

Translation of Conceptual Metaphor in George Orwell's 1984 from English to Croatian

Zundanović, Dragana

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2021

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:142:815331>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-04-25**



Repository / Repozitorij:

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



Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Dvopredmetni preddiplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti i hrvatskog
jezika i književnosti

Dragana Zundanović

**Prevođenje konceptualnih metafora u romanu Georgea Orwella
"1984." s engleskog na hrvatski jezik**

Završni rad

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Goran Schmidt

Osijek, 2021.

Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku
Filozofski fakultet Osijek
Odsjek za engleski jezik i književnost
Dvopredmetni preddiplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti i hrvatskog
jezika i književnosti

Dragana Zundanović
**Prevođenje konceptualnih metafora u romanu Georgea Orwella
"1984." s engleskog na hrvatski jezik**
Završni rad

Znanstveno područje: humanističke znanosti

Znanstveno polje: filologija

Znanstvena grana: anglistika

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Goran Schmidt
Osijek, 2021.

J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Study Programme: Double Major BA Study Programme in English Language and
Literature and Croatian Language and Literature

Dragana Zundanović

Translation of Conceptual Metaphor in George Orwell's *1984*

Bachelor's Thesis

Supervisor: Goran Schmidt, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2021.

J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Study Programme: Double Major BA Study Programme in English Language and
Literature and Croatian Language and Literature

Dragana Zundanović

Translation of Conceptual Metaphor in George Orwell's *1984*

Bachelor's Thesis

Scientific area: humanities

Scientific field: philology

Scientific branch: English Studies

Supervisor: Goran Schmidt, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2021.

IZJAVA

Izjavljujem s punom materijalnom i moralnom odgovornošću da sam ovaj rad samostalno napravio te da u njemu nema kopiranih ili prepisanih dijelova teksta tuđih radova, a da nisu označeni kao citati s napisanim izvorom odakle su preneseni.

Svojim vlastoručnim potpisom potvrđujem da sam suglasan da Filozofski fakultet Osijek trajno pohrani i javno objavi ovaj moj rad u internetskoj bazi završnih i diplomskih radova knjižnice Filozofskog fakulteta Osijek, knjižnice Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku i Nacionalne i sveučilišne knjižnice u Zagrebu.

U Osijeku, datum 15.7.2021.

Dragana Zundarović, 0122229977
ime i prezime studenta, JMBAG

Abstract

Metaphors, and figurative language in general, have been a phenomenon studied by a great number of linguists, philosophers, and psychologists. The beginning of their exploration dates back to the time of Aristotle. Despite the popular belief that metaphors are a feature belonging exclusively to poetry or rhetoric, cognitive linguistics and conceptual metaphor theory prove this idea to be wrong. Conceptual metaphors can be found in everyday communication. They are created on the basis of experience and our knowledge about the world around us. Their conventionality range can encapsule highly conventional expressions as well as the innovative ones created on a daily basis by creative speakers. However, the fact that they are so closely related to different cultural environments and corresponding conceptual systems represents a sort of a challenge for the process of translation. Due to potential diversities in the source language and the target language, it is necessary to convert them accurately and maintain their nature. That is why there are numerous metaphor translation strategies according to which a metaphorical expression can be transferred from the source to the target text. The aim of this paper is to show how one such typology functions in the context of translation from English into Croatian. The corpus-based research consists of the analysis of 20 sentence pairs from the source language (en) and the target language (hr), each containing a metaphorical expression in at least one of the instances. The texts that served as a basis for the corpus were George Orwell's novel *1984* and its Croatian translation by Antun Šoljan.

Key words: conceptual metaphor, metaphor translation, source text, target text, *1984*

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Conceptual metaphor.....	2
2.1. Etymology and meaning of metaphors.....	2
2.2. Metaphor exploration.....	2
2.3. Conceptual metaphor theory (CMT).....	3
2.3.1. Definition	4
2.3.2. Conventionality of metaphors.....	4
2.3.3. Fundamental distinction between metaphors.....	5
3. Metaphor translation.....	7
3.1. Modes of translation from SL to TL.....	7
4. <i>1984</i> and metaphor use.....	9
5. Research design and methods.....	10
6. Corpus analysis.....	11
7. Conclusion.....	19
References.....	20
Appendices.....	23

1. Introduction

This bachelor paper examines the means by which conceptual metaphors can be translated from English into Croatian. The source that served as a corpus for this research is George Orwell's novel *1984* and its Croatian equivalent, translated by the author and translator Antun Šoljan.

The first half of the paper consists of a theoretical background regarding the issue of conceptual metaphor and translation. First there is a brief overview of the term metaphor; its etymology and definition as provided by Cambridge Dictionary and Oxford Lerner's Dictionaries. Besides that, a short historical overview of metaphor research can be found in the same subsection. The rest of the section on metaphor concerns the conceptual metaphor theory – its definition, main features, conventionality of metaphors and the fundamental distinction between orientational, ontological, and structural metaphors. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's 1980 publication *Metaphors We Live By* served as a basis for the illustration of CMT, along with Zoltán Kövecses's *Metaphor: A practical Introduction*. Furthermore, the theoretical part of the paper is complemented by a synopsis of translation studies, with the emphasis on metaphor translation. In this section, the issue of metaphor translation is put into context by articulating a number of challenges that could arise in the process. Alongside that, the section also includes different typologies by means of which a metaphor can be translated from the source to the target text. Another theoretical element in the paper concerns the connection between the novel, *1984*, and the use of figurative language. It is shown how George Orwell is perceived as a writer whose language transcends the ordinary level of metaphor use.

