MINISTERUL EDUCAȚIEI
ROMÂNIA
UNIVERSITATEA DE MEDICINĂ, FARMACIE, ȘTIINȚE ȘI TEHNOLOGIE „GEORGE EMIL PALADE” DIN TÂRGU MUREȘ

FACULTATEA DE ȘTIINȚE ȘI LITERE „PETRU MAIOR”

Acta Marisiensis. Philologia
Volume 2 (2020), Issue 1
p-ISSN: 2668-9537, e-ISSN: 2668-9596

sciendo

10.2478/amph-2022-0036

APPLYING COGNITIVE APPROACHES TO STUDY METAPHOR TRANSLATION IN ECONOMIC PRESS ARTICLES

***Daniela Dălălău*[1,2]**

[1]*Teaching Assistant, 'G.E. Palade' University of Medicine, Pharmacy, Science and Technology of Târgu Mureș, Târgu Mureș, Mureș county, 540 142, Romania*

[2]*PhD candidate, "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu, Bulevardul Victoriei 10, Sibiu 550024, Romania*

Abstract: *The purpose of the present paper is twofold - first to highlight the shift of attention from linguistic towards cognitive approaches to metaphor translation within Translation Studies and then to use the procedures advanced within the cognitive framework to analyse a specialised corpus of economic and financial press articles published in The Economist.*

Keywords: *conceptual metaphor, metaphorical expression, metaphor translation, cognitive approach*

1. Linguistic approaches to metaphor translation

In the early days of Translation Studies, scholars forging the new discipline gave little consideration to metaphor, thus only a few of the early works published within the field of translation tackled the issue of metaphor, however this happened only on a few pages. Since the middle of the 1970s, the situation has slowly started to change, and it was Dagut (1976) who published an entire seminal article on metaphor in translation, and who was then followed by Newmark with a series of claims on this subject (1977, 1980, 1985, 1988), van den Broeck (1981), Mason (1982), and Toury (1995).

This body of research focused on addressing questions regarding the translatability of metaphor (i.e. whether or not metaphors can be translated) and translation procedures (i.e. how metaphors should be or are translated). Examining the former, translation researchers highlighted that difficulties may arise due to a number of linguistic and cultural constrains and differences between languages and cultures respectively (e.g. Dagut 1976). Introducing the latter, scholars adopted either a normative approach (elaborating on how metaphors should be translated, e.g. Newmark 1981, 1988) or a descriptive approach (analysing how metaphors are actually translated in real translated texts, e.g. van den Broeck 1981, Toury 1995).

Two of the most common features of all these early studies were their traditional perception of metaphor as a rhetorical device used mainly for embellishing a text, which reduced metaphor to a mere linguistic expression that can render "the object more comprehensively, succinctly and forcefully than is possible in literal or physical language" (Newmark, 1988: 95), and their reliance on terminology borrowed from semantic theories such as 'image' or 'vehicle', which were used for the conventional

© 2020 Published by University Press, Târgu Mureș, România, 2020. This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

referent, 'object' or 'topic' for the actual unconventional referent, and 'sense', 'ground', or 'tenor' to account for the similarities and/or analogies involved (Schäffner 2004: 1255).

Van den Broeck (1981: 1981: 77) tackles both issues, i.e. the translatability of metaphor and establishing translation procedures. He addresses the issue of translatability by taking into consideration three distinctive aspects – (1) categories of metaphor (lexicalised, conventional and private metaphors); (2) use of metaphor and (3) functions of metaphor in text. Following the tradition of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), which points out that the main task of any translation theory is to describe and explain the solutions identified in actual translated texts, not to prescribe how metaphors should be translated, he suggests three possible translation procedures: (1) translation 'sensu stricto' – which refers to transferring both SL tenor and SL vehicle into the TL; (2) substitution – which implies the replacement of the SL vehicle by a different TL vehicle with more or less the same tenor, and (3) paraphrase – which means using a non-metaphorical expression in the TL for a SL metaphor.

As opposed to van den Broeck's descriptive model, Newmark (1981: 87-91) adopts a prescriptive approach to present his list of translation procedures. Regarding metaphors as translation problems in the ST and focusing on how metaphors should be translated, he provides precise rules and guidelines for metaphor translation, based on his classification of metaphor - dead, cliché, stock, recent, and original (Newmark 1981: 85) and arranges his procedures in order of preference, as listed below:

(1) Reproducing the same image in the TL,
(2) Replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture;
(3) Translation of metaphor by simile, retaining the image.
(4) Translation of a metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense.
(5) Conversion of metaphor to sense.
(6) Deletion, when metaphors are redundant.
(7) Using the same metaphor, combined with sense for enforcing the image.

