

Translating Metaphors We Live By
Conceptual Metaphors in a Cross-Cultural Setting



29-06-2015

Martine de Nijs

S0824526

A.G. Dorst

K.L. Zeven

Table of Contents

Chapter One	4
Introduction	4
Chapter Two Translating Conceptual Metaphors	7
2.1 Translation Studies	7
2.2 Metaphor Theory	11
2.2.1 Metaphor as a linguistic phenomenon	11
2.2.2 Cognitive Approach	14
2.3 Metaphors We Live By	16
2.3.1 Theory	16
2.3.2 Conceptual Metaphors and culture	17
2.4 Metaphor Translation	19
2.4.1 Translation Procedures in Metaphor Translation	19
2.4.2 Metaphor Translation and Culture	22
2.4.3 CMT and Translation Studies	23
2.5 Translating Metaphors We Live By	24
Chapter Three Methodology	26
3.1 Monti	26
3.1.1 Research	26
3.1.2 Results Monti	28
3.2.1.1 CONDUIT METAPHOR	28
3.2.1.2 TIME IS MONEY	28
3.2.3 Conclusion Monti	29
3.3 Dutch Translation	29
3.3.1 Research	29
3.3.2 Dutch Publication	30
Chapter Four	32
Results	32
4.1 Explanation data	32
4.2. CONDUIT METAPHOR	32
4.2.1 Corpus analysis	34
4.2.2 Survey	36
Conclusion CONDUIT Metaphor	40
4.3 TIME IS MONEY	41
4.3.1 Corpus analysis	43
4.3.2 Survey	45
Conclusion TIME IS MONEY	49
4.4 ARGUMENT IS WAR	49
4.4.1 Corpus analysis	50
4.4.2 Survey	52
Conclusion ARGUMENT IS WAR	56
Chapter Five Conclusion	57

Conclusion	57
Chapter Six	59
Limitations and further research	59
6.1 Limitations	59
6.2.1 The Corpora	59
6.2.2 The survey	60
6.3 Suggestions further research	60
References	61
Appendix A	64
CONDUIT METAPHOR	64
Corpus analysis	64
Survey	66
Appendix B	75
TIME IS MONEY	75
Corpus analysis	76
Survey	78
Appendix C	90
ARGUMENT IS WAR	90
Corpus analysis	90
Survey	91

Chapter One

Introduction

From a linguistic perspective metaphors are often regarded as mainly decorative language (Schäffner 2003). Most people will be familiar with metaphors in poetry and literature where they are used to convey a certain image or feeling. This is however only one theory on the subject of metaphors. Giving it a second thought many will realize that metaphors occur in everyday language and not just in literature. Many of those metaphors are so well incorporated in our language that we no longer perceive them as such.

This means that metaphors are more than decoration. Lakoff and Johnson argue in *Metaphors We Live By* that metaphors lie at the base of the human thought process and find their way into language from our abstract or conceptual thoughts. Lakoff and Johnson's book discusses the field of Conceptual Metaphors (CM). In Conceptual Metaphors Theory (CMT) metaphors are not regarded as decorative language. It argues that people speak (or write) metaphorically because they think metaphorically and that every metaphor can be traced back to one of the Conceptual Metaphors.

Since metaphors occur in every language Translation Studies and theories on Metaphor Translation should discuss CMT when considering various translation procedures for metaphors. There are many theories about translation procedures for various text types and text elements. These theories discuss what the most important factors are when translating: linguistic elements, the purpose of the text or cultural factors? All these factors could create problems of their own in the process of translating because it is uncommon that a text can be translated from one language to another without any changes in for instance, word order, syntax or references. These problems become especially apparent when discussing Metaphor Translation. Metaphors can be very culturally specific and are presented in a language with its specific syntax and vocabulary. There are several theories on how to treat metaphors in a translation, yet within Translation Studies very little has been discussed about CMT. This is odd because the theory might shed some light on how to treat the phenomenon of metaphor on a cross-cultural level. Schäffner (2003) has consequently argued that CMT should be taken into account when translating. However, how does one incorporate this theory in Translation Studies? In order to fully understand this problem and possible solutions the following questions should be answered

Do all languages and cultures have the same Conceptual Metaphors? And, if so, are these Conceptual Metaphors represented in the same way? In other words, do all languages

have the same linguistic representations of the Conceptual Metaphors? It is already known that the latter cannot be entirely true, because most people that are fluent in more than one language can think of examples of metaphors, often expressions, that exist in their native tongue but not in another language. Yet, following Conceptual Metaphor Theory it would suggest that if two cultures and therefore languages share a Conceptual Metaphor they would still be able to understand the foreign metaphor, even if it is not as regularly used as an expression in their native language. If this is true, how should the metaphors be treated in translation? In the next chapter it will be discussed why most Translation Studies researchers argue in favour of looking at the context when translating in general and especially when translating metaphors. But what if there is hardly any context? If that would be the case the translator would not be able to 'hide' behind the context of the text.

Metaphors We Live By provides very little context in the sense that the metaphors are not used to describe a certain person, object or situation, the metaphors stand on their own, as individual examples of a Conceptual Metaphor. Therefore it is interesting to investigate how various translations adapted these examples for the Target Language. These examples are the basis of the theory the book discusses. Therefore it is crucial for the translator to find translated examples that will have the same persuasive power in the Target Language as in the Source Language.

Enrico Monti's paper *Translating The Metaphors We Live By: Intercultural negotiations in conceptual metaphors*, discusses the translatability of metaphors and the cross-cultural productivity of Conceptual Metaphors. Therefore in this paper Monti's research will serve as a basis for another comparable study of the Dutch translation for the purpose of this paper. The fact that Monti has only analysed languages from the Romance branch of languages might influence the outcome of his research, since the linguistic representation of metaphors might differ greatly between languages (or language groups). Since Dutch, like English, is a Germanic Language the results found for the Dutch translation may differ from the results from the study of the Romance translations. By looking into several translations of *Metaphors We Live By* from two language groups, it is possible to determine if the Conceptual Metaphors that work for English speakers also apply to speakers of French, Spanish, Italian and Dutch. The translated examples give insight in to what extent these Conceptual Metaphors are embedded in our brain and what this could mean for the metaphor translation within Translation Studies. So, what this paper discusses is:

Do Conceptual Metaphors work in a cross-cultural setting and what does this mean for Metaphor Translation?

Before being able to examine the position of CM in translation studies in the future, it is vital to explore the various views on CMT and Metaphor Translation that have been presented up until now. Therefore first some established ideas on Metaphor Theory, Translation Studies, and Metaphor Translation are discussed.

Secondly I shall discuss various translations enclosed in *Metaphors We Live By*. These translations are the French, Italian, Spanish and Dutch translations. For the analysis of the translations of Italian, French and Spanish the earlier mentioned research by Enrico Monti shall be used. The study of the Dutch translation consists of two corpus analyses and a survey amongst speakers of Dutch about the use of the examples in the Dutch language.