The second part of the paper focuses on a corpus research in which 20 randomly selected conceptual metaphors from *1984* are analyzed and classified according to Schmidt's 2012 metaphor translation typology.

The appendices at the end of the paper include a list of metaphors from the source and the target text along with the mode by which they were translated, a list of abbreviations and the frequency of metaphor types.

2. Conceptual metaphor

2.1. Etymology and meaning of metaphors

The word metaphor in the English language stems from the end of the 15th century. Originating from Greek *metaphora* and being later used in Latin as well, this term was adopted from the French *metaphore*. The core meaning of this term is ‘a transfer’, where the process of transferring is commonly associated with the change from one word to another. The use of one of the words is characterized as strange or unusual (*Online Etymology Dictionary*, 2021).

According to the *Cambridge Dictionary* (2021), the term metaphor constitutes a language phenomenon, most commonly found in literature, which has the purpose to “describe a person or object by referring to something that is considered to have similar characteristics to that person or object”. Furthermore, the *Oxford Learner’s Dictionary* (2021) provides a definition that focuses on another important aspect of metaphorical expressions – the ability to connect elements from two or more distinct domains: “a word or phrase used to describe somebody/something else, in a way that is different from its normal use, in order to show that the two things have the same qualities and to make the description more powerful”.

2.2. Metaphor research

Metaphors have been a point of interest among a great number of researchers from various fields of human knowledge throughout history. The research of this linguistic phenomenon dates back to the period of Ancient Greece, where it was thoroughly studied by Aristotle, who carried out a distinction between four types of metaphors. However, at that time any type of figurative expression was considered to be a metaphor. Such a view on metaphor was significantly reduced and made more elaborate in the time of Cicero and Quintilian. Metaphor was recognized as a separate figure of speech that arises from an analogy between the “regular referent” and its temporary counterpart. Another feature of metaphor that the ancient philosophers identified is the speaker’s intention to impress the audience with the complexity of their figurative utterances. Moreover, instances like those tend to activate the audience’s ability to think and they therefore put effort into conveying the analogy between literal, everyday elements and less transparent, abstract notions included in the metaphorical expression (*Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*).

Following the pathways of the philosophers and linguists from Ancient Greece and Rome, a significant increase in the interest in metaphor arose in the 20th century. In the mid-20th

century 4 traditional approaches towards metaphor observation emerged: Semantic Twist Accounts, Pragmatic Twist Accounts, Comparativist Accounts and Brute Force Accounts. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2017) lists conceptual metaphor theory as another approach from the 20th century which differs from its contemporaries. According to Danesi (1992), even though this linguistic phenomenon was studied from the time of Aristotle, the 1970s were the key period for a systematic research on metaphors in the form of cognitive semantics (Coulson, Canovas: 2014).

2.3. Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT)

As Bednáriková (2013) states, cognitive linguistics is a series of theories investigating the association between human cognition and language use. In relation to previous approaches to language observation, which were predominantly of descriptive nature, cognitive linguistics served as a system of explanatory nature. One of the important dichotomies with opposing views on language knowledge in the field are the modular and holistic approaches. While the modular approach conveys language as a module that is completely independent from other cognitive skills, the holistic approach sees it as their inextricable part. The latter is a commonly used approach among many cognitive linguists like George Lakoff, Ronald Langacker and Leonard Talmy. Language knowledge is in this approach seen as a link between various principles, one of which is the creation of metaphors. According to the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Hills, 2017: “Recent developments”, para. 7), metaphor creation can be elicited from various aspects of human experience - most commonly from “folk geometry, folk kinematics, and folk dynamics”. Lakoff and Johnson (2003) point out that speakers are prone to connecting the term metaphor with arts such as poetry or rhetoric. However, metaphors are in fact ingrained in their everyday communication, which is based on experience, knowledge and action. The authors also indicate that the conceptual system, according to which the speakers think and act, is usually an element that they are not aware of.

2.3.1. Definition

Cognitive linguistics define conceptual metaphors as concepts which are expressed in terms of another concept. The concepts in question are related not only to language and words, but to thoughts and actions as well. Thus, they are one of the key elements that reveal how we perceive the world around us. When creating a metaphor, one structures a concept from one domain in terms of another domain. These are called source and target domains (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). The relation between the source domain, denoting a physical notion close to

human knowledge and experience, and the target domain, denoting an abstract notion, can be explained with the formula “CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN A IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN B” (Kövecses, 2002: 4). Some commonly used source domains are *the human body*, *plants*, *buildings*, *money* and *movements*, while *emotions*, *desires*, *thoughts*, *politics*, *society* and similar notions which are not easily fathomable represent some frequent target domains. The links between notions from each of the domains are expressed through the process of mapping (Kövecses, 2002). Lakoff and Johnson (2003) exemplify such a connection between an abstract and an easily comprehensible concept with the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor. It is an example of aspects of source domain such as *attack*, *win*, and *defense* being used in order to structure aspects of target domain – argument. Therefore, the concept of argument is often understood in terms of a (verbal) battle.

Cultural experience has a strong impact on language. Comprehension and use of a particular metaphor can vary from one culture to another due to the fact that their conceptual systems might differ. Future is in particular cultures understood as a notion positioned in the front, while other cultures see it positioned in the back (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). Littlemore (2009) points out that the discrepancies in understanding and use of figurative language can arise among foreign speakers. Due to potential differences in cultural experience, an L2 speaker might face misunderstandings in communication.

