

Teresa Maria Włosowicz

University of Economics and Humanities in Bielsko-Biała/Poland

The translation of metaphors in a linguistics publication, as exemplified by the Polish, German and French translations of *Metaphors We Live By*

Abstract

The translation of metaphors in a linguistics publication, as exemplified by the Polish, German and French translations of *Metaphors We Live By*

The study analyses and compares the Polish, German and French translations of Lakoff and Johnson's book *Metaphors We Live By*. Being a specialist publication in linguistics, it requires particular precision in translation. Special attention is paid to the ways of rendering metaphors in the target languages (TLs), simultaneously preserving the underlying concepts and making them sound natural to TL readers. As the results show, the translators managed to preserve most of the metaphors making the necessary changes, so the TL examples of metaphors can be said to be both equivalent to the SL ones and adequate in the TL.

Keywords: metaphors, translation, informative text, equivalence, adequacy

1. Introduction

The present study investigates the procedures adopted by the Polish, German and French translators of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's (1980) book *Metaphors We Live By* in the translation of metaphors, both in the generic names applied to the underlying conceptual metaphors (e.g. *Time is money*, *Happy is up*, etc.) and in the example sentences illustrating them. A functional approach based on Reiß and Vermeer's (2014) Skopos theory is adopted, taking into consideration both the TL equivalents of the sentences containing the metaphors and their adequacy to the skopos, i.e. the purpose of the translation. As the book

constitutes an academic publication in linguistics, the examples of metaphors in their sentence contexts had to be translated with great precision, so as to preserve the metaphorical character of the English expressions discussed by Lakoff and Johnson and, at the same time, to sound natural in the target languages (TLs), showing TL readers that many everyday expressions are indeed metaphorical.

In general, translating metaphors is challenging as they cannot be interpreted literally and in a different language a similar conceptual metaphor may be expressed by different linguistic means. The cross-cultural productivity of the metaphors discussed by Lakoff and Johnson has been studied by Monti (2009) for three Romance languages: French, Italian and Spanish, and by de Nijs (2015) for Dutch, a Germanic language. As Monti (2009: 214) observes, the *time is money* metaphor is shared by all three languages due to their cultural proximity. However, the conduit metaphor *Ideas (or meanings) are objects, Linguistic expressions are containers and Communication is sending* (Reddy 1993; in Monti 2009: 212), though shared by them too, shows less productivity and more variation (Monti 2009: 214), and the metaphors *foreseeable future events are up and finishing is up* are even less productive and non-existent in the three Romance languages respectively (Monti 2009: 217). On the other hand, de Nijs (2015) compared the presence of the Dutch translations of selected English conceptual metaphors (*Time is money*, the conduit metaphor (*Ideas (or meanings) are objects, Linguistic expressions are containers and Communication is sending*) and *Argument is war*), taken from the Dutch translation of *Metaphors We Live By, Leven in Metaforen* (1999, in de Nijs 2015: 29) in two corpora, one of spoken and one of written Dutch, and their acceptability as rated by the respondents in her study, i.e. fifty native speakers of Dutch aged between 18 and 72. As she concludes, although these metaphors are not very often used in Dutch, given their limited presence in the corpora, they are understood by native Dutch speakers, which demonstrates their productivity and shared conceptual representations, even though their linguistic representations may differ (de Nijs 2015: 57).

The present study, on the other hand, analyses the translation of the metaphors contained in Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* into a Slavic language (Polish), a Germanic one (German), and a Romance one (French). It might be assumed that both cultural and linguistic differences led to even greater differences between the three TL versions than in Monti's (2009) and de Nijs's (2015) studies. However, here the focus is not so much on the cross-cultural productivity of the metaphors, but on the procedures actually used by the translators, though their choices must undoubtedly have been driven by cross-cultural productivity. Moreover, Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 3) posit that not only are metaphors present in our daily lives, but they indeed also govern our conceptual

system and, consequently, our thought and action. Therefore, the TL sentences containing the same conceptual metaphors cannot be literal, gloss translations of the SL English examples, but they must sound natural to the TL readers in their respective native languages. Special attention is thus paid to how the translators coped with the differences, so as to preserve the conceptual metaphors, employing idioms and expressions used in Polish, German and French.

2. The translation of metaphor

2.1. Metaphors in language

In general, metaphors are often associated with literature, especially poetry and, indeed, original, creative metaphors can evoke unusual images and liven up the language (Newmark 1985: 296). However, they play other roles as well. As has been noted above, Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 3) regard them as an inherent component of the conceptual system, used in thinking and reflected in language. Newmark (1985: 295) enumerates three functions of metaphor: first, describing entities, events, concepts, states, etc. in a more vivid, concise, but simultaneously more complex way than in literal language; second, entertaining and pleasing the recipient aesthetically, also to draw his or her attention to a “physical” subject and to provide a clarification; and third, pointing out a resemblance between seemingly different objects; but, as he remarks (Newmark 1985: 295), “this is more often the process and procedure rather than the purpose of metaphor.”

