

Cognitive Linguistics and Translation

Applications of Cognitive Linguistics

Editors

Gitte Kristiansen

Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez

Honorary editor

René Dirven

Volume 23

Cognitive Linguistics and Translation

Advances in Some Theoretical
Models and Applications

Edited by
Ana Rojo and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano

**DE GRUYTER
MOUTON**

ISBN 978-3-11-030199-1
e-ISBN 978-3-11-030294-3
ISSN 1861-4078

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP Catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2013 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: Apex CoVantage, LLC, Herndon, Virginia, USA

Printing and binding: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Author index—vii

Mona Baker

Foreword—xi

Introduction—1

Ana Rojo and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano

Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies: Past, present and future—3

Part I: Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Theory—31

Sandra L. Halverson

Implications of Cognitive Linguistics for Translation Studies—33

Ricardo Muñoz Martín

More than a way with words: The interface between Cognitive Linguistics and Cognitive Translatology—75

Celia Martín de León

Who cares if the cat is on the mat? Contributions of cognitive models of meaning to translation—99

Part II: Meaning and translation—123

Hans C. Boas

Frame Semantics and translation—125

Eva Samaniego Fernández

The impact of Cognitive Linguistics on Descriptive Translation Studies: Novel metaphors in English-Spanish newspaper translation as a case in point—159

Mario Brdar and Rita Brdar-Szabó

Translating (by means of) metonymy—199

Part III: Constructions and translation—227

Elżbieta Tabakowska

(Cognitive) grammar in translation: Form as meaning—229

Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Luna Filipović

Lexicalisation patterns and translation—251

Ana Rojo and Javier Valenzuela

Constructing meaning in translation: The role of constructions in translation problems—283

Part IV: Culture and translation—311

Enrique Bernárdez

A cognitive view on the role of culture in translation—313

Farzad Sharifian and Maryam Jamarani

Cultural conceptualisations and translating political discourse—339

Part V: Beyond translation—373

Michele I. Feist

Experimental lexical semantics at the crossroads between languages—375

Anna Hatzidaki

A cognitive approach to translation: The psycholinguistic perspective—395

Author and Subject Index—415

Language Index—420

Author index

Ana Rojo

Universidad de Murcia
Departamento de Traducción e Interpretación
Campus de La Merced
Plaza de la Universidad 30071 Murcia
Spain
E-Mail: anarojo@um.es

Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano

Universidad de Zaragoza
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Departamento de Lingüística General e Hispánica
Pedro Cerbuna, 12
E-50009 Zaragoza
Spain
E-Mail: iraide@unizar.es

Sandra L. Halverson

Norges Handelshøyskole / Norwegian School of Economics
Institutt for fagspråk og interkulturell kommunikasjon/ Department of Professional and Intercultural Communication
Norwegian School of Economics
Helleveien 30
NO-5045 Bergen
Norway
E-Mail: Sandra.Halverson@nhh.no

Ricardo Muñoz Martín

Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria
Facultad de Traducción e Interpretación
C/Pérez del Toro, 1
35003 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria
Spain
E-Mail: rmunoz@dfm.ulpgc.es

Celia Martín de León

Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria
Facultad de Traducción e Interpretación
C/Pérez del Toro, 1
35003 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria
Spain
E-Mail: cmartin@dfm.ulpgc.es

Hans C. Boas

The University of Texas at Austin
Department of Germanic Studies
2505 University Ave, C3300
Austin, TX 78712-1088
USA
E-Mail: hcb@mail.utexas.edu

Eva Samaniego

Dpto. de Filologías Extranjeras y sus
Lingüísticas
UNED
Despacho 3, planta -2
Senda del Rey s/n
28040 Madrid
Spain
E-Mail: esamaniego@flog.uned.es

Mario Brdar

Josip Juraj Strossmayer University
Faculty of Humanities and Social
Sciences
L. Jägera 9
31000 Osijek
Croatia
E-Mail: mbrdar@ffos.hr

Rita Brdar-Szabó

Eötvös Loránd University
Faculty of Arts
School of Germanic Studies
Rákóczi út. 5.
1088 Budapest
Hungary
E-Mail: ritamario@dravanet.hu

Elżbieta Tabakowska

UNESCO Chair for translation Studies
and Intercultural Communication
Jagiellonian University
ul. Czapskich 4
31-110 Kraków
Poland
E-Mail: [elzbieta.muskat-
tabakowska@uj.edu.pl](mailto:elzbieta.muskat-tabakowska@uj.edu.pl)

Luna Filipović

University of East Anglia
School of Language and
Communication Studies
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Norwich Research Park
Norwich NR4 7TJ.
UK
E-Mail: L.Filipovic@uea.ac.uk

Javier Valenzuela

Universidad de Murcia
Departamento de Filología Inglesa
Campus de La Merced
Plaza de la Universidad 30071 Murcia
Spain
E-Mail: jvalen@um.es

Enrique Bernárdez

Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Facultad de Filología
Departamento de Filología Románica,
Filología Eslava y Lingüística General
Ciudad Universitaria
28040 Madrid
Spain
E-Mail: ebernard@filol.ucm.es

Farzad Sharifian

Monash University
English as an International Language
School of Languages, Cultures and
Linguistics
Building 11
Melbourne, Victoria, 3800
Australia
E-Mail: [Farzad.Sharifian@arts.
monash.edu.au](mailto:Farzad.Sharifian@arts.monash.edu.au)

Maryam Jamarani

School of Languages & Comparative
Cultural Studies
Gordon Greenwood Building,
University of Queensland
Brisbane Q 4072
Australia
E-Mail: maryam.jamarani@monash.
edu

Michelle Feist

Institute of Cognitive Science
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
P. O. Drawer 43772
Lafayette, LA 70504–3772
USA
E-Mail: feist@louisiana.edu

Anna Hatzidaki

Universitat Pompeu Fabra
Center of Brain and Cognition
Speech Production and Bilingualism
Group
Tànger, 122–140
08018 Barcelona
Spain
E-Mail: annh_22@yahoo.com

Mona Baker

University of Manchester
Centre for Translation and
Intercultural Studies
School of Languages, Linguistics and
Cultures
Oxford Road M13 9PL
UK
E-Mail: mona.baker@manchester.ac.uk

Foreword

Translation and interpreting are complex phenomena that have been examined from a variety of perspectives – linguistic, literary, political, social, and cognitive. These perspectives are not mutually exclusive; they complement each other and enrich our understanding of translation and interpreting in a variety of ways.

Translation Studies has often been described as an interdiscipline that thrives on exploring connections and synergies with other fields of enquiry. Although issues of cognition have always attracted considerable attention, especially in interpreting studies, the current volume represents one of the few sustained attempts to explore the interface between Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies from a range of perspectives. It brings a wide range of voices to bear on this important area of enquiry and features a series of detailed theoretical expositions and case studies.

One of the advantages of bringing insights from Cognitive Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology to bear on the study of translation is that cognitive approaches in general place the translator/interpreter – rather than the text – at the centre of enquiry. They also encourage a view of translation as a dynamic, fluid activity that involves several parties and is influenced by a wide range of environmental and other factors, as is evident in Sager's account of the phenomenon (1994: 139):

The process of translation itself constitutes a temporary suspension, of variable duration, of an intended communication process and therefore a separation of the source text from its production environment and the pragmatic meaning that can be associated with it. To justify and sustain this suspension, we must assume a strong initial motivation to communicate or to receive information which cannot be fulfilled in the intended manner because of a language barrier. The need for communication must be considered important enough to wait for the translation to be carried out and to engage other parties, i.e. mediators, to assist. Time and cost factors introduce a certain level of formality into the proceedings and increase the complexity of the task.

Cognitive approaches share Sager's focus on the conditions under which mediation takes place, the manner in which it proceeds, and the various ways in which it is influenced by a wide range of factors – environmental, emotional, linguistic, memory-related, and so on.

Although Translation Studies is widely recognized as interdisciplinary by nature, borrowing concepts and exploiting insights from other disciplines on a regular basis, this interaction must lead to new insights to be worthwhile. Interdisciplinarity does not mean uncritical borrowing or mechanistic copying

of theoretical notions. The current collection of articles demonstrates how sustained engagement with another discipline can provide a platform for innovation and productive critique and offers a glimpse of the insights that Translation Studies is capable of feeding into other disciplines.