Considering all the relevant features important to understand the circumstances in which metaphors can be found and the way they are implemented in everyday communication, Zoltán Kövecses summarizes Lakoff's and Johnson's main findings from *Metaphors We Live By*:

„(1) metaphor is a property of concepts, and not of words; (2) the function of metaphor is to better understand certain concepts, and not just some artistic or esthetic purpose; (3) metaphor is often not based on similarity; (4) metaphor is used effortlessly in everyday life by ordinary people, not just by special talented people; and (5) metaphor, far from being a superfluous though pleasing linguistic ornament, is an inevitable process of human thought and reasoning.“ (2002: 10).

2.3.2. Conventionality of metaphors

When it comes to the distinction between different kinds of metaphors, Kövecses (2002: 33) points out that there are numerous criteria according to which metaphors can be distinguished. However, the most important ones are conventionality, function, nature, as well as level of generality of metaphor.

Level of conventionality is based on how well accepted a certain conceptual metaphor is in everyday communication. Therefore, it can be said that a metaphor is highly conventional or conventionalized among speakers. These strongly entrenched metaphors, such as LOVE IS A JOURNEY, ARGUMENT IS WAR, and IDEAS ARE FOOD, are often not even perceived to be metaphors and speakers are usually not aware of them. On the other hand, some metaphors are novel or highly unconventional, although they can still be based on some conventional conceptual metaphors, e.g. LIFE IS A JOURNEY (Kövecses uses the example of Frost's poem „The Road Not Taken“ to illustrate such use of an unconventional metaphor: „Two roads diverged in a wood, and I— / I took the one less traveled by.“). Although majority of such metaphors emerge from literature and poetry, many of them are often produced by creative speakers. (Kövecses, 2010).

2.3.3. Fundamental distinction between metaphors

As it was previously mentioned, metaphor creation is dependent on human experience and universal knowledge. Spatial relations, movements of various elements, the ability to accommodate another entity into a certain container and a number of similar examples from everyday life serve as a basis for vivid imagery according to which conceptual metaphors are organized. Lakoff and Johnson (2003) thus construct a fundamental distinction between three types of conceptual metaphors: orientational, ontological, and structural metaphors.

Orientational metaphors are founded on the human perception of spatial relations as means of conveying abstract notions. Some instances of the orientation system according to which metaphors are created are up-down, back-front, in-out, on-off, central-peripheral and so on. According to Lakoff and Johnson's article *Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language* (1980, p. 464), orientational metaphors are commonly used among speakers because majority of our conceptual understanding is based on spatial relations, which are “rooted in physical and cultural experience”. Some manifestations of this strong impact of spatial relations on our conceptual system are metaphors such as HAPPY IS UP (“*I'm feeling up today.*”), SAD IS DOWN (“*I'm depressed.*”), HAVING CONTROL IS UP (“*I am on top of the situation.*”), or LOW STATUS IS DOWN (“*He's at the bottom of social hierarchy.*”) (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003: 16-18).

The second metaphor type that Lakoff and Johnson (2003) examine are ontological metaphors. They are based on our conceptualization of substances and objects brought into relation with the limitations of physical space. Therefore, it is common for speakers to view

abstract notions as entities which have the ability to perform various activities or to be facilitated within certain containers, limited by the boundaries that humans apply in their visual reality. Such notions can represent a number of ideas, emotions, events, etc. in the form of ontological metaphors. As examples of that, Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 27-29) list metaphors INFLATION IS AN ENTITY (“*Inflation is lowering* our standard of living.”, “If there’s *more inflation*, we’ll never survive.”), THE MIND IS AN ENTITY, which can be culturally subcategorized into THE MIND IS A MACHINE (“My *mind* just *isn’t operating* today.”) or THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT (“*She is easily crushed.*”). Further examples regarding container metaphors are VISUAL FIELDS ARE CONTAINERS (“The ship is coming *into view.*”), meanwhile activities are often seen as substances (within containers) as it is the case with (“How did you *get into* window-washing as a profession?”).

The final type that Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 15) describe are structural metaphors and they define them as “cases where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another”. Just like the previous two metaphor types, the structural ones are based on the human experience as well. However, the property that differs them from orientational and ontological metaphors is a much wider range of possibilities in structuring of metaphorical concepts which are not simply bounded by spatial relations or object-substance relations. Therefore, new structural metaphors can be invented by almost any speaker on a daily basis. Nevertheless, there is a great number of highly conventional structural metaphors that are strongly entrenched in our communication. Some examples of it are classified under the TIME IS A RESOURCE and LABOR IS A RESOURCE metaphors. Material resources are a well-known concept in our culture and therefore speakers tend to structure other, non-material concepts in said terms. The non-material concept then assumes the features from the source domain: time can, despite being an abstract arbitrary concept, in discourse be *saved*, *used up*, or *running out* as it is the case with any type of material resource such as *fuel*. Some other highly conventional structural metaphors are IDEAS ARE BUILDINGS, LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, ARGUMENT IS A WAR, etc.

3. Metaphor translation

In the preface of *A Translator's Invisibility* (1995) it is noted that translation became an independent discipline in the 1980s and has been evolving ever since. It is a multidisciplinary study connecting fields like linguistics, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, etc. Its main purpose is to rewrite the original text in a different language while maintaining its essence and register. A translator's task is to subtly manipulate the language use and provide the readers with an adequate equivalent of the original text. Such an approach to the issue, which reflects the language culture, is called the target-oriented approach (Toury, 1995).