Metaphor can be defined as “a type of semantic extension” (Taraszka-Drożdż 2016: 175). Following Langacker (2000), Taraszka-Drożdż (2016: 175–176) explains that such an extension is based on a comparison between two entities: the standard (the point of reference, for example, “pig” in: “You greedy pig, you ate all the candy!”¹) and the target (here, the person being compared to a pig), where “the standard and target represent different domains of experience” (Taraszka-Drożdż 2016: 176). As Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 5, original emphasis) observe, “[t]he essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.”

Newmark (1985: 299) distinguishes five types of metaphor: dead, cliché, stock, recent, and original. Dead metaphors are lexicalised and deep-rooted in language, so they are not dealt with by translation theory which focuses on conscious decisions and not on the mechanics of language (Newmark 1985: 301). Examples include the verb “reflect” in the sense of “think”, “dog” as a “mechanical device for holding, gripping, fastening [...]” (Newmark 1985: 301), or “foot” (“pied” in French) in “au pied de la lettre” (to the letter). Some dead metaphors can be

1| <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/pig>.

brought to life in certain contexts, such as “high on the social scale”, as distinct from “large-scale” (Newmark 1985: 302). Cliché metaphors are defined as stereotyped collocations of two kinds: “figurative adjective plus literal noun” (e.g. “filthy lucre”) and “figurative verb plus figurative noun” (e.g. “stick out a mile”, Newmark 1985: 302). While clichés can be removed in the translation of an informative text, in expressive texts, authoritative statements, regulations, etc., they should be retained. Stock metaphors are also quite conventional and often involve idiomatic expressions (e.g. “he plays second fiddle”) or build on the connotations of words (e.g. “birth” as “awakening”, Newmark 1985: 304). They are often coined by one person and later spread in speech, writing, and the media (Newmark 1985: 306). Recent metaphors are metaphorical neologisms which may be fashionable, e.g. “a tug of love” (Newmark 1985: 312). Finally, original metaphors are used in a creative way, for example, in expressive texts such as poetry.

From a cross-linguistic perspective, the images evoked by metaphors are undoubtedly diverse, for example, the physiological reactions associated with anger vary from a higher body temperature and blood pressure in English and Hungarian (Kövecses 2010: 203) to the presence of pressure in Chinese (Yu 1998, in Kövecses 2010: 203). However, some conceptual metaphors such as *happy is up*, are (near-) universal, which Kövecses (2010: 199–200) attributes to “universal bodily experience,” for example, turning up the corners of the mouth while smiling. Thus, while some metaphors are culture-specific and may require indirect translation procedures including a translator’s note, others can quite easily be rendered in the TL by resorting to word-for-word translation, or the use of equivalent idiomatic expressions.

2.2. Procedures used in translating metaphors

For the translation of metaphors Newmark (1985: 304–311) proposes eight procedures. The first one involves “[r]eproducing the same image in the TL” (Newmark 1985: 304) as long as that image is comparable in frequency and use, e.g. “ray of hope” – “rayon d’espoir.” Second, the SL image may be replaced by a standard TL image compatible with the TL culture, e.g. “to have other fish to fry” – “avoir d’autres chats à fouetter” (literally: to have other cats to whip). This resembles Vinay and Darbelnet’s (1995: 38) procedure of equivalence, which involves translating idioms, proverbs, onomatopoeias, etc., by standard TL equivalents. The third procedure is the use of a simile that retains the image, e.g. “La fénicie è Dorabella” (Cosi fan tutte, in Newmark 1985: 308) – “Dorabella is like the Phoenix of Arabia.” Fourth, a simile plus sense emphasises the gloss rather than achieving an equivalent effect, e.g. “C’est un renard” – “He is as sharp and cunning as a fox” (Newmark 1985: 309). In fact, this procedure requires adding a sense component for the purpose of clarification, e.g. “C’est un bœuf pour le travail” (literally: This is an ox for work) – “He’s a glutton for work.” Fifth, in the conversion of metaphor to

sense, the metaphorical element is replaced by a non-metaphorical one, e.g. “She is as good as gold” – “Sie ist sehr artig” (She is very well-behaved). Sixth, the modification of a metaphor is employed in non-expressive texts if the SL metaphor sounds bizarre or exaggerated, e.g. “bruciare all’altare” (to burn on the altar) – “to sacrifice” (Newmark 1985: 310). Seventh, a metaphor can be deleted completely; and eighth, it can be combined with sense, as in James 3.6 “The tongue is a fire,” where a translator may add: “A fire ruins things; what we say also ruins things” (Beckman/Callow 1974, as cited in Newmark 1985: 311).

The latter procedure is a case of explicitation, or adding an element that makes explicit something that is implicit in the SL text, or in some other way clarifies a SL element. Klaudy and Károly (2005: 15) provide such examples of explicitation as adding new meaningful elements in the TT (target text), replacing a more general SL unit with a more specific TL one, distributing the meaning of a SL unit over several TL units, where such units may be words, phrases or even sentences, and extending SL phrases to form TL clauses. By contrast, implicitation can involve using a TL unit with a more general meaning, combining “the meanings of several SL words in one TL word” (Klaudy/Károly 2005: 15), dropping meaningful elements, conjoining several sentences into one, and reducing SL clauses to TL phrases.