Chapter Two

Translating Conceptual Metaphors

2.1 Translation Studies

Within Translation Studies there are many theories on how to translate various text types. Some authors argue that the Target Text (TT) should display the closest equivalent to the Source Text (ST), translating word-for-word or sense-for-sense. Some, as will be discussed in this chapter, argue that a text should be translated as literally as possible, while others advocate a more free approach, whereby the sense, or meaning, of the text is more important than finding the exact equivalent. Equivalence means to find a translation for a unit of translation (a part of a text that is treated as a single cognitive unit), such as a word, a sentence or several sentences from one language that has the same meaning and connotation in another text and language. This equivalence could, for instance, be on the level of grammar, vocabulary, connotation, cultural references or purpose of the text.

Some translations stay very true to the original text and ensure that the meaning is transferred to the TT in such a way that the original linguistic and cultural elements are altered as little as possible. Other translations focus on the TT and the target audience, allowing for some freedom with the ST in order to create a TT that is easier to comprehend for the audience, changing the linguistic elements to fit the Target Language (TL) or adding explanations to the cultural elements or adapt them for the target language and culture. For instance, when something is compared to the national sport in the ST the translator might change the comparison in the TT to a comparison with the national sport of the TT.

In *Introducing Translation Studies* by Munday (2001), some thoughts on translation are illustrated by a quote from Cicero:

“And I did not translate them as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and forms, or as one might say, the ‘figures’ of thought, but in language which conforms to our usage. And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the style and force of the language” (Cicero 46 BCE/1960 CE: 364)

The ‘interpreter’ mentioned by Cicero in the first line is the literal (word-for-word) translator. The orator is more creative in his translation and actually tries to emotionally involve the listeners. St. Jerome (385 CE), too, stated: ‘I render not word-for-word but sense-for-sense.’ In ancient times word-for-word was exactly what it implies: replacing each word (consistently in Greek) with its closest grammatical equivalent in Latin. Both Cicero and St

Jerome rejected the word-for-word approach, because it led to ridiculous translations where the meaning of the source text was lost. The theories discussed above mainly focus on the linguistic aspects of translating, whether the grammatical structure should be maintained as much as possible or whether the equivalence of the meaning of the text is more important.

Maalej (2008) states that it is customary to think that the aim of translation is ‘the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language’. This can be interpreted as that the linguistic equivalence is assumed to be of the most importance. Yet, there are more levels of equivalence than only linguistic equivalence.

With regard to equivalence Schäffner states that: “Equivalence is probably most controversial notion in TS. Texts do not have an intrinsically stable meaning that could be repeated elsewhere” and that “translation should be set apart from other kinds of derived texts, and the label ‘translation’ should only be applied to those cases where an equivalence relation obtains between ST and TT (1255).” It is unclear to what extent and on which terms this equivalence should be reached. Schäffner describes the most prominent approaches to translation as follows:

1. The Linguistic-based approach: this approach “defines translation as transferring meanings, as substituting Source Language (SL) signs by equivalent Target Language (TL) signs (e.g., Xatford, 1965) (Schäffner 2003).” This equivalence is aimed at the lexical and grammatical level and not as much on the cultural level.
2. The Text-linguistic approaches regard translation as producing a Target Text that is induced by the Source Text. The unit of translation is the text itself. This text is seen as a text in a situation and a cultural context and this should be taken into account when translating.
3. The Functionalist approaches focus on the intended purpose of the text. The production of the TT should be aimed at it being appropriate for its specific purpose and not at the (linguistic) equivalence to the ST.

Munday writes,

“Newmark indicates that semantic translation differs from literal translation in that it ‘respects context’, interprets and even explains (metaphors, for instance). Literal translation, on the other hand, (...), means word-for-word in its most extreme version and, even in its weaker form, stays very true to ST lexis and syntax. Importantly, literal translation is held to be the best approach in both semantic and

communicative translation. 'In both communicative as in semantic translation, provided that equivalent effect is secured, the literal word-for-word translation is not only the best, it is the only valid method of translation. (Newmark 1951: 39 in Munday 2008:44-45)."

Newmark here explains that if equivalent effect is secured, the literal word-for-word translation should be used. However, it is unclear whether this should be equivalence on a linguistic level or cultural level, the purpose of the text all of the above or something completely different. Toury (1995) claims that if these forms of equivalence should pose a problem with the literal approach then 'communicative equivalence' should be the main goal.

Lefevere and Bassnett write about "faithfulness that that will ensure (...) that a given text is received by the target audience in optimal conditions (Lefevere and Bassnett 1988:3)." These optimal conditions can be interpreted in various ways. For instance, an optimal condition could be the best translation for the purpose of a text. "Some texts are primarily designed to convey information, and it stands to reason that translations of such texts should try to convey that information as well as possible (Lefevere and Bassnett 1988:4)." The TT should aim "to function in the receiving culture in a meaningful way (Lefevere and Bassnett 1988:5)." The focus on the purpose of the text has been introduced by the *skopos theory* (Vermeer 1996). In this theory the equivalence to the Source Text is not as prominent as in other theories; a translation should be aimed at a target audience in a target setting, under target circumstances for a target purpose. This is a particularly Target Text oriented approach to translating and offers a different view on what is most important within the field of translation.

The focus of Translation Studies has moved from focus on the linguistic factors towards an interest in the cultural and contextual factors that affect a translation (Schäffner 2003). One of the authors that support this shift away from the linguistic approaches is Selver (1986). He argues that the linguistic claim should not be the most important factor for the translator. He states that translation must balance different claims:

- The linguistic claim: which focuses on the closest linguistic equivalent. For instance if the ST uses the present tense then the TT should also use the present tense (if this is grammatically possible in the TT). Selver does not regard this claim as the most pressing one.

- The time claim: which focuses on when an ST was written, this will influence the way certain elements can be translated. The sentence ‘passing by *coach* through a valley’, when written more than a century ago cannot be translated by something meaning ‘a bus’ but would sooner be translated as ‘carriage’ (Selver 1986).
- Cultural claims: the differences between cultures are not simply differences in words. The phenomena itself may differ or the way people perceive a certain situation or text. When the ST is English and the TT is French a comparison to the game of cricket might be changed to a comparison to the Tour de France.
- Aesthetic claim: “How is the translator to reproduce in the new language the peculiar force and strength, the inner meanings as well as the merely outer ones, of what the original writer created solely and exclusively for and in a different language and a different culture (Alvarez 1993).”

Cultural claims here are mentioned as part of the balance that should be created.

Consecutively, it is emphasized that these cultural differences exceed the differences in language. The cultural aspect is gaining more and more attention within Translation Studies and the importance of linguistic equivalence is decreasing. Maalej (2008) actually states that the cultural view is “paramount”. He stresses that different cultures conceptualize experience in varying ways. As will be further discussed in the paragraph on Metaphor Translation.