Newmark's recommendation for translators is to begin with the first procedure and, whenever cultural constrains make this option unsuitable, he advises them to move down the list and select the next suitable option.

Analysing Newmark's list of procedures, Toury (1995: 81) emphasises that these are based on metaphors identified in the ST. Therefore, he posits that by taking into consideration the perspective of the TT, two more procedures can be added to the previous list, i.e. using a metaphor in the TT to render a non-metaphorical expression in the ST, and adding a metaphor in the TT without any linguistic motivation in the ST. As Schäffner (2004: 1257) appositely points out, by adopting the TT perspective, Toury no longer regards metaphor as a translation problem of the ST, but rather as a translation solution in the TT.

2. Cognitive approaches to metaphor translation

The traditional view of metaphor as an ornamental device dominated the studies focusing on metaphor translation for quite a long time, actually fifteen years after Lakoff and Johnson (1980) published their seminal work - *Metaphors we live by* and introduced the conceptual metaphor Theory (CMT), translation studies still failed to look into and apply the advancements of cognitive linguistics in terms of metaphor research as it was "thoroughly at odds with the findings of the Cognitive Linguistics research on metaphor" (Mandelblit, 1995: 485). Since Mandelblit made this observation, scholars studying metaphor in translation (such as Mandelblit 1995, Schäffner 2004, 2012, Al-Hasnawi 2007, Crerar-Bromelow 2008, Schmidt 2015) have started to acknowledge the importance of the insights provided by metaphor studies and have included postulations from cognitive linguistics in their research. Almost twenty years later, while highlighting the possible paths of interaction between translation studies and metaphor studies, Shuttleworth (2014) posits that "it is now virtually inconceivable that a study of metaphor in translation should not take full account of work by scholars specialising in metaphor studies" (2014: 53).

The basic tenet of the CMT advanced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and then refined by Lakoff (1993), which opposes the previous linguistic view, is that metaphors are actually matters of thought and not of language as it has been contended for so long. According to Lakoff (1993: 203), "the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another". Thus, metaphors are defined as cognitive mechanisms which entail a transfer between two

conceptual domains, i.e. the source domain (SD) and the target domain (TD). Within this metaphorical transfer, one conceptual domain (SD) is partially projected or mapped onto a different conceptual domain (TD). This process of mapping allows the TD (which is usually abstract) to be comprehended in terms of the SD (which is usually more concrete) as "the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another." (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 5). This mapping or set of conceptual correspondences between the elements of two conceptual domains in our conceptual system is called by Lakoff and Johnson a conceptual metaphor and it surfaces in language as metaphorical expressions (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 6, Kövecses, 2010: 4).

Another fundamental claim opposing the linguistic tradition is that metaphor is pervasive in our ordinary language, it is definitely not limited to the realm of poetry or rhetoric. To support this claim, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) provide plenty of examples of instantiations of metaphorical thought which surface in our everyday conventional language. They shift attention from the 'poetic', novel metaphorical expressions found mostly in literature towards the bulk of metaphorical expressions used in everyday language, since Lakoff (1993: 246) argues that the former is only "an extension of our everyday, conventional system". It has been proved for quite some time now that metaphor has also permeated specialised languages, including economics and finance, as the examples provided in the paper shall indicate.

Mandelblit (1995) is one of the first translation scholars who gives the cognitive view of metaphor serious consideration and uses the cognitive framework developed within the CMT for the study of metaphor translation. As a result, he advances the Cognitive Translation Hypothesis which distinguishes between two schemes of cognitive mapping conditions, i.e. similar mapping conditions (SMC) and different mapping conditions (DMP). Furthermore, he claims that when mapping conditions are similar in the source and target language, the translator will simply choose an equivalent metaphor in the TL or a simile (if absolutely needed). Conversely, in case the mapping conditions in the two languages are different, the translator will be faced with a challenging and time-consuming situation, in which case he/she can choose to render the metaphor as a simile, a paraphrase, a footnote, an explanation or even omit it in the TL (Mandelblit, 1995: 489-492).