Mona Baker
January 2012

Reference

Sager, Juan C. (1994) *Language Engineering and Translation. Consequences of Automation*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Introduction

Ana Rojo and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano

Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies: Past, present and future*

1 Introduction

For more than thirty years now Cognitive Linguists have striven to drift away from generativist attempts to explain linguistic patterns as internal to language. Their endeavours to relate language structure to cognition have contributed to enrich long-established linguistic areas (e.g. lexical semantics, grammar, phonology or discourse studies) with other aspects related to cognition, such as construction grammar, conceptual metaphor and blending, conceptual organisation (e.g. metonymy, Frame Semantics, iconicity), construal and subjectivity or linguistic relativism. In their attempt to connect the study of language to the study of the mind, they have brought linguistics closer to other disciplines such as psychology, sociology, embodied philosophy and cognitive science. This volume contains a collection of papers which discuss the contributions of Cognitive Linguistics to translation, a discipline long kept at bay from structuralist approaches to language.

Before we proceed to describing the contents of the volume, we will summarise the evolution of the relationship between translation and linguistics. This evolution signals the advancements of both disciplines and constitutes the framework which motivates the elaboration of the present volume.

2 Translation and linguistics: A love-hate relationship

Translation and linguistics have always held a love-hate relationship. On the one hand, their relationship has been marked by an irresistible attraction; translation scholars have searched linguistic works for concepts and principles suitable to be applied to translation, and linguists have found in translation an excellent source of examples for language teaching and the contrastive study of language. On the other hand, this attraction has at times turned into mutual dislike; linguists have looked down on translation as a type of second-class

* This research has been funded by grant FFI2010-14903 from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness.

language activity which they have long considered inadequate as a language teaching method and too complex to reveal reliable data on linguistic communication. Meanwhile, translation scholars have reacted to this patronising attitude of linguists with a mutual scornful stance which has highlighted the inability of linguistics to account for the cultural and cognitive aspects of translation. In this section, we describe the evolution of this love-hate relationship in order to show that the principles of Cognitive Linguistics can provide a suitable meeting point where linguistics and translation can finally forget their differences and start working together towards a cognitive theory of language and translation.

2.1 The beginnings: The 1970s and early 1980s

At the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, translation approaches shifted from a traditionally prescriptive methodology to a descriptive one. The earliest linguistic approaches focused on the contrast of the language system overlooking questions related to language use. From Vinay and Darbelnet's *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais* (1958), linguistics became the main analytical tool to systematise translation phenomena. A “bottom-up” methodology was adopted which proceeded from the level of words and covered the different linguistic levels in order to establish a list of translation procedures which helped predict translation errors. The list of procedures varied according to the perspective adopted in the study of the linguistic aspects of translation: from the classical structuralism of Vinay and Darbelnet's contrastive stylistics (1958), to Catford's (1965) Hallidayan systemic-functional grammar, Vázquez-Ayora's (1977) generative grammar or García Yebra's (1982) traditional contrastive linguistics. But irrespective of the linguistic method used, all these academic works have been highly criticised, being repeatedly accused of adopting a contrastive approach in which equivalence at word or sentence level was the central issue. Their use of decontextualised sentences and their lack of attention to communicative factors soon moved these approaches away from the focus of any translation theory.

The endeavours to put an end to the servitude of translation to the source text coincided with the move from contrastive to text linguistics by the mid-1970s and with the acknowledgment of the audience's role brought about in biblical translation (Nida 1964; Nida and Taber 1969). Both in linguistics and Translation Studies the focus of attention moved from the linguistic system to language use, from the individual sign to the text. These approaches based on text linguistics defined translation as a textual operation in which the text

became the central factor in the translation process. Text-based approaches to translation are highly varied; some examples are those by Neubert 1985; Neubert and Shreve 1992; Wilss 1982; Baker 1992 or Hatim and Mason 1990, 1997. But despite the differences, all of them shared a common interest for the textual factors which take part in the translation process, and highlighted the important role context, discourse and pragmatic factors play in such process.

However, the revalued importance of context and pragmatics which was shouted from the rooftops of textual approaches was still inadequate to account for their role in the translation process. In textual approaches context and receptor were still envisioned as text-bound secondary issues, whose main functions were helping disambiguate indeterminate expressions and establish their function within the text. This prime dependency on text still undervalued the primary role of cultural context in literary translation and failed to appreciate the relevance for the translator's decisions of the effect which the function of a translated text has on a given audience. To bridge these gaps, sociocultural and function-based models of translation are developed through the 1980s and 1990s in what has been called the "cultural turn" of Translation Studies.

2.2 The distant past: The 1980s and early 1990s

Function-based models of translation took as their starting point the study of text in a given situation and emphasised the role of the receptor and the communicative situation in which the translated text is received by a given audience. They expanded Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence, contributing to change the focus of attention from equivalence of linguistic units to equivalence of the text's communicative function, which was established in relation to its audience. Among the most radical versions of this type of approach we find Vermeer's (1989) *Skopostheorie* and Holz-Mänttari's (1984) approach. They postulate that the translator is the one who defines the purpose or *skopos* of a given translation on the basis of the receptors it is aimed at and the combination of the other factors which take part in the communicative situation. The function of a translation may differ from that of the source text, since their production processes are different and may, thus, have different communicative purposes. If the communication contexts of both source and target texts are different by nature, the similarity of value which underlies the notion of equivalence becomes obsolete. Instead, they adopt the notion of "adequacy" to the function or purpose which the translated text must fulfil in the target audience's context. Some examples of more moderate versions of functionalist models are those by J. House (1977) and C. Nord (1991, 1997), who adopt a less radical approach

which looks for a compromise between functionalism and faithfulness to the source text. In Nord's opinion, the function of the text depends, on the one hand, on the function receptors decide to assign it, but also on the author's intention.

Sociocultural approaches have a more pronounced literary orientation. Two of the most renowned are Gideon Toury's (1980, 1985) "Polysystem theory" and T. Hermans' (1985) "Manipulation School".¹ In these approaches, translation is defined as a sociocultural, norm-governed activity. Toury argues for the need to establish a descriptive and systematic branch of study which at last puts an end to the prescriptive tendency of linguistic approaches to translation. They adopt Holmes' ([1972] 1988) coinage of *Translation Studies* as the flagship of this new descriptive branch of the discipline. They abandon the linguistic search for invariant meaning equivalents and they propose, instead, a more functional and relational notion of equivalence, with a predominantly dynamic and historical character, which is established between every source text and each of its translations. This concept is established on the basis of what is regarded or not as a translation in a given sociocultural context. The other key notion in these approaches is that of *norm*, which is defined as certain patterns of translational behaviour which determine what translation procedures are considered acceptable in a given historical and cultural context. In each historical period, translations follow the prevailing norms, which are ultimately determined by the reception situation. These approaches have contributed to research translation norms and describe their behaviour in a given system or society. But from a teaching perspective, there is still the need to elaborate a detailed method of description which allows us to carry out a systematic comparison of source and target text. A useful attempt to fulfil this need is that of van Leuven-Zwart (1989, 1990), who, aiming at a more dynamic concept of equivalence, proposes a system which replaces the notion of equivalence for that of *shift*. In this system, shifts are first analysed at the microstructural level (words, phrases and sentences), then their consequences are described at the macrostructural level (characters, facts, time, etc.) and finally they are categorised. In spite of the empirical value of this type of framework to determine the influence of the historical and cultural context in translation, these models exhibited a primarily literary orientation which contributed to widen the gap between literary and non-literary translation.

¹ Other relevant names in this approach are Lambert and van Gorp (1985), Delabastita (1989), Rabadán (1991) or van Leuven-Zwart and Naaijken (1991).

2.3 The immediate past: The 1990s

But despite the recognition of the importance of context and communicative function, translation approaches entered the 1990s with a series of important issues which still needed solving. One of most important questions revolved around the status of the notion of context. The notion of context still had a secondary status which was either tightly bound to text analysis or to the reception situation in literary translation. Something similar happened with the notions of meaning and equivalence. The search for meaning invariants which underlined the notion of equivalence in linguistic approaches implied an “objectivist” view of meaning as something which existed outside the speaker’s mind and in the text, and which could be apprehended and transferred into a different language. Similarly, the notion of translational norms postulated by sociocultural approaches could still be interpreted as a certain tendency to prescriptivism which had not been completely shaken off translation approaches. Moreover, even if one assumed that the ultimate purpose of these norms was descriptive, it could still be argued that translation approaches were focused on pragmatic and sociocultural factors, but lacked explanatory capacity to account for the complexities of translation in relation to general communication and language abilities. To cap it all, the breach between linguistic and literary approaches still remained to be filled. The so-called cultural turn drifted the attention of translation approaches to the cultural context, but for both types of approaches to come together it was still necessary to adopt a common definition of context.