Snell-Hornby called this shift in approach from linguistic to cultural ‘the cultural turn’ (Maalej 2008). Many scholars in the field of translation have adopted this term. Munday (2008) explains that this turn started in the 1990s and that Cultural Studies has influenced Translation Studies in various ways. One of the approaches to translation influenced by the increasing attention for culture in Translation Studies is the perception of translation as ‘rewriting’. There are several forms of rewriting, but for the purpose of this paper only rewriting in the form of translation will be discussed. Lefevere states: “Translation is the most obviously recognizable form of rewriting, and it is potentially the most influential because it is able to project the image of an author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture and origin (Lefevere 1992:9).” The translator thus must find a balance between the source culture and the target culture and while translating he has to decide which cultural aspects from the ST will be transferred to the TT and which will be altered.

Lefevere and Bassnett state about the earlier mentioned faithfulness: “‘faithfulness’ then does not enter into translation in the guise of ‘equivalence’ between words or texts but if at all, in the guise of an attempt to make the target text function in the target culture the way

the source text functioned in the source culture (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990:10-12).” In order to achieve this goal the translator needs to not only be bilingual but also develop a ‘bicultural attitude’ and become ‘ambicultural’ according to Deeney (1977). In *Encyclopedia of Translation: Chinese-English, English-Chinese* he states that “complete bilingualism must include a broad cultural dimension (Sin-Wai 1995:111).”

Being bicultural is defined by Deeney as being at home in two cultures and understanding the attitude and way of thinking of two cultures. Ambiculturism also denotes the ability to occasionally take necessary creative liberties with the original text.

The language of two cultures is partially different because the way of thinking and the attitude to life is different. The Italian director and scriptwriter Federico Fellini once explained why he could not make films in English: “A language is not just a dictionary of words, sounds and syntax. It is a different way of interpreting reality refined by the generations that developed that language. How can I express in English the sentiments of another way of looking at life, of other myths, of other rites of other philosophies and another history (Fellini 1986:37)?” This quote by Fellini, although it is about filmmaking, illustrates the difficulty of cross-cultural translation. He shows the problems that translators often encounter. This idea that a translator should be ‘bicultural’ is also expressed by Lefevere and Bassnett (1990), who argue that translation is always contextualised because it has a place in two cultures.

The fact that several authors stress the importance and difficult position of culture in translation and the shift that Translation Studies has undergone from linguistic to contextual and cultural factors demonstrates that translating involves more than just translating word-for-word or sense-for-sense. It is translating cultural values and knowledge from one text to another.

2.2 Metaphor Theory

Before exploring the particular problems that occur when translating metaphors from one language and culture into another it is important to look into the various views on what metaphors are and what their function is.

2.2.1 Metaphor as a linguistic phenomenon

Metaphors are often seen as merely linguistic elements. In this traditional approach metaphor is described as an individual linguistic phenomenon in the form of a metaphorical expression. Philosophers of language considered them to be “constructed in contrast with ‘literal’ language, and used chiefly for poetic or rhetorical emphasis”. This view stems from

the belief that language is essentially and primarily literal (Cameron and Low 1999:78). Many scholars still follow this linguistic approach. Schäffner describes how the traditional understanding of metaphor is often that metaphors are figures of speech or linguistic expressions, which are substituted for an expression with a literal meaning and which is used as a stylistic embellishment (Schäffner 2003:1254). Within this approach a clear distinction is made between literal language and figurative language. Cameron states that one of her favourite descriptions of metaphor is one by Burke: “Metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else (Cameron & Maslen 2010:3).” This explanation is of course is a very simplistic and inaccurate description of what metaphor is. First of all, ‘seeing’ could be replaced by, ‘saying’, ‘writing’, or ‘explaining’ which would suggest that metaphor is a linguistic phenomenon that as a result would primarily be found in language. One of the most important things to note about the linguistic approach to metaphor is that within this approach it is often believed that the messages that metaphors convey can be easily rephrased in literal language.

However, “the line between literal and metaphorical language is not clear since some metaphors are in the process of dying and becoming part of common language (Alvarez 1993:479).” This dying of metaphors means that the metaphorical expression or idiom is so commonly used in a language that these expressions are no longer regarded as metaphorical. For instance ‘to fall in love’ is one of these expressions. There will be few speakers of English that will mark this as a metaphor when given a text and asked to underline the metaphor. This suggests that there are several types of metaphors for instance metaphors with a decorative function and metaphors that are common expressions. A scholar that has written extensively about metaphor translation is Newmark. In *A Textbook of Translation* (1988) he distinguishes six types of metaphors: dead, cliché, stock, adapted, recent and original. Eventhough Newmark is a Translations Studies scholar his ideas are discussed in this paper within Metaphor Theory. Newmark not only argues that there are various types of metaphor he also discusses the purpose of metaphor which according to him is not only decoration, therefore his work in this paper is not only regarded as a theory of translation but also as a Metaphor Theory.

Dead metaphors, according to Newmark, are the metaphors that have been used so often that people do not regard it as metaphors any longer. These dead metaphors are idioms that are very well known and often the origin is unknown. ‘To fall in love’ is an example of a dead metaphor.

Stock metaphors are defined by Newmark as: “an established metaphor which in an

informal context is an efficient and concise method of covering a physical and/or mental situation (...) and which is not deadened by overuse (1988:108).” These metaphors are, like dead metaphors, often used but are more expressions of which people are aware that it is metaphorical in some way.

Recent metaphors are metaphors that are neologisms. Often it is not clear where these metaphors originated, but they have spread quickly.

Original metaphors are metaphors that are created by an individual within a certain text and context. They often contain an important message of the writer and his personality and attitude to life. These types of metaphors will later be discussed in the section on Metaphor Translation.

Even though Newmark describes various types of metaphor he describes ‘metaphors’ in general as “any figurative expression” and “the application of a word or collocation to what it does not literally denote (1988:104).” However when he comes to describing function of metaphors he states that there are two:

- Aesthetic purpose
- Cognitive purpose, which is to express a mental process or state.

He states: “its [the metaphor’s] referential purpose is to describe a mental process or state, a concept, a person, an object, a quality or an action more comprehensively and concisely than is possible in literal or physical language; its pragmatic purpose, which is simultaneous, is to appeal to the senses, to interest, to clarify graphically, to please, to delight, to surprise (1988:104).” The first purpose, according to Newmark, is thus cognitive and the second aesthetic, bringing the linguistic and the cognitive approach to metaphor together. Newmark uses the terms ‘image’ and ‘object’. The image is the picture created by the metaphor (which according to him can be universal, cultural or individual) and the object is what is described by the metaphor: P.J. in P.J. was bounding up his wounds (Newmark 1988:105). Other authors use the terms ‘tenor and vehicle’ for these terms (vehicle being the image and tenor the object).

