all facts like frightened forest things'*)

TT1: *Činjenice su ispred nje bježale kao uplašena šumska bića.* (1a)

TT3: *Činjenice su bježale pred njom kao uplašena šumska stvorenja.* (1a)

In the TT2 facts 'took to flight' (*prhnule u bijeg*) instead of 'fleeing', which is more specific (SPECIFIC FOR GENERIC metonymy). There is an addition emphasizing that *all* facts fled, not just some of them. TT1 and TT3 translate the ST sentence literally.

(55) ST: What matter what the *cost* was? One could never pay too high a price for any sensation.

TT2: *Nije važno što te spoznaje skupo plaćamo!*

('It doesn't matter that we pay dearly for these insights')

TT1: *Što je bilo do onoga, što se stavljalo na kocku?*

('What matter what was being put on the dice?' – procedure 2)

TT3: *Kakve ima veze koliko to stoji?* ('What matter what it costs?')

There is a metonymic link in between 'cost' in the ST and *plaćamo* ('we pay') in TT2, established via the EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymy (cause: something has a price/cost, effect: we pay for it). So, the aspect is changed. There is also an addition that makes explicit that the cost we pay is high ('we pay dearly') and that we pay for the insights. There is also a syntactic change from a question to an exclamation. TT1 uses another procedure, the one we labeled as 'different expression of different CM' and which is discussed below as procedure 2. TT3 is almost a literal translation, except for a minor structural change.

(56) ST: *Life has always poppies in her hands.*

TT2: *Posvuda u životu za nas rastu crveni cvjetovi maka*

('Everywhere in life for us grow red poppy flowers.')

TT1: *Život nosi u svojim rukama uvijek makovih glavica.*

('Life carries in its hands always poppy heads.')

TT3: *Život ima uvijek mak u svojim rukama.*

(literal transl., except for neutralization of gender)

In ex. (56) the TT2 neutralizes the personification of life as a woman, and it changes the image, but it keeps the 'poppy' metaphor. In ST there is an image of life as a woman holding poppies in her hands. TT2 offers an image of red poppy flowers growing everywhere around us (LIFE IS A GARDEN). The neutralization of gender is conditioned by the language, since life in Croatian is masculine. The fact that poppies have red flowers is made explicit. Poppies themselves probably symbolize beauty because of their showy red flowers. TT1 uses the procedure 1a+, staying pretty close to ST, except for the neutralization of gender and the change of 'poppies' into 'poppy heads'. TT3 is almost literal, except for the obligatory neutralization of gender.

(57) ST: "I am tired of strawberry leaves." "They become you." "Only in public." "You would miss them," said Lord Henry. "I will not *part with a petal.*"

TT2: - *Sita sam jagodina lišća**. - *Ovo vam dobro pristaje.* - *Samo u javnosti.* - *Ipak bi vam nedostajalo – na to će lord Henry. Neće mi pasti nijedan listić s vojvodske krune.* ('Not one leaflet will fall off my ducal crown.')

[*footnote: *Lišće jagode – amblem vojvodske časti (na vojvodskoj kruni) = 'Strawberry leaves – and emblem of ducal honour (on a ducal crown)'*]

TT1: »*Zasitila sam se jagodnih listova u našoj kruni.*« »*Lijepo vam pristaju.*« »*Samo u javnosti.*« »*Zaželjet ćete ih se.*« »*Ne ću pustiti nijednog listića.*«
(I will not let go of a single leaflet.)

TT3: -*Sita sam jagodina lišća**. -*Pristaje vam.* -*Samo u javnosti.* -*Nedostajalo bi vam -reče lord Henry. Neću se rastati ni od jedne latice.* (1a)

[*footnote: *Lišće jagode je amblem vojvodske titule ('Strawberry leaves is an emblem of the ducal title')*]

The above is a very interesting excerpt from a conversation between Lord Henry and the pretty Duchess of Monmouth. She first makes an allusion to strawberry leaves, which symbolize the ducal crown (metonymy PART FOR WHOLE), stating that she is tired of them, which means she is tired of leading the life of a duchess. And yet, after a few sentences she concludes with a metaphor „I will not part with a petal“, meaning that she, nevertheless, will not give up her crown. TT2 makes a footnote explaining the symbolism of strawberry leaves. Even so, in the translation of the Duchess' last reply it makes the allusion to the ducal crown explicit. Instead of 'petal' TT2 has *listić* ('a leaflet'), which is a part of a flower just as a petal is, so the link between ST and TT is established by the metonymy PART FOR PART. There is also a change of aspect: in ST the Duchess 'will not part with a petal' while in TT2 'not one leaflet will fall' from her crown, which is in a way more specific (SPECIFIC FOR GENERIC). TT1 in the last sentence also uses another expression of the same CM, but there is no addition, perhaps because the allusion to the ducal crown is already made in the translation of the first sentence ('in our crown'). TT3, like TT2, explains the allusion in a footnote, but then literally translates the last sentence. The translation of the first sentence is also very interesting. All three TTs combine the metonymy with a convenient metaphor: 'I am *fed up* with the strawberry leaves', cleverly using the fact that strawberries are food. This is one of the most complex examples, and it shows how metaphor and metonymy sometimes work together. In this case in order to understand the metaphor one has to understand the metonymy. The metonymy is culture-specific and its referent has to be made explicit, either by a footnote (TT2 and TT3) or by explicitation in the text (TT1). Sometimes, like in TT2, the metonymy also affects the way the metaphor based on the metonymy is translated, which underlines the importance of co-text in the translation of metaphor.

(58) ST: One should *absorb the colour of life*

TT2: *Trebalo bi s nasladom srkati svu čarobnu šarolikost života*

('sip with delight all the magical colorfulness of life')

TT1: *Mi treba da upijemo boju životnu.* (1a)

TT3: *Čovjek treba upiti boje života.* (1a)

One can 'absorb' something by 'sipping' (Cro. *srkati*), so the link between the ST metaphorical expression and the TT2 translation is established via metonymy SPECIFIC FOR GENERIC. The translator, however, thinks that one should sip the color of life 'with delight', and that the color of life is 'magical'. This is what we labeled as 'quasi-explicitation' in connection with the procedure 1a+. By contrast, TT1 and TT3 are more modest, rendering the ST sentence literally.

- (59) ST: The *arrows of craft* shot by her.
TT2: *Mimo nje zujnule su strelice prepredenosti i lukavstva.*
(By her buzzed the arrows of shrewdness and cunning')
TT1: *Strijeje prevejanosti zujale su oko nje.*
(The arrows of shrewdness buzzed around her.)
TT3: *Strelice prepredenosti preletješe pokraj nje.*
(The arrows of shrewdness flew past her.)

The link between the TT2 metaphoric expression *zujnuti* ('to buzz') and the ST 'to shoot' is again established via metonymy SPECIFIC FOR GENERIC. 'Craft' is translated as two words: *prepredenost* and *lukavstvo* ('shrewdness and cunning'), which we would classify as an unmotivated addition. TT1 also uses the verb 'to buzz', while TT3 uses 'to fly' to replace the ST verb 'to shoot', but in contrast to TT2 there are no additions.

Summing up the above, the translation procedure 1b+ is similar to 1b, in that an ST metaphorical expression is translated by a TT metaphorical expression which is different but belongs to the same conceptual metaphor, and the two metaphorical expressions are in most cases linked by metonymy (SPECIFIC FOR GENERIC, EFFECT FOR CAUSE, PART FOR PART), making the entailments explicit, or highlighting a different aspect of the CM. However, procedure 1b+ is different than 1b because it has an added part that is often motivated by (quasi-) explicitation or stylistic reasons.

4.1.1.6. Simile (1c)

The procedure 1c consists of turning a ST metaphorical expression into a TT simile. As explained earlier, simile is just another form of metaphor. The metaphorical expression stays basically the same, except for a formal marker of likeness ('like' or 'as (if)' in English, *kao* (*da*) or *poput* in Croatian).

(60) ST: No; she had died for love of him, and love would always be *a sacrament* to him now.

TT2: *Ne; ta ona je pošla u smrt od ljubavi za njim, i ljubav će odsada biti za nj kao neko sveto otajstvo.* ('like a holy mystery')

(TT1: 1a, TT3: 1b; see ex. 45)

(61) ST: Yes; *she is a peacock* in everything but beauty

TT1: ***Ona je osim ljepotom u svemu kao paun*** ('She is [...] like a peacock')

(TT2 and TT3: 1a; see ex. 3)

An ST metaphorical expression of the type A IS B is rendered in the TT2 as a metaphorical expression of the type A IS LIKE B (called simile). A simile is a metaphor with 'hedges'. The effect of this type of procedure is like toning down of a metaphor. This procedure is sometimes preferred to procedure 1a by translators because it is 'safer'- a simile is more transparent and easier to understand than a metaphor.

4.1.1.7. Simile, with an addition (1c+)

The procedure 1c+ is basically the same as 1c, except that here we have an addition of information.

(62) ST: *Leaden with fear*, his mother watched him.

TT1: *Majka ga je promatrala sa strahom kao da ju je pritisla kao olovo teška mora.*

(‘Mother watched him *with fear as if a feeling as heavy as lead pressed on her*’)

TT2: *Majku je **strah tištio olovnom težinom.***

(‘Fear weighed down on mother with a leaden weight.’)

TT3: *Majku je **tištio olovni strah dok ga je promatrala.***

(‘A leaden fear weighed down on mother while she watched him.’)

The above is the only example of this procedure in the whole corpus. Thus, it is not frequent but it is an option. We assume it safe to qualify the above example as ‘quasi-explicitation’, resulting from the translator’s subjective interpretation. The ST metaphorical expression would be hard to translate literally into TL, so both TT2 and TT3 use a different expression of the same CM (procedure 1b).

4.1.2. CM -> CM1 (conceptual metaphor -> different conceptual metaphor, with a similar meaning)

So far we have seen examples of translation procedures involving the same conceptual metaphor. Procedure we call ‘CM -> CM1’ is a translation of a metaphorical expression by a different metaphorical expression having a similar meaning, but belonging to a different conceptual metaphor. One of the fundamental questions is how can we be certain that the two CMs are indeed different, since they obviously have to share some elements of meaning. In

order to decide that, I would like to propose a test: if the two CMs cannot be combined under a more abstract CM, they are different, and if they can, they are just different entailments of the same CM.

(63) ST: What matter what the *cost* was? One could never pay too high a price for any sensation.

TT1: *Što je bilo do onoga, što se stavljalo na kocku? Ni za koji osjećaj nije ni najviša cijena previsoka.* ('What mattered *what was being put on the dice?*'...)

(TT2: 1b+, TT3: 1a; see ex. 55)

The ST metaphorical expression seems to be based on the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS TRADE, e.g.:

Everything has a *price*;

You will *pay* for this;

That mistake *cost* him his life;

She *sold* her principles for a successful career; etc.

TT1 uses an expression of the CM LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME. In what way is TT1 similar to ST? The ST sentence could be interpreted as 'It doesn't matter to me what I have to give to get that sensation'. The 'cost' here is not money, but a sacrifice one has to make. In a game of dice one is also making a sacrifice, being prepared to lose something in order to get something more valuable. So, we can see how trade and gambling share some properties. However, trade and gambling are not the same. In trade, you get what you pay for, whereas in gambling it is uncertain whether you will get anything for your money (except, perhaps, for the thrill of uncertainty). That is why we consider the CM in ST and the CM in TT1 in the above example as indeed two different CMs, and not just different aspects of one, more abstract, CM.

- (64) ST: His sudden *mad love* for Sibyl Vane was a psychological phenomenon of no small interest.
- TT2: *Njegova je naglo **usplamtjela ljubav** prema Sibyl Vane bila vrlo značajna psihološka pojava.* ('his suddenly kindled love for S.')
- TT1: *Njegova nenadana **mahnita ljubav** prema Sibyli Vane* (1a)
- TT3: *Njegova iznenadna [0] **ljubav** prema Sibyl Vane* (deletion)

The expression 'usplamtjela ljubav' used in the TT2 belongs to the CM LOVE IS FIRE, while the ST expression 'mad love' belongs to the CM LOVE IS INSANITY. The meaning of the two metaphoric expressions is similar, in that both madness and fire are uncontrollable. By way of comparison, TT1 uses procedure 1a, while TT3 deletes the metaphor (CM -> 0).