In the 1990s, some translation scholars started to see in the postulates of Cognitive Linguistics (see Section 3 below) a way to answer all these questions which were still pending. The relevance of Cognitive Linguistics for translation arises mainly from the “experiential” notion of meaning proposed by cognitivists, which abandons the traditional notion of referential truth and highlights the central role of human experience and understanding. This type of approach based on experience allows us to bring together thought, language and culture in the speakers’ cognitive context. From such a cognitive perspective, translation is still regarded as a communicative process, although one which is part of the participants’ mental life. All the pragmatic and sociocultural factors underlined by descriptive approaches can be accommodated in cognitive models as part of the interlocutors’ cognitive context. In this way, the notion of context can at last get rid of its burden as a secondary concept to become the prime factor in the translation process. Furthermore, a cognitive approach to translation is provided with enough explanatory capacity to account for the role of human cognitive abilities (i.e. perception, reasoning, information processing and other cognitive mechanisms) in linguistic and translation issues.

In this regard, Gutt (1991) has illustrated the usefulness for translation of Sperber and Wilson's (1995) principle of relevance (which does not belong to Cognitive Linguistics in a strict sense, but is directly related to Cognitive Linguistics postulates). Snell-Hornby ([1988] 1995) has indicated the advantages of applying the notion of "prototype" to translation: placing the different types of texts and translation situations along a continuum which ranges from more to less literal underlies the connections between the different types of translation and contributes to bringing literary and non-literary translation closer. Another cognitive approach which helps to blur the separating line between literary and non-literary translation and between literary and linguistic approaches is Tabakowska's (1993) proposal to exploit Cognitive Grammar notions – specifically, Langacker's (1987) notion of "*imagery*" – in the analysis of literary translation. For her, Cognitive Grammar provides a suitable meeting point between semantics and stylistics, since both of them focus on the study of *construal* as the speaker's choice to conceptualise a given situation in different ways. In this sense, there is not a clear boundary between the concept of *imagery* as a function of everyday language or as creative combination and exploitation of the resources available to the writer. Kussmaul (1995) and Rojo (2000, 2002a, 2002b) have stated the applicability to translation of Fillmore's "Frame Semantics". Kussmaul (1995) has argued that Fillmore's (1982, 1985) initial notion of "scene" has a plastic or pictorial quality that makes it especially useful to help understand abstract terms and find an adequate translation. He has also illustrated the usefulness of the principles of "*foregrounding*" and "*suppression*" of semantic features for the translation of terms with complex meaning. These two principles explain the fact that during comprehension only those semantic features which are relevant in a given context get activated. Extrapolating these principles to translation, Kussmaul states that translators must keep or foreground those features which are relevant in a given context, suppressing or backgrounding the non-relevant ones. Similarly, Rojo (2000, 2002a, 2002b) has illustrated the usefulness of Frame Semantics when translating cultural terms and humour, proposing a notion of equivalence based on the activation of similar frames, which envisages the translator's goal as one of guiding the target text audience along a cognitive or conceptual route similar to that of the source text reader.

The cognitive approaches of the 1990s contributed to a new way to view translation which combined traditional findings with current cognitive notions and real data analysis. They illustrated a general turn of Translation Studies towards a more experimental approach which deviated the attention from description of the translation product to research on the translation process. A similar search for an empirical-experimental approach which could shed some

light on the translation process by using real data analysis was the aim of psycholinguistic approaches to translation (e.g. Séguinot 1989, 1991; Lörscher 1991a, 1991b; Tirkkonen-Condit 1991). This type of approach has mainly provided the description of a series of translation strategies which help understand the translation process better and are useful teaching instruments. They started by following a “retrospective” methodology which established translation strategies on the basis of the comparison between source and target text. Later on, they adopted an “introspective” line of research which aimed at studying the “black box” containing the translator’s mental transference processes. To access this box, they developed a method taken from cognitive psychology which consisted of verbalising the translator’s mental process while translating and recording their result in protocols. This technique was named the *Thinking Aloud Protocol* (TAP) and was sometimes combined with the filming of translators’ eye movements and pupils’ dilation as a reflection of their mental activity. This technique has been highly criticised by many scholars (e.g. Toury 1991: 59; Hatim 2001: 157–161) who have questioned the validity of recordings as a reflection of translators’ mental processes: the data obtained are, after all, indirect and could be somehow affected during the task, since mental production and verbalisation are not simultaneous processes.

2.4 The present: 21st century and beyond

Since the 1990s, translation research has continued to emphasise the cultural turn of Translation Studies (e.g. Bassnett and Lefevere 1998; Bassnett and Bush 2006; Bielsa and Bassnett 2008; Pym 2004; Pym, Schlesinger and Simeoni 2008; Tymoczko 2007) and the need for empirical and experimental methodologies based on real usage data (e.g. Hansen, Chesterman and Gerzymisch-Arbogast 2009; Olohan 2004; Baker 2003, 2004). The search for these types of methodologies has swerved the attention of translation scholars to corpus-based methods which have been used either to investigate those processes which are specific to translation (cf. Olohan 2004), to validate theoretical principles and claims (e.g. Charteris-Black and Ennis 2001; Stefanowitsch 2004), or even with teaching purposes (e.g. Zanettin, Bernardini and Stewart 2003). Moreover, the investigation of the translation process has continued to look for new experimental methodologies which can overcome the shortcomings of TAPs. For example, *Translog*, a computer programme, was developed in 2002 to allow researchers to record the translator’s typing production (i.e. it records all the keystrokes, including all changes, deletions, additions, cut-and-paste operations and cursor movements). By logging information about the exact time at which

each keystroke operation is made, the programme allows you to create a linear representation of an entire typing event (including changes) with a graphic and/or numerical representation of the duration of any pauses occurring during the process of typing. This method allows researchers to locate problems in the translation process by measuring speed and pauses (e.g. Sullivan and Lindgren 2006).

Translation Studies entered the new century with a past background loaded with notions to be redefined, a present full of suggestive ideas to be further developed and a future packed with challenges awaiting to be achieved. The past brought about central issues whose importance still prevails in Translation Studies, such as the practical notion of equivalence or the importance of cultural and cognitive issues, but it also brought to the attention of translation scholars the need to redefine these issues in order to account for the complexity and dynamism of translation as a communicative process with a markedly cultural character. The present has reinforced the cultural turn of Translation Studies and initiated the search for new empirical methods based on real usage data, but in its efforts to grant power to cultural approaches it has relegated linguistic models to the background. In the light of such past and present research, what are then the future challenges translation must face? A critical look at the history of translation research allows us to sketch its future around five pivotal points or needs: redefine the notion of equivalence and the process of meaning construction, revisit the notions of context and culture in order to definitely bridge the gap between linguistic and literary approaches, uncover the conceptual operations which guide the use of translation strategies in the process of recreating meaning, readdress the research methodology employed in order to give way to new empirical methods, and establish the impact of the translator's bilingual competence on the translation product.

3 Cognitive Linguistics and translation

Cognitive Linguistics is a linguistic framework that, given its epistemological and ontological bases, can address all these issues in a satisfactory manner. It is often said that Cognitive Linguistics more than a unified model is a “linguistic movement” since it subsumes under its name theories and research goals of different kind. From the theories of conceptual metaphor and metonymy, Frame Semantics and blending which are mostly focused on semantic issues to the frameworks of Cognitive Grammar and Construction Grammar which are more devoted to morphosyntactic issues (see Evans and Green 2006; Geeraerts and Cuyckens 2007; Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Valenzuela 2012; for an overview).

However, all of these models and approaches, despite their different interests and viewpoints, share the same main tenets and foundations, both epistemological and methodological. The same basic pillars that can be very useful for translation theory and that we briefly summarise next.