Moreover, while translating a text from a different culture, a translator is often faced with elements which may require domestication or, conversely, foreignisation. Following Schleiermacher’s lecture (1813/1838), Venuti (1995: 20) distinguishes between a domesticating method or “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home,” and a foreignising one characterised by “an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register a linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad.” While Venuti (1995: 20–24) clearly advocates the foreignising approach, the choice of the method, arguably, depends on the intended TL readership, the purpose of the translation, etc., which will be further discussed in Section 3. In the case of metaphors, retaining a SL metaphor, however strange it might seem in the TL, might be regarded as foreignisation, while using a standard TL image might be interpreted as domestication. In context, domestication might also affect a cultural reference accompanying the metaphor, such as a proper name serving as the source.

3. The translation of academic publications from a functional point of view

In general, the approach to the translation of a particular text largely depends on the text type. Reiß and Vermeer (2014: 182–183) distinguish three text types:

the informative type, which aims to convey information, knowledge, news, etc., and is associated with the representational function of language (e.g. operating instructions, a research report), the expressive type, related to the expressive function of language and conveying artistically organised content (e.g. a poem), and the operative type, associated with the appellative function and aiming to persuade the recipient to act in a certain way (e.g. a propaganda pamphlet). Following this distinction, academic publications can be classified as informative texts and in translation into a foreign language this function does not change. Therefore, the translators of *Metaphors We Live By* had to preserve its informative character and convey the conceptual metaphors in such a way as to illustrate Lakoff and Johnson's arguments with appropriately formulated and easily comprehensible examples.

According to Reiß and Vermeer's (2014: 85, original emphasis) Skopos theory, "[a] translational action is governed by its purpose." At the same time, every translation is performed with a specific audience in mind and, even though the translator may not know the individual recipients, he or she translates, for example, for an educated audience (Reiß/Vermeer 2014: 77). Another factor is "the manner the target culture expects the information to be offered" (Reiß/Vermeer 2014: 77), for example, using a conventional style, adapting it for the intended audience such as children, adding politeness formulae, etc.

In fact, the importance of the audience was already raised by Nida (1964/2000: 128), who pointed to the different decoding abilities of children, newly literate adults, and specialists, as a criterion for preparing a translation. He also emphasised the purpose of a translation, which dictates the need for adaptation, the focus on conveying information or, conversely, evoking emotions, etc. (Nida 1964/2000: 128). Given the different text types and translation purposes, he distinguished between formal equivalence, which "focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content" (Nida 1964/2000: 129), and dynamic equivalence, which "aims at complete naturalness of expression" and where "the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message" (Nida 1964/2000: 129). In particular, it seeks "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message" (Nida 1964/2000: 136), as perceived by the TL audience.

Taking into consideration the priority of the purpose of a translation, Reiß and Vermeer (2014) propose a distinction between equivalence and adequacy. Adequacy is defined as "the relationship between a source text and a target text, where consistent attention is paid to the purpose (*skopos*) of the translation process" (Reiß/Vermeer 2014: 127, original emphasis). Thus, if the requirements of the purpose are met, the translation is adequate. On the other hand, equivalence is considered at the level of the SL and the TL cultures rather than the purpose

of translating a particular text. Reiß and Vermeer (2014: 128, original emphasis) define equivalence as “*the relationship between a target text and a source text which (can) achieve the same communicative function at the same level in the two cultures involved*” and, in this respect, it constitutes “a particular kind of adequacy,” where the skopos requires the SL and the TL texts to perform the same function.

With regard to linguistics publications such as *Metaphors We Live By*, their translations are supposed to achieve both equivalence and adequacy. They are intended for specialists in the field (and students aiming to become specialists), and their purpose is to describe specific language phenomena in a clear and informative way. The effect on the TL reader is not an emotional reaction, but rather his or her gaining or updating knowledge of a given topic and, however exotic the examples might be, the text must be comprehensible and facilitate the integration of information in the recipients’ minds.

4. The analysis of the translations

4.1. The material under analysis

The material analysed in the present study comprises the English original of *Metaphors We Live By*, written by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980), and its Polish translation *Metafory w naszym życiu* by Tomasz P. Krzeszowski (2010), the German one, *Leben in Metaphern. Konstruktion und Gebrauch von Sprachbildern*, by Astrid Hildenbrand (2011), and the French one, *Les métaphores dans la vie quotidienne*, by Michel de Fornel and Jean-Jacques Lecerclé (1985).