- (65) ST: to *lend colour* to his imagination
- TT2: ***davala je** njegovoj mašti **više poleta*** ('it gave his imagination *more flight*')
- TT1: *ta spoznaja kao da [...] **podavala** [...] njegovoj imaginaciji **boju**.*
(('it gave his imagination color'))
- TT3: a **mašti posudila boju** (1a)

'Lending color' to imagination (underlying ontological metaphor IMAGINATION IS AN OBJECT) gives it more variety (VARIETY IS COLOR). If you make imagination fly, you give it freedom to take you in any possible direction, which again implies more variety (FREEDOM IS FLIGHT, and if freedom entails variety then VARIETY IS FLIGHT). TT1 uses a different expression of the same CM (1b), while TT3 uses procedure 1a.

- (66) ST: You *filled me with a wild desire* to know everything about life.
- TT2: *Vi ste **u meni rasplamtjeli pomamnu želju** da upoznam život.*
(('You kindled in me a wild desire'...))
- TT1: *Vi ste **u meni pobudili neku divlju požudu**, da upoznam sve strane života.*
(('You woke in me a wild lust'...))

TT3: **Vi ste u meni pobudili divlju želju** da upoznam život.
(‘You woke in me a wild desire’...)

The ST makes use of the CM THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS and DESIRE IS A SUBSTANCE, the TT2 combines the CM THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS and DESIRE IS FIRE, while the TT1 and TT3 combine THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS and DESIRE IS A LIVING BEING DORMANT WITHIN THE BODY. The difference between ST and the TTs is that ST implies that desire is coming from the outside, while the TTs imply that desire was already within the body, waiting to be kindled or stirred. However, the intended meaning is same: ‘you caused the desire I feel’. It is curious that none of the TTs used literal translation, which would be perfectly acceptable: *Ispunili ste me divljom željom da upoznam život.*

In all of the above examples of the procedure 2 (CM -> CM1), procedure 1a could have been used, and indeed was used in one of the parallel translations (except for ex. 66), which points to the conclusion that the use of ‘different expression of different CM’ is in most cases subjective, i.e. it depends on the individual preferences of the translator. The motivation for using this procedure could be the desire to make the text more expressive or to creatively differ from the original text.

4.1.3. CM-> non-M (conceptual metaphor -> non-metaphor; paraphrase)

(67) ST: Ah! I wish you would *fall in love*.

TT1: *Ah! kako bih željela da se zaljubiš.*

(same meaning by means of literal⁸⁴ expression)

TT2: *O, kad bi se bar ti jedanput zaljubio.*

(same meaning by means of literal expression)

⁸⁴ The term ‘literal’ is used here as opposed to ‘figurative’.

TT3: *Ah! Željela bih da se i ti zaljubiš.* (same meaning by means of literal expression)

The Croatian verb *zaljubiti se* is a non-metaphoric reflexive verb with the same denotative meaning as the English metaphoric expression 'to fall in love' – the referent undergoes a change of state whereby s/he suddenly feels love for somebody. Nevertheless, a part of the meaning is lost in translation, and that is the 'falling' part. 'Falling' here has a connotation of losing control, while *zaljubiti se* carries no such connotation (at least not explicitly). This just proves the earlier statement that a metaphor cannot be replaced by a non-metaphor without loss of meaning.

Motivation: since the metaphor TO FEEL LOVE SUDDENLY FOR SOMEONE IS TO FALL INTO A HOLE is non-existent in the TL, and there is no other CM with a similar meaning, we are forced to use a non-metaphoric conventional equivalent. The literal translation *Željela bih da padneš u ljubav* would be understood, but it is not conventional. In Croatian, *pasti u* ('to fall in(to)') when used metaphorically is found exclusively in negative contexts: *pasti u nesvijest* ('unconsciousness') / *grieh* ('sin') / *zaborav* ('oblivion') / *(krive) ruke* ('wrong hands') / *u komu* ('a coma') / *u vodu* ('the water' = fall through) / *u zamku* ('a trap') / *depresiju* ('depression') / *kaos* ('chaos'). This is probably due to the belief that lack of control implied by the verb *pasti* (= to fall) cannot be a positive thing. On the other hand, in English the same verb is used metaphorically in a number of positive or neutral meanings: fall in(to) place, fall in(to) line, fall into sleep, fall into conversation, fall into the glitter, fall into good habits, fall into freedom, fall into you/me, fall into my mind, fall into fitness, fall into adventure, fall into reading, fall into faith, which leads us to the conclusion that for the English/Americans lack of control is not necessarily a negative thing. Falling in love is considered to be a positive thing, and therefore it is not congruent with the Croatian conceptual system. However, under the influence of the dominant English language, things seem to be changing. On the Internet one can come across examples of unconventional usage such as: *pala sam u ljubav* (in a forum) – (lit. *I've fallen in love*-feminine subject) and *pao sam u ljubav* (in a blog), (lit. *I've fallen in*

love- masculine subject), which seem to indicate a change in the conceptual system of Croatian – an adoption of a foreign conceptual metaphor.

(68) ST: My child, you are far too young to think of *falling in love*.

TT1: *Dijete moje, ti si još premlada, da ozbiljno misliš na ljubav.*

('to seriously think of love')

TT2 *Odveć si mlada, dijete moje, za zaljublivanje.*

('too young for falling in love' – by means of literal expression)

TT3: *Dijete moje, odveć si mlada da se zaljubljuješ.*

('to young to fall in love'– by means of literal expression)

'Falling in love' (change of state) is replaced in TT1 by 'love' (the state itself), which is possible via metonymy THE WHOLE SCENARIO FOR THE INITIAL PART OF THE SCENARIO. The reason for the change from a paraphrase by the conventional equivalent to a paraphrase by metonymy is arguably a subjective one. It may have been the wish to improve on the original rewriting it in a more elegant style, which Antoine Berman in his 'negative analytic' of translation calls „ennoblement“⁸⁵. The adverb *ozbiljno* ('seriously') is added for the purpose of intensification. TT2 and TT3 use a conventional non-metaphoric TL equivalent of 'falling in love', and both curiously omit the verb 'to think'.

(69) ST: I am too much *in love*.

TT2: *Ja sam suviše zaljubljen.* (same meaning by means of literal expression)

(TT1 and TT3: same)

This example is similar to the example with 'falling in love' since the metaphor TO BE IN THE STATE OF LOVE IS TO BE IN A CONTAINER is also non-existent in the TL. The conventional non-metaphoric equivalent is *biti zaljubljen* (= 'to be' + predicative adjective 'in-the-state-of-love'). The literal translation *Ja sam suviše u ljubavi* would probably be understood, but it is

⁸⁵ Cf. Munday, 2001:150.

not conventional. However, an Internet search reveals that *biti u ljubavi* (lit. 'to be in love') is, under the influence of the English language, getting more common, especially in informal contexts. There are many examples of this unconventional usage, which indicates that the process of adopting this metaphor in Croatian is well on its way. In some cases of this unconventional usage, there is a shift in meaning, and *biti u ljubavi* cannot be interpreted as 'to be in love', but rather 'to be in a love relationship' or 'to be on good terms with sb.' Shifts in meaning indicate that the process of adopting foreign metaphors is not purely mechanical, but can also be a creative process resulting in new meanings.

- (70) ST: It is a gentleman, isn't it, who is *in love* with her, or says he is?
 TT1: *Onaj koji je ljubi otmen je gospodin, nije li tako, ili barem kaže?*
 ('who kisses her')
 TT2: *koji je zaljubljen u Sibyl* (same meaning by means of literal expression)
 TT3: *onaj koji je u nju zaljubljen* (same meaning by means of literal expression)

As in the example (69), the ST metaphorical expression 'to be in love' is replaced in the TT1 by a non-metaphoric conventional equivalent, only in this case the equivalent used is today archaic: *ljubiti* (= 'to love'). Interestingly, in the case of the translations of the phrase 'to be in love' throughout the novel, a historic development can be clearly seen: in the TT1 *ljubiti* is used exclusively, in the TT2 it is used alternatively with *biti zaljubljen*, and in the TT3 only *biti zaljubljen* is used.

- (71) ST: the *bees shouldering their way through* the long unmown grass
 TT1: *pčela, koje su se protiskivale kroz visoku nekošenu travu*
 ('the bees, which squeezed through the long unmown grass'...)
 TT2: *pčela, što promiču kroz visoku nepokošenu travu and*
 ('the bees, which pass through'...)
 TT3: *koje su promicale kroz dugu nepokošenu travu* ('that passed through'...)

- (72) ST: she took it into her head to *lionize me*
 TT1: *da me stvori slavnim čovjekom* ('to make me a famous man')
 TT2: *da me mora učiniti salonskim junakom dana*
 ('that she had to make me the salon-hero of the day')
 TT3: *da učini od mene junaka tog dana* ('to make me the hero of the day')
- (73) ST: I should have [...] *thrown my bonnet right over the mills*⁸⁶ for your sake. As it was, *our bonnets were so unbecoming, and the mills were so occupied in trying to raise the wind*, that I never had even a flirtation with anybody.
- TT1: *te bih bila vama za volju sve žrtvovala. Bilo kakogod, činjenica je, da sam bila tako nespretna, a oni, za koje bih se bila rado žrtvovala, tako zaokupljeni drugim čim, te nisam ni s kim ni flirtovala.*
 ('I would have sacrificed everything for your sake. In any case, it is a fact that I was so clumsy, and the ones, for whose sake I would have gladly sacrificed myself, were so occupied with other things, that I did not have a flirtation with anybody.')
- TT2: *te bih za vas bila kadra sve učiniti. No, u ono su vrijeme žene bile prilično nepristojne, a muškarci su se trudili zaraditi novac i jedva da mi se pružila prilika za najnevinija ljubakanja.*
 ('I would have done anything for your sake. However, as it was, our women were quite unbecoming, and the men were trying to make money, so I barely had a chance for a most innocent flirtation.')
- TT3: *i da bih radi vas bila kadra sve učiniti. U to su vrijeme žene bile prilično nepristojne, a muškarci su se trudili da zarade novac, tako da čak nisam ni sa kime imala ni najmanji flert.* (same as TT2)

⁸⁶ An idiomatic expression, popular in France at that time, about 'throwing one's bonnet over the mill', meaning to act in folly or to wander into wickedness. Retrieved on 2011-09-16 from: <http://swarmuth.blogspot.com/2011/04/bob-dylan-and-high-water-for-henry.html>.

In the three above examples (71 - 73), the metaphorical expressions used in the ST are specific of the SL (as also 'to fall/be in love'), and one option left to the translator was to use a non-metaphoric paraphrase (another option would be to try to find a metaphoric expression of a different CM, with a similar meaning, i.e. CM -> CM1). Example (73) is another interesting case of metaphor and metonymy working together. Wilde uses elements of the metaphor 'to throw one's bonnet right over the mills' to refer to women ('bonnets' – metonymy – characteristic headwear for women, a hat tied under the chin) and men ('the mills' – metaphor - men were occupied in trying to make money like the mills in trying to raise the wind) of his time. The metaphor could not be translated directly because it does not exist in the TL, so the translators used a non-metaphoric paraphrase. As a consequence, the metonymy and the metaphor relying on that metaphor also had to be translated by a paraphrase. In example (57) the metonymy ('strawberry leaves') affected the way the metaphor based on that metonymy ('I will not part with a petal') was translated, and here we have a converse situation: the translation of the metaphor affects the way the metonymy based on that metaphor is translated.