Newmark mentions the cognitive purpose of metaphors and in his description of the six types of metaphors he includes metaphors that are not necessarily recognised as such. This contrasts with the notion that metaphors are merely decorative elements. How can an element be decoration if it is hardly noticed? This would mean that metaphors are more than just embellishment. If some metaphors are no longer recognised as such and are therefore not

deliberately used are they really no more than linguistic elements or do they extend beyond language?

2.2.2 Cognitive Approach

Gibbs wrote: “is metaphor linguistic, conceptual or both? Despite centuries of widespread belief that metaphor is a special linguistic, rhetorical device, much research in cognitive linguistics over the past twenty years has demonstrated that metaphor is not merely a figure of speech, but is a specific mental mapping that influences a good deal of how people think, reason and imagine in everyday life (Gibbs and Steen 1997:145).”

Gibbs is one of the authors that support a cognitive view on metaphors. This subdivision of cognitive linguistics is known as Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and is more extensively explained by Lakoff and Johnson in *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). They argue that metaphors are not merely decorative elements in texts, but the basic resources for the human thought process. Lakoff and Johnson would therefore disagree with the notion about metaphors mainly occurring as embellishment. Lakoff and Johnson state: “We have found (...) that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in any language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature (1980:3).” This means that the differences between literal and figurative language is not as black and white as the more traditional views on metaphors want us to believe. Figurative meanings cannot be expressed in a literal manner from a cognitive linguistic point of view, according to Kövecses (2003:314).

This is where the most important difference between the linguistic and cognitive approaches lie: where the linguistic approach regards metaphor as a decorative substitute for something that could just as easily be transferred through literal language, the cognitive view regards metaphor as an internal process within the human thought process. This process is linked to the human experience, bodily experience, and these experiences are conceptualized. Therefore it would be very difficult to convey the exact same image or experience to literal language. The CMT distinguishes between Conceptual Metaphors (CM) or metaphors and ‘linguistic metaphorical expressions’ the latter being the linguistic representations of the Conceptual Metaphors. CMT thus does not regard metaphor as merely linguistic. In fact the term metaphor is used for what Lakoff and Johnson explain as follows: “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:5).” This is very similar to the description by Burke mentioned above, with the key difference being that metaphor within the cognitive approach is not just being ‘seen’,

‘said’ or ‘written’, but also experienced. Lakoff and Johnson’s ‘thing’ is later on described as a domain. In other words metaphor is understanding one domain of experience in terms of another. Deignan explains the term ‘domain’: ‘a domain is an area of meaning, such as the ideas associated with CLEANLINESS AND DIRT (in the literature on conceptual metaphors, small capital letters are used to show that a domain is being described). Domains consist of sets of linked entities, attributes, processes and relationships, which are apparently stored together in the mind (Cameron and Maslen 2010:44).” These elements are lexicalised using words and expressions. The words and expressions comprising the domain of CLEANLINESS AND DIRT would include: *clean, dirty, filthy* etc. The main implication is that metaphors function not only on the linguistic level, but also on the level of thinking. In this mental process the two domains, the ‘source’ and the ‘target’ are linked. The source domain is usually concrete, for instance the literal meanings of cleanliness and dirt. The target domain is principally abstract and ‘takes its structure from the source domain, through the metaphorical link, or ‘Conceptual Metaphor’ (Cameron and Maslen 2010:45).” For instance: in the Conceptual Metaphor of AMORAL IS DIRTY, MORAL/ETHICAL (Kövecses 2002:210), the source domain is CLEANLINESS AND DIRT, which is mapped onto the domain of human moral behaviour, which is the target domain. Human moral behaviour is understood through the domain of CLEANLINESS AND DIRT.

Kövecses (2003) points out that from the cognitive linguistic point of view, metaphor is seen as being composed of various components that interact, namely:

1. Experiential basis
2. Source domain
3. Target domain
4. Relationship between the source and the target
5. Metaphorical linguistic expressions
6. Mappings
7. Entailments
8. Blends
9. Non-linguistic realizations
10. Cultural models

“A brief explanation of the components of metaphor could be given as follows:

Conceptual Metaphors consist of a source and target domain (2 and 3). The choice of particular sources to go with particular targets is motivated by an experiential basis

(1). The relation of the source and the target is such that a source domain can apply to several targets and a target can attach to several sources (4). The particular pairings of source and target domains give rise to metaphorical linguistic expressions (5). There are basic conceptual correspondences, or mappings, between source and target domains (6). Source domains often map materials onto the target beyond the basic correspondences. These additional mappings are called entailments, or inferences (7). The bringing together of a source with a target domain often results in blends, that is, not only in language and thought but in social reality (9). Conceptual Metaphors converge on, and often produce, cultural models, that is, holistically structured conceptual units (10) (Kövecses 2003:312)."

2.3 *Metaphors We Live By*

2.3.1 *Theory*

Deignan points out that CMT is not developed to explain linguistic patterns, but that it is the other way around. She bases this on three types of evidences by Lakoff:

- The systematicity of correspondence between linguistic metaphors
- The use of metaphor to govern reasoning and behaviour based on that reasoning
- The possibility for understanding novel extensions in terms of the conventional correspondences. (Stefanowitsch & Gries 2006:107).

This systematicity can be found in the linguistic metaphors, which are a source of evidence for CMT. Steen describes how to determine which CM is expressed by a linguistic representation (Gibbs and Steen 1997:57-73).

In *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson describe CMT in detail. They explain that "primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, we have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:4)." As an example they give ARGUMENT IS WAR.

Your claims are *indefensible*

He *attacked every weak point* in my argument

His criticisms were *right on target*.

I *demolished* his argument.

I've never *won* an argument with him.

Your disagree? Okay, *shoot!*

If you use that *strategy*, he'll *wipe you out*.

He *shot down* all of my arguments.

(Lakoff and Johnson 4)

These are all examples of a linguistic representation of the conceptual metaphor that is ARGUMENT IS WAR. As can be seen, these linguistic metaphors form a pattern: they all use war terminology to refer to arguments or the process of being in an argument. Because metaphorical concepts are systematic, the language used when talking about that concept is systematic (L&J 1980:7). It should be noted that this is not just a matter of linguistic expression. It is actually possible to win or lose an argument. This shows what it means for a metaphorical concept to structure (at least partly) what we do and how we understand what we are doing when we are in an argument. Argument is to a certain degree structured, understood, performed and talked about in terms of WAR, even though WAR and ARGUMENT are two dissimilar things. Because the concept is metaphorically structured, the activity is metaphorically structured and as a result the language is metaphorically structured. Yet, few people would regard these utterances as metaphors, since this is the conventional manner in which people talk about arguments. These expressions are so common that they are no longer regarded as metaphorical. This is not poetic or rhetorical language; it is literal (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:5). Lakoff and Johnson also state that these 'dead' metaphors are not actually dead. They claim that they are "alive in the most fundamental sense (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:55)" because they are the metaphors we live by. Monti argues that these so-called dead metaphors are 'revitalised' in *Metaphors We Live By* because the supposed underlying conceptual metaphors are foregrounded (2009).