The analysis focuses on the ways of rendering the conceptual metaphors underlying the different idiomatic expressions, phrases, etc., used in daily life (e.g. happy is up, sad is down, argument is war, etc.), as well as the sentences illustrating the use of those metaphors in context. 81 conceptual metaphors are analysed, as well as 641 English example sentences and their TL translations. While all three TL versions have kept the 81 conceptual metaphors, the numbers of example sentences vary from one language to another, as some of them have been omitted as untranslatable and others have been added, which may not be translations of English sentences but which illustrate the same metaphors. Hence, the analysis covers 623 Polish example sentences, 640 German ones and 594 French ones. As omission is also regarded as a translation procedure (“deletion” in Newmark’s terminology, but here not only is the metaphor deleted but the whole sentence containing an untranslatable expression is omitted), the numbers of items included in the calculations, including omissions, are 657 for Polish, 642 for German and 646 for French.

While the translators can be assumed to have done their best to demonstrate the universality of the conceptual metaphors using representative TL examples,

the TLs differ considerably and, consequently, some of the SL images had to be replaced by other images associated with the same conceptual metaphors in the TLs. It must be remembered that the metaphors were not translated in isolation but in context, that is why the whole sentences are analysed, as finding a TL expression conveying the SL metaphor was not always straightforward and some changes had to be made.

4.2. Research questions and method

The research questions the study attempts to answer are as follows: First, what translation procedures did the translators use to render the conceptual metaphors and the sentences presenting them in context in the respective TLs? Second, what differences can be observed between the three translated versions of the book, and to what extent are they statistically significant?

The methods employed here are both qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative analysis focuses on the translation procedures used in the TL versions and their potential effects on the TL reader, whereas the quantitative one calculates the percentages of the different translation procedures in each TL version, followed by a chi-square test aiming to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Polish, German, and French versions. It is assumed that such differences are attributable to conscious decisions on the translators' part, attempting to illustrate the conceptual metaphors with the best TL examples possible.

As the three TL versions of *Metaphors We Live By* contain a large number of translations of SL sentences, a purely qualitative analysis might focus too much on interesting examples which might not necessarily be generalisable to the whole sample (Dörnyei 2007: 41), thereby failing to reveal any tendencies in the use of translation procedures. However, given the high complexity of the material, a purely quantitative analysis might offer an oversimplified view of the translation procedures (Dörnyei 2007: 39) and not show how the translators rendered particular metaphors in the TLs. In fact, some TL sentences are difficult to classify unequivocally, as they involve more than one translation procedure, or the procedures used in their translation might be interpreted in more than one way. For the purposes of the quantitative analysis they are placed in the most likely category, but to explain the use of translation procedures selected examples are discussed in a qualitative way. Therefore, a mixed methods analysis is adopted in order to combine the presentation of both representative examples and general tendencies in the choice of translation procedures depending on the language.

Following the classifications of translation procedures proposed by Newmark (1985), Klaudy and Károly (2005) and Venuti (1995), as well as the present author's analysis of the TL sentences, the translation procedures used in

the Polish, German, and French texts are divided into the following eleven categories: (1) the same image in the TL, e.g. He's in *top*² shape (p. 15) – Jest w *szczytowej* formie (p. 42); Er ist in *Höchstform* (p. 23); Il est au *sommet* de sa forme (p. 25); (2) a different TL image, reflecting the same conceptual metaphor, e.g. He's living on *borrowed* time (p. 8) – Seine Tage sind *gezählt* (p. 16) (His days are counted), both expressing the metaphor *time is a limited resource*; (3) a semantic change which may not affect the conceptual metaphor, but either it changes the point of view, shifts emphasis, etc. (as in Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995: 37) modulation procedure), e.g. I *gave* you that idea (p. 11) – To ja ci *podsunąłem* ten pomysł (p. 38) (=It was I who gave you this idea); Die Idee hast du von mir *bekommen* (p. 19) (=You got the idea from me); C'est moi qui t'ai *donné* cette idée (p. 21) (=It was I who gave you this idea), or it includes a change of tense, person, gender, etc., e.g. That was a *brilliant* remark (p. 48) – C'est une remarque *brillante* (p. 57) (=That is a brilliant remark); (4) domestication: unlike in (2), where a standard or more usual TL image is used instead of the SL image, domestication is used here to refer to the change of a cultural reference, e.g. *Casey Stengel* won a lot of pennants (p. 38) – *Piechniczek* pokonał Hiszpanię (p. 70) (=Piechniczek defeated Spain); *Franz Beckenbauer* hat viele Pokale gewonnen (p. 49) (=Franz Beckenbauer won a lot of cups); *Hidalgo* a gagné beaucoup de coupes (p. 47) (=Hidalgo won a lot of cups). This may not affect the metaphor, but the sentence becomes more comprehensible to TL readers.