Metaphors are a frequent element of everyday communication. Steen et al. (2010: 1) conducted a corpus-based research which found that metaphors can appear on average in "one out of seven and a half lexical units." Considering their frequency, as well as their culture- and language-bound characteristics, it is not surprising that they raise certain problems in the process of translation. Kövecses (2014) indicates that some of the problems involved in metaphor translation are connected with coherence, cultural differences and the relations between literal and abstract meaning of the metaphor in each of the languages. Conceptual approach to metaphor translation has in recent years become highly investigated due to its involvement of conceptual systems belonging to the other language. That way, the focus is redirected from the individual metaphor to the implications of the whole system it belongs to (Schäffner, 2004). Vanderbroeck (1981) identifies 4 important aspects of metaphor translation needed to elicit an adequate translation. Among them is a suitable definition of a metaphor, the meaning of transferring metaphor from SL to TL, the context and limitations imposed on the structurability of a metaphor in translation.

3.1. Modes of translation from SL to TL

Newmark (1981) proposes 6 modes by means of which metaphors are to be translated. The first is to create the same image¹ in TL, which is predominant in translation of metaphors consisting of one lexical unit. Another option is the replacement of SL image by standard TL image. These are often clichés and stereotypes, which can be found in all languages but often differ from culture to culture. Moreover, it is also possible to translate a metaphor by using a simile, which is not as expressive in nature and represents a type of a description emphasizing the similarity which often remains indirectly expressed in metaphors. The fourth possibility is to

¹ "the item in terms of which the object is described" (Newmark, 1981: 85)

translate a metaphor by means of simile plus sense², where the focus is not placed on the equivalent as much as it is on the gloss. Furthermore, a metaphor can commonly be translated to sense by means of which it is possible to maintain the emotiveness and factuality from ST. In the case of redundancy, a translator can opt for the option of metaphor deletion. However, such a decision must meet certain criteria, the most important of which is that the ST is not of expressive nature where metaphors represent manifestations of the author's style. The final solution that Newmark suggests is the combination of the same metaphor with the addition of sense, which guarantees easier understanding.

Ostroški Anić (2014) evaluates a 2014 publication *Metafore Koje Istražujemo* by Mateuzs-Milan Stanojević focusing, among other topics, on the progress of metaphor translation. Although this matter has not been given a significant amount of attention, this publication brings forth a typology in which the TL applied on English-Croatian translation, proposed in Schmidt's 2012 doctoral thesis. In this new metaphor translation typology, Schmidt (2012) combines Toury's 6 translating methods and Kövecses's demonstration of cognitive patterns. Among the 6 translation types, the first instance concerns the conversion of one conceptual metaphor with another; it can have the same expression or different expression, or it can simply be translated by a simile. Furthermore, a CM can be translated by a different CM of similar meaning. The third type is an instance where CM is paraphrased, while the fourth one includes metaphor deletion in TT. Another possibility is the translation of a non-metaphorical expression with a conceptual metaphor. The last is the instance where a conceptual metaphor only appears in the TT with no equivalent in ST.

² "point of similarity, which shows in what particular aspects the object and the image are similar" (Newmark, 1981: 85)

4. 1984 and metaphor use

1984 is a book published by George Orwell in 1949. It describes a dystopian society struck by totalitarian regime and the ordeal that citizens of Oceania must face on a daily basis. Besides its immense popularity due to political connotations, it is also well-received among audiences due to Orwell's style and approach to the concept of language. Even with his invention of *Newspeak*, the language constructed within this dystopian society, George Orwell emphasized the great importance that language has on the way humans evolve and think (McInnis, Turner, 1984). This author not only tackles language as one of the major topics in his works because it functions as a medium through which ideologies are implemented among societies, but also impresses with his style. Orwell's language could be described as one abundant with "striking figurative expressions, pastoral, naturalism, surrealism, representation of thought..." (Fowler, 1995: 7). Cognitive linguistics shows that metaphor is a matter of everyday communication, but also demonstrate a different approach to metaphor in literature. From this perspective, metaphors in literary works can be seen as highly creative versions of conventional CM, ubiquitous in non-literary contexts (Semino, Steen, 2008). In her article *Speech, music and dehumanisation in George Orwell's: a linguistic study of metaphors*, Simon-Vandenberg (1993: 181) points out that the presence of metaphors in *1984* is to be traced in syntax and lexemes; the Party establishes its power "from above", while lack of freedom among individuals emerges "from below". Besides that, this article adds that metaphors in this novel are to a significant extent conventional. Nonetheless, they appear very often and Orwell "exploits" their usage by creating a number of creative metaphors needed for description of life in an antiutopian society. Thus, the author creates a striking connection between the main ideas of the narrative and the formal aspect of the novel.

5. Research design and methods

5.1. Corpus description

This research will analyze 20 metaphorical expressions in English and their Croatian equivalents. They will first be detected in the source text in English – George Orwell's *1984*. After that, their equivalents will be collected from the target text in the form of Croatian translation of Orwell's *1984*, translated by Antun Šoljan.