2.3.2 Conceptual Metaphors and culture

According to Lakoff (1993) the basic level metaphors are grounded in human experience and therefore likely to be found across different languages and cultures. Yet, as has been mentioned before, it is easy to think of idiomatic expressions (a form of metaphors) that do exist in one language but not in another. Deignan argues that possible reasons for these cross-linguistic differences are that different cultures hold different attitudes to metaphor vehicles or that the source domain elements are more salient in one culture than another

(Deignan 2003:255). In order to discuss this matter properly it is important to keep in mind that there are various ways to explain what culture is. "Culture can be perceived as including the dominant ideologies of a community (Deignan 2003:255)." In this case bodily experience could be shared by various cultures, since 'culture' is mainly denoted by ideologies. However, there is another view on what culture is and how it relates to experience.

Where Lakoff argues that bodily experience is universal, and therefore probably results in basic level metaphors that are widely shared, these metaphors might be regarded as not cultural dependent. Yet, if 'culture' is understood in its broadest sense, it could be argued that every aspect of human experience is filtered through it (Deignan 2003:255) and therefore understood differently. To explain this she quotes Gibbs "One cannot talk about, or study, cognition apart from our specific embodied interactions with the cultural world, (and this includes the physical world, which is not separable from the cultural world in the important sense that what we see as meaningful in the physical world is highly constrained by our cultural beliefs and values)" (Deignan 2003:256)."

If the cultural world and the physical world are not separable, this would mean that bodily experience can differ from culture to culture. Boers (in Deignan 2003) points out that the logical entailment of Lakoff's division of experience into universal and specific is that "unlike general physical experience, specific experiential domains are more likely to be culture-dependent and thus to vary from place to place (2003:256)." This would explain why there are different patterns in figurative language use found in a cross-cultural setting. Metaphors often derive from the same source domain, but differ in the linguistic details. Kövecses asks whether these differences in detail are "isolated, accidental, and without any real significance in the study of metaphorical thought in culture" or "systematic, motivated and of significance in the study of this thought (Kövecses 2009:317)." He believes the latter, arguing that larger cultural themes that have the potential to distinguish different cultures manifest themselves in various ways.

Ponterotto explains the same effect by using the term 'partial similarity' (Tabakowska *et al.* 2010). Two languages use different elements of the source domain to represent different aspects of the target domain. According to Ponterotto, this can be explained by the possibilities of activating different source domains within the same semantic field or culturally specificities within the same Conceptual Metaphor. Deignan clarifies the same concept:

1. Different cultures may hold different folk beliefs about attributes of the source domain.
2. The source domain is less salient in different cultures.

Yet, Deignan (2003) also points out that while English and Spanish both associate dogs with positive qualities, in both languages many metaphors involving dogs do not follow this notion. This shows that cultural values may not always explain the differences in metaphors. This also suggests that cultural differences might not be as relevant as would be expected. In a different article, Deignan explains that metaphors that are used nowadays may not reflect our current understandings about the world around us. This might explain the in-congruency between some cultural beliefs and some metaphors that are used within that culture.

2.4 Metaphor Translation

2.4.1 Translation Procedures in Metaphor Translation

As discussed in the preceding chapter, there are several Translation Theories and Metaphor Theories. These two disciplines are combined in the field of Metaphor Translation. In Translation Studies, metaphors and their translatability have been widely discussed. The linguistic and cultural differences that translators have to consider when translating are also present in metaphors. In literature on translation procedures several procedures for metaphors translations have been described. Often it is unclear if these theories are based on the linguistic or cognitive approach, but it seems that most of the time the procedures are meant for the linguistic metaphors. Some of the suggested procedures will be discussed below.

Van den Broeck offers three models for translating metaphors.

1. Translation ‘sensu stricto’ (both tenor and vehicle (Richards 1936) transferred to TT
2. Substitution (The vehicle is replaced but the tenor is preserved)
3. Paraphrase into a non-metaphorical phrase.

SL metaphor	TL expression	Matching pattern	Transl. mode
La nuit tombe	Die Nacht fällt ein	corresponding T corresponding V	Translation ' <i>sensu stricto</i> '
Le jour tombe	Der Tag fällt	corresponding T corresponding V	
Le jour tombe	Die Nacht bricht (her)ein	corresponding T different V	Substitution
Le jour tombe	Es wird Abend	corresponding sense	Paraphrase

Figure 1. Examples of Van Den Broeck's translation procedures (1981:78)

Van Den Broeck divides metaphors into three categories (1981:74):

1. Lexicalised metaphors, metaphors that have become part of the established semantic stock (or lexicon) of the language, for instance idioms.
2. Conventional metaphors. Metaphors that are an established part of the language for a certain generation or period, as for instance the Old English kennings.
3. Private metaphors, which are creations of individual poets or authors, but which frequently overlap with the metaphorical tradition of the author's culture.

The last category consists for the most part of creative metaphors. These metaphors have an important bond between 'tenor' and 'vehicle.' The 'tenor' and 'vehicle' are carefully chosen and when translating, the translator should take care in choosing the right vehicle that goes with the tenor in the TL. Dagut states that: "the framework of 'possible' metaphors for any given language is determined by a combination of the accumulated cultural experience of the members of that language community and the 'institutionalised' semantic associations of the items in their lexicon' (in Van den Broeck 1981:81)". These 'institutionalised' or lexical metaphors might be incorporated in the thought process of the native speakers who no longer regard it as a metaphor, but may by foreigners learning the language as a second language be interpreted as a creative or extended metaphor and therefore be translated as an ornamental part of the text. This could cause some unintentional foregrounding (creating emphasis on a particular part of a text) which changes the meaning of the entire text.

Newmark readdresses Metaphor Translation in *A Textbook of Translation* (1988). He states that the translation of metaphors is the most important particular problem of translation. He explains one of the problems: when translating an original metaphor it is important to find out what the similarity between the 'object' and the 'image' is. The image is the picture that is conveyed by the metaphor, the object is that what is described (Lakoff and Johnson describe this as source and target domain). In, for instance, an original metaphor there might have several similarities between the two domains, but only one might be relevant. For each of the types of metaphors, as discussed in his section on Metaphor Theory, Newmark describes the translation procedure that he regards the most suitable.

Newmark in *Approaches to Translation* (1981) proposes the following procedures:

- Transferring the same image from the ST to the TT
- substitution (metaphor into a different metaphor)
- paraphrasing
- deletion
- reproducing the same image in the TL
- translating the metaphor by a simile
- converting the metaphor into sense

These procedures are linked to the types of metaphors.