In the case of explicitation (5), meaningful elements are added in the TL version, the sentence becomes longer, or the TL meaning becomes more specific, e.g. *Thank you for your time* (p. 8) – *Dziękuję ci za poświęcony mi czas* (p. 34) (=Thank you for the time devoted to me); *Danke für die Zeit, die Sie sich für mich genommen haben* (p. 16) (more or less: Thank you for the time you have taken the trouble to give me); *Merci de nous avoir donné de votre temps* (p. 18) (=Thank you for having given us your time). Here, thanks to explicitation, the TL sentences sound more natural and the metaphor remains the same. By contrast, the term “implicitation” (6) is used here in reference to removing some elements of the sentence, rendering some elements implicit, shortening the sentence or reducing its meaning, e.g. They are uncontrollably *attracted* to each other (p. 49) – *Coś ich do siebie ciągnie* (p. 84) (=Something attracts them to each other).

Omission (7), as has already been mentioned above, is the procedure of leaving out a SL sentence completely, for example, because no corresponding expression evoking the same or a similar image, exists in the TL, and a literal translation would not make sense. It is sometimes accompanied by a translator's

2| The metaphorical elements in the example sentences are italicised in the original and, consequently, in the translations.

note indicating, for example, that the metaphor *foreseeable future events are up (and ahead)* does not appear to have an equivalent in French (p. 26). As the translators themselves admit, “[i]n contrast to others, this metaphor does not seem to have an equivalent in French” (de Fornel/Lecercle 1985: 26, the author’s translation).

The opposite procedure is addition (8), where a TL sentence which is not a translation of any SL sentence is added, for example, to compensate for an omission or to show that the conceptual metaphor is expressed in still another way in the TL, e.g. He *sank* into a coma (p. 15) – Jest *pod* narkozą (=He is under general anaesthesia); *Zatopił się* w rozmyślaniach (=He was deep in thought) (p. 42). While the first sentence is classified as a different image (2), since anaesthesia is a medical procedure, whereas a coma is a state of the body which may be caused by an illness, an accident, etc., not necessarily by an anaesthetic, the second sentence is an addition, as it is absent from the SL text. However, the conceptual metaphor *CONSCIOUS IS UP; UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN* is obviously the same, as being deep in thought involves becoming unconscious of the outside world.

The remaining three categories are very rare and include: (9) a non-metaphorical translation or the failure to recognise the metaphor, e.g. Boy, *the wheels are turning* now! (p. 27) – Coś takiego! Ależ się te *kółka obracają!* (p. 58) (=Boy!/ Fancy that! How the wheels are turning!). The Polish translation seems literal and appears to refer to wheels which have unexpectedly started turning, but another plausible interpretation might be that the wheels are in somebody’s head, which is indeed metaphorical, though the image is not so strong. A possible alternative might be: “No! *Główka pracuje!*” (=Yeah! The little head is working!), which reflects a metonymic relationship between the head and the mind. By contrast, the German translation „Junge, jetzt *kommt* mein Geist aber *in Fahrt!*” (=Boy, now my mind is getting in motion!) (p. 38) is more accurate from the metaphorical point of view and has been classified as category (1), i.e. the same image, but at the same time, the interjection was translated literally as a form of address.

Category (10) is the conversion of metaphor to sense, but as the TL sentences were supposed to contain the conceptual metaphors defined by Lakoff and Johnson, it can only be observed in translations which do not sound metaphorical and might be taken literally as well, e.g. If you *play your cards right*, you can do it (p. 51). – Wenn du geschickt vorgehst, wirst du *das Spiel machen* (p. 65) (=If you act skilfully, you will have the upper hand/the initiative). Unlike the expression “to play one’s cards right,” “geschickt vorgehen” (to act skilfully) does not contain a metaphor related to playing a game, but to compensate for the loss of the metaphor the translator used “*das Spiel machen*” in the second part of the sentence.

Finally, narrowing the sense (11) is a category where a translator used a word which limited the sense of a word, for example, to a part of the SL meaning. Unlike explicitation, where narrowing the sense results in a more specific meaning, here it seems more arbitrary, e.g. I don't approve of the *government's* actions (p. 38) – Ich kann die Entscheidungen der *Regierung* nicht gutheißen (p. 49) (=I cannot approve of the government's decisions). The underlying metonymy Institution for people responsible certainly remains the same, but decisions are only a part of actions. As for the other procedures, such as Newmark's (1985) simile that retains the image and simile plus sense no such examples have been found, so they do not appear in the results.

4.3. Results

First of all, the percentages of the different translation procedures in each TL version were calculated both for the conceptual metaphors and for the example sentences. The results are presented in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: The percentages of the different translation procedures for the conceptual metaphors

Language	Same image	Different image	Semantic change	Explicitation	Implication	Narrowing the sense
Polish	86.42	0	1.23	8.64	2.47	1.23
German	75.31	2.47	6.17	11.11	3.70	1.23
French	82.72	2.47	3.70	8.64	0	2.47

It can thus be seen that translations retaining the same image are clearly dominant in all three languages, which means that the translators largely retained the conceptual metaphors, for example, linguistic expressions are containers (p. 10), wyrażenia językowe to pojemniki (p. 37), sprachliche Ausdrücke sind Gefäße (p. 18), and les expressions linguistiques sont des contenants (p. 20). In fact, the Polish translations include the original English metaphors in square brackets, for instance, miłość to magia [love is magic] (p. 85) as points of reference. However, the percentages were calculated only for the TL versions.