Another noticeable attempt to make a transition in translation studies from the traditional view of metaphor to the (then) contemporary theory of metaphor (Lakoff, 1993) is made by Schäffner (2004). Although she uses the prescriptive list of translation procedures proposed by Newmark (1981) as a starting point, Schäffner adopts a descriptive approach and analyses a series of examples of German into English translations extracted from political discourse from the cognitive perspective of metaphor. Adding valuable insights from the CMT allows her to carry out a more in-depth analysis of the solutions found by translators in those particular cases and to put forth a list of five procedures that she identified. She highlights that her list does not represent 'ready-made solutions' instructing translators how to translate a specific conceptual metaphor, but rather 'observational data' collected during her comparative analysis of the STs and the TTs. Moreover, she underlines that for any hypotheses to be properly formulated more detailed analyses are needed based on a larger corpus. The list of solutions Schäffner (2004: 1267) identified is presented below:

(1) A conceptual metaphor is identical in ST and TT at the macro-level without each individual manifestation (by this she means metaphorical expression) 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.

Furthermore, Schäffner highlights that by examining actual translated texts to describe the actual strategies employed by translators and to explain their effects on readers in the target languages and cultures respectively, Translation Studies can help reveal particular cultural aspects of conceptual metaphors. Such a comparative analysis of metaphors and metaphorical reasoning processes in different languages conducted within Translation Studies can point out potential cultural differences in the conceptual structures, and thus significantly contribute to the study of metaphor (2004: 1264).

Schmidt (2015: 255) points out that Schäffner does not provide a systematic typology of cognitive-based translation procedures and attempts to fill this gap by putting forth a new typology. Just as Schäffner (2004) did, Schmidt (2015) starts from a linguistic model, but instead of choosing Newmark's list of translation procedures, he opts for Toury's typology. The reason behind his decision is the fact that Toury's typology is more complex as it seems "to cover all the theoretical possibilities" (Schmidt, 2015: 256) due to the fact that it also includes the TT perspective. However, he acknowledges that the main drawback of Toury's typology is that it was not developed within the cognitive framework of the CMT. Therefore, to overcome this setback, he adds the pivotal distinction between a conceptual metaphor (**CM**) and a metaphorical linguistic expression (**m**) using the parameters set by Kövecses (2003, 2005). Schmidt's typology (2015: 257) is presented briefly below:

1. (CM → CM)

a. m → m – a metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphorical expression of the same conceptual metaphor with the same mapping and the same meaning

b. m → m' – a metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphorical expression of the same conceptual metaphor with a different mapping and a similar meaning

2. CM → CM1

m → m1 – a metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphorical expression of a different conceptual metaphor with a different mapping and a similar meaning

3. m → non-m – a metaphorical expression is translated by a non-metaphorical expression with a similar meaning (also known as a paraphrase)

4. m → Ø – a metaphorical expression is translated by a zero-element (also known as deletion, omission or zero-translation)

5. non-m → m – a non-metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphorical expression with a similar meaning

6. Ø → m – a zero-element is translated by a metaphorical expression.

Schmidt tested his typology on two corpora, one of literary translations (consisting of the Oscar Wild's novel *The picture of Dorian Gray* as the ST and three of its different translations into Croatian as the TTs) and another of film subtitles (consisting of the dialogues list of a Croatian movie as the ST and a set of English subtitles of that movie as the TT). Based on his analysis, Schmidt reports that the typology he proposed is adequate for the investigation of metaphor translation and points out that no further types were identified. Furthermore, he provides examples from the two corpora for each of the translation procedures described in his typology, except for the last one, i.e. **Ø → m**. This procedure refers to the use of a metaphorical expression in the TT for which no correspondent can be identified in the ST. Schmidt states that he did not identify any examples for this procedure in his corpora, but he decided to maintain it for the completeness of his typology.

Schmidt (2015: 259) emphasises that his typology can be applied for analysing the translation of metaphors in any kind of text either for qualitative or quantitative purposes. Therefore, Schmidt's typology was chosen in this paper to test its reliability for an analysis of the translation of metaphorical expressions identified in a corpus of economic and financial press articles published in *The Economist* between 2011 and 2013, and their translations into Romanian. The analysis we conducted reveals some interesting aspects which are presented briefly below together with a short description of the examples extracted from the corpus for each of the translation procedures.

The first noticeable aspect is that examples were identified for each of the translation procedures proposed in Schmidt's typology, including for the last procedure, the one for which Schmidt reported no examples in his corpus.

The example provided below for the first procedure shows that the conceptual metaphor EURO IS A PERSON was kept in the Romanian translation. Moreover, the metaphorical linguistic expression was retained as well.