5.2. Research components

- a) Identification of CM in ST
- b) Identification of CM (Croatian equivalents) in TT
- c) Description of the metaphorical expressions
- d) Identification of the type of metaphor translation

Each analysis contains a brief description of the sort of metaphor found in the text, namely orientational, ontological, and structural, as defined by Lakoff and Johnson in *Metaphors We Live By*. The translation patterns are observed from the perspective of Schmidt's (2012) typology consisting of 6 respective models of translation of metaphors:

- 1) CM→CM (same/different expression of the same CM or simile)
- 2) CM→CM1
- 3) CM→non-M
- 4) CM→0 (deletion)
- 5) non-M→CM
- 6) 0→CM

6. Corpus analysis

1. **ST:** Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a normal whisper, would be picked up by it; moreover, so long as he remained **within the field of vision** which the metal plaque commanded, he could be seen as well as heard. (p. 4)

TT: Koji bi god zvuk Winston proizveo iznad razine vrlo tihog šapta, telekran bi ga registrirao; štoviše, dokle god je **u vidnom polju** koje obuhvaća metalna ploča, nisu ga samo čuli, nego i vidjeli. (p. 8)

The source text contains an ontological metaphor **VISUAL FIELDS ARE CONTAINERS**, based on “what we see and a bounded physical space” (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). The translation retains the same expression of the same conceptual metaphor. Thus, according to Schmidt’s typology (2012), the example given above can be classified in the first type of metaphor translation.

2. **ST:** He tried **to squeeze out some childhood memory** that should tell him whether London had always been quite like this. (p. 5)

TT: Htio je **iz sjećanja iscijediti neku djetinju uspomenu** koja bi mu rekla je li London bio uvijek ovakav... (p. 9)

In the second set of examples, both the source and the target text contain an ontological metaphor. As it was mentioned by Lakoff and Johnson (2003), ontological metaphors enable the possibility of viewing abstract notions as entities, but also to view the mind as a container. In this case, the ST contains the concept of a memory being an entity. However, the TT also contains an explicit mention of recollection (*sjećanje*) as a container from which a certain memory is *squeezed out*. However, both of the examples can be classified under the same conceptual metaphor and thus belong to the first type of metaphor translation.

3. **ST:** Instantly **his face turned scarlet** and the water ran out of his eyes. (p. 7)

TT: Smjesta **mu se lice zajapurilo** i suze su mu navrle na oči. (p. 11)

The third example from the source text contains a metaphor signifying emotional distress. The color red, as well as various shades from the red spectrum, such as *scarlet*, is in our conceptual system often related to emotional distress (Berlin, Kay, 1969; Kövecses, 2004). The TT, however, does not include a CM and it can rather be viewed as a non-metaphorical paraphrase. Considering that, this set of examples could be classified under the 3rd type of translation of metaphors.

4. **ST: His mind slid away** into the labyrinthine world of darkness. (p. 37)

TT: Duh mu je kliznuo labirintski svijet dvomišljenja. (p. 42)

As Lakoff and Johnson (2003) point out, ontological metaphors allow the speakers to interpret the *mind* as an entity. Such is the case with the source text, where the *mind* is personified, adopting the ability to *slide away*. However, the target text does not contain a direct equivalent of the word *mind*. Instead, it is replaced by a synonymous word *duh* (*spirit*). Due to slight differences in expression of the same metaphor, THE MIND IS AN ENTITY, the fourth example of metaphor can be classified under the first metaphor translation type: CM→CM (different expression of the same CM).

5. **ST: It was partly the unusual geography of the room that had suggested to him** the thing that he was now about to do. (p. 8)

TT: Dijelom pod utjecajem upravo te neobične sobne geografije njemu je palo na pamet ono što je sada namjeravao učiniti. (p. 11)

The source text contains an ontological metaphor in which the *unusual geography* is personified. Lakoff and Johnson (2003) point out that personification is one of the most commonly used modes in production of ontological metaphors. The presence of a metaphor is slightly different in the target text, where it is present in the form of an ontological metaphor IDEAS ARE OBJECTS THAT COME INTO THE MIND. According to Schmidt's (2012) typology, this is a case of a CM being translated by a different CM of similar meaning.

6. **ST: All he had to do was to transfer to paper the interminable restless monologue that had been running inside his head**, literally for years. (p. 9)

TT: On jedino treba prenijeti na papir beskrajan i nespkojan monolog koji mu stalno, doslovno već godinama, **teče u glavi**. (p. 13)

THE MIND IS A CONTAINER metaphor is present in both instances from Orwell's novel. Besides that, the content inside the container is described as a fluid considering its ability to *run*. However, the verb *run*, unlike *flow*, does not necessarily only denote movements of fluids as it is the case with *teći* in Croatian. Therefore, the ST and the TT differ slightly in the way the CM is expressed. This set of metaphors is an example of first type of metaphor translation where a CM is translated by the same CM of a slightly different expression.

7. **ST:** ... and the woman was putting her arms round him and comforting him although she was **blue with fright** herself... (p. 10)

TT: ... a žena stavlja ruke oko njega i tješi ga premda je i sama sva **poplavila od straha**... (p. 14)

Physiological changes in an individual's bodies are often associated with emotions. Fear metaphors can commonly be based on metonymies, one of which is DROP IN BODY TEMPERATURE (Kövecses, 2004). This physiological concept, caused by the emotion of fear, can be connected with the color blue, as it is the case in the source text and the target text. Both texts represent a conversion from one conceptual metaphor to another, all the while maintaining the same expression. Because of that, the metaphors from this set of sentences belong to the first type of metaphor translation.