(74) ST: makes *an ass* of himself

TT1: *čini sam iz sebe budalu* ('makes a fool of himself')

TT2: *ako se tko od nas blamira* ('discredits himself')

TT3: *pravi od sebe magarića* (1a)

(75) ST: for the face of the man he had sought to kill *had all the bloom of boyhood*

TT2: *jer je lice čovjeka kojega je htio ubiti bilo mladenački lijepo* ('was youthfully beautiful')

TT1: *jer se na licu čovjeka, štono ga je htio ubiti, kazivala sva cvjetna draž dječastva* ('the face [...] showed all the flowery charm of boyhood' - 1b)

TT3: *jer lice čovjeka kojeg je želio ubiti imalo je svu svježinu dječastva* ('had all the freshness of boyhood')

- (76) ST: When *the sound* of their footsteps *had died away*
 TT3: ***Kad je nestalo zvuka njihovih koraka*** ('When the sound disappeared')
 TT1: *čim je štropot njihovih koraka prestao* ('clatter of their footsteps stopped')
 TT2: *Pošto je utihnuo bat njihovih koraka* ('the trample of their footsteps became still')
- (77) ST: The love *that he bore him*
 TT3: ***Ljubav koju je osjećao prema njemu*** ('that he felt for him')
 TT1: *Njegova ljubav prema njemu* ('his love towards him')
 TT2: ***Ljubav koju je slikar za nj osjećao*** ('that the painter felt for him')
- (78) ST: *burying* his face in his hands
 TT3: ***prekrivši rukama lice*** ('covering his face with his hands')
 TT1: *zastrvši svojim rukama lice*
 ('draping his face over with his hands' – CM->CM1)
 TT2: ***zakrivši lice rukama*** (same as TT3)
- (79) ST: I wish I had never *laid eyes upon you!*
 TT3: ***Da vas bar nikada nisam ugledao!*** ('I wish I had never spotted you')
 TT1: ***Htio bih da te moje oči nisu nigda ugledale!***
 ('I wish my eyes have never spotted you')
 TT3: ***Kamo sreće da te nikad nisam ni ugledao!*** (same as TT3)

In the above set of examples (74 - 79) a fairly common metaphoric expression in the ST is translated by a non-metaphoric paraphrase in the TT. In each case, however, a metaphorical translation is possible, and indeed occurs in some of the parallel translations (ex. 74: TT3, 75: TT1, 78: TT1).

The examples (80 - 82) show how a creative ST metaphoric expression is in some cases translated less creatively by a non-metaphoric paraphrase.

- (80) ST: a flush of pleasure *stealing* into his cheek.
TT1: *a od veselja se njegovi obrazi zarumene.* ('his cheeks blushing from joy')
TT2: *a obrazi mu se zarumenješe od zadovoljstva*
(('his cheeks blushing from satisfaction'))
TT3: *rumenilo zadovoljstva naviralo mu je na obraze* ('a flush of satisfaction gushing into his cheeks' – CM -> CM1)

TT1 and TT3 (ex. 80) use a non-metaphoric paraphrase, while TT3 uses a different expression of a different CM, thus keeping the metaphoricity of the text.

- (81) ST: A laugh *ran* round the table.
TT1: *Uokolo su se stola svi smijali.* ('Around the table everybody laughed')
TT2: *Svi za stolom prasnuše u smijeh.*
(('Everyone at the table burst into laughter' – CM -> CM1))
TT3: *Svi se za stolom nasmijaše.* ('Everyone at the table laughed.')

In (81) only TT2 manages to keep the metaphoricity, while the other two TTs use an uninventive non-metaphoric paraphrase.

- (82) ST: When the blood *crept* from its face
TT3: *Kad krv nestane s njegova lica* ('disappeared from its face')
TT1: *Kad se iz njegovih obraza bude odšuljala krv* ('crept from its cheeks' – 1a)
TT2: *I kad se na licu toga portreta ugasi posljednja rumen*
(('the last flush went out' – CM -> CM1))

In (82) TT3 uses a non-metaphoric paraphrase. By contrast, the other two TTs are far more imaginative. TT1 managed to render the ST metaphor more or less literally, while TT2 used an expression of another CM to convey a very similar meaning.

The motivation for using a non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> non-M):

- a. the CM does not exist in the TL (ex. 67 - 73, 79 - 81);
- b. the CM exists in the TL, but the non-metaphoric expression is more conventional in the TL than literal translation is (74 - 78, 82);
- c. subjective reasons – referring to all the cases, where a metaphoric translation (except for procedure 1a) could have been used, but a non-metaphoric paraphrase was used instead.

4.1.4. CM -> 0 (deletion)

In procedure CM -> 0 an ST metaphorical expression is entirely omitted (ex. 83 - 86) or 'neutralized' (87) in a TT.

(83) ST: His sudden *mad* love for Sibyl Vane

TT3: *Njegova iznenadna [0] ljubav prema Sibyl Vane*

(TT1: 1a, TT2: 2, see ex. 64)

(84) ST: The only pity was one had to pay so often for a single fault. *One had to pay over and over again*, indeed.

TT3: *Jedina je šteta što je čovjek tako često morao plaćati za jednu te istu pogrešku.[0]*

TT1: *Jedina je nevolja bila, da se često plaćala jedna jedina pogreška. Uvijek i uvijek se moralo opet plaćati. (1a)*

TT2: *Nesreća je samo u tome što je za jednu jedinu pogrešku trebalo plaćati tako često. I zaista, trebalo je plaćati, i opet samo plaćati.* (1a)

(85) ST: Victor came in *softly* with a cup of tea,

TT2: *Napokon zazvoni zvonce te Victor uđe [0] noseći šalicu čaja*

TT1: *Victor udje **tiho** s čašom čaja* (1a)

TT3: *Victor **tiho** uđe unutra* (1a)

(86) ST: Love is a more wonderful *thing* than art.

TT2: *Ljubav je kudikamo divnija [0] od Umjetnosti.*

TT1: *Ljubav je **nešto** mnogo divnije nego Umjetnost.*

('Love is something more wonderful'...)

TT3: *Ljubav je mnogo ljepša stvar od umjetnosti.* (1a)

The reasons for the deletion in the above set of examples are not entirely transparent. We can only guess that in examples (84) and (86) the translator wanted to avoid redundancy. In ex. (84) such a procedure cannot be justified because the redundancy in the ST has a purpose (stylistic reasons), and it should be retained. The use of 'thing' in ex. (86) is conventional in English, while some may object to its use in Croatian.

(87) ST: I love him because he is like what love *himself* should be.

TT2: *Volim ga jer je tako nalik na to što bi ljubav [0] **moral**a biti.*

('love should [feminine suffix] be')

TT1: *Ljubim, ga jer je on onakav kakova Ljubav **sama** treba da bude.* ('love herself')

TT3: *Volim ga zato jer je on ono što ljubav [0] treba biti.*

('love should [unmarked for gender] be')

In the ST love is personified as a man; in the TT2 there is no personification. In the TL 'love' (*ljubav*) is of feminine grammatical gender, so it would be very unnatural to change it to

masculine. Accordingly, in two of three translations (TT1 and TT2) the feminine gender is retained, and in one (TT3) the gender is not marked. If the gender is retained or unmarked, we do not feel the personification, so the effect is like deletion, although there is a case for calling this procedure neutralization and consider it as a separate procedure.

4.1.5. non-M -> CM (non-metaphor into conceptual metaphor)

In procedure 'non-M -> CM', a non-metaphorical expression from the ST is rendered as a metaphorical expression in a TT. This is just the opposite of procedure 'CM -> non-M'.

(88) ST: A beautiful woman risking everything

TT1: *Lijepa žena koja je za volju jedne mahnite strasti stavila sve na igru.*

('A beautiful woman [...] putting everything *on the play*' [on the line])

TT3: *Jedna prekrasna žena sve stavlja na kocku*

('A beautiful woman putting everything *on the dice*' [on the line])

TT2: *Lijepa žena koja žrtvuje sve svojoj ljubavnoj strasti.*

('sacrificing everything to her love passion')

Strictly speaking, this procedure is outside the scope of our research, since it is not the translation of metaphor. It is rather a translation *into* metaphor, which can be detected only when doing the research from the reverse position, starting from the TT. Nevertheless, we included it into our typology because we relied in part on Toury's typology and because it is connected both with translation and with metaphor. Some authors, such as Uwe Kjær (1988; in Kurth 1995: 109 ff.) suggest that cases such as this point to the spreading of the metaphoric process in the text. It may also be the case that the translator does this on purpose, since s/he is aware that some metaphors cannot be translated and tries to compensate for that loss by using metaphor in other places, where there was not necessarily one in the ST. Another

explanation is that the translator is not at all aware of using a 'metaphor' since in all examples the TT metaphoric expression is a cliché, and does not strike us as metaphor immediately.

- (89) ST: Then wisdom altered its method
TT2: *I tada Mudrost **okrene drugi list*** ('turned a new leaf')
TT1: *Onda promijeni Mudrost svoju metodu* (1a)
TT3: *Tada je mudrost promijenila metodu* (1a)
- (90) ST: Why should he trouble about Sibyl Vane?
TT2: *Čemu **razbijati glavu zbog Sibyl Vane?***
(*'Why smash one's head [cudgel one's brains] over S.V.'*)
TT1: *Zašto da se on uznemiruje radi Sibyl Vane?* (1a)
TT3: *Zašto da se uznemirava zbog Sibyle Vane?* (1a)
- (91) ST: "I'll back English women against the world, Harry," said Lord Fermor, striking the table with his fist. "The betting is on the Americans." "They don't last, I am told," muttered his uncle. "A long engagement exhausts them, but they are capital at a steeplechase."
TT2: - *Za me je Engleskinja kao favorit u konjskim trkama, na kojeg bih se **kladio** protiv čitava svijeta, Harry — ražesti se lord Fermor i lupi šakom o stol. - Ali većina se kladi na Amerikanke. - Ljudi govore da nisu nimalo izdržljive - promumlja njegov ujak. - Dugo trčanje ih zamara, ali im u utrkama s preponama nema premca. One jednostavno prelete preko svake prepone.*
(*'To me, an English woman is like a favorit in horse races, on which I would bet against the world'...*)
TT1: *Za engleske bih se žene proti svima ženama na svijetu **okladio***
(*'I'd bet on English women against all women in the world'*)
TT3: *Podupirat ću Engleskinje usprkos cijelome svijetu* (1a)

Example (91) is interesting because there is an extended metaphor stretching through several sentences. However, in the ST the first sentence is not yet metaphorical, while in the TT2 and TT1 it is and it becomes a part of the extended metaphor. This is a fine example of the above-mentioned spreading of the metaphoric process in the text.

In this section we have analyzed examples of all the identified procedures for the translation of metaphor in the corpus, focusing on the mechanisms of the procedures, the semantic interpretation of the examples and the motivation for using a particular procedure. In the following section we focus on the analysis of the distribution of particular procedures in the corpus and a discussion of its implications.

4.2. Quantitative analysis

Let us now take a look at the distribution of the identified metaphor translation procedures in the corpus. Table 2 shows the distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT1.

Table 2: *Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT1*

Procedure	N	%
1a	211	45.2
1a+	6	1.3
1b	127	27.2
1c	12	2.6
1c+	1	0.2
2 (CM -> CM1)	23	4.9
3 (CM -> non-M)	86	18.4
4 (CM -> 0)		0.2
TOTAL 467		100

{ CM -> CM } 76.5

The left-hand column in Table 2 lists the identified procedures, sorted by the order established by our typology (p. 90), and labeled accordingly. For example, 1a is a shorthand label for 'same expression of the same CM' (literal translation), etc. N in the middle column is the number of occurrences (tokens) of each procedure in the corpus. For example, 1a occurs 211 times in the TT1. The total number of identified metaphorical expressions in the ST is 467. The right-hand column shows the rate of occurrence of each procedure in the TT1. For example, 1a is used in 45.2 percent of all translation solutions in TT1 (211 / 467).


Same expression of the same CM (1a) is by far the most frequently used procedure in TT1; it is used in 45.2% of all the cases. Variants of procedure 1 all employ the same conceptual metaphor (CM → CM), and it should be noted that when all the rates for these procedures are added up we get a figure of 76.5%, which means that more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of all the identified metaphorical expressions are translated in TT1 by a form of the same conceptual metaphor. In the CM → CM group, the most frequent procedure is 1a (45.2%), followed by 1b (27.2%), 1a+ (1.3%), 1c (2.6) and 1c+ (0.2). The figures for 1c and 1c+ (variants of simile) are surprisingly low and directly contradict J. Levi's claim that „[c]onverting metaphors into similes is one of the most characteristic features of poetic translation“ (1982: 149, my own translation).

The rest of the metaphorical expressions are translated in TT1 either by a different expression of a different conceptual metaphor (CM → CM1 - 4.9%), by a non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM → non-M - 18.4%) or are deleted (CM → 0 - 0.2%). Of the procedures employing a translation other than by a form of the same CM, the non-metaphoric paraphrase is by far the most frequent, making almost 20% of all identified cases. The non-metaphoric paraphrase is followed by a translation employing another CM, which makes about 5% of the identified cases. Deletion (CM → 0) is in TT1 insignificant, with only 0.2%, or just 1 identified token.