Perhaps the most basic principle of Cognitive Linguistics is the assumption that language is an integral part of cognition, and thus, a product of general cognitive abilities. This idea opposes the belief in the independence of general cognition processes from linguistic structures and rules, as postulated in some formal approaches. Instead, Cognitive Linguists believe that different levels of linguistic analysis do not form independent modules but that all linguistic principles must be investigated in relation with other mental faculties such as memory, attention, or reasoning. This proposal is known as the “cognitive commitment” (Lakoff 1990: 40).

Another crucial tenet is that human language is symbolic in nature because it arises from the association between a phonological representation and a semantic representation (Langacker 1987). The symbolic nature of language, naturally, goes back to Saussurian linguistics but there is a radical difference that distinguishes both approaches. While Cognitive Linguistics accepts to a certain extent that the link between form and meaning is somewhat arbitrary, it denies that language is totally structured arbitrarily. Quite on the contrary, another basic principle in this model is that language is motivated and grounded more or less directly in our bodily, physical, social, and cultural experience. In other words, we create our mental and linguistic categories under the constraints imposed by our bodies, through the culture sieve, and on the basis of our concrete experiences. In short, language is *embodied* (Johnson 1987).

The postulate that language is usage-based is also crucial in Cognitive Linguistics. It has two complementary interpretations. On the one hand, it suggests that the structural properties of language emerge from usage, that is, language is a system shaped by linguistic usage (see Barlow and Kemmer 2000 for an overview) and, on the other, that every theoretical assumption has to be based on real and substantial empirical data, and not on *ad hoc* examples.

These basic principles have consequences for how Cognitive Linguistics deals with linguistic structures. First of all, classical dichotomies in traditional linguistics disappear and become clines. For example, the distinction between semantics and pragmatics, between *langue* and *parole*, between competence and performance, between linguistic meaning and encyclopaedic meaning. Language is based on our experience as human beings in this world, in a culture and in a society, and therefore, all the knowledge that we have about the system of our language must arise from our experience. Meanings reflect the mental categories we create from our interaction with the world and our conceptual

structures are invoked in language use and comprehension. This relationship between language and experience has encouraged cognitive linguists to study how conceptual structures or models are reflected in language and thus proposed analytical tools such as cognitive domains, i.e. knowledge structures, mental representations about the organisation of the world around us (Langacker 1987), and similar proposals like “idealised cognitive models” (Lakoff 1987), “mental spaces” (Fauconnier 1994, 1997) and “frames” (Fillmore 1982, 1985).

Another consequence of believing in the integration of language in our cognitive abilities is that some of these abilities can precisely help us organise our mental and linguistic structures. One of these abilities is human categorisation, i.e. the ability to judge whether a particular entity is an instance of a particular category or not. Based on Rosch and colleagues’ work (Mervis and Rosch 1981; Rosch 1973, 1977, 1978, 1983) on prototype categorisation model, Cognitive Linguistics organises linguistic structures around a prototype, that is, the best, most prominent and most typical member of a category. And around this prototype the other members of the category are also organised depending on how much these members resemble the prototype, on how many characteristics they share with the best example of the category (cf. Taylor 2003). This prototypical organisation has been applied to the study of different areas in linguistics, namely phonology (Mompeán 2006; Nathan 2008), morphosyntax (cf. Goldberg’s *Construction Grammar* [1995, 2006]) and semantics (cf. Lakoff’s [1987] radial categories, polysemy and semantic fields [see Valenzuela, Ibarretxe-Antuñano, and Hilferty 2012]).

Another cognitive human ability is imagination, not understood as a non-rational, unruly and idiosyncratic play of ideas, but as a basic mechanism to create meaning and rationality. Imagination, by means of metaphor and metonymy, helps us to make sense of our less directly apprehensible experiences on the basis of more directly apprehensible experiences. In Cognitive Linguistics, metaphor and metonymy are not mere figures of speech, only available to some gifted speakers, that obscure our language. They are figures of thought that shape the conceptual structure of our language. Metaphor is a basic imaginative device that establishes mappings or projections usually from a concrete source cognitive domain onto a target abstract cognitive domain (Lakoff 1993; Kövecses 2010). Similarly, metonymy also sets up mappings but within the same experiential domain (Barcelona 2000; Kövecses and Radden 1998; Panther, Thornburg, and Barcelona 2009).

The brief overview we have just presented should help the reader foresee the type of translator, translation (product-process), and translation theory that Cognitive Linguistics would favour. The emphasis of Cognitive Linguistics on cognitive aspects gives prominence to the role of the translator, who would

no longer be considered just as a specialist in two languages, but rather an intercultural mediator between source and target texts. The translation as a product would be understood as a manipulation, a retextualization guided by a mediator who knows what is functionally appropriate in the target language, and not as loyal and right transfer from a source into a target language. The translation as a process would be regarded as both a communicative and a cognitive process in which linguistic and conceptual aspects are perfectly integrated, and not as a mechanical equivalence transfer between two linguistic systems. From a Cognitive Linguistics point of view, the translational act would comprise the activation and selective use of several particular kinds of knowledge filtered through the translator's cognitive process. The search for equivalence would no longer be the search for identifiable linguistic features, but the search for a complex set of links in the translator's mind, and the aim of a translation theory would be to explain aspects related to how these links are cognitively represented or cognitively processed. Therefore, a translation theory which draws on the cognitive postulates of Cognitive Linguistics would support all these characteristics and provide a solid epistemological base that relies on the relationship between language and cognition, and on the embodied character of language.

We have drawn here a possible sketch of what a Cognitive Translation Theory could be like. This type of theory is now taking its first steps in Translation Studies and some time and work would still be needed before a full-fledged form of the theory can be developed. Such enterprise is beyond the scope of this work, but it is our intention to contribute to this endeavour by raising some questions that we consider crucial for a future framework of Cognitive Translation Studies. Thus, the questions brought up in the following section pose some of the key topics that researchers should bear in mind when defining the main tenets of a cognitively founded translation theory.

4 Cognitive Linguistics and translation: Some relevant questions

This book and the papers included herein are organised and selected in order to respond to the following basic and general questions:

- How can Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies be bridged together?
- What theoretical constructs and empirical mechanisms does Cognitive Linguistics have that can be successfully applied to Translation Studies? In what ways can these be useful and used?

- Are there any other unexplored (or scarcely explored) areas in translation theory in which Cognitive Linguistics can make a contribution?
- Are there any insights from Translation Studies that can be adopted and benefit Cognitive Linguistics?

Taking into account the pivotal needs in translation mentioned above and bearing in mind these general research questions, the book is organised around five main research issues or areas:

- *Theoretical aspects of Cognitive Linguistics and translation.* This part offers a theoretical background to the Cognitive Translation Studies. Several research questions are addressed here: Which impact do the epistemological and ontological assumptions in Cognitive Linguistics have on Translation Theory? And the other way round, what aspects of Translation Theory are still to be sorted out by Cognitive Linguistics? In other words, the interaction between CL and translation is introduced, focusing specifically on how both fields of study can benefit from each other.
- *Meaning in Cognitive Linguistics and translation.* Previous research in Cognitive Linguistics has already proven that cognitive mechanisms such as frames, metaphor and metonymy are powerful analytic linguistic tools, but are they really useful for translation? Can these mechanisms shed some light on how to translate meaning or on what meaning should be translated?
- *Constructions in Cognitive Linguistics and translation.* The relationship between form and meaning is problematic in translation theory. Should the author be loyal to form, to meaning or to both? Form and meaning pairings, i.e. constructions, and their constructional patterns are hot topics in Cognitive Linguistics, the question now is: can they be of any help for translators?
- *Culture in Cognitive Linguistics and translation.* This is a big issue in both areas, but can Cognitive Linguistics offer solutions to deal with the cultural component in translation? Can Cognitive Linguistics integrate cultural aspects in translation while keeping both the acceptability and the adequacy poles balanced?
- *A step beyond in Cognitive Linguistics and translation.* Psycholinguistic investigation is a fruitful empirical method in Cognitive Linguistics nowadays. It has contributed to add further support to theoretical concepts (e.g. motivation and embodiment) and cognitive mechanisms, but can this methodology be applied to translation? Is it possible to use certain cognitive principles to research translation from a psycholinguistic perspective? Is translation an adequate research field to investigate Cognitive Linguistics postulates?