8. **ST:** Goldstein was delivering his usual **venomous attack** upon the doctrines of the Party – an attack so exaggerated and perverse... (p. 14)

TT: Goldstein je izvodio svoj uobičajeni **otrovni napad** na dogme Partije – napad tako pretjeran i izopačen... (p. 18)

The source text contains a structural metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. Same is the case with the translation. Attack is one of the key elements according to which one structures the concept of war. This structure from the source domain is metaphorically mapped onto the domain of argument (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). Moreover, the attack is amplified by the premodifier *venomous*. This set of examples also belongs to the first type of metaphor

translation considering the fact that a CM from ST is in TT translated by a CM of the same expression.

9. **ST:** In its second minute, **the Hate rose** to a frenzy. (p. 16)

TT: U drugoj minuti **Mržnja je porasla** do mahnitosti. (p. 19)

The ninth set of sentences from George Orwell's *1984* is the first one featuring orientational metaphors, which are based on spatial relations (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). Orientational metaphor MORE IS UP is present in both instances of the text. Since the TT retains the same expression of the same CM, it can be perceived as belonging to the first translation type.

10. **ST:** At those moments his secret loathing of Big Brother changed into adoration, and **Big Brother seemed to tower it up**, an invincible, fearless protector... (p. 17)

TT: U tim bi se trenucima njegova potajna mržnja prema Velikom Bratu pretvarala u obožavanje, i **Veliki Brat bi** u njegovim očima **porastao do gorostasne visine**... (p. 20)

Another example of an orientational metaphor is present in the tenth set of sentences. Although not necessarily good in the context of the novel, this metaphorical expression, HAVING CONTROL/FORCE IS UP, is a type of metaphor that stems from the speakers' conceptualization of physical abilities, size and strength ratio. A physically more dominant person is typically stronger and usually perceived as bigger in size (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). The TT contains the same CM as ST and they both have the same expression, rendering it suitable for the first type of the typology.

11. **ST:** ... seemed like some sinister enchanter, capable by the mere power of his voice of wrecking **the structure of civilisation**. (p. 17)

TT: ... djelovao kao kakav zlokoban čarobnjak, sposoban da snagom samog svoga glasa razori **tkivo cijele civilizacije**. (p. 21)

The two sentences above differ in their level of figurativeness. While TT contains a structural metaphor, the ST does not. The structural metaphorical expression from the translation is a BODY IS SOCIETY CM. One aspect of the body structure (the tissue) is

brought into correlation with the concept of society, namely its stability. Since a CM is not present in the original language, and it is translated by a CM, it aligns with the formula of the fifth type of metaphor translation (non-CM→CM).

12. **ST:** He was out in the light and air while they were being **sucked down to death**, and they were down there because he was up here. (p. 32)

TT: On je bio gore na svjetlu i zraku dok je njih **dubina usisavala u smrt**, a bile su dolje baš zato što je on bio gore. (p. 36)

Orientational metaphor SICKNESS AND DEATH ARE DOWN is present both in the source text as well as the target text. The human experience and its view on sickness and death is highly influenced by physical basis: when one is ill or dying, they are physically down (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). The TT retains the same CM and expression, and thus this pair of sentences belongs to the first translation type.

13. **ST:** But that was merely a piece of furtive knowledge which he happened to possess because **his memory was not** satisfactorily **under control**. (p. 37)

TT: Ali bio je to samo potajni podatak koji slučajno posjeduje jer **svojim pamćenjem nije ovladao** koliko bi trebalo. (p. 41)

The orientational metaphor BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL/FORCE IS DOWN is present in the ST. However, the TT differs from it slightly and cannot be described as having the same CM. The Croatian translation contains the verb *ovladati* which is, on the level of word formation, enriched with the prefix *o-*. Šarić and Nedelcheva (2015: 153) point out that the meaning of this prefix is also based on spatial relations; its semantic implication is the process of “wrapping” or “framing” where X “performs an action around” Y. Despite having the property of being based on spatial relations, the spatial relations in question do not align with the ones from ST (up-down vs. around). Therefore, it can be concluded that the CM from ST was translated by a paraphrase (third type of translation). An equivalent that could possibly fully align with the ST is *njegovo pamćenje nije u potpunosti bilo pod kontrolom*.

14. **ST**: Statistics were just as much **a fantasy** in their original version as in their rectified version. (p. 43)

TT: Statistika je bila jednako tako **plod mašte** u svojoj prvotnoj verziji, kao i u kasnijim, reguliranim verzijama. (p. 48)

In this case, the expressions differ in ST and TT. The conceptual metaphor THEORIES ARE PLANTS is present in the translation, although it does not exist in the original text. Despite comparing statistics to fantasy, ST does not structure it in terms of plant growth. That is why this sentence pair is an example of a non-metaphorical expression being translated by a conceptual metaphor (5th type).

15. **ST**: Winston didn't know why Withers **had been disgraced**. (p. 48)

TT: Winston nije znao zašto je Withers **pao u nemilost**. (p. 53)

This set of sentences also differs in metaphor expression. While the ST does not contain a metaphor, it can be found in the TT in the form of an orientational metaphor BAD IS DOWN (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). Therefore, the fifteenth set of sentences represents the fifth metaphor translation type in which a non-CM is translated by a CM.