In sum, it could be said that in the TT1 nearly a half of all identified metaphorical expressions are translated literally (1a and 1a+). The following one quarter of the identified metaphoric expressions is translated by a different expression of the same CM (1b). The following one fifth of the identified metaphoric expressions is translated by a non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM → non-M). The rest is translated either by a different expression of a different conceptual metaphor (CM → CM1) or by a simile (1c and 1c+). Translation by deletion (CM → 0) is in TT1 extremely rare.

Figure 1 (below) shows the same data as presented in Table 2 in a pie chart, which should make the proportions stand out even more vividly. In Figure 1, the identified metaphor translation procedures are labeled according to our typology, and the numbers around the chart represent the rates with which each procedure is used in the TT1. The green areas, which make the largest piece of the pie, represent forms of translation employing the same CM (CM -> CM). The yellow slice, which is the second largest, represents translation by a non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> non-M). The remaining red slice accounts for a translation by a different expression of a different conceptual metaphor (CM -> CM1).

Figure 1: *Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT1 (pie chart)*



Let us now compare the data for the TT1 with the data for the TT2. Table 3 (below) shows the distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT2. As shown in Table 3, in the TT2 there are 9 identified procedures, in contrast to 8 procedures in the TT1. In TT2 type 1c+ is not represented, whereas we find types 1a- and 1b+, which were not found in TT1. In contrast to the TT1, where the most frequent procedure was 1a (45.2%), in the TT2 the most frequent procedure is 1b (32.3% or one third). Nevertheless, 1a in the TT2 is still ranking very high, with 29.6%, which is a bit less than one third, and when the variations 1a+ and 1a- are added, the rate amounts to 33.4%. On the other hand, when we add up 1b and 1b+, the rate amounts to 34.2%.

Table 3: *Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT2*

Procedure	N	%	
1a	138	29.6	} 33.4
1a+	15	3.2	
1a-	3	0.6	
1b	151	32.3	} 34.2
1b+	9	1.9	
1c	13	2.8	} 70.4
2 (CM -> CM1)	33	7.1	
3 (CM -> non-M)	102	21.8	
4 (CM -> 0)		0.6	
TOTAL 467		99.9 ⁸⁷	

⁸⁷ The sum of the rates is 99.9 and not 100 because the numbers are rounded (to the nearest tenth) and not exact. For example, 21.76 would have been rounded to 21.8, while 21.74 would be rounded to 21.7.


The overall frequency of the procedures employing the same conceptual metaphor (CM -> CM) in TT2 amounts to 70.4%, which is less than the corresponding figure in the TT1 (76.5%), but is still very high. In the CM -> CM group, the most frequent procedure is 1b (32.3%), followed by 1a (29.6%), 1a+ (3.2%), 1c (2.8%), 1b+ (1.7%), 1a- (0.6%), and 1b- (0.2%). Interestingly, the frequency of 1c in the TT2 matches exactly the joint frequency of 1c and 1c+ in the TT1 (2.8%).

The representation of both CM -> non-M and CM -> CM1 is greater than in the TT1 (21.8% to 18.4%, and 7.1% to 4.9%, respectively), which points to a higher tendency toward the procedures employing a translation other than by a form of the same CM. Deletion is also more frequent in the TT2, although it is still under-represented (0.6%).

In sum, it could be said that in the TT2 there is a greater variety of translation procedures (9 procedures in the TT2 to 8 in the TT1). Relative to the TT1, the TT2 shows a lower tendency toward the procedures employing the same conceptual metaphor (CM -> CM) and a higher tendency toward the procedures employing a translation other than by a form of the same CM. One third of all identified metaphoric expressions are translated literally (1a, 1a+ and 1a-). Another third of the identified metaphoric expressions are translated by another expression of the same CM (1b, 1b+). The following one fifth of the identified metaphoric expressions are translated by a non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> non-M). The rest is translated either by a different expression of a different conceptual metaphor (CM -> CM1) or by a simile (1c). Translation by deletion (CM -> 0) is still rare.

Figure 2 (below) shows the distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT2 in the form of a pie chart.

Figure 2: *Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT2 (pie chart)*



The pie chart for the TT2 (Figure 2) looks very similar to that for the TT1 (Figure 1), but a few differences can be observed. First, the green area is smaller in comparison to the green area in the TT1 pie chart, which means that the share of forms of translation employing the same CM (CM -> CM) is smaller than in the TT1. Secondly, the green area here is more differentiated; there are more shades of green, meaning there are more sub-procedures of CM -> CM involved. Thirdly, both the yellow slice and the red slice are larger than in the TT1 chart, which means that there are more non-metaphoric paraphrases (CM -> non-M) and more cases of translation by a different expression of a different CM (CM -> CM1), respectively.

Let us now include the data for the TT3 into the comparison. Table 4 shows the distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT3.

Table 4: *Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT3*

Procedure	N	%
1a	251	53.7
1a+	5	1.1
1a-	5	1.1
1b	90	19.3
1b+	1	0.2
1c	10	2.1
2 (CM -> CM1)	23	4.9
3 (CM -> non-M)	79	16.9
4 (CM -> 0)		0.6
TOTAL 467		99.9

} 77.5


As shown in Table 4, the number of identified translation procedures in the TT3 is 9, which is the same as in the TT2 and more than in the TT1 (8). Like in the TT1, the most represented procedure in the TT3 is 1a, used in more than a half (53.7%) of identified cases. The percentage of the translation by the same expression of the same CM (1a) in the TT3 is higher than in the TT1 (45.2%), and far higher than in the TT2 (29.6%), which means that the TT3 shows the strongest tendency toward literal translation of metaphoric expressions (1a). The second most represented procedure is, as in the TT1, 1b, with a share of almost one fifth (19.3%). The overall frequency of the procedures employing the same conceptual metaphor (CM -> CM) amounts to 77.5%, which is more than both the corresponding figure in the TT1 (76.5%) and the TT2 (70.4%). Thus, the TT3 also shows the highest tendency toward translation with a form of the same CM. In the CM -> CM group, the most frequent procedure is 1a (53.7%), followed by 1b (19.3%), 1c (2.1%), 1c+ (1.1%), 1c- (1.1%), and 1b+ (0.2%). The frequency of 1c in the TT3 is even lower than in the TT1 and TT2, which brings Levi's statement (see p. 164) even more in question.

Non-metaphoric paraphrase (procedure 3) is represented in TT3 by a share of 16.9%, which is less than both TT2 (21.8%) and TT1 (18.4), and reinforces the tendency toward using metaphorical translation. Translation by a different expression of a different CM (CM->CM1) is used in 4.9% of the cases, which is the same as in the TT1, and less than in the TT2 (7.1%). Deletion is equally rare as in the TT2 (0.6%).

In sum, the distribution of the metaphor translation procedures in the TT3 looks more like the distribution in the TT1 than in the TT2, with an even more pronounced tendency toward literal translation (1a and variants) and toward procedures involving the same CM (CM -> CM). Non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> non-M) is used less frequently. More than a half of all identified metaphorical expressions is in TT3 translated literally (1a and variants). About one fifth of the identified metaphorical expressions are translated by a different expression of the same CM (1b and 1b+). The following one sixth of the identified metaphorical expressions is translated by a non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> non-M). The rest is translated either by a different expression of a different conceptual metaphor (CM -> CM1) or by a simile (1c). Translation by deletion (CM -> 0) is rare.

Figure 3 below shows the distribution of the metaphor translation procedures in TT3 in the form of a pie chart.

Figure 3: *Distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT3 (pie chart)*



The bright green slice in Figure 3 is the largest of all three TTs, showing the highest tendency toward literal translation (same expression of the same CM or 1a) in the TT3. The rest of the layout looks very similar to that for the TT1, the only difference being a larger green area, representing procedures of translation by a form of the same CM (CM -> CM), and, consequently, smaller yellow and red areas, representing translation by non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> non-M) and by a different expression of a different CM (CM -> CM1), respectively.

For the sake of clarity the data for the TT1, TT2 and TT3 are presented side by side in a 'stacked columns' chart as Figure 4.

Figure 4: comparative distribution of metaphor translation procedures for the TT1, TT2 and TT3 (stacked columns)




Figure 4 consists of 3 columns, each column representing the distribution of metaphor translation procedures in one of the TTs. The left-hand column represents the distribution for the TT1, the middle column represents the distribution for the TT2, and the right-hand column represents the distribution for the TT3. The columns are called 'stacked columns' because the values for each of the procedures are stacked on one another, thus making a column. The values for each procedure are also differently colored (in the same colors as in the pie charts), in order to enhance clarity. Underneath the columns there is a table with the corresponding rates for each procedure and each TT.


Looking at the columns in Figure 4, the differences in the distribution of the procedures in the TT1, TT2 and TT3 do not look drastic. The two columns that are the most dissimilar are most certainly the one in the middle (TT2) and the one on the right (TT3). The lowest, bright green stack in the column TT3 is almost twice the height of that in the column TT2, indicating the pronounced tendency towards the translation by the same expression of the same CM (procedure 1a - literal translation) in the TT3. The yellow stack in the column TT3 is also significantly smaller than that in the column TT2, indicating a lower tendency toward using a translation by non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> non-M). The reason why TT1 and TT3 are similar to one another, while TT2 stands out, may lie in the different poetic preferences of the translators. This hypothesis is confirmed by even a quick glance at the profiles of the translators. TT2 stands out because its translator stands out. The translator of TT2, Zlatko Gorjan, was the most prolific translator of the three translators involved here. He translated from German, English and French. He translated around 160 books of prose and poems and around 800 poems of Croatian authors into German. He was not only a translator, but also a poet, a journalist, an editor, a drama repertoire consultant for a theatre, a producer, and a painter. He was one of the founders of *The Croatian Literary Translators Association*, and for a while he was its chairman and also an honorary chairman for life of *The International Federation of Translators*. For his work, he received some important awards etc. (cf. Wilde, 200: 278) Compared to him, the other two translators were just 'ordinary' translators. Artur Schneider, the translator of TT1, was an art and music historian and critic, who, according to

the digital online catalogue of the *Croatian National and University Library*⁸⁸ translated only 6 books of prose. Zdenko Novački, the translator of TT3, according to the same source translated just 5 books of prose. It is no wonder then that Gorjan, who was a lot more experienced and who had a high status in the field of translation, allowed himself much more freedom in his style, more of creative solutions and less of literal translation. Our data confirm that claim: in comparison to TT1 and TT3, the rate of 1a in TT2 is much smaller (which means fewer cases of literal translation), and the rate of 1b and 3 (CM -> non-M) is considerably higher (which means more cases of translation by a different expression of the same CM and more paraphrasing). He also uses procedure 4 (CM -> CM1, which demands the most creativity) a lot more than the other two translators. If we accept that the reason why TT2 is so different from TT1 and TT2 is the more creative style of the translator, then we can conclude that TT1 and TT3 are more typical translations, whereas TT2 is more idiosyncratic and closer to original creative writing.

Based on the comparative distribution of the data for the TT1, TT2 and TT3 it seems that it cannot be said much about the historic development of the tendencies concerning the way metaphors are translated. There is no consistent rise or fall in any of the values. Figure 5 (below) shows a comparison of values across categories TT1, TT2 and TT3. If we look at how the values change from TT1 over TT2 to TT3, we notice that there is no consistent rise or fall in any of the values. Thus, the value for procedure 1a starts at 45.2% in TT1 then falls to 29.6% in TT2 and then rises in TT3 to 53.7%. There is no straight development here. However, if we would disregard TT2 as too idiosyncratic, we could see a clear development in the tendencies. If we draw a trendline of values for 1a, it would be rising, indicating that there is a rising trend towards using the translation by the same expression of the same CM. The value for the procedure 1b starts at 27.2% in TT1, then rises to 32.3% in TT2 just to fall again to 19.3% in TT3. This is the exact opposite of 1a, in that although there is a rise in the middle, the trendline is falling, indicating that translators tend to use the translation by a different expression of the same CM (1b) less and less.

⁸⁸Available at <http://katalog.nsk.hr/F?RN=186511614>.