The papers compiled in the present volume purport to investigate the many fruitful manners in which Cognitive Linguistics can expand further on Cognitive Translation Theory. Some papers (Muñoz Martín, Halverson, Martín de León) take a theoretical stand, since the epistemological and ontological bases of both areas (Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies) should be known before specific contributions of Cognitive Linguistics to translation are tackled.

The volume opens with the work by Halverson, which discusses the general implications of Cognitive Linguistics for Translation Studies, focusing on three areas: theory development, methodology, and epistemology. From the point of view of a Translation Studies scholar, the author focuses on the translational issues that are of urgency with regard to future theorising and empirical study. The following two papers which adopt a theoretical stand elaborate further on two of the areas outlined by Halverson. The contribution by Muñoz Martín expands on the area of theory development. He helps to put in perspective the interaction between linguistics and translatology within second-generation Cognitive Science. The author defends the relationship between both disciplines, arguing that if Cognitive Linguistics and Cognitive Translatology share their cognitive commitment and language has a central position in translating and interpreting processes, Cognitive Linguistics should then have a crucial role in the development of Cognitive Translatology. The paper by Martín de León elaborates on the contributions of Cognitive Linguistics to the epistemological question of meaning construction in translatology. She analyses how different cognitive models have tried to solve the problem of symbol grounding, and how they can contribute to the development of a coherent and realistic theoretical framework for translatology.

Several works in the volume attempt to illustrate how some of the notions imported from Cognitive Linguistics may contribute to enriching our understanding of the translation process in a general translation problem such as metaphor (e.g. Samaniego Fernández, Sharifian and Jamarani), the relationship between form and meaning (Tabakowska, Rojo and Valenzuela), cultural aspects (Bernárdez, Sharifian and Jamarani), as well as political discourse (Sharifian and Jamarani).

Samaniego Fernández's paper focuses on metaphor and on the positive influence that the cognitive approach to metaphor has exerted on Descriptive Translation Studies. She argues that the notion of metaphor imported from Cognitive Linguistics has led to a more realistic study of metaphor translation which has allowed researchers to explain cases traditionally disregarded for being "anomalous" or "incorrect" renderings.

This cultural embodiment of the notion of metaphor acts as a kind of bridge between the papers devoted to metaphor and the two papers which focus on

cultural aspects. In this sense, Sharifian and Jamarani's work also focuses on the notion of metaphor but the authors are more interested in the sociocultural and political implications of this phenomenon. They aim at demonstrating how the notion of metaphor can be a powerful analytical tool in translation by showing how the literal translation of a metaphor can be used to disclose certain underlying mismatches in cultural conceptualisations. By focusing on the implications that these mismatches may have for a particular type of communication, in this case for political discourse, the authors also provide a significant contribution in order to deal with the translation problems that characterise a specific discourse area.

Bernárdez also uses the notion of metaphor as a starting point in his paper to illustrate the problems that arise from the cultural differences which may be found in conceptual metaphors. However, the scope of his paper is more ambitious, proposing a unified framework for the analysis of cultural elements on the basis of a form of Cognitive Linguistics which integrates culture into its overall theoretical framework. Being a connoisseur of the type of cultural problems translators are faced with, the author argues that the success of the applicability of a model for dealing with cultural problems in translation depends on its capacity to integrate cultural and linguistic aspects and to analyse linguistic elements in its real use and function.

Besides cultural aspects, another area of interest in Translation Studies has been the relationship between form and meaning. In this volume, the works by Tabakowska and Rojo and Valenzuela show how Cognitive Linguistics can contribute to throwing light on this issue. The paper by Tabakowska illustrates the applicability of a model based on the principles of Cognitive Grammar when analysing those cases, such as the translation of a poem, in which meaning and form are inseparable because grammatical elements carry some meaning relevant for the interpretation of the text and thus, for its rendering into a different language. Rojo and Valenzuela's work also contribute to enriching our view of the relationship between form and meaning by focusing on the notion of construction as another case which illustrates how changes in the syntactic form of the sentence can entail subtle variations in meaning. They show how the particular mismatch which is found in the use of the resultative construction between English and Spanish can account for the difficulties translators face when dealing with this construction and for the strategies employed to sort them out. An eye-tracker is used to measure these difficulties in terms of the higher or lower level of cognitive effort employed by the translators, which is reflected in their eye movements and in the changes in their pupil dilation.

A slightly different perspective is adopted in this volume by a set of papers which use translation as a type of empirical field to test some of the basic

assumptions of Cognitive Linguistics, such as frames (Boas), metonymy (Brdar and Brdar-Szabó), and lexicalisation patterns (Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Filipović). The work by Boas uses both human and machine translation to illustrate the applicability of frames to the analysis of languages for translation purposes. He manages to demonstrate that an approach to lexical organisation based on Frame Semantics offers a unique way of capturing both generalisations and idiosyncrasies in the description of semantically related words across languages. Furthermore, he also provides evidence in favour of the value of frames to integrate linguistic and cultural information, since they allow researchers to include references to culturally significant categories in the lexicon. Brdar and Brdar-Szabó argue in their paper that Translation Studies can contribute towards a better understanding of the nature of metonymy, providing practical evidence which can be used to test and/or refine some of the claims and postulates about metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics. They demonstrate that the translation of metonymies can help uncover some conditions of their use at the token level. The type of analytical model they propose shows that the degree of the difficulty in translating utterances with metonymic expressions may be linked to the type of metonymy in question as well as to the degree of its regularity and to their complexity in terms of metonymic mappings.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Filipović offer an overview of how the theory of Talmy's lexicalisation patterns and Slobin's thinking for speaking hypothesis has been successfully applied to translation in motion events. Translators have to make different choices in order to accommodate the characteristics of the source language to the requirements of the target language, while keeping the content of source text as accurate and fluent as possible. The main idea is that these choices are guided by the narrative or rhetorical styles that each language has. In other words, languages offer different linguistic means to codify a motion event, and as such, languages influence the way speakers, and in this paper, translators, pay attention to different elements. These authors, by compiling a list of translation strategies, attest that, in general, translators from verb-framed into satellite-framed languages tend to omit Manner and offer few details about the trajectory, whereas translators from satellite-framed into verb-framed languages behave just the other way round. They also demonstrate that to be aware of these rhetorical styles in each language is of great importance not only from a linguistic point of view but also from an applied perspective (translators' training, forensic linguistics). By examining witness reports, they convincingly show that the rhetorical styles are crucial, and that translators should keep alert about these differences in language, especially in cases where certain pieces of information can be essential for our own judgments about events and their participants.

Finally, another set of papers (Feist, Hatzidaki) opens up new lines of investigation for experimental research, a very promising area still underdeveloped. The paper by Feist explores the contribution that experimental work in lexical semantics might make to the discussion of meaning and equivalence in translation, focusing on the recent work in Cognitive Linguistics which experimentally probes word meanings, both within and across languages (e.g. Feist 2000, 2008; Tanenashi 2005). Her review of experimental work in lexical semantics makes two potential contributions to the theory and practice of translation: firstly, by illuminating the meanings of individual lexical items, it provides a means for analysing the meaning encoded in the source-language words as used in context; and secondly, this body of work provides evidence regarding the degree of equivalence between words of the source language and matched words of the target language. Hatzidaki's paper provides an overview of a variety of experimental methods and techniques that the field of psycholinguistics has used to study the cognitive underpinnings of translation. She demonstrates that the theoretical questions that concern both Cognitive Linguistics and translation have been thoroughly examined and their assumptions tested in a number of different language pairs and conditions. But despite this available evidence, she notices that most psycholinguistic work that has been conducted employing a translation task aimed at contributing to the field of psycholinguistics and Cognitive Linguistics, and not to that of Translation Studies. However, now there are well-established psycholinguistic paradigms that allow researcher to access the translator's "black box" and investigate a set of theoretical assumptions and processes central to translation.

5 From Cognitive Linguistics towards a Cognitive Translation Theory

This book constitutes the first attempt to unify previous isolated works on Cognitive Linguistics and translation. In a century which has brought to light the central role of cognition in the study of the translation process, Cognitive Linguistics can be discerned as a suitable candidate to account for the linguistic aspects of such a process. Any cognitive theory of translation will find in the postulates of Cognitive Linguistics the adequate theoretical background to explain the role which language plays in the translation process in relation to other cognitive abilities. The research programme of Translation Studies is currently staged by the desire to describing translation as a cognitive process and the tendency towards adopting an interdisciplinary approach which can contribute to describing such process from a variety of perspectives. In the same way as

research on literary translation has extensively benefited from previous literary and cultural works, research on the cognitive aspects of translation will certainly benefit from works in those disciplines which have been devoted to the study of cognition in the monolingual and the bilingual mind (e.g. psychology, neurology, bilingualism, etc.).