The second most frequent category was explicitation, for example, argument is war (p. 4) – argumentowanie to wojna (p. 30); argumentieren ist Krieg (p. 12) and la discussion, c'est la guerre (p. 14). Given the two meanings of an argument: a discussion and a reason given in a discussion, the translators chose more specific words to render the conceptual metaphor precisely. Changes of the image were less frequent, but an example

might be the mind is a brittle object (p. 28) – die Seele ist ein zerbrechliches Objekt (=The soul is a brittle object) (p. 38), where the image evoked is that of the soul. A more precise equivalent of “the mind” would be “der Geist,” which simultaneously means “the spirit,” which is a possible reason for the translator’s decision. In fact, the adjective “seelisch” can mean both “psychological” and “mental”, like “geistig,” but the collocations vary and, for example, “mentally ill” can be both “geisteskrank” and “seelisch krank,” but “mental work” is only “geistige Arbeit”, not: “*seelische Arbeit”.

The numbers of translation procedures used in the three languages were compared by means of a chi-square test; $df = 12$, $p > 0.7$, which means that the difference is not statistically significant. In other words, there is no significant difference between the Polish, German, and French translations of the conceptual metaphors.

Table 2: The percentages of the different translation procedures for the example sentences

Language	Same image	Different image	Semantic change	Domestication	Explicitation	Implicitation	Omission	Addition	Non-metaph.	Conversion	Narrowing
Polish	59.66	17.05	5.48	1.22	4.11	4.26	5.18	2.28	0.15	0.3	0.3
German	65.11	18.85	4.21	0.93	7.94	2.02	0.31	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
French	60.68	14.4	5.42	1.39	4.95	4.33	8.05	0.62	0	0	0.15

As in the case of the conceptual metaphors, metaphors evoking the same image are the most numerous, followed by “a different image,” which is in most cases the standard TL image evoked by an expression which sounds natural in the TL. Omission is particularly frequent in French, less so in Polish, and actually very rare in German, which may be due to the existence of expressions conveying the SL meanings in the TLs. However, the Polish translator relatively often sought to compensate for the loss of some of the SL metaphors, adding sentences of his own which would sound more natural in Polish, for example, He *dropped* dead (p. 15) – *Padł* martwy (=He dropped dead) (p. 42), and: *Nastąpiło zejście* (= A demise occurred; in addition to “death” or “demise”, the noun “zejście” also means “descent” and evokes the image of a downward movement) (p. 42); We’ll just have to *go our separate ways* (p. 44) – *Musimy się rozstać* (= We must part) (p. 79), *Niech każde z nas idzie swoją drogą* (= Let each of us go his or her way) (p. 79); She *cut* his argument *to ribbons* (p. 48) – *Pocięła*

go na wąskie paseczki (= She cut him in thin stripes) (p. 83) and: *Ucięto wszelką dyskusję* (= All discussion was cut short) (p. 83), etc. While in the first example both the Polish translation of the sentence and the additional one (classified as an addition, see the classification of translation procedures above) evoke the same image, in the second one the sentence “*Niech każde z nas idzie swoją drogą*” evokes the same image, while “*Musimy się rozstać*” is not only an addition but also an implicitation, as parting means separation, but going two separate ways is only implied. In the third example, “*Pocięła go na wąskie paseczki*” is an implicitation, as it is implied that she disproved the opponent’s argument. Yet, the TL sentence is also metaphorical, or, more precisely, metonymic³, as it involves the metonymy *The person for the argument*; obviously, she could not have literally cut her opponent in thin stripes. On the other hand, the sentence “*Ucięto wszelką dyskusję*,” though classified as an addition, as it does not correspond to any sentence in the ST, actually evokes a different image, while the conceptual metaphor *Ideas are cutting instruments* remains the same.

As for semantic changes, again, Polish and French, being more distant from English than German is, required them more often. However, in the French translation some of them seem arbitrary, for example: I’m *insane* about her (p. 49) – Il a failli *perdre la raison* par amour (=He nearly lost his mind out of love) (p. 58), where the first person becomes the third person, the current state of insanity is changed into a nearly realised event in the past, and the reason for the man’s insanity is love rather than a woman, which might also be classified as implicitation (it is implicit that he is in love with a woman). Explicitation is particularly frequent in German and, indeed, the translator relatively often added elements aimed at making the sentences sound more natural in the TL, for example: What’s coming *up* this week? (p. 16) – Was steht diese Woche *auf* dem Programm? (= What is in the program this week?) (p. 24); where the metaphor *foreseeable future events are up (and ahead)* is expressed in German by the verb “*stehen*” (to stand). Another example is: He *fell into* a depression (p. 32) – Er *fiel in* eine tiefe Depression (= He fell into a deep depression) (p. 42).