Figure 5: A clustered column chart comparing values across categories TT1, TT2 and TT3.



Values for procedure 2 (CM -> CM1) rise from 4.9% to 7.1% to fall back to 4.9%, so although there is a rise in the middle the trendline is flat, indicating that the frequency of using the translation by a different expression of a different CM tends to be constant. Procedure 3 (CM -> non-M), similarly to 1b, first rises then falls, from 18.4% in TT1 to 21.8% in TT2 to 16.9% in TT3. Thus, there is a falling trend in using the translation by a non-metaphoric paraphrase. The values for the rest of the procedures are low and more or less constant. The greatest change in values that can be observed concerns the rising tendency

towards literal translation (1a), which was high in the TT1, then fell pretty low in the TT2, then rose again to a highest point in the TT3. If the TT3 can be taken as the current norm, since it at best represents the norm valid at the time around 1987, then currently there is a rising tendency toward translating metaphorical expressions literally (1a) and a falling tendency towards other types of CM -> CM translation procedures (except 1a-, which is rising), and also a falling tendency towards non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> non-M). Of the individual procedures, only CM -> CM1 tends to be constant (but relatively low).

On the other hand, if we interpret the data from a different perspective, we can actually see a common thread, a regular pattern that repeats itself in TT1, TT2 and TT3. If we look at the distribution of green, red, yellow and white areas only (see Figure 4 on p. 172), representing the four major types of translation procedures: translation by a form of the same CM (CM -> CM), translation by a different CM (CM -> CM1), translation by a non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> no M), and translation by deletion (CM -> 0), respectively, we can see that there is very little change over time. Thus, it can be hypothesized that, over time, there is little or no change in the distribution of the major categories of metaphor translation; the greatest change is in the distribution of the subcategories of CM -> CM (1a, 1a-, 1b, 1b+, 1c-). In order to confirm that hypothesis, we should examine some up-to-date translations to see if the distribution of metaphor translation procedures at the present moment would match the results obtained from our corpus.

A more important and fundamental question, however, is whether the data obtained from our corpus can be taken as trends indicating the norm at the given time, or their validity is limited to the corpus alone. This is the question of the representativeness of the corpus. It could be the case that the reason the overall distribution of the major categories of metaphor translation, as hypothesized above, is very similar for the TT1, TT2 and TT3, is just because they are translations of one and the same ST, with the nature and type of the ST metaphors dictating the way they are to be translated. In order to test the assumption that the type of the ST metaphor dictates the way the metaphor is translated, we must look at the parallel

translations (TT1, TT2 and TT3) of the identified ST metaphors, to see whether the same ST metaphor is translated by the same procedure or by a different one in TT1, TT2, and TT3. This is illustrated in Table 5 (below).

Table 5: A parallel distribution of translation procedures used in the selected examples from the corpus

Ex.	TT1	TT2	TT3
1	1b	1b+	1a
2	1a	1a	1a
3	1c	1a	1a
4	1b	1b	1a
5	1a	1a+	1a
16	1a	1a	1a+
17	1b	1a+	1a
18	1a	1a+	1a
19	1a	1a+	1a
20	1a+	1a+	1a+
21	1a+	1b	1b
22	1a+	1a	1a
23	1a	1a+	1a
24	1a	1a+	1a
25	1a	1a+	1a
26	1a	1a+	1a
27	1a	1a+	1a
28	1b	1a	1a+
29	1a	1b	1a+
30	1a+	1a+	1a+
31	1a+	1a+	1a
32	1b	1a+	1a
33	1a	1a+	1b
34	1a	1a+	1b
35	1a-	1a-	1a-

(continued)			
36	1a	1a-	1a
37	1b	1a	1a-
38	1a	1b-	1a-
39	1a	1b	1a-
40	1b	1a-	1b
41	1b	1b	1a-
42	1b	1b	1a
43	1a	1c	1b
44	1b	1a	1b
45	1a	1b	1b
46	1b	1b+	1a
47	1b	1b	1a
48	1b	1b	1a
49	1b	1b+	1a
50	1a	1b+	1b+
51	1a	1b+	1a
52	2	1b+	1a
53	1b	1b+	1a
54	1b	1b+	1a
55	1a	1b+	1a
56	1a	1b+	1a
59	1c+	1b	1b
60	1a	2	4
61	2	3	1a
62	1a	2	1a

(continued)			
63	3	3	2
64	2	2	2
65	3	3	3
66	3	3	3
67	3	3	3
68	3	3	3
69	1b	3	3
70	3	3	3
71	3	3	3
72	3	3	3
73	3	3	1a
74	1b	3	3
75	3	3	3
76	3	3	3
77	3	3	3
78	3	3	3
79	3	3	3
80	3	3	3
81	1b	3	3
82	1a	2	3
83	1a	2	4
84	1a	1a	4
85	3	4	3
86	3	4	1a
87	4	4	4

The shades of green in Table 5 represent the forms of translation using the same CM (CM -> CM), yellow represents translation by a non-metaphoric paraphrase (CM -> no-M), red represents translation by a different expression of a different CM (CM -> CM1), and white (no fill) represents translation by deletion of the metaphor (CM -> 0). Not all 467 identified examples from the corpus are included in the table, but only selected examples, which we hold to be representative enough. Looking at the parallel translations from the left to the right it can be seen that in the first 50 or so examples only the shade of green changes, meaning that the major category of metaphor translation CM -> CM in these examples stays unchanged, while only the subcategory (1a, 1a+, 1a-, 1b, 1b+, 1b-, 1c, 1c+) changes. This indicates that certain metaphors tend to be translated by CM -> CM in all the TTs. The yellow parts are also pretty consistent, which means that certain types of metaphor are often translated by a paraphrase (CM -> non-M) in all three TTs. Nevertheless, there are a number of rows in which yellow is used parallel with green, red or white.

What is more, there are many cases, as shown by our analysis, where all three TTs used a paraphrase, and they could have used the same expression of the same CM (1a) or some other CM -> CM procedure. The rows containing the red or white boxes are the most varied, which indicates that the major types CM -> CM1 and CM -> 0 are the least consistently used and are not determined by any type of metaphor. However, procedure CM -> 0 is under-represented in the corpus to such an extent that it is almost pointless to generalize about it. We can conclude that the type of metaphor dictates only the major translation procedures CM -> CM and CM -> non-M, but it has little or no effect on CM -> CM1 and CM -> 0. In other words, certain types of metaphoric expressions are regularly translated by the same CM, certain other types are regularly translated by a non-metaphoric paraphrase, and there are certain types of metaphoric expressions that allow for more freedom in the way they are to be translated. Procedures of the type CM -> CM and CM -> non-M seem to depend on the type of the ST metaphorical expression, while procedures CM -> CM1 and CM -> 0 seem not to depend on the type of the ST metaphorical expression.

What are the types of metaphor on which procedures CM → CM and CM → non-M depend, and in exactly what way do they depend on them? An important factor influencing the choice of translation procedure in translating metaphors is the so-called universality of the metaphor – whether a CM or, more specifically, a particular metaphorical expression is shared between the SL and the TL or not. Thus, according to the universality, there are two types of conceptual metaphor:

- a) a shared CM; and
- b) a non-shared CM.

Type (a) can be further differentiated on the level of metaphorical expression:

- i) a shared metaphorical expression;
- ii) a non-shared metaphorical expression.

With respect to those types, there are certain expectations as to what translation procedure will be used; we may even call it default procedures. If a CM is shared, we would expect it to be translated by a CM → CM type procedure. If a particular metaphorical expression is also shared, we would expect it to be translated by the same expression of the same CM (1a and variants). If a CM is shared, but not the particular metaphorical expression, we would expect a different expression of the same CM (1b or 1b+) or a simile (1c). If the CM is not shared, we would expect one of the following types of procedures: CM → no M, CM → CM1, or CM → 0.

Let us now compare the expectations to the realization in our corpus, in order to see to what extent the factor universality influences the choice of translation procedure. Table 6 below shows the influence of the categories of metaphor universality on the choice of translation procedure.

Table 6: *Influence of the categories of metaphor universality on the choice of translation procedure*

category of universality	ST rate% (N)	default procedure	TT1	TT2	TT3	other procedures used
			rate% (N) of default procedure	rate% (N) of default procedure	rate% (N) of default procedure	
			ratio ST:TT1	ratio ST:TT1	ratio ST:TT1	
shared CM	92.9 (433)	CM->CM	76.5 (357)	70.4 (329)	77.5 (362)	CM->CM1, CM->non-M, CM->0
			1.2 ⁸⁹	1.3	1.2	
shared ME ⁹⁰	81.1 (378)	1a(+/-)	46.5 (217)	34.7 (156)	55.9(261)	1b(+/-), 1c(+) CM->CM1, CM->non-M, CM->0
			1.7	2.4	1.4	
non-shared ME, shared CM	11.8 (55)	1b(+/-), 1c(+)	30.0 (140)	37.0(173)	21.6(101)	CM->CM1, CM->non-M, CM->0
non-shared CM	7.1 (34)	CM->CM1, CM->non-M, CM->0	23.5 (110)	29.6 (138)	22.5 (105)	1c (+)

⁸⁹ Value 1.0 would be a perfect match, meaning that ST rate of a category overlaps with the TT rate of default procedure. The closer to 1.0 value is, the better is the match. Value 2.0 is a 50% match.

⁹⁰ ME = metaphoric expression.

As shown in Table 6, the rate of shared CMs in the ST is 92.9%, or 433 tokens. The rate of CM → CM procedures in TT1 is 76.5%, or 357 tokens. If we assume that CM → CM procedures are used exclusively for shared CMs (except for 1c), then all tokens of CM → CM procedure are translations of shared CMs. If we then compare the number of tokens of CM → CM procedures in TT1 (N = 357) to the number of tokens of shared CMs in ST (N = 433), we can calculate that 82.4% of shared CMs is translated in TT1 by CM → CM. The remaining 76 tokens or 17.6% of shared CMs are translated in TT1 by procedures other than CM → CM. In TT2, 76% of shared CMs are translated by CM → CM, 24% by other procedures. In TT3, 83.6% of shared CMs are translated by CM → CM, and 16.4% by other procedures. Thus, the deviation rates are -17.6%, -24% and -16.4% for TT1, TT2 and TT3, respectively. The rate of CM → CM procedures is in all three TTs lower than expected (negative deviation), which means that some of the shared CMs are not translated by CM → CM type, but by another type of procedure. TT3 is the most in line with the expectations, while TT2 deviates the most. In other words, the role of other factors besides universality of CM is the least pronounced in TT3 and the most pronounced in TT2.

The rate of shared metaphorical expressions in ST is 81.1%, or 378 tokens. The rates of (expected) translation by the same expression of the same CM (1a) are 46.5%, 34.7%, and 55.9% for TT1, TT2, and TT3, respectively. If we assume that 1a and its variants are used exclusively for shared metaphorical expressions, then all the tokens of 1a (+/-) are translations of shared metaphorical expressions. Thus, in TT1, 57.4% of the shared metaphorical expressions are translated by the same expression of the same CM (1a and its variants). The same number for TT2 is 41.5%, and 69.1% for TT3, which is considerably lower than expected, especially for TT2. The deviance rates from the expected values are -42.6%, -58.5%, and -30.9% for TT1, TT2, and TT3, respectively. Thus, the translation procedure 1a could have been used a lot more often. In many cases, shared metaphorical expressions were not translated by 1a or its variants (the default procedure), but by other procedures. Again, TT3 conforms to the expectations to the greatest extent, while TT2 deviates the most from the expectations.