1. (CM → CM) / a. m → m

English ST	***Romanian TT***

"***The fate of the euro*** will probably be determined by politics as much as economics." (1a)	"***Soarta monedei euro*** va fi probabil decisă atât de factorii politici, cât și de cei economici" (1b)

The next example illustrates the second procedure. The often-used conceptual metaphor MONEY IS A LIQUID is retained in the TT, but the translator chooses a different metaphorical expression. Thus, the money is no longer ***channelled***, but ***injected*** in the TT.

1. (CM → CM) / b. m → m'

English ST	***Romanian TT***
"… both of them financed by foreign savings ***channelled through*** an undercapitalised financial system." (2a)	"… ambele finanțate din bani străini, ***injectați*** într-un sistem financiar subcapitalizat." (2b) [both financed with foreign money ***injected*** in an undercapitalised financial system.]

The example below shows how the conceptual metaphor in the ST was changed into a different one in the TT, consequently the metaphorical expression is different as well. Despite the fact that the mapping is different, the meaning is similar. The CM in the ST is THE ECONOMY IS A PERSON and the translator chose to render it as THE ECONOMY IS A MACHINE in the TT. However, both **revive** and **restart the engines** imply an interruption of the economic activity which requires that specific actions are taken so that production and growth happen again.

2. CM → CM1 / m → m1

English ST	***Romanian TT***
"… he can ***revive the economy.***" (3a)	"… știe cum ***să repornească motoarele economiei***." (3b) [… he knows how ***to restart the engines of the economy***.]

The examples selected to illustrate the next two translation procedures were extracted from the same article. Procedure 4 (**m → Ø**) appears first in the article and it is then followed by procedure 3 in the next paragraph. These are the only two instances the metaphorical expression **ailing** is used in this ST. The function of the metaphor here is to particularise, to refer to a specific type of banks, thus procedure 4 used the first time the term appears in the text is rather unsuitable. Although procedure 3 entails a loss in terms of metaphorical meaning, it is a much better choice as the readers of the TT get an exact idea of the types of banks the ST makes reference to.

3. m → non-m (demetaphorisation / paraphrase)

English ST	***Romanian TT***
"…to restructure and wind down **ailing banks**…" (4a)	"de a restructura sau a falimenta ***băncile cu probleme***" (4b) [...to restructure and make ***banks with problems*** bankrupt…]

4. m → Ø (deletion / omission of the metaphorical expression)

English ST	*Romanian TT*
"Rescue funds could then be used directly to recapitalise **ailing banks**." (4a)	"Ulterior, fondurile de salvare ar putea fi utilizate pentru recapitalizarea directă a ***băncilor Ø***." (4b) [Afterwards, rescue funds could be used for the direct recapitalisation of **Ø** banks.]

There are cases, as the example below shows, when the translator chooses to use a metaphorical expression even if the corresponding ST is non-metaphorical. Here, **to keep lending money** was rendered as **to keep pouring money**. Thus, the conceptual metaphor MONEY IS A LIQUID is introduced.

5. non-m → m

English ST	*Romanian TT*
"… the willingness of the euro-zone creditors ***to keep lending money to Greece***" (5a)	"… disponibilitatea viitoare a statelor din zona euro de ***a mai turna bani în economia elenă***." (5b) […the future willingness of the euro-zone states ***to keep pouring money into the Greek economy***]

Schmidt (2015) did not find any examples for the next procedure in his corpora, however the example below illustrates that sometimes translators choose to introduce a metaphorical expression in the TT which does not match anything in the ST. In this case, the conceptual metaphor that is introduced is THE MONETARY UNION IS A PERSON.

6. Ø → m

English ST	*Romanian TT*
"**Ø** Monetary union was meant to be a blessing." (6a)	"***Când a luat naștere***, uniunea monetară a fost văzută ca o binecuvântare." (6b) [***When it was born***, the monetary union was seen as a blessing.]

As the examples provided above indicate, all the procedures described in Schmidt's typology were used in the economic and financial articles translated in our corpus. Furthermore, our analysis reveals that Schmidt's typology could be further refined and new procedures could be added, as the examples below demonstrate. As the same CM is retained in the TT, we included the examples below within the first category of procedures, i.e. **1. (CM → CM)** – but we added a new procedure which shows that the same metaphorical expression is used in the TT to which explanatory elements are added. Although different scholars have used different names (e.g. 'same metaphor combined with sense', elaboration or explanation), we chose the term 'addition' used by Chesterman (1997: 30) to describe both examples provided below. In the first example, an attributive adjective that is used non-metaphorically is added to the metaphorical noun rendered in the TT. Sullivan (2013) calls them "domain adjectives" as they clearly point out the target domain. In the second example, a metalinguistic element was added in the TT - ***așa-zisului (so-called)***. The use of the inverted commas in the ST indicates that this is a new metaphor in English. By adding the explanation in Romanian, the translator indicates that this is a borrowed metaphor.