This book starts from the assumption that Cognitive Linguistics is one of the disciplines which can help describe translation as a cognitive process by contributing to integrate linguistic aspects with other aspects relating to cognition. The central place attributed to cognition in modern Translation Studies does not interfere with the fact that language is still the raw material translators work with; therefore, a deeper understanding of language comprehension and production and of how language fits in with the rest of human cognitive abilities will undoubtedly cast some light on the role language factors play on the translation process.

In the previous section, we raised four questions that summarise the main points that we consider crucial for a future framework of Cognitive Translation Studies. These questions are the foundations that researchers working in this area and coming from these two research worlds should bear in mind and hopefully, expand in future studies. The *first question* asks whether Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies could be bridged together. Our answer is yes, they can. From a theoretical point of view, Cognitive Linguistics can provide the solid theoretical framework which Translation Studies has long demanded to account for the linguistic matters involved in the translation process. Its basic assumption that language is an integrated part of cognition supports the idea that translation is not a mere interchange of linguistics structures, an applied version of the linguistics principles that rule a language and that can be judged in terms of right and wrong, depending on how faithful they can be reproduced from the source language into the target language. Quite on the contrary, Cognitive Linguistics supports the cognitive nature of translation as a mediating process between two different conceptual worlds. Moreover, its integrated view of language and cognition together with the crucial role of culture helps to reinforce the link between the translator's behaviour and the cognitive strategies which lead to such behaviour, strengthening thus the link between the product and process of translation. We should bear in mind that Cognitive Linguistics fully supports the idea that the translator is an intercultural mediator who knows the cultures in which the translation process takes place. The translator, as any other speaker and supported by concepts such as embodiment and motivation, manipulates the texts based on his own knowledge and experience about the world. The translator is no longer viewed just as a "language expert" who has to remain faithful to the source text, he can and should adapt it to the target

language and audience, both conceptually – appropriate information – and linguistically – appropriate constructions – and this view is supported by Cognitive Linguistics. This model then favours a more descriptive model of TS, and its usage-based approach is particularly helpful to describing the translator's behaviour.

It also supports a more explanatory approach to the study of translation, providing the necessary theoretical explanations to account for many translation phenomena which remained unexplained or unclear such as transfer, equivalence, translation shifts and translation norms. The word “transfer” falls short when describing the translation process since it is not just a mere “relocation” of some linguistic meanings from one source language into a target language. It involves, first, a whole decoding process that unveils all the conceptual meaning contained in the concepts, the contexts and the constructions used, and second, a whole recoding process in the target language. This decoding-recoding process reflects the importance of some notions which are pivotal in CL, such as those of construal, encyclopaedic meaning and the symbolic nature of language. Applying the notion of construal to translation emphasises the dynamic aspect of meaning construction which is central to translation, and allows us to integrate linguistic and other kinds of knowledge with social, historical, and contextual influences through the cognitive processes of the translator. From this perspective, the concept of transfer acquires a more dynamic nature which entails the activation and selective use of several particular kinds of knowledge filtered through the translator's cognitive process.

As a consequence, a term like “equivalence” cannot be taken to refer to the whole process of translation. If each translation text is unique – it has a particular context, meaning and constructions – the equivalence between source and target texts is “situated”, and therefore, more individualised (Samaniego Fernández 2007; see also Halverson's paper). From this perspective, the notion of “shift” in translation can no longer be seen either as a *post hoc* product category established on the basis of an identified invariant. It is rather an operation of construal which translators make on the basis of their online creative interpretation of a translation, the contextualised interpreting of the source text and their knowledge of the conventionalised construals in the languages they work with. It is precisely in this concept of conventionalised construal where the controversial notion of “norms” (cf. Schäffner 1998) best fits in this cognitive approach. From a Cognitive Linguistics perspective, norms are rejected in the form of linguistic or text-related rules which regulate the translator's behaviour in all types of situations. Following the trend established by Descriptive Translation Studies, norms are best understood as general tendencies in translators' behaviour which, being motivated and constrained by the factors

mentioned above, become conventionalised construals at the service of other professionals.

Translation Studies, on the other hand, provide a complex model of language functioning since, as mentioned above, we have a double process of decoding and recoding in a different language, so we can say that it provides a good/more demanding testing field to check whether the assumptions of Cognitive Linguistics work. For instance, the question of how the translator decides what and how is to be decoded from the source text and recoded in the target text. So far, some of the answers might lie in Cognitive Linguistics (cf. motivation, embodiment, cognitive process [. . .]), but others can be provided by Translation Studies, which can tell us more about general factors such as genre characteristics or text types as well as particular factors such as the translators' own individual and sometimes *ad hoc* choices.

This complexity can also serve to discover or reveal new aspects of the theory which do not appear in a simple language model. Research on the cognitive process of translation has started to use research methods (linguistic analysis, corpora studies, verbal reports, reaction time, and fMRIs) which are also popular in experimental work in Cognitive Linguistics. From this perspective, as Feist's, Hatzidaki's, and Rojo and Valenzuela's papers have shown, they appear to be a suitable interface to connect both disciplines, either by using cognitive principles to research translation from a psycholinguistic perspective or by using translation as a research field to investigate Cognitive Linguistics postulates. Both disciplines are also interested in similar areas of research: communicative and cultural systems, performance domain, and neural systems, just to name a few, which opens up a whole new array of possibilities for future conjoined research.

The *second question* that we put forward was whether Cognitive Linguistics has specific tools that can be useful and therefore, implemented in Translation Studies. Once again, the answer is yes, it does. Cognitive Linguistics provides a set of methodological tools that allow Translation Studies researchers to analyse in a more rigorous and systematic manner a set of traditional translation phenomena which demanded a more unified and theoretically sound explanation. We outline here some of the main, but probably not the only, tools that have already been put into practice.

Conceptual metaphor and metonymy. In traditional Translation Studies, the "translatability" of metaphors is often a major issue with mostly negative answers (see Samaniego Fernández's paper). Vinay and Darbelnet (1958: 199) state it clearly: "La langue d'arrivée ne permet pas de traduire la métaphore littéralement" [the target language does not permit literal translation of metaphor]. The problem is that in most of these studies, metaphor (and metonymy) are

considered a matter of words, a figure of speech that adds stylistic effects to the text. As Dagut (1976: 22) puts it, “when translating a metaphor, the shock effect of the created image should be maintained and that is not possible when there are linguistic and cultural factors which hinder this effect”. Metaphor and metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics are not a matter of translating words from one language into another, but a matter of decoding and recoding conceptual systems from a source culture into a target culture. The distinction in Cognitive Linguistics between conceptual metaphor and metonymy – the conceptual information – and the metaphorical or metonymical expression – the linguistic structure particular to each language – is paramount to understanding the potentiality of this tool. It means that metaphor is no longer a problem for translation; all conceptual metaphors are translatable from the source into the target text. What the translator needs to do is to establish which conceptual domains are involved in the metaphorical mapping that appears in the source text, and then find either the equivalent linguistic means to codify that mapping in the target text or find alternative conceptual domains that are equivalent to those in the source text. These two solutions would cover metaphors in all “gradients” and “degrees” of translatability (Dagut 1987; Van der Broeck and Lefevere 1979). As Schäffner (2004: 1258) argues, “Translatability is no longer a question of the individual metaphorical expression, as identified in ST, but it becomes linked to the level of conceptual systems in source and target culture”. In this book, Samaniego Fernández’s paper on metaphor and Brdar and Brdar-Szabó’s paper on metonymy clearly show this capacity. What is more, novel metaphors, Samaniego Fernández suggests, can “enlarge the target conceptual world” since translators, aware of the potentiality of a given conceptual metaphor in the source text, can adapt it and use it in the target text. Besides, as Sharifian and Jamarani’s paper argues, a cognitive view of metaphor can also help us to disclose underlying mismatches in cultural conceptualisations, which lead to the misrepresentation of political discourse in translation.