The rate of examples where CM is shared but the particular metaphorical expression is not shared in ST amounts to 11.8%, or 55 tokens. The rate of CM → CM procedures other than 1a (1b and 1c and variants) is 30% in TT1, 37% in TT2 and 21.6% in TT3, which is considerably higher than expected (in relation to ST rate of non-shared metaphorical expressions of a shared CM the rates of 1b (+/-) and 1c (+) are 254.5%, 314.5%, and 183.6% for TT1, TT2 and TT3, respectively), which means that there are more tokens of 1b (+/-) and 1c (+) than tokens of non-shared metaphorical expressions of a shared CM in ST. This can be accounted for by the fact that 1b (+/-) or 1c (+) were used in many of the cases where 1a could have been used. In this case, we cannot assume that 1b (+/-) and 1c (+) are used exclusively for non-shared metaphorical expressions of a shared CM because they can also be used for shared metaphorical expressions (1c can also be used for non-shared CMs). Consequently, if in TT1 140 tokens (30% of 467) were translated by 1b (+/-) and 1c (+) that does not mean that all of those 140 tokens were translations of non-shared metaphorical expressions of a shared CM. Perhaps none of them was. Neither can we say that all non-shared metaphorical expressions of a shared CM were translated by 1b (+/-) and 1c (+); some of them (possibly all) are translated by procedures other than CM → CM. The above restrictions make it impossible to calculate to which extent the type 'non-shared metaphorical expressions of a shared CM' influences the choice of translation procedure, without detailed information about each individual token. We can only guess that non-shared metaphorical expressions of a shared CM will often be translated by 1b (+/-) and 1c (+).

The rate of non-shared CMs in the corpus is 7.1%, or 34 tokens. The rate of procedures other than CM → CM is 23.5% (110 tokens) in TT1, 29.6% (N = 138) in TT2, and 22.5% (N=105) in TT3, which is much higher than expected. We assume that all non-shared CMs are translated by a procedure other than CM → CM. This entails that a considerable number of metaphorical expressions (TT1: 76 tokens or 69.1%, TT2: 104 tokens or 75.4%, and TT3: 71 tokens or 67.6%) translated by CM → CM1, CM → non-M, and CM → 0 are not non-shared CMs, i.e. are shared CMs and could have been translated by a CM → CM procedure.

We cannot calculate the rates for individual procedures without details about individual tokens, because none of the procedures is used exclusively for non-shared CMs.

Based on the above figures (see also Table 6), the factor of universality is relevant, but it is not the only factor influencing the choice of translation procedure, which is shown by the deviations from expected values. We can look at the relevance of universality categories from two aspects:

- a) from the aspect of the categories themselves – how strongly they condition the choice of procedure; or
- b) from the aspect of individual procedures – how strongly they are motivated by the categories of universality.

From aspect (a) the category of non-shared CMs is very likely to yield a translation by a procedure other than CM → CM, shared CMs will most likely be translated by a CM → CM type procedure (true for 80% of them, on average), shared metaphorical expressions have on average more than 50% chance of being translated by 1a (+/-), while non-shared metaphorical expressions of a shared CM exercise the weakest influence on the choice of procedure (1b is the most probable procedure, but all the other procedures are possible). Looking from aspect (b) we can say that CM → CM type procedures are generally used for shared CMs (except for 1c), 1a (+/-) is most likely used for shared metaphorical expressions, 1b (+) is most likely used for shared CMs, 1c can be used for any type of metaphor, as also CM → CM1, CM → non-M, and CM → 0, although the last three procedures are most often used for non-shared metaphors. In conclusion, universality is a very relevant factor determining the choice of translation procedure, and it has a predictive value.

Universality of metaphor is one of the reasons why the distribution of the major metaphor translation procedures is so similar in the TT1, TT2 and TT3: they are translations of the same ST, which has a definite number of metaphors belonging to a certain category of universality

as described above. However, how can we account for the fact that in many cases all three TTs use CM → non-M, and not 1a, even though the metaphorical expression is shared, or that a different expression of a different CM is used (CM → CM1), and not e.g. CM → non-M, where the CM is not shared? In this connection it is worth considering the influence of the TT1 to the TT2 and TT3, and the influence of the TT2 on the TT3. If it is reasonable to assume that the translators of the TT2 and TT3 used the previous translations in their work, then the influence of the previous translations on the way metaphors are translated should not be overlooked. In sum, at least two factors are responsible for the similar distribution of metaphor translation procedures in the TT1, TT2 and TT3:

- a) the universality of the ST metaphors; and
- b) the influence of the previous translations.

Another feature of metaphor may influence the choice of translation procedure, and it is the conventionality of a metaphor. Conventionality can be seen on two different levels:

- a) on the level of CM;
- b) on the level of metaphorical linguistic expressions.

On both levels we can differentiate between conventional and creative. A metaphor can be conventional on both levels or just at the level of linguistic expression. The latter is the case of creatively using a conventional CM. In this dissertation, the influence of conventionality is not examined, for practical reasons. Namely, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to say which metaphorical expressions or CM were conventional and which were creative at the time of the publishing of the ST (1891). This is the problem of time distance, and the diachronic change of connotation and outdated socio-cultural references. Another practical problem is determining which CM or metaphorical expression is conventional and which is not, because the difference is not clear-cut. Between conventional and creative there is a continuum of possibilities. For these reasons, the question of the influence of conventionality of metaphor

on the translation is left open. This kind of research, we believe, could be done most efficiently on a smaller corpus of translations of contemporary works.

One more thing has to be taken in consideration: only the major category CM -> CM seems to be determined by the ST metaphors, while the subcategories do vary significantly in the TT1, TT2 and TT3 (look at different shades of green in almost every row of Table 5). This is interesting, and it shows that there are also other factors influencing the translation of shared metaphors. Our analysis shows that the other factors are conventionality of the TL (e.g. even though many times 1a is possible, translators use 1b because it is more conventional in the TL) and individual preferences of the translator (among them the tendency to make things explicit or implicit, to add intensity to an expression, the wish to differ creatively from the original, to impose their personal style), some of which are considered to be translation universals.

To obtain a more reliable outline of the historic development of the tendencies of metaphor translation in Croatian tradition of literary translation, more works from the respective periods of the TT1, TT2 and TT3 will have to be examined. While doing so, not only different translators, but also different texts will have to be included in the analysis. We see this research as a basis for such a prospective project. There is, however, another way of checking the validity of our data. By looking at the distribution of metaphor translation procedures in a corpus of up-to-date translations, it will be possible to obtain a provisional picture of the current tendencies, which then could be compared to the results obtained from our corpus. This would give us a clearer perspective on the issue of translating metaphors, which deserves to be further investigated.

5. Conclusion

In Section 5.1 a list of conclusions is given. This is followed by a review of the objectives and research questions set for the present research project; the objectives and research questions are compared to the results of the research in order to see whether the objectives have been attained and the research questions answered, i.e. whether the research project has been successfully carried out (Section 5.2). An attempt is also made to evaluate the scientific contribution of our research, focusing on its strengths, weaknesses and limitations (Section 5.3). Possibilities for practical application of research findings are considered as well (Section 5.4). At the end of the chapter, some ways in which the present research could be used as a starting point for future research are suggested (Section 5.5).

5.1. Conclusions

- CMT can be fruitfully applied to research of metaphor translation, bringing new insights into the issue.
- By combining CMT with the existing typologies in TS, a typology of metaphor translation procedures was devised which was found to be adequate and sufficient for a complete description of the procedures.
- In the analysis of the corpus the total of 10 translation procedures for the translation of metaphoric expressions were identified (for a complete list, see Section 5.2 below). These 10 procedures are contained in 4 major categories. A conceptual metaphor can be translated either by the same CM, or by a different CM, or by a non-metaphoric paraphrase. In some cases, a CM is not translated at all (deletion).

- The motivation for using a particular translation procedure is very complex, consisting of numerous reasons, both objective and subjective, such as the features of metaphors themselves, conventionality of the TL, language asymmetry, the general ST-orientation or reader-orientation, various elements of style such as explicitation and implicitation, adding intensity to an expression, increasing expressivity of the text, avoiding redundancy, idiosyncrasies of the translator, the influence of TL literary discourse and literary translation tradition etc.

- A parameter proved to be relevant for the choice of translation procedure is the universality of metaphor (i.e. whether the metaphor is shared between SL and TL or not). The relevance of other parameters, such as the conventionality of metaphor and the cognitive function of metaphor remains to be explored.

- We may use different metaphor translation procedures to produce different effects, such as to shock and provoke the readers, to enrich the TL, to add intensity, to make elements of meaning explicit, to avoid redundancy, to make the text more expressive or less expressive, to change perspective by highlighting a different aspect of the CM, to tone the metaphor down and to hedge it, to preserve or increase metaphoricity/ figurativeness/ expressivity, or to lose metaphoricity/ figurativeness/ expressivity.

- The distribution of the major types of procedures (CM -> CM, CM -> CM1, CM ->non-M, CM -> 0) in TT1, TT2 and TT3 is similar, although TT2 stands out a bit. The average share of CM -> CM procedures in TT1 and TT3 is about 77%, the rate of CM -> CM1 is about 5%, CM -> non-M is used in about 17% of the cases and CM -> 0 is used rarely, in less than 1% of the cases. In TT2, CM -> CM is less represented (70%), while CM -> CM1 (7%) and CM -> non-M (22%) are more represented. The distribution of the subprocedures of CM -> CM (especially 1a and 1b) differs in TT1, TT2 and TT3, although the differences are not very pronounced.

➤ The distribution of the translation procedures in the corpus leads to the following conclusions:

- Most of the metaphors are preserved (77% same domain, 5% different domain), while some of the metaphors are paraphrased (17%). Deletion is, on average, very uncommon (<1%).
- In general, of the CM → CM procedures, translation by the same expression of the same CM (1a) is more used than translation by a different expression of the same CM (1b).
- The most frequently used procedure is 1a (literal translation)
- The least frequently used procedure is deletion (less than 1% on average).
- The share of non-metaphoric paraphrases is considerable (17% on average)

➤ On the basis of the distribution of procedures in our corpus, one can, to an extent, predict the distribution of the procedures in any given TT. Predictions for particular cases can be made on the basis of universality of the metaphor, with accuracy up to 80%.

5.2. Review of the objectives and research questions

The main objective of the dissertation was to test the applicability of Conceptual Metaphor Theory in a research project on metaphor translation. We found that CMT can be fruitfully applied to research of metaphor translation, bringing new insights into the issue. The specific objectives have also been successfully obtained:

- a typology of metaphor translation procedures has been set up by combining CMT and existing typologies in TS;
- the typology has been tested on a corpus by identifying the procedures for translating metaphors used in the corpus and, after minor adaptations according to the findings, the

typology was found to be adequate and sufficient for a complete description of the procedures;

- we have managed to a considerable extent to account for the motivation for using a particular procedure;
- the distribution of the procedures in the corpus has been calculated;
- based on the distribution of the procedures some tendencies in metaphor translation have been identified;
- some cultural differences between English culture and Croatian culture that are manifested through different conceptual systems of those two cultures, i.e. their respective languages have been brought to light;
- the range of possibilities for translating metaphors has been shown.

The basic research questions have been answered as follows:

1. What translation procedures for the translation of metaphoric expressions can be found in the TT1, TT2 and TT3?

In the analysis of the corpus the total of 10 translation procedures for the translation of metaphoric expressions were identified:

1. same expression of the same CM (1a);
2. same expression of the same CM, with an addition (1a+);
3. same expression of the same CM, with an omission (1a-);
4. different expression of the same CM (1b);
5. different expression of the same CM, with an addition (1b+);
6. simile (1c);
7. simile, with an addition (1c+);
8. different expression of a different CM, with a similar meaning (2);
9. non-metaphoric expression (3);

10. deletion (4).

The numbers in brackets are the labels used in the analysis of the procedures, indicating the major types (numbers), and subtypes (letters and +/- signs). These 10 procedures are contained in 4 major categories:

1. CM -> CM (conceptual metaphor translated by the same conceptual metaphor);
2. CM ->CM1 (conceptual metaphor translated by a different conceptual metaphor);
3. CM -> non-M (conceptual metaphor translated by a non-metaphoric paraphrase);
4. CM -> 0 (conceptual metaphor (non-) translated by deletion).

2. Why is a particular translation procedure used in a particular context?

The motivation for using a particular translation procedure is very complex, consisting of numerous reasons, both objective and subjective. First, there are objective reasons, such as the features of metaphors themselves, conventionality of the TL, and language asymmetry. The subjective reasons range from the general ST-orientation (i.e. the desire to stay close to the ST) or reader-orientation (i.e. the desire to facilitate understanding), to various elements of style (many of which are said to be translation universals), such as explicitation and implicitation, adding intensity to an expression, increasing expressivity of the text, avoiding redundancy, and idiosyncrasies of the translator, such as a creative change of aspect. Then, there are other reasons such as the influence of TL literary discourse and literary translation tradition. There may also be other reasons that are yet to be identified.