Dead metaphors

According to Newmark, dead metaphors are easy to translate. Yet, they often defy literal translation. He advises to look up every word from the unit of translation in both a monolingual and a bilingual dictionary in order to be sure of the meaning. He notes that many languages have different metaphors that carry the same meaning.

Cliché metaphors

Newmark claims that a translator should get rid of all clichés and that these metaphors should either be reduced to sense (or literal language) or replaced with metaphors that are less overused or turned into a dead metaphor.

Stock or standard metaphors

These, Newmark claims, are difficult to translate. He warns to refrain from using stock metaphors that do not come naturally to the translator. He advises to reproduce the same image in the TL if it has comparable frequency and currency. If this is not the case the SL metaphor can be replaced with an established TL image that conveys a comparable meaning. When opting for one of the procedures that do not copy the metaphor, it should be noted that there will be a degree of change in meaning and tone.

Adapted metaphors

Newmark states that these should where possible be translated by an equivalent adapted metaphor.

Recent Metaphors

If it is possible to copy the metaphor and make sure the sense is clear to the target audience it is advised to do so.

Original Metaphors

Original metaphors are open to a variety of translation procedures.

2.4.2 Metaphor Translation and Culture

According to Mason, “each occurrence of a metaphor must be treated in isolation’ (in Alvarez 1993:487). This means that, as discussed above, there is not one translation procedure to deal with all metaphors. Mason states that the cultural connotations are important as well.

According to Dagut quoted in Newmark, cultural-specific metaphors “are untranslatable” (Dagut 1987:80). Newmark softens this statement stating: “Usually cultural metaphors are harder to translate than universal or personal metaphors (Newmark 1988:106).”

These are just some of the remarks that authors have made about the cultural context in metaphor translation. It has been made clear before that culture is obtaining a more prominent place in translation, but this importance might be even higher when it comes to translating metaphors.

Stienstra (1993), like Van Den Broeck, also distinguishes three types of metaphors: universal, culture-overlapping and culture-specific metaphors. These would also all require different strategies when translating.

Maalej claims that the essential problem with metaphor translation is that different cultures conceptualize and create symbols in different ways. Lakoff and Johnson explain that if a culture would have the conceptual metaphor ARGUING IS DANCING, it would be doubtful if the culture that has the ARGUING IS WAR metaphor would see this activity that the other culture calls ‘arguing’ as arguing at all, they would be regarded as doing something completely different (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:5).” The Conceptual Metaphors of these cultures would be so different that it would be impossible to understand the TT if the metaphors from the ST would be copied.

2.4.3 CMT and Translation Studies

Slowly CMT is thus taking its place within Translation Studies. Schäffner has written some papers on CMT and translation. Within Translation Studies there is a big contrast between normative models and descriptive models. This, she writes, is also the case for Metaphor Translation. As can be deduced from the previous chapter within Metaphor Translation two main concerns arise:

1. Translatability of metaphors.
2. Procedures to transfer them from SL to TL.

Schäffner states that “establishing the conceptualization on which a particular metaphorical expression is based is relevant for translation (2003:1258).” This has been shown above by the example of ARGUMENT IS WAR and ARGUMENT IS DANCING. When keeping this in mind the question of translatability of metaphor does no longer apply to only individual metaphorical expressions, but it becomes connected to the level of conceptual systems in the Source and Target Languages. Source Cultures may share some CMs and differ in others. Schäffner identifies the following cases:

1. A CM is identical in ST and TT at the macro-level without each individual manifestation being shared at the micro-level.
2. Structural components of the basic conceptual schema in the ST are replaced in the TT by expressions that make entailments explicit.
3. A metaphor is more elaborate in the TT.
4. ST and TT employ different metaphorical expressions, which can be combined under a more abstract CM.
5. The expression in the TT reflects a different aspect of the CM (Schäffner 2003).

She makes clear that these are not ready-made translation procedures, but they might be candidates for potential strategies

2.5 Translating Metaphors We Live By

It has been described above that if two languages would have radically different conceptual systems, the translation from one of these languages into the other will be challenging. Yet it has also been argued that the differences in metaphors are merely differences in linguistic representations.

Various authors (Stienstra, Deignan, Kövecses) claim that the Conceptual Metaphors are not necessarily culture depended, but their linguistic realisations are. This means that Conceptual Metaphors may be culturally specific on a linguistic level, but culturally overlapping (or universal) on an abstract level. Schäffner clarifies this by giving the following example: in Germany being under a roof is a metaphor for being protected, while in England the roof is substituted by an umbrella. The general conceptual metaphor would in this case be 'BEING PROTECTED IS BEING UNDER A COVER (Schäffner 2003). This example is taken from her research on the translations of metaphors within the debate on the economic crisis within the EU. In this case the conceptual metaphor above is used to refer to being protected from the financial crisis. She states that since metaphors are culturally specific on a linguistic level, they cannot be transferred intact to the TL. Schäffner summarizes her argument stating that in this context and according to her, the three main procedures for translating metaphors are:

1. Direct translation or literal translation (metaphor into same metaphor)
2. Substitution (metaphor into different metaphor)
3. Paraphrase (metaphor into sense)

The fact that Lakoff and Johnsons claim that Conceptual Metaphors are universal and Schäffner's example shows that even though the linguistic representations are not necessarily similar, the underlying CM might make the translation of metaphors slightly easier. Because if the TT does not have the same linguistic metaphor as the ST, the translator may try to find a similar comparable linguistic metaphor derived from the same CM to convey the image.

The translation of metaphors generally occurs within a larger body of text and therefore within a context, but what if the metaphors are decontextualized. This is the case for the translations contained in *Metaphors We Live By*. The examples given in the book

stand on their own and there is no context, because they are not a part of a discourse but are merely examples to support the Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

The book has been translated into most European languages (Monti 2009:207). Looking at the examples above, can these metaphors be translated into any language and still be convincing examples to support Lakoff and Johnson's theory of Conceptual Metaphors? Enrico Monti studied the cross-cultural productivity of Conceptual Metaphors by investigating the translations of the book in three Romance languages: French, Spanish and Italian. He wanted to determine "whether Lakoff and Johnson's basic Conceptual Metaphors are equally productive in the different Romance languages and cultures (Monti 2009:208)." He states that the translatability of metaphor has been under debate since the 1980s (Monti 2009:208). Monti continues to discuss the translation of the title of *Metaphors We Live By*. In the translations he investigated the phrase 'live by' is substituted by 'everyday life' (French: metaphor *in* everyday life, Spanish: metaphor *of* everyday life and Italian: metaphors *and* everyday life). He argues that it is odd that the metaphor in the title is transferred into a non-metaphor in the translations, while the subject of the book is metaphors (Monti 2008:211). Monti explains that due to the anisomorphism, the scope of semantic terms with which is referred to the world around us is different for various languages, between languages the title-metaphor is hard to translate because the meaning would change.