The importance of grammar. The concept of grammar in Cognitive Linguistics surpasses the traditional understanding that grammar is a set of structural rules that govern the composition of sentences in a language; grammar is symbolic in nature and as such, it has meaning. As a consequence, every structure or construal that the translator chooses to include in the target text adds a meaning dimension to the text. Cognitive Linguistics offers a wide array of construal operations (see Croft and Cruse 2004: ch. 3 for a review) that, as Halverson (see p. 47 of the present volume) points out, are integral to translation processes. They not only allow “us to maintain many of the insights of previous work on translational procedures such as Vinay and Darbelnet’s methodology [. . .] or

Klaudy's translational operations", but also to emphasise "the creative, non-deterministic nature of the process". Construal operations, therefore, help the translator to focus on certain aspects. Tabakowska's paper is a perfect example for their usefulness in translation. In her analysis of one of Dickinson's poems, she uses three construal operations – specificity, trajectory/landmark alignment and perspective – and demonstrates that the choice of one construal can affect the whole interpretation of the translation in the target text. This, of course, also favours the integration of linguistic and cultural approaches to translation. It helps translators to be aware of the potential consequences of grammatical shifts which may go beyond the stylistic lack of naturalness.

Frames. These are also powerful tools in translation due to their double application. On the one hand, as Boas suggests, they can be useful for the creation of translation resources such as multilingual dictionaries since they offer "finely-grained conceptual structure". On the other hand, frames, as cognitive structuring devices, allow us to shed some light on how the process of meaning construction takes place in translation (see Martín de León's paper), and to analyse semantic fields both within and across languages. They consequently provide us with a mechanism for highlighting cross-linguistic similarities and differences.

Rhetorical style. Grammar is important but equally important is to adapt the translation to the style of the target language. As Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Filipović's paper shows, translators, beyond grammatical choices, count on several strategies to translate all the information from the source into the target text. However, not only do they prefer some strategies over others, but also these seem to be motivated by the narrative style that predominates in the target language.

The role of culture. Culture is part of the conceptualisation of meaning; that is why, from a Cognitive Linguistics perspective, encyclopaedic meaning cannot be separated from linguistic meaning. This favours the integration of cultural and linguistic aspects, of the cultural and linguistic context, something which is basic in the translator's work. In this way, it can also contribute to unifying linguistic and cultural approaches to translation. Following Bernárdez's proposal, a form of Cognitive Linguistics which integrates culture into its overall theoretical framework is especially suitable for translation, where linguistic elements are necessarily analysed in linguistic use and function.

We have just seen some of the prolific areas from Cognitive Linguistics that already have some implementation in translation. However, there are still other possible candidates that, as the *third question* poses, have not been applied, or not enough, to translation. One of those areas is Construction Grammar.

The notion of “construction” is one of the basic tools in Cognitive Grammar. This is defined as follows:

Any linguistic pattern is recognised as a construction as long as some aspect of its form or function is not strictly predictable from its component parts or from other constructions recognised to exist. In addition, patterns are stored as constructions even if they are fully predictable as long as they occur with sufficient frequency. (Goldberg 2006: 5)

In a recent book on contrastive Cognitive Grammar, Boas (2010) demonstrates that it is possible to find similar constructions in different languages, but also that this framework is useful to discover not only similarities but also differences, even between genetically-close languages (see also Boas’ paper). This reinforces the idea that not only is grammar symbolic, but also that it is an important factor to bear in mind in translation. Still, constructions have not been sufficiently studied under the translation perspective. Rojo and Valenzuela’s chapter is perhaps one of the first attempts to do so. They show that constructional mismatches between different languages allow us to explain differences in the translator’s behaviour in terms of the higher or lower processing effort involved.

Another underdeveloped area is Experimental Lexical Semantics. It has been criticised that traditional translation is mainly concerned with translation at word-level, and although Cognitive Linguistics supports the idea that there is more to translation than just words, it also provides the study of word meaning with a wide array of basic tools that can be helpful such as prototype or basic level categories. Despite the prominent role of context in translation, research on word meaning can still throw some light on how translators establish equivalence between lexical units. Moreover, although cognitive translatology has started to focus on an experimental methodology, the lack of an experimental background of most researchers has resulted in weak experimental designs. The article by Feist shows how experimental work in lexical semantics can contribute to enlighten the role of meaning and equivalence in translation.

Finally, the *fourth question* we raised was whether there were any insights from Translation Studies that could be adopted and benefit Cognitive Linguistics. Our answer yet again is yes, there are.

Muñoz Martín argues that translation provides an excellent example of realistic language use, free from the potential biases of the researchers, where meaning may be discerned by triangulation of several languages. For example, Brdar and Brdar-Szabó’s and Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Filipović’s papers show us how translation is a good tool to collect objective data. Translation involves different languages; therefore, it is especially suitable to illustrate culture-specific differences in linguistic phenomena. He also suggests that many traits of the

translator's behaviour (as the existence of the so-called "translation universals" or general distinctive features in the language of translation; see Halverson's paper) can be explained in terms of the process of socialisation underwent by the translators. In this sense, research on translation universals could be used to illustrate the principle of motivated linguistic behaviour. Muñoz Martín also points out that by helping to show if there are distinct tendencies associated to certain language pairs and translation directions, Translation Studies can contribute to determining, for example, whether Langacker's construal dimensions are general and motivated and to provide them with empirical support.

Translation also offers us the possibility to investigate some aspects of bilingualism and second language acquisition which may also benefit research in Cognitive Linguistics. Halverson, Hatzidaki, Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Filipović, and Muñoz Martín's papers mention this possibility. One way of exploring this research path is, as Halverson (see p. 45 of the present volume) suggests, "to look for ways in which specific linguistic items may be represented and activated in the language of a bilingual and how various representational characteristics might impact translational outcomes". Another possible way could be to analyse patterns of second language acquisition and to investigate in which way code-switching optional restrictions are related to translators' interferences and Talmy's linguistic salient features. The study of interferences of the source language in the translator's performance can certainly throw some light on issues such as the role of attention or linguistic entrenchment.

In sum, the primary focus of Translation Studies on language in use points to translation as an excellent source of information about how linguistic principles work. As Martín de León's paper suggests, translation requires a dynamic process of meaning construction which can provide interesting data on this situated process of on-line meaning elaboration.

By attempting to answer the questions posed in the previous section, we have tried not only to give a coherent overview of the papers included in this volume but also to offer a general description of the theoretical and methodological stage at which these two worlds stand at the present time. It was not our intention to elaborate a full-fledged version of a Cognitive Translation Theory, but rather to depict a thorough state-of-affairs that can provide scholars with the basic ground for future research in this area. Our discussion on the status of both disciplines and their potential interaction leads us to pose a closing question for all the researchers interested in both areas: Can we talk about a promising new research framework called Cognitive Translation Studies that bridges Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies together? And the concluding answer can easily be glimpsed from a volume placed at the interface of both disciplines: Translation Studies have already turned to cognition in

search of answers, and Cognitive Linguistics has already seen the potential of translation as a testing field. The establishment of a common framework does not seem to require any longer a radical change in the attitude of the researchers in both areas; rather, it seems to be more a matter of time, good intentions and joint work.

References

- Baker, Mona 1992 *In other words*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, Mona 2003 Corpus-based translation studies in the academy. In: Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast, Eva Hajicová, Petr Sgall, Zuzana Jetmarová, Annely Rothkegel and Dorothee Rothfuß-Bastian (eds.), *Textologie und Translation: Jahrbuch Übersetzen und Dolmetschen* 4/II, 7–15. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Baker, Mona 2004 A corpus-based view of similarity and difference in translation. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9.2: 167–193.
- Barcelona, Antonio (ed.) 2000 *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: Cognitive approaches*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Barlow, Michael and Suzanne Kemmer (eds.) 2000 *Usage-based models of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bassnett, Susan and Peter Bush (eds.) 2006 *The translator as writer*. London: Continuum.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere (eds.) 1998 *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bielsa, Esperanca and Susan Bassnett 2008 *Translation in the global news*. London: Routledge.
- Boas, Hans C. 2010 *Contrastive construction grammar studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Catford, John C. 1965 *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Charteris-Black, Johnatan and Timothy Ennis 2001 A comparative study of metaphor in Spanish and English financial reporting. *English for Specific Purposes: An International Journal* 20.3: 249–266.
- Croft, William and D. Alan Cruse 2004 *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dagut, Menachem B. 1976 Can metaphor be translated? *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 22.1: 21–33.
- Dagut, Menachem B. 1987 More about the translatability of metaphor. *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 33.2: 77–83.
- Delabastita, Dirk 1989 Translation and mass communication: Film and TV translation as evidence of cultural dynamics. *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 35.4: 193–218.
- Evans, Vyvian and Melanie Green 2006 *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles 1994 *Mental spaces*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles 1997 *Mappings in thought and language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feist, Michele I. 2000 *On in and on: An investigation into the linguistic encoding of spatial scenes*. PhD dissertation, Department of Linguistics, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- Feist, Michele I. 2008 Space between languages. *Cognitive Science* 32.7: 1177–1199.