3. Which parameters (conventionality of metaphor, universality of metaphor, cognitive function, nature of metaphor) are relevant for the choice of translation procedure?

As explained above, the relevance of conventionality of metaphor is yet to be explored. As for the universality of metaphor (i.e. whether the metaphor is shared between SL and TL or not),

we have evidence that it is a relevant factor determining the choice of translation procedure. Other parameters, such as the cognitive function of metaphor (i.e. whether a CM is structural, orientational or ontological) and the nature of metaphor (i.e. whether a CM is proposition-based, image-based or image-schematic) may also be relevant in this context, and are yet to be explored.

4. What are the effects of using a particular procedure?

It is very difficult to differentiate the effects or function of a procedure from the motivation for using it because in many cases the usage is motivated by the function. A particular procedure is often used because we want to produce a certain effect. For example, if we want to shock and provoke the readers, or enrich the TL (depending on the attitude of the reader), we may use a strange, unconventional sounding literal translation of a metaphorical expression that is non-existent in TL, e.g. *pasti u ljubav* (literal translation of 'to fall in love' – procedure 1a in our typology). To add intensity or to make elements of meaning explicit we may use 1a+ or 1b+. To avoid redundancy and have a smoother style we may use 1a- or CM -> 0. To make the text more expressive by making it more specific or less expressive by making it more general, or to change perspective by highlighting a different aspect of the CM, we may use 1b (a different expression of the same CM). To tone the metaphor down and to hedge it, we may turn the metaphor into a simile (1c). The effect of CM -> CM1 (a different expression of a different CM, with a similar meaning) is preserving metaphoricity / figurativeness / expressivity, whereas the effect of CM -> non-M is just the opposite – losing metaphoricity / figurativeness / expressivity. To increase metaphoricity / figurativeness / expressivity or to compensate for the loss of it in other places, we may use a metaphor where there was not any in ST (non-M -> CM).

5. What is the distribution of the different translation procedures in the TT1, TT2 and TT3?

The distribution of the major types of procedures (CM -> CM, CM -> CM1, CM-> non-M, CM -> 0) in TT1, TT2 and TT3 is similar, although TT2 stands out a bit. The average share of CM -> CM procedures in TT1 and TT2 is about 77%, the rate of CM -> CM1 is about 5%, CM -> non-M is used in about 17% of the cases and CM -> 0 is used rarely, in less than 1% of the cases. In TT2, CM -> CM is less represented (70%), while CM -> CM1 (7%) and CM -> non-M (22%) are more represented.

The distribution of the subprocedures of CM -> CM (especially 1a and 1b) differs in TT1, TT2 and TT3, although the differences are not very pronounced. TT1 (1a: 47%, 1b: 27%) and TT2 (1a: 34%, 1b: 34%) are mutually more similar than TT3 (1a: 56%, 1b: 20%).

6. What are the tendencies in choosing a particular translation procedure?

The distribution of the procedures leads to the following conclusions:

- Most of the metaphors are preserved (77% same domain, 5% different domain), while some of the metaphors are paraphrased (17%). Deletion is, on average, very uncommon (<1%). (The average is based on TT1 and TT3. TT2 follows the same general tendencies, but it tends to use the translation by the same CM less, while using translation by a different CM and by non-metaphoric paraphrase more often.)
- In general, of the CM -> CM procedures, a translation by the same expression of the same CM (1a) is used more frequently than a translation by a different expression of the same CM (1b). TT2 is different in this respect (the ratio of 1a and 1b is about 50:50), which we consider as idiosyncratic and not typical.

- The most frequently used procedure is 1a (literal translation) and in our corpus it tends to be on the increase (TT1: 47%, TT3: 56%).
- The least frequently used procedure is deletion (less than 1% on average).
- The share of non-metaphoric paraphrases is considerable (17% on average), and in our corpus it tends to be on the decrease.
- All of the above conclusions are true to the extent to which the distribution of the procedures in TT1, TT2 and TT3 can be generalized to include other TTs and other STs.

7. Can we predict what procedure is going to be used in a particular situation?

One can predict the distribution of the procedures in a TT on the basis of the distribution of procedures in our corpus, although we cannot be sure of the accuracy of those predictions, since the distribution in our corpus may to an extent depend on the ST, which was the same for all three TTs, as well as on the individual translator preferences. Predictions for particular cases can be made on the basis of universality of the metaphor, with more or less accuracy (in some cases, as it was shown, with 80% accuracy).

In sum, the objectives of the research have been attained and the research questions largely answered, thus the research project has been successfully carried out. However, nothing is ever black or white – every research projects has its weaknesses. A research project is successful if its strengths outnumber its weaknesses, and if its limitations do not prevent useful insights. The next section discusses the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of this research project.

5.3. Strengths, weaknesses and limitations

It is by no means an easy task to evaluate one's own work. No matter how hard one tried to be objective, it is not possible to completely eliminate the subjective element. Nevertheless, self-evaluation is necessary in order to see what has been done and what is yet to be done. As every other piece of research, this piece of research has some strengths, some weaknesses, and some limitations.

The strongest point of this dissertation, we believe, is that it offers a new and more precise typology of translation procedures for the translation of metaphors by combining CMT and the existing typologies in translation studies. This typology can be put to use in practically any research involving metaphor translation. In addition to the new typology, another strong point is that by a careful analysis of the selected examples, we managed by large to account for the motivation and implications of the different translation solutions in metaphor translation. The analysis of the distribution of the translation procedures in our corpus also brought us interesting insights. Last but not least, the research findings have a potential for application in translator training and practice.

There are also some weak points to this research. First, one of our specific objectives - to obtain a preliminary diachronic picture that reflects the development of the tendencies concerning the translation of metaphor in Croatia – could not be fully realized. During the analysis of the research findings, we came to the realization that a large part of the translation solutions is in a way predetermined by the very nature of the ST metaphors. As a result, the distribution of the translation procedures in TT1, TT2 and TT3 is very similar. In addition, since each historic period is represented by only one translator, the results may well reflect their individual preferences, rather than general tendencies of the respective periods. In order to accomplish our objective, more literary works from the respective periods have to be analyzed, and more translators included. Only the average distribution of translation procedures in a number of literary translations by different translators from the same period

can point to the norm. However, this does not imply that our results are wrong or useless, they are just limited.

The research findings are limited in such a way that, as explained above, they do not allow us to make generalizations about the translation norm or tendencies concerning the translation of metaphor. But, they do allow for some very useful insights and they do give us at least a provisional norm. Even in a limited context such as this (one ST, three TTs) there are variations to be observed concerning the use of translation procedures. These variations may or may not coincide with the historic development of the norm (they may have a lot to do with individual differences between translators), but they definitely point the way to future research – they show us where to look and what to look for. Another limitation is the scope of the present research, which includes only a single work of literature, of a single literary genre, which makes any kind of generalization provisional.

5.4. Practical application of research findings

In the connection with the practical application of the research findings, at least two aspects are worth considering:

- 1) In what way can we use CMT in translator training and practice? and
- 2) In what way can we use the findings of the present research?

Re 1: Our hypothesis is that CMT should be included in the translator training curriculum, which would allow for a more adequate translation of metaphorical expressions. Wolfgang Walther (1990)⁹¹ points to the fact that uncertainties in translating metaphor arise from the lack of knowledge about the essence of metaphor. The translator is often not certain about

⁹¹ In Kurth, 1995: 110.

what s/he should transfer into the TT: the image, the metaphorical expression or the metaphorical meaning. CMT shows the range of possibilities to the translator in doubt. The easiest way to translate a metaphor is to translate the metaphoric expression literally. This is possible if the particular metaphoric expression / mapping is shared between ST and TT. If the particular metaphoric mapping is not shared, but the CM is shared, either look for another metaphorical expression from the same source domain or turn the metaphor to a simile. If the CM is not shared, one can:

- a) translate non-metaphorically (paraphrase), and lose the metaphoricity; or
- b) use another metaphorical expression from another source domain with a similar meaning, and lose the original image; or
- c) experiment and translate literally anyway to test the limits of the reader's understanding and cultural acceptability, and possibly initiate a change in the conceptual system of the target culture.

An important point is that these are possibilities and not rules – the translator still has the freedom to be creative. These possibilities just help the translator to make an informed decision as to the way s/he will behave in an actual situation. Of course, in order to appreciate the above possibilities the translator has to be familiar with at least the basics of CMT and with the meaning of the terms such as source and target domain, metaphoric mapping, s/he has to know the difference between the basic concepts of conceptual metaphor and metaphoric expression etc. We would therefore like to suggest that including CMT in the translator training can be rewarding, and that many experienced translators could also benefit from getting familiar with the basic tenets of CMT. Of course, this is just a hypothesis, which is yet to be confirmed. The best way to test this hypothesis is by experiment, which could be the focus of one of the future research projects.

Re 2: In addition to CMT in general, the findings of the present research could also be useful in the translator training and practice. One way is to use some of the analyzed examples

to show students how metaphoric expressions can be translated and to discuss the motivation and implications of the different translation procedures. The typology we developed can be useful when discussing the different translation procedures. Another way to use the research findings is to make guidelines for the students concerning the translation of metaphors, based on the distribution of the translation procedures and the universality of metaphor.

Our findings can also be used in translation assessment and criticism; a translation critic may use our typology and research findings, especially those concerning the motivation and the effects of using different procedures, as a tool to analyze the translations in regard to the aspect of metaphor translation and to evaluate the success of particular translation solutions.

5.5. Recommendations for future research

The present study opens up some new avenues of research. One way to proceed is to build up from its foundations and add more translations of literary works, by different translators, to the corpus, from the respective periods of our TT1, TT2 and TT3, and possibly adding more stages in-between, before and after, thus contributing to an outline of historical development of the norm regarding the translation of metaphor in Croatian culture of translation. This could even be turned into a large-scale project, which could benefit from contributions of any number of interested scholars.

Another, more immediate way to proceed from here is to collect and analyze a corpus of up-to-date translations in order to identify the current tendencies regarding the translation of metaphors in Croatian translated literature. Knowing the tendencies could help us understand our culture better, and it could serve as a reference point to all translators.

During the analysis of the findings, a number of new research questions and hypotheses emerged:

- 1) The fact that around $\frac{3}{4}$ of all the identified metaphoric expressions were translated by a form of the same conceptual metaphor leads to the following hypothesis: There is an implied norm that in translating metaphors you should keep the same CM, if you can;
- 2) Turning a metaphor into a simile is considerably underrepresented in our corpus. Does that imply that turning metaphors into similes is in general marginally used? Does that depend on the genre/ type of discourse, etc.? ;
- 3) Since paraphrase is frequent even when the CM is shared between SL and TL, is the number of metaphors in a TT always smaller than that in an ST? If yes, in what proportion? Hypothesis: Yes, depending on the number of non-shared CMs. The more non-shared CMs there are, the more paraphrases and fewer metaphors. This is partly compensated by using procedures non-M \rightarrow CM and 0 \rightarrow CM. Another related question is: Why do translators opt for a non-metaphoric paraphrase if they can use a metaphor? ;
- 4) We have also found that in our corpus deletion (CM \rightarrow 0) is rare. We may ask ourselves whether deletion is rarely used in general. When is deletion used; what is the motivation for using deletion? Our hypothesis is that in some types of discourse deletion is used more frequently than in other types of discourse. For instance, it is used more frequently in informative type of discourse (e.g. newspaper articles) and it is used less in expressive types of discourse (e.g. works of literature);
- 5) We have identified universality of the metaphor as one of the important factors influencing the choice of translation procedure. Is universality the most important factor? What other factors are important? ;
- 6) Hypothesis: CMT should be included in translator training. Translators should know about CMT; it would help them in dealing with metaphor translation.

The kind of research conducted in the present dissertation can be broadened to include more genres, different styles and registers (e.g. journalistic or scientific texts). Interpreting can also be analyzed, as well as subtitling, surtitling⁹² etc. The typology and methodology developed in this research can also be applied to any language and any cultural setting. Besides broadening, the research topic can also be made more specific: it can concentrate on just one aspect or one type of translation procedure, looking for its motivation and implications.