With regards to the translatability of 'dead' metaphors Monti argues that it would be quite high 'if the book (*Metaphors We Live By*) did not 'revitalize' these metaphors by foregrounding the subjacent Conceptual Metaphors (Monti 2008). This foregrounding may cause problems for the translator when the idiom or lexicalised metaphor does not exist in the target language. While for most lexicalized metaphors there is a suitable translation in the target language (expressions like 'falling asleep') as soon as the underlying conceptual metaphor needs to be preserved (UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN) it rapidly becomes more complicated. In this specific case, the translation of *Metaphors We Live By*, the preservation of the Conceptual Metaphor definitely causes a problem, since it is this sort of metaphors that are used as examples in the book. With the translation of these examples the translator should take into account which Conceptual Metaphor is used, how the Source and Target Domains function in SL and TL, and also he should preserve the metaphor's persuasive power for the purpose of the text. In other words, he needs to know how the Conceptual Metaphors work on a cross-cultural level and which translation procedure to use.

Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1 Monti

3.1.1 Research

Monti (2009) points out that for most expressions found in languages it is unproblematic to find an acceptable translation into another language. However, when during this translation process the same Conceptual Metaphor needs to be preserved it becomes more challenging. For instance, there is a perfectly good expression for “falling asleep” in any language, but they probably do not all correspond with the Conceptual Metaphor UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN. The research in this paper is based on Monti’s research on the translations of *Metaphors We Live By*. Therefore first his paper and his method of research will be discussed.

Monti analyzed the French, Spanish and Italian translations. He chose these languages because they belong to the same linguistic group (Monti 2009:208). These three languages belong to the Romance languages. Since English is a Germanic language and thus belongs to a different group, there might be fewer differences in Conceptual Metaphors between the three Romance languages as between each of the Romance languages and English. Monti states: “My analysis is designed to investigate the translatability of conventional metaphors and, more specifically, whether similarities exist among the three translations; whether these similarities can be traced back to common linguistic structures or cultural heritage; and, tentatively, whether Lakoff and Johnson’s basic conceptual metaphors are equally productive in the different Romance languages and cultures (2009:208).”

Monti begins by giving some information on the circumstances of the publication of the translations. In addition, he compares the number of examples in the translations to the number of examples presented in the original. Below the summarized versions of the information about the publications given by Monti (209-210) are provided:

French

Published by: Editions de Minuit (Paris) in 1985. It has not been republished.

Translator: Michel Defornel (with the collaboration of Jean-Jacques Lecercle).

Paratextual additions: no introduction, practically no footnotes.

Number of examples compared to original: roughly the same.

Approach to translation: Target-oriented. This is shown by small variations that can be found

in the translations of the metaphors, clearly made in order to find a French metaphor that has a similar degree of currency as the English original.

Spanish

Published by: Cátedra (Barcelona) in 1986. Republished several times (7th edition in 2007)

Translator: Carmen González Marín

Paratextual additions: Introduction and note to the Spanish Edition and footnotes in which the author explains cases of cultural-linguistic variation. Editors state that “all examples come from the English language”, but that ‘in several cases the Spanish equivalent is also a common metaphor in our language’ (SP 27, 2001). Readers are also warned that some examples might sound unnatural in Spanish and they are asked to think of them as natural expressions in English.

Number of examples compared to original: roughly the same. Sometimes original examples are added in brackets in support of L&J’s argument.

Approach to translation: Source-oriented. This is shown by the notes.

Italian

Published by: Bompiani (Milan) in 1998. Republished twice.

Translator: Patrizia Violi

Paratextual additions: Introduction explaining the theme of the book and the translation strategies. Practically no footnotes.

Number of examples compared to original: approximately ten of the examples are omitted because they were ‘less translatable’.

Approach to translation: Source-oriented.

All of the translations only provide the examples in the target language.

After Monti has described the specifics about the translations he explains which metaphors will be analyzed. He has decided on a limited number of examples. He stated: “I will assess these examples according to both their cognitive relevance (which in principle should be preserved, being essential to the scope of the text), and their currency and naturalness, which is what made Lakoff and Johnson’s argument so strong and convincing (Monti 2009:210).” The first Conceptual Metaphor he investigates is the CONDUIT METAPHOR. This metaphor was first studied by Michael Reddy (1993 [1979]), who confirmed the hypothesis that IDEAS (OR MEANINGS) ARE OBJECTS, LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS, and COMMUNICATION IS SENDING (Monti 2009: 212).

The second Conceptual Metaphor investigated in the article is TIME IS MONEY, which according to Monti is coined by Benjamin Franklin in 1748. It should be kept in mind that all the examples in *Metaphors We Live By* are decontextualised. They occur in a list of examples of a certain Conceptual Metaphor. Translators, therefore, have to translate these metaphors in line with the Conceptual Metaphor that is being discussed, but do not have to be concerned about context. The last conceptual metaphor Monti discusses is FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS ARE UP.

Monti discusses the translated metaphors and how conventional these examples are in the three languages. However, the only corpus he seems to use appears to consist of the three translated books and he fails to explain how he established to what extent these examples are conventional. Monti mentions several times that corpus analysis is needed, but he does not seem to have tested these metaphors against a larger corpus himself. He appears to rely on his own knowledge of the languages. Since it is unlikely that all three languages are his native language, and even in one's native language nobody knows all the nuances, it is rather bold that he only relies on his own experience.

3.1.2 Results Monti

In this paper only the results for TIME IS MONEY and the CONDUIT METAPHOR will be discussed, since FUTURE EVENTS ARE UP will not be analyzed for the Dutch adaption of the book.

3.2.1.1 CONDUIT METAPHOR

The Italian translation omits four of the fourteen examples provided in the original book. According to Monti, the Italian translator has refrained from translating what he regarded as implausible solutions which would be unsupportive of the argument.

The French translation contains minor variations in the TT, in order to provide examples that have a similar degree of conventionality.

The Spanish translation offers a philological approach to the Source Text. The translations are quasi-literal renditions of the English expressions. It asks more interpretive effort from the readers and also includes less conventional expressions.

3.2.1.2 TIME IS MONEY

It has become apparent that some expressions in *Metaphors We Live By* are not conventional in some of the Target Languages and this is not merely because the translation approach is source-oriented. "It should be pointed out that a wholly different Conceptual Metaphor is usually activated in the case of the most widespread of these conventional metaphors, 'to

spend time'. Despite the adjustments made in the three translations to preserve this conceptual metaphor, it is in general expressed in Romance languages by way of a TIME IS A MOVING OBJECT metaphor ('passer le temps', 'pasar el tiempo' and 'passare il tempo')(Monti 2009 :216) The results for each language are not described in much more detail by Monti but he mentions that this metaphor is not as successful as others in these languages.