1. (CM → CM) / c. m → m + addition

English ST	*Romanian TT*
"The IMF has improved its 2012 **growth** forecasts" (7a)	"FMI a îmbunătățit estimările de ***creștere economică***." (7b) [The IMF has improved its ***economic growth*** forecasts.]
"This may be the best answer to the "**fiscal cliff**" that looms in 2013." (8a)	"soluție care s-ar putea dovedi cea mai bună în condițiile apropierii ***așa-zisului „vârf fiscal"***, în 2013" (8b) [solution that might prove the best in case of the approach of the ***so-called "fiscal cliff"***]

3. Conclusions

The present paper has highlighted some of the main approaches to metaphor translation that have been developed over time and has focused particularly on analysing the recent trend which applies the cognitive framework within CMT to the study of how metaphors are translated. The shift towards the cognitive approaches leads to a more refined analysis of metaphor translation, which the linguistic framework could not provide. The cognitive approach was used for a specialised corpus of economic and financial press articles and our analysis provided examples for an entire typology of procedures and even identified examples of procedures that might be used to expand the existing models. Although, a more in-depth analysis conducted on a larger corpus is required to support this tentative conclusion, this is a promising starting point for further research.

Primary sources:

(1a) Currency disunion (7th Apr 2012) / (1b) Dezbinarea monetară (16 Apr 2012)

(2a) Comeback kid (14th Jul 2012) / (2b) Copilul-minune se întoarce (23 Jul 2012)

(3a) The silence of the suits (13th Oct 2012) / (3b) Tăcerea gulerelor albe (24 Oct 2012)

(4a) Disunited states of Europe (21st Jul 2012) / (4b) Statele dezbinate ale Europei (1 Aug 2012)

(5a) A Greek exit (26th Feb 2012) / (5b) Exitul Greciei (6 Mar 2012)

(6a) Europe on the rack (30th Jun 2012) / (6b) Europa, în chingile torturii (10 Jul 2012)

(7a) Spain and the euro: Tempestuous times (21st Apr 2012) / (7b) Cerul Spaniei se întunecă (30 Apr 2012)

(8a) Democracies and debt (1st Sep 2012) / (8b) Legătura dintre democrație și datorii (11 Sep 2012)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: the spread of ideas in translation theory*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Crerar-Bromelow, Grace (2008) "Can an Awareness of Conceptual Metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) Aid the Translator in His/Her Task?", in Johannesson, N.-L. and Minugh, D.C. (eds.) Selected Papers from the 2006 and 2007 Stockholm Metaphor Festivals, Stockholm University, pp. 75-84.

Dagut, Menachem (1976). "Can metaphor be translated?" in *Babel* 12 (1): 21-33.

Kövecses, Zoltán. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Zoltán. (2010). *Metaphor. A practical introduction*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, George. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 202-250.

Mandelblit, Nili. (1995). “The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory”. Thelen, Marcel and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.) Translation and meaning, part 3, vol 71. Maastricht: Universitaire Press Maastricht, pp. 483–495.

Mason, K. (1982). Metaphor and translation. Babel 28 (3), pp. 140 − 149.

Newmark, Peter. (1988). *Approaches to Translation*, Cambridge: Prentice Hall.

Schäffner, Christina. (2004). “Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach”, in *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, pp, 1253–1269.

Schäffner, Christina. (2012). “Finding space under the umbrella: The Euro crisis, metaphors, and translation”, in *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 17, pp. 250 – 270.

Schmidt, Goran. (2015). “Applying Conceptual Metaphor Theory in cross-linguistic and translation research”, in Belaj, B. (ed.), *Dimenzije znacênja.* Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet sveucilista u Zagrebu, pp. 243-265.

Shuttleworth, Mark. (2014). “Translation Studies and Metaphor Studies: Possible Paths of Interaction Between Two Well-Established Disciplines”. In Donna R. Miller and Enrico Monti (eds.), Tradurre Figure/Translating Figurative Language. Bologna: Bononia University Press, pp. 53-65.

Sullivan, K. (2013). *Frames and constructions in metaphoric language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Van den Broeck, R. (1981). “The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation.” in *Poetics Today* 2 (4): 73-87.