⁹² The term 'surtitle(s)' is used to describe in situ theatre and opera translation titles. They first appeared in Canada when, in 1983, they were used for the first time on an experimental basis by the Canadian Opera Company in Toronto. The mentioned institution registered SURTITLESTM as a trademark. (Kuhiwczak, P, Littau, K. 2007: 132-3)

References

- Ahrens, K., Say, A.L.T. (1999). Mapping Image-Schemas and Translating Metaphors. *National Taiwan University* ahrens@ms.cc.ntu.edu.tw
- Al-Hasnawi, Ali R. (2007). A Cognitive Approach to Translating Metaphor. *Translation Journal*, 11/3. Available at: <http://translationjournal.net/journal/41culture.htm>
- Alvarez, A. (1993). On translating metaphor. *Meta* 38 (3), 479-490
- Anderman, G. (2007). Linguistics and Translation. In Kuhlmczak, P., Littau, K. (eds.) (2007). *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 45-62.
- Anderman, G. , Rogers, M. (eds.) (2008). *Incorporating Corpora: The Linguist and the Translator*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (1995). Corpora in translation studies: An overview and suggestions for future research. *Target* 12 (2), 223-44
- Baker, M. (ed.) (1998). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (2004). A corpus-based view of similarity and difference in translation. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9 (2), 167-193
- Bassnett, S. (1980/2000). *Translation Studies* (3rd rev.edn). London: Routledge.
- Black, M. (1993). More about metaphor. In Ortony, A. (ed.) (1993). *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 19-42
- Boys-Stones, G.R. (ed.) (2003). *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Oxford, New York etc.: Oxford University Press
- Crerar-Bromelow, G. (2008). Can an Awareness of Conceptual Metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) Aid the Translator in His/Her Task? In: *Selected Papers from the 2006 and 2007 Stockholm Metaphor Festivals*, eds. N.-L. Johannesson & D.C. Minugh, 75–84. Stockholm: Department of English, Stockholm University.

- Croft, W., Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickins, J. (2005). Two models for metaphor translation. *Target*, 17/2, 227-273.
- Dobrzyńska, T. (1995). Translating metaphor: Problems of meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24 (1995) 595-604
- Evans, V., Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fawcett, P. (1998). Linguistic approaches. In Baker, M. (ed.) (1998). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 120-125.
- Gentzler, E. (2000). Metaphor and Translation. In: Classe, O. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English. Volume 2, M-Z*. London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Innes, D. (2003). Metaphor, Simile, and Allegory as Ornaments of Style. In Boys-Stones, G.R. (ed.) (2003). *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Oxford, New York etc.: Oxford University Press, 7-27.
- Johnduff, M. (2009). On tenor and vehicle. Available at:
 <<http://mikejohnduff.blogspot.com/2009/10/on-tenor-and-vehicle.html>>
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion. Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford, New York, etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2003). Language, Figurative Thought, and Cross-Cultural Comparison. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18:4, 311 — 320
- Kövecses, Z. (2004). *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2006). *Language, Mind, and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kurth, E. (1995). *Metaphernübersetzung: dargestellt an grotesken Metaphern im Frühwerk Charles Dickens in der Wiedergabe deutscher Übersetzungen*. Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Bern; New York; Paris; Wien: Peter Lang.
- Kuhiwczak, P, Littau, K. (eds.) (2007). *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. (+ Afterword, 2003). Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Levi, J. (1982). *Umjetnost prevodjenja*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Lloyd, G.E.R. (2003). The Problem of Metaphor: Chinese Reflections. In: Boys-Stones, G.R. (ed.) *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Oxford, New York etc.: Oxford University Press, 101-114.
- "metaphor." *Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*. HarperCollins Publishers. 11 Nov. 2010. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/metaphor>>.
- "metaphor." *Dictionary.com Unabridged*. Random House, Inc. 11 Nov. 2010. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/metaphor>>.
- "metaphor." *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Douglas Harper, Historian. 11 Nov. 2010. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/metaphor>>.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies*. London/New York : Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *Approaches to Translation*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Prentice Hall. (first published in 1982)
- Omazić, M., Čačija, R. (2007). Metonymy across languages, cultures, and translations. In: Muráth, J., Oláh-Hubai, Á. (eds.) *Interdisziplinäre Aspekte des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens. Interdisciplinary Aspects of Translation and Interpreting*. Wien: Praesens, 227-235.

- Ortony, A. (ed.) (1993). *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press. First published 1979
- Pender, E.E. (2003). Plato on Metaphors and Models. In: Boys-Stones, G.R. (ed.) *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Oxford, New York etc.: Oxford University Press, 55-81.
- Prunč, E. (2002): *Einführung in die Translationswissenschaft. Band 1: Orientierungsrahmen*. Graz: Institut für Translationswissenschaft.
- Prunč, E. (2007). *Entwicklungslinien der Translationswissenschaft: Von der Asymmetrien der Sprachen zu den Asymmetrien der Macht*. Berlin: Frank & Timme
- “Resource2: A short history of metaphor”. 14 Jan 2011. <The Open University
<http://web.archive.org/web/20070101145805/tscp.open.ac.uk/t185/html/resources/r2history.htm#richards>>
- Richards, I.A. (1936). *Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: OUP
- Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach
Journal of Pragmatics 36, 1253-1269.
- Shabani, A. (2008). A Comparative Study of the Translation of Image Metaphors of Color in the Shahnameh of Ferdowsi. Available at:
<http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article1701.php>
- Silk, M. (2003). Metaphor and Metonymy: Aristotle, Jacobson, Ricoeur, and Others. In: Boys-Stones, G.R. (ed.) *Metaphor, Allegory and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Oxford, New York etc.: Oxford University Press, 115-151
- Stallman, B. (1999). Divine Hospitality in the Pentateuch: A Metaphorical Perspective on God as Host (doctoral dissertation). Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved on 14 Jan 2011 from:
<http://eagle.northwestu.edu/academic/ministry/faculty/bstallman/Dissertation/2.pdf>
- Stefanowitsch, A., S. T. Gries (eds.) (2006). *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

van der Broeck, R. (1981). The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation.
Poetics Today 2, 73-87

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

Data sources

Wilde, O. (1920). *Dorian Gray*. S engleskoga preveo dr. Artur Schneider. Zagreb: St. Kugli.

Wilde, O. (2000). *Slika Dorian Gray*. Prijevod: Zlatko Gorjan. Koprivnica: Šareni dućan

Wilde, O. (1987). *Slika Dorian Gray*. Preveo Zdenko Novački. Zagreb: Mladost

Dictionaries

Anić, V. (2007). Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika. Priručno izdanje. Zagreb: Jutarnji list i Novi liber

Bujas, Ž. (2001). *Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rječnik. Drugo izdanje. Croatian-English*

Dictionary. Second edition. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus

Englesko-hrvatsko-engleski rječnik. (software) Bosiljak d.o.o. Vinkovci.

Filipović, R. (ed.) (1999). English-Croatian Dictionary. Englesko-hrvatski rječnik. Zagreb:

Školska knjiga

Hrvatski jezični portal (online). Copyright Novi Liber i Srce

Longman's Dictionary of English Language and Culture, Second Edition. (1998) Harlow:

Longman

The Free Dictionary (online). Copyright 2011 Farlex, Inc.

WordWeb Pro 5.00e. (software). Copyright Antony Lewis, 2007

Software

ABBYY FineReader 9.0 Professional Edition. Optical Character Recognition System. © 2007

ABBYY

WordSmith Tools 5.0. Finding word patterns. PC software published by Lexical Analysis

Software Ltd. and Oxford University Press since 1996

Curriculum vitae

GORAN SCHMIDT

was born in Osijek on 11 May 1982. In 2005 he receives a Bachelor's degree in English language and literature and German language and literature from the Faculty of Philosophy in Osijek. From September 2005 to February 2006 he works as a teacher of English and German at Valpovo High School in Valpovo. In February 2006 he starts working as a teaching assistant in the Department of English Language and Literature at the Faculty of Philosophy in Osijek, Subdepartment for Applied Linguistics, and in November that same year he enrolls into the doctoral study program in linguistics („Jezikoslovlje“) at the same institution. In the six years he has spent at the Faculty of Philosophy, he taught the following courses: English Language Practice, English Translation Practice, Survey of Translation Studies, and Contemporary Translation Studies.

Since 2007 he has been a researcher on the project “Cognitive-linguistic approach to polysemy in Croatian and other languages” (project manager: Mario Brdar, Ph.D.; project code: MZT 122-1301049-0606). His professional and research interests include translation studies and cognitive linguistics. Since 2006 he has taken part in eight scientific conferences (on applied linguistics, translation and interpreting, cognitive linguistics, and phraseology), four of them international, and the other four domestic. From 22 August - 2 September 2011 he attended the internationally renowned translation research summer school CETRA 2011, at Katholieke Universiteit in Leuven, Belgium, for which he won a scholarship.

He published five scientific papers, four in international publications and one in a publication by the Osijek Faculty of Philosophy, and one more paper is in press by an international publication. He also published a number of translations, the most important among them a translation of a science book from German into Croatian.

Conferences:

2011, May 12 -14, Osijek

25th CALS Conference. Current Research in Applied Linguistics (poster)

2010, May 20-22, Osijek

24th CALS Conference. Discourse and Dialogue Studies between Theory, Research Methods, and Application (listener)

2009, May 21-23, Osijek

23th CALS Conference. Space and time in language: Language in space and time (poster)

2008, September 30 – October 1, Dubrovnik

Cognitive Linguistics between Universality and Variation (presentation)

2008, May 22-24, Osijek

22th CALS Conference. Linguistics of Public Communication (presentation)

2007, November 2-3, Edinburgh (UK)

TIPCITI. The Third International Postgraduate Conference in Translation and Interpreting. (poster)

2007, October 18-19, Osijek

30 YESO. An international conference to mark the 30th anniversary of English studies at Josip Juraj Strossmayer University, Osijek. Cognitive Approaches to English. (presentation)

2006, September 19-22, Santiago de Compostela (Spain)

CIFP2006. International Conference on Phraseology and Paremiology (presentation)

PUBLICATIONS

Scientific papers:

Schmidt, Goran and Mario Brdar (in press). "Variation in the Linguistic Expression of the Conceptual Metaphor LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME in English and Croatian and its Possible Cultural Implications". In Milena Žic Fuchs, Ida Raffaelli and Mario Brdar, eds. *Cognitive Linguistics between Universality and Variation*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Schmidt, G., and M. Omazić (2011) "Time metaphors in English and Croatian: A corpus-based study" In Brdar, M., M. Omazić, V. Pavičić-Takač, T. Gradečak-Erdeljić, G. Buljan, eds. *Space and Time in Language*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Omazić, Marija; Schmidt, Goran, and Čačija, Romana (2009) "The Role of Cognitive Mechanisms – Conceptual Metaphor and Metonymy in the Translation Process". In Brdar, Mario; Omazić, Marija and Pavičić Takač, Višnja, eds. *Cognitive Approaches to English: Fundamental, Methodological, Interdisciplinary and Applied Aspects*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Schmidt, Goran (2008) "Polysemy in Translation. Selecting the Right Sense". In Karabalić, Vladimir, and Marija Omazić, eds. *Istraživanja, izazovi i promjene u teoriji i praksi prevodenja*. Osijek: Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet.

Omazić, Marija and Goran Schmidt (2008) "Polysemy in phraseology". In Maria Álvarez de la Granja, ed. *Lenguaje figurado y motivación. Una perspectiva desde la fraseología. Studien zur romanischen Sprachwissenschaft und interkulturellen Kommunikation*. (Vol. 41). Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien.

Translations:

Što je bilo prije velikog praska (2011) (German Source: Zurück vor den Urknall by Martin Bojowald; 282 pp). Zaprešić: Fraktura

Gradska liga protiv raka Osijek. 40 godina (2007). Kušen, Dražen i Zdravko Ebling. Osijek.
(English summary of the monograph)

On i njegov čovjek (JM Coetzee's Nobel lecture, He and his man, Guardian Unlimited);
Dagens Nyheter – Kultur, ekskluzivni intervju s J.M. Coetseeom (DN Kultur, An exclusive interview with J.M. Coetzee); *Christopher Hope: Susret izgubljenih duša* (C.Hope, Meeting of Lost Souls). In: KNJIŽEVNA REVIIJA, br. 1-2, 2006., Ogranak Matice hrvatske Osijek