A chi-square analysis was carried out to determine whether the differences between the TL versions were statistically significant. There were nine categories of procedures, as the least frequent categories: “non-metaphorical,” “conversion of metaphor to sense” and “narrowing the sense,” were combined into one category called “others”. Thus, at $df = 16$, $p < 0.001$, which means that the differences were statistically significant and the use of translation procedures depended on the language.

3| Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 35–40) regard metonymy as a type of metaphor, and this approach is also followed here.

Selected examples of English sentences containing metaphors and their Polish, German and French translations are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Examples of translations of the sentences illustrating the metaphors

No.	English version	Polish version	German version	French version
1.	Love <i>showed</i> in his eyes (p. 50)	Miłość malowała się w jego oczach (p. 86)	In seinen Augen <i>zeigte sich</i> Liebe (p. 64)	L'amour se <i>montrait</i> dans ses yeux (p. 59)
2.	Their marriage is <i>on its last legs</i> (p. 49).	Ich związek się <i>kończy</i> (p. 85).	Ihre Ehe <i>pfeift aus dem letzten Loch</i> (p. 62).	Leur mariage <i>va s'effondrer</i> (p. 58).
3.	I'm <i>a little rusty</i> today (p. 27).	Coś mi się dzisiaj <i>umysł zacina</i> (p. 58).	Mein Gedanken- <i>gang ist heute etwas eingerostet</i> (p. 38).	Je suis un <i>peu rouillé</i> aujourd'hui (p. 37).
4.	His <i>religion tells</i> him that he cannot drink fine French wines (p. 33).	Jego <i>religia zabrania</i> mu pić wino (p. 64).	Seine <i>Religion verbietet</i> ihm, den guten französischen Wein zu trinken (p. 44).	<i>Sa religion lui interdit</i> de boire du vin français (p. 42).
5.	The <i>BLT</i> is a lousy tipper (p. 38).	<i>Hala maszyn</i> ma dzisiaj wolne (p. 70).	Das <i>Schnitzel</i> bringt kaum Trinkgeld ein (p. 49).	<i>La salade niçoise</i> donne des pourboires minables (pp. 46–47).
6.	That's <i>food for thought</i> (p. 47)	To jest <i>pokarm</i> dla ducha (p. 82)	Das ist <i>Nahrung für den Geist</i> (p. 60)	Voici de la <i>bonne nourriture</i> pour l'esprit (pp. 55–56).

In Example 1, the German and the French versions evoke the same image. The Polish version contains a slightly different metaphorical expression which literally means: “Love was painted in his eyes,” but this is the standard TL image. A literal translation, “Miłość pokazywała się w jego oczach” would certainly sound less natural.

In Example 2, the Polish version uses implicitation: their relationship is coming to an end, but no further information is given. Still, being on its last legs, the relationship is really weak and likely to end soon, which is conveyed in the German and French versions, though by means of expressions which evoke different images: an entity deprived of breath or steam and, literally, blowing it out of the last hole, and a building which is likely to collapse respectively.

In Example 3, the metaphor *the mind is a machine* is used metonymically: the speaker is rusty, not his or her mind, which is retained in the French version. In Polish, the mind is not rusty, but it keeps jamming, whereas in German the speaker's train of thought, not the mind itself, is somewhat rusty.

Example 4 retains the same image only in German, where his religion forbids the man to drink fine French wine. By contrast, both the Polish and French translators used implicitation. In Polish, he cannot drink any wine at all, while in the French version he cannot drink French wine, but its quality is not mentioned. Possibly, to a French speaker French wine is fine by definition, so the attribute can remain implicit.

Example 5 is a case of metonymy where a customer referred to as a bacon, lettuce and tomato (BLT) sandwich gives poor tips. In the Polish version, a completely different example of metonymy is used, namely that the machine hall has a day off today, where "the machine hall" stands for the people working there. On the other hand, the German and French translators opted for domestication, changing the BLT to a cutlet and to a *salade niçoise* respectively.

Finally, Example 6 contains a very well-known English expression, "food for thought." In all three translations, expressions evoking the standard TL images are employed, which mean "food for the spirit" rather than for thought. However, while they all convey the metaphor *ideas are food*, there is a slight difference in meaning. Whereas in English "food for thought" is something that provokes reflection or requires consideration, in Polish, German and French the expressions meaning "food for the spirit" can refer to literature, music, etc., which give us spiritual pleasure.

5. Conclusions

To answer the research questions, the following conclusions can be drawn from the analysis: first, the translators used six procedures in the translation of conceptual metaphors and eleven procedures in that of the example sentences. The procedures involved expressions evoking the same image, ones evoking different images (often being the standard TL images), translation with a semantic change, explicitation, implicitation, and narrowing the sense in the case of the conceptual metaphors, as well as domestication, omission, addition, a non-metaphorical translation and conversion of metaphor to sense, in addition to the aforementioned six, in the case of the example sentences. By contrast, no similes retaining the image or similes plus sense were observed, possibly because the *skopos*, or purpose, required the translators to translate the sentences in such a way as to demonstrate the (near-)universality of the metaphors under discussion (in fact, some of them proved not to exist in French or in Polish; in Polish, the metaphor *an instrument is a companion* does not work because of the existence

of the instrumental case, but an example sentence is provided: “*I sliced the salami with a knife*” – “*Pokrajalem salami nozem*” (p. 185). Predictably enough, preserving the same image is the most frequent, as the translators tried to render not only the underlying conceptual metaphors but also the examples illustrating them as accurately as possible. Second, the differences between the three versions are statistically significant in the case of the example sentences, but not in that of the conceptual metaphors, where the use of the different procedures proved comparable. This indicates that, while the conceptual metaphors are largely shared, they are expressed by different linguistic means in English, Polish, German, and French.