- Fillmore, Charles 1982 Frame semantics. In: Linguistics Society of Korea (ed.), *Linguistics in the morning calm*, 111–137. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing.
- Fillmore, Charles 1985 Frames and the semantics of understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica* 6: 222–254.
- García Yebra, Valentín 1982 *Teoría y práctica de la traducción*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Geeraerts, Dirk and Hubert Cuyckens 2007 *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995 *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006 *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gutt, Ernst-August 1991 *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hansen, Gyde, Andrew Chesterman and Heidrun Gerzymisch-Arbogast 2009 *Efforts and models in interpreting and translation research: A tribute to Daniel Gile*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hatim, Basil 2001 *Teaching and researching translation*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason 1990 *Discourse and the translator*. London: Longman.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason 1997 *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Hermans, Theo (ed.) 1985 *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*. London: Croom Helm.
- Holmes, James S. [1972] 1988 *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holz-Mänttari, Justa 1984 *Translatorisches Handeln. Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- House, Juliane 1977 *Translation quality assessment. A model revisited*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide and Javier Valenzuela 2012 Lingüística Cognitiva: origen, principios y tendencias. In: Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Javier Valenzuela (eds.), *Lingüística cognitiva*, 13–38. Barcelona: Anthropolos.
- Johnson, Mark 1987 *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltan 2010 *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltan and Gunter Radden 1998 Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic approach. *Cognitive Linguistics* 9.1: 37–77.
- Kussmaul, Paul 1995 *Training the translator*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lakoff, George 1987 *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George 1990 The invariance hypothesis: Is abstract reason based on image–schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.1: 39–74.
- Lakoff, George 1993 The contemporary theory of metaphor. In: Andrew Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and thought*, 202–251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambert, Jose and Hendrik van Gorp 1985 On describing translations. In: Theo Hermans (ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*, 45–53. London: Croom Helm.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987 *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 1, Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. van 1989 Translation and original: Similarities and dissimilarities, I. *Target* 1: 151–182.

- Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. van 1990 Translation and original: Similarities and dissimilarities, II. *Target* 2: 69–96.
- Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. van and Ton Naaijken (eds.) 1991 *Translation studies: The state of the art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Lörscher, Wolfgang 1991a Thinking-aloud as a method for collecting data on translation processes. In: Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit (ed.), *Empirical research in translation and intercultural studies*, 67–78. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Lörscher, Wolfgang 1991b *Translation performance, translation process, and translation strategies*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Mervis, Carolyn B. and Eleanor Rosch 1981 Categorization of natural objects. *Annual Review of Psychology* 32: 89–115.
- Mompeán, José Antonio (ed.) 2006 Cognitive phonology. *Special issue. International Journal of English Studies* 6.2.
- Nathan, Geoffrey S. 2008 *Phonology: A cognitive grammar introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Neubert, Albrecht 1985 *Text and translation*. Leipzig, Germany: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Neubert, Albrecht and Gregory M. Shreve 1992 *Translation as text*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Nida, Eugene A. 1964 *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber 1969 *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nord, Christiane 1991 *Text analysis in translation*. Translated into English by Christiane Nord and Penelope Sparrow. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Nord, Christiane 1997 *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Olohan, Maeve 2004 *Introducing corpora in translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda Thornburg and Antonio Barcelona (eds.) 2009 *Metonymy in grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pym, Anthony 2004 Propositions on cross-cultural communication and translation. *Target* 16.1: 1–28.
- Pym, Anthony, Miriam Schlesinger and David Simeoni (eds.) 2008 *Beyond descriptive translation studies: Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rabadán, Rosa 1991 *Equivalencia y traducción. Problemática de la equivalencia transléfica inglés-español*. León, Spain: Universidad de León, Secretariado de Publicaciones.
- Rojo, Ana 2000 *Esquemas y Traducción: un Acercamiento Cognitivo a la Traducción de Elementos Culturales*. Published PhD dissertation, CD-ROM version. Murcia, Spain: Universidad de Murcia.
- Rojo, Ana 2002a Applying frame semantics to translation. *Meta* 47: 311–350.
- Rojo, Ana 2002b Frame semantics and the translation of humor. *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 48: 34–77.
- Rosch, Eleanor 1973 Natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology* 4: 328–350.
- Rosch, Eleanor 1977 Human categorization. In: Neil Warren (ed.) *Studies in cross-cultural psychology*, 1–49. London: Academic Press.
- Rosch, Eleanor 1978 Principles of categorization. In: Eleanor Rosch and B. B. Lloyd (eds.), *Cognition and categorization*, 27–48. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Rosch, Eleanor 1983 Prototype classification and logical classification. In: Ellin Scholnik (ed.), *New trends in cognitive representation, challenges to Piaget's theory*, 73–86. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Samaniego Fernández, Eva 2007 El impacto de la Lingüística Cognitiva en los Estudios de Traducción. In: Pedro Fuertes Olivera (ed.), *Problemas lingüísticos en la traducción especializada*, 119–154. Valladolid, Spain: Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Schäffner, Christina 1998 The concept of norms in translation studies. *Current Issues in Language and Society* 5.1–2: 1–9.
- Schäffner, Christina 2004 Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36.7: 1253–1269.
- Séguinot, Candance (ed.) 1989 *The translation process*. Toronto: School of Translation, York University.
- Séguinot, Candance 1991 A study of student translation strategies. In: Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit (ed.), *Empirical research in translation and intercultural studies*, 79–88. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary [1988] 1995 *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sperber, Dan and Deidre Wilson 1995 *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol 2004 HAPPINESS in English and German: A metaphorical-pattern analysis. In: Michel Achard and Suzanne Kemmer (eds.), *Language, culture, and mind*, 137–149. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Sullivan, Kirk P. H. and Eva Lindgren 2006 *Computer keystroke logging and writing*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta 1993 *Cognitive linguistics and poetics of translation*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Tanehashi, Nanako 2005 *Cross-linguistic differences and the second language acquisition of spatial terms: The case of English "in" and "on"*. Master's thesis, Nagoya Gakuin University, Nagoya, Japan.
- Taylor, John 2003 *Linguistic categorization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja (ed.) 1991 *Empirical research in translation and intercultural studies*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Toury, Gideon 1980 *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv, Israel: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.
- Toury, Gideon 1985 A rationale for descriptive translation studies. In: Theo Hermans (ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*, 16–41. London: Croom Helm.
- Toury, Gideon 1991 Experimentation in translation studies: Achievements, prospects and some pitfalls. In: Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit (ed.), *Empirical research in translation and intercultural studies*, 45–66. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Tymoczko, Maria 2007 *Enlarging translation, empowering translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Valenzuela, Javier, Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Joseph Hilferty 2012 La semántica cognitiva. In: Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Javier Valenzuela (eds.), *Lingüística Cognitiva*, 41–68. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Van der Broeck, Raymond and André Lefevere 1979 *Uitnodiging tot de vertaalwetenschap*. Muiderberg, the Netherlands: Coutinho.
- Vázquez-Ayora, Gerardo 1977 *Introducción a la Traductología*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Vermeer, Hans J. 1989 Skopos and commission in translational action (translated by Andrew Chesterman). In: Andrew Chesterman (ed.), *Readings on translation theory*, 173–187. Helsinki: Oй Finn Lectura.
- Vinay, Jean Paul and Jean Darbelnet 1958 *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction*. Paris: Didier. [Eng. translation: *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. 1995. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.]
- Wilss, Wolfram 1982 *The science of translation: Problems and methods*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Zanettin, Federico, Silvia Bernardini and Dominic Stewart (eds.) 2003 *Corpora in translation education*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Part I: **Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Theory**