16. **ST**: He had no subjects of conversation except the principles of Ingsoc, and **no aim in life except the defeat** of the Eurasian enemy and the hunting-down of spies, saboteurs, thought-criminals and traitors generally. (p. 50)

TT: Nije znao za drugi predmet razgovora osim načela Anglosoca i **nije imao drugog cilja u životu do poraza** eurazijskog neprijatelja i otkrivanja špijuna, sabotera i izdajnika uopće. (p. 55)

It is possible to notice the use of the same structural metaphor in both sentences above. The ST and the TT both contain a conceptual metaphor TRYING TO SOLVE A PROBLEM IS SHOOTING AT A TARGET (*Conceptual Metaphor Homepage*, 1994). The intention to solve a problem is structured in terms of the ability to reach the center of a target and thus includes an element needed for this process to occur – shooting. Due to the fact that both of the texts contain the same CM with the same expression, this is an example of the first metaphor translation type.

17. **ST:** 'Of course we **can't afford to take chances**,' agreed Winston dutifully. (p. 60)

TT: Razumije se, **ne smijemo ništa riskirati** – složio se Winston spremno. (p. 67)

The ST is a sentence example in which a structural metaphor ACTION IS CONTROL OVER POSSESSIONS. Despite this CM's property of being highly developed, the tendency to construct actions in terms of possessions is highly unusual (*Conceptual Metaphor Homepage*, 1994). Nonetheless, this metaphor is clearly strongly entrenched in both languages considering the fact that both sentences contain the same CM with a slightly different expression, rendering it the 1st metaphor translation type.

18. **ST:** It was the **type that seemed to flourish** best under the dominion of the Party. (p. 63)

TT: Bio je to **tip koji**, izgleda, najbolje **cvjeta** pod vlašću Partije. (p. 70)

PEOPLE ARE PLANTS is a structural metaphor ingrained in both sentences. Stages of human life are in such metaphors are conceptually connected with plant life cycle (*MetaNet Metaphor Wiki*, 2016). This metaphor is present in both instances and therefore it can be classified under the 1st translation type (CM→CM with the same expression).

19. **ST:** **The old man brightened** again. (p. 94)

TT: **Starcu se iznenada razvedrilo lice**. (p. 100)

The ST and the TT both contain the same structural metaphor. The CM MOOD IS WEATHER is a metaphor in which the elements from the source domain, *weather*, are mapped onto the target domain, *mood*. Żołnowska (2011) offers a more specified metaphor, ANYTHING THAT SHINES IS HAPPINESS, which could be applied to the metaphor in question. Due to the repetition of the same CM, this example can be classified under the 1st type of metaphor translation. The expression is not completely the same in both examples considering the fact that the translation contains an additional clarification denoting the location where the process of brightening occurs – the face. Despite that, both expression contain the same CM.

20. **ST:** It is impossible **to see reality** except by looking through the eyes of the Party. (261)

TT: Nemoguće je **vidjeti zbilju** osim gledajući kroz oči Partije. (p. 271)

UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING is a CM metaphor found in ST as well as TT. As Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 47) explain that “metaphors partially structure our everyday concepts”, and such a concept is the ability to see as well. In this case it is applied to the concept of understanding and the more one sees, the more one understands. The final set of examples is yet another instance of the 1st metaphor translation type in which a CM is translated by the same CM with the same expression.

7. Conclusion

Despite the common belief that metaphors are only a feature of poetry and rhetoric, cognitive linguistics and conceptual metaphor theory prove that they are a matter of everyday communication. Conceptual metaphors reflect the way humans understand complex, abstract notions around them, largely depending on the culture and conceptual system they belong to. Considering their qualities related to various cultures and conceptual systems, it is only natural that they represent a certain type of a challenge for translators. Therefore, a number of modes for the translation of conceptual metaphors exist and they mainly focus on the transfer of meaning from one language to another.

The aim of this paper was to explore the use of conceptual metaphors in George Orwell's *1984* and its translation into Croatian. A special emphasis was put on the observation of modes according to which a certain metaphor is converted from source text to target text. In my corpus, consisting of 20 randomly selected metaphorical expressions from the novel, the most common translation type is the one in which a conceptual metaphor is translated by the same conceptual metaphor, predominantly with the same expression. Such instance occurs in 14 out of 20 cases. The translation type that occurred significantly less often, 3 times, is a non-metaphor being translated by a conceptual metaphor. Following closely behind with only 2 occurrences is the type demonstrating from a conceptual metaphor in source text to a non-metaphor in target text. The type where a certain conceptual metaphor is converted to another with a similar meaning occurred just once. In this corpus, there were no instances of metaphor deletion in the target text, nor cases where a metaphor only occurred in target text with no indication of it in the source text. Furthermore, the most common metaphor type, used in 10 out of 20 randomly selected sentence pairs in *1984*, were structural metaphors. Ontological and orientational metaphors were equally distributed in the rest of the texts.

Orwell's novel, *1984*, exemplifies how conceptual metaphors can reflect everyday communication in literature too. Based on cultural identity and comprehensive knowledge about the world, they represent an omnipresent feature of language by means of which one verbally or textually expresses their thoughts, ideas and opinions. Therefore, the process of translation can also be viewed as a property denoting the similarities and differences in the English and Croatian language, as well as the corresponding conceptual systems.