It can be concluded that all three translations are both equivalent to the original text and adequate in the respective TLs. Not only do they fulfil the informative purpose of translating a linguistics book on metaphor from English into Polish, German, and French, preserving the conceptual metaphors very well, even though this required changing or modifying the actual examples, but they also sound natural in the TLs because they call to mind images that are familiar to TL readers. They are also equivalent in terms of their communicative functions in the different languages. Indeed, they can serve as reference books for linguists working on metaphor in Polish, French, and German.

Moreover, the present study offers several perspectives for future research. First of all, given the variety and complexity of the translation procedures observed, a more detailed analysis of the examples might shed more light on the similarities and differences between the ways of expressing conceptual metaphors in English, Polish, German and French and, possibly, some other languages into which *Metaphors We Live By* has been translated. Second, following de Nijs’s (2015) example regarding Dutch, the reception of translated metaphors by native speakers of Polish, German and French might be investigated. Third, the translation of conceptual metaphors in *Metaphors We Live By* might be compared with that of the same conceptual metaphors in other texts, for example, novels, poetry or advertisements.

References

Primary sources

- Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago/London.
 Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (1985). *Les métaphores dans la vie quotidienne*. Paris. (Translated by Michel de Fornel and Jean-Jacques Lecercle).
 Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (2010). *Metafory w naszym życiu*. Warszawa. (Translated by Tomasz P. Krzeszowski).
 Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (2011). *Leben in Metaphern. Konstruktion und Gebrauch von Sprachbildern*. Heidelberg. (Translated by Astrid Hildenbrand).

Secondary sources

- Beckman, Joseph/Callow, John (1974). *Translating the Word of God*. Rapids, Michigan.
- De Nijs, Martine Rianne (2015). *Translating Metaphors We Live By. Conceptual metaphors in a cross-cultural setting*. Master's thesis. Leiden. (<https://studenttheses.universiteitleiden.nl/access/item%3A2606877/view>, accessed on 05.05.2022).
- Dörnyei, Zoltán (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford.
- Klaudy, Kinga/Károly, Krisztina (2005). "Implication in translation. Empirical evidence for operational asymmetry in translation." In: *Across Languages and Cultures* 6/1. Pp. 13–28.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2010). "Metaphor and culture." In: *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 2/2. Pp. 197–220.
- Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (1999). *Leven in Metaforen*. Nijmegen. (Translated by Monique Van Dam).
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2000). "A dynamic usage-based model." In: Barlow, M./Kemmer, S. (eds.) *Usage-based Models of Language*. Stanford. Pp. 1–63.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (no date). "Pig". (<https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/pig>, accessed on 07.05.2022).
- Monti, Enrico (2009). "Translating the metaphors we live by. Intercultural negotiations in conceptual metaphors". In: *European Journal of English Studies* 13/2. Pp. 207–221.
- Newmark, Peter (1985). "The translation of metaphor." In: Paprotté, W./Dirven, R. (eds.) *The Ubiquity of Metaphor. Metaphor in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. Pp. 295–326.
- Nida, Eugene Albert (1964/2000). "Principles of correspondence." In: Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London/New York. Pp. 126–140.
- Reddy, Michael J. (1993). "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language." In: Ortony, A. (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge. Pp. 284–324.
- Reiß, Katharina/Vermeer, Hans-Josef (2014). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action. Skopos Theory Explained*. London/New York. (Translated by Christiane Nord).
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich (1813, published in 1838) *Sämtliche Werke. Dritte abteilung: Zur Philosophie, Zweiter Band*. Berlin.
- Taraszka-Drożdż, Barbara (2016). "Lexical and grammatical dimensions of metaphor. A Cognitive Grammar perspective". In: Drożdż, G. (ed.) *Studies In Lexicogrammar. Theory and applications*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. Pp. 175–192.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995), *The Translator's Invisibility. A history of translation*. London/New York.

- Vinay, Jean-Paul/Darbelnet, Jean (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English. A methodology for translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. (Translated by Juan C. Sager and Marie-Josée Hamel).
- Yu, Ning (1998). *The contemporary theory of metaphor in Chinese: A perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam.

Teresa Maria Włosowicz

Wyższa Szkoła Ekonomiczno-Humanistyczna
ul. Sikorskiego 4
43-300 Bielsko-Biała
melomane.plurilingue@gmail.com, twlosowicz@wseh.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-8767-9332