References

- Bednáríková, M. (2013). *Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Słowaków w Polsce.
- Berlin, B., Kay, P. (1969). *Basic color terms: Their universality and evolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coulson, S., Cánovas, C. (2009). Understanding Timelines: Conceptual Metaphor and Conceptual Integration. *Cognitive Semiotics*, 5 (1 - 2), 198 - 219.
- Fowler, R. (1995). *The Language of George Orwell*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Hills, D. *Metaphor*, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/metaphor>
- Kövecses, Z. (2002/2010) *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*, London/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2004). *Metaphor and Emotion. Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2014). Conceptual metaphor theory and the nature of difficulties in metaphor translation. *Tradurre Figure/translating figurative language*, 25-39.
- Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980). Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 77 (8), 453 – 486.
- Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by: with a new afterword*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Littlemore J. (2009). ‘Eyebrow heads’ and ‘yummy mummies’: *Metaphor and Second Language Learning*. In: *Applying Cognitive Linguistics to Second Language Learning and Teaching*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McInnis, R. G., Turner, M., (1984). A Reader's Guide To George Orwell's 1984. *Reference Services Review*, Vol. 12 Iss 1 pp. 89–97
- metaphor - Definition, pictures, pronunciation and usage notes* | Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary at [OxfordLearnersDictionaries.com](https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/metaphor?q=metaphor). (n.d.). <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/metaphor?q=metaphor>
- metaphor* | *Origin and meaning of metaphor* (n.d.). Online Etymology Dictionary. <https://www.etymonline.com/word/metaphor>

- metaphor*. (n.d.). Cambridge Dictionary. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/metaphor>
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Ostroški Anić, A. (2015). Od izvorne do ciljne domene na deset načina (Stanojević, Mateusz-Milan (ur.). 2014. *Metafore koje istražujemo: suvremeni uvidi u konceptualnu metaforu*. Srednja Europa. Zagreb.). Rasprave: *Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 41 (1), 208-214.
- Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(7), 1253–1269.
- Schmidt, G. (2012). *A cognitive-linguistic approach to the translation of metaphor from English into Croatian* (Doctoral dissertation). Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- Semino, E., Steen, G. (2008). *Metaphor in Literature*. In: *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge University Press.
- Simon-Vandenberg, A. M. (1993). Speech, music and dehumanisation in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: a linguistic study of metaphors. *Language and Literature*, 2(3), 157–182.
- Steen, G., Dorst, A., Herrmann, J., Kaal, A., Krennmayr, T. (2010). Metaphor in usage. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 21(4), 765-796.
- Šarić, Lj., Nedelcheva, S. (2015). The verbal prefix o(b)– in Croatian and Bulgarian: The semantic network and challenges of a corpus-based study. *Suvremena lingvistika*, 41 (80), 149-179.
- Toury G (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Van den Broeck, R. (1981). The Limits of Translatability Exemplified by Metaphor Translation. *Poetics Today*, 2(4), 73-87.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Żołnowska, Izabela (2011). Weather as the source domain for metaphorical expressions. *Avant: Trends in Interdisciplinary Studies*. 2 (1), 165-179.
- Orwell, G. (2008). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books.
- Orwell, G. (2015). *1984*. Koprivnica: Šareni dućan. Translated by Antun Šoljan.
- Conceptual Metaphor Home Page. (1994, March 22). <http://www.lang.osaka-u.ac.jp/%7Esugimoto/MasterMetaphorList/MetaphorHome.html>

MetaNet Metaphor Wiki. (3 January 2018).
https://metaphor.icsi.berkeley.edu/pub/en/index.php/MetaNet_Metaphor_Wiki_2016

Appendices

Appendix 1: Abbreviation list

CM – conceptual metaphor

CMT – conceptual metaphor theory

L2 – second language

SL – source language

ST – source text

TL – target language

TT – target text

Appendix 2: Metaphors from ST and TT with metaphor translation type

METAPHOR FROM ST	METAPHOR FROM TT	TRANSLATION TYPE
within the field of vision	u vidnom polju	1 st (CM→CM)
to squeeze out some memory	iz sjećanja iscijediti neku uspomenu	1 st (CM→CM)
his face turned scarlet	lice mu se zajapurilo	3 rd (CM→non-CM)
his mind slid away	duh mu je kliznuo	1 st (CM→CM)
had suggested to him	njemu je palo na pamet	2 nd (CM→CM1)
running inside his head	teče u glavi	1 st (CM→CM)
blue with fright	poplavila od straha	1 st (CM→CM)
venomous attack	otrovni napad	1 st (CM→CM)
the Hate rose	Mržnja je porasla	1 st (CM→CM)
(he) seemed to tower it up	(on) bi u njegovim očima porastao	1 st (CM→CM)
the structure of civilisation	tkivo cijele civilizacije	5 th (non-CM→CM)
sucked down to death	dubina usisavala u smrt	1 st (CM→CM)
his memory was not under control	svojim pamćenjem nije ovladao	3 rd (CM→non-CM)
statistics were a fantasy	statistika je bila plod mašte	5 th (non-CM→CM)
had been disgraced	pao u nemilost	5 th (non-CM→CM)
no aim in life	nije imao drugog cilja u životu	1 st (CM→CM)

can't afford to take chances	ne smijemo ništa riskirati	1 st (CM→CM)
the type that seemed to flourish	tip koji, izgleda, najbolje cvjeta	1 st (CM→CM)
(he) brightened	(njemu) se razvedrilo lice	1 st (CM→CM)
to see reality	vidjeti zbilju	1 st (CM→CM)

Appendix 3: Metaphor translation type frequency in the corpus

METAPHOR TRANSLATION TYPE	NUMBER OF OCCURENCES (20)
1 st (CM→CM)	14
2 nd (CM→CM1)	1
3 rd (CM→non-M)	2
4 th (CM→0)	0
5 th (non-M→CM)	3
6 th (0→CM)	0

Appendix 4: Metaphor type frequency in the corpus

METAPHOR TYPE	NUMBER OF OCCURENCES (20)
Orientational	5
Ontological	5
Structural	10