3.2.3 Conclusion Monti

The majority of the examples can be transferred successfully to the TL. Even though some expressions are not conventional in the TL, they are comprehensible to the reader, because the Conceptual Metaphor is shared. Only some are rendered incomprehensible and only a few metaphorical concepts seem unshared. "So it can be said that metaphors cut across cultures much more at the conceptual level than at the strictly linguistic level (Monti 2009:220)."

3.3 Dutch Translation

3.3.1 Research

For this research the Dutch translation of *Metaphors We Live By* is investigated the translation's title is *Leven in Metaforen*. Dutch and English both belong to the Germanic language family and this might result in some similarities regarding the Conceptual Metaphors. First the circumstances of publication will be discussed and the general content of the book (number of examples and notes) to the original will be compared. This research will partially rely on Monti's results. Two of the conceptual metaphors investigated by Monti will be discussed for the Dutch translation: TIME IS MONEY and the CONDUIT METAPHOR. FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS ARE UP is replaced with ARGUMENT IS WAR. The reason for this adjustment is that FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS ARE UP includes very few examples, which makes it difficult to comment on how conventional it is in any language.

Since it is important to investigate how conventional the examples are in the Dutch language, two types of research have been conducted to be able to show how regularly these metaphors occur. The first is a corpus analysis, using two corpora. The first is the *Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands*, which consists of 800.000 texts from newspapers, magazines, news broadcasts and legal documents from 1814 up until 2013. The second corpus is the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*, which consists of 900 hours (9.000.000 words) of spoken Dutch by both people from the Netherlands and Flanders. These have been recorded between 1998 and 2003. These two corpora have been chosen for the reason that some metaphors might occur mainly in the written and others mainly in the colloquial language. The software used to search these corpora is the software that is provided by the organizations that manage the

corpora. When testing the metaphors against the corpora the search was based on lemma. This means that when searching for ‘tijd verspillen’ also ‘verspilt tijd’, ‘verspilde tijd’ etc. were found. This means that the results were not limited by the grammatical form of the metaphor. In addition comparable metaphors, for instance, ‘dat kostte een uur’ and ‘dat kostte tijd’ were investigated. The searches were conducted for the metaphorical aspect of the example, not the entire sentence. When investigating ‘Daar wil ik mijn tijd niet aan verspillen,’ the lemma searched for was ‘tijd verspillen’. The results for each metaphor are presented in two tables (one for each corpus) and the tables represent the number of hits for the lemma of the specific metaphor and the number of hits for the comparable metaphors.

Apart from the corpus analysis, a survey among speakers of Dutch has been conducted. There were fifty participants between the age of 18-72 years, sixteen were male and 34 were female. Their education level varied between HAVO (Higher Secondary Education) and Master’s level education. The survey consisted of six questions per example. The entire sentence (not just the metaphorical aspect) was given and the participant was asked to fill out five questions about whether he would use the metaphor himself, whether he thought the metaphor was frequently used, whether the metaphor could theoretically be used and whether he thought that the metaphor was more often used in the written language than the colloquial language and *vice versa*. The participant had to choose his answers from a four point Likert-scale, ranging from ‘fully disagree’ to ‘fully agree’. In addition to the Likert-scale questions, there was one open question per metaphor, namely: ‘How would you say this differently?’ This last question mainly served as a control question to see whether the participants generally thought that the metaphor had the same meaning. Not all participants answered all questions, as can be seen in the results. The results of the corpus analysis and the survey combined should give a reliable indication of how frequently a certain metaphor is used in the Dutch language.

3.3.2 Dutch Publication

First the specifics of the Dutch translation will be given.

Dutch publication

Published by: Sun, Nijmegen, in 1999

Translator: Monique van Dam

Paratextual additions: Foreword, Afterword, Notes to the Dutch Translation

Number of examples compared to original: roughly the same, sometimes the translation contains more examples than the original

Approach to translation: Is not stated by the translator

Chapter Four

Results

4.1 Explanation data

In this result section the results from the Corpus analyses and the main results from the survey will be discussed. Each investigated Conceptual Metaphor will be discussed individually. All the linguistic representations in the Dutch version have been investigated, but not all will be discussed. At the end of each section discussing the survey results for that CM, the last table shows the percentage of the examples for which the various questions from the survey were mostly answered with ‘fully disagree’ or ‘mostly disagree’ represented as ‘disagree’ and ‘fully agree’ or ‘mostly agree’ represented as ‘agree’. For instance, if there were ten examples for a particular Conceptual Metaphor and for four of the examples most participants selected either ‘fully disagree’ or ‘mostly disagree’ for the statement ‘I would use this metaphor myself’ and for six of the examples most participants selected ‘fully agree’ or ‘mostly agree’ then it is represented in the table as follows. For this metaphor for 40% of the examples most participants disagreed that they would use it themselves and 60% agreed that they would use it themselves.

4.2. CONDUIT METAPHOR

The CONDUIT Metaphor is a rather complex metaphor. It is structured as follows: IDEAS (OR MEANINGS) ARE OBJECTS. LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS. COMMUNICATION IS SENDING. This metaphor has been illustrated by fourteen examples in the original version of the book and thirteen in the Dutch translation. Below all the examples of both versions are shown in the order in which they appear in the book. As can be seen, the Dutch translation has omitted one example. It is difficult to say which example is omitted, since it seems that none of the examples is literally translated and the Dutch examples that seem to derive from a specific English example so not have the same number as the English version. For instance, the closest equivalent to ‘it’s hard to get that idea across to him’(no.1 EN) is ‘dat idee is niet eenvoudig over te brengen’(no.3 NL). ‘I gave you that idea (no.2 EN) has a closest equivalent in ‘zij heeft me een paar goede ideeën aan de hand gedaan’(no.1 NL). However, this equivalence is more in sense than in literal meaning this can be seen as an example of substitution. Several English examples do not find a translation in the Dutch version and *vice versa*. Since it is not possible to paraphrase the metaphors into sense, for this translations the

translator had to choose to either translate the metaphor directly (metaphor into same metaphor) or to substitute the metaphor for a different metaphor with a comparable meaning. Because these metaphors serve as examples that prove the CMT it is vital that the metaphors draw on the same source domain. In this case the translator opted for some examples that are very comparable to the source text and for other examples that have the same source and target domain as the original text but are more well known to the Dutch audience. For this particular Conceptual Metaphor it seems that the Dutch translation is more target-oriented than source-oriented, because the examples are not literally translated but the translator has attempted to find a translation that is more conventional to the Dutch language. The differences in metaphors seem to be mainly on the linguistic level and not as much on the level of the Source and Target Domains.

English (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:11)

CONDUIT METAPHOR

1. It's hard to *get* that idea *across* to him.
2. I *gave* you that idea.
3. Your reasons *came through* to us.
4. It's difficult to *put* my ideas *into* words.
5. When you *have* a good idea, try to *capture* it immediately in words.
6. Try to *pack* more thought *into* fewer words.
7. You can't simply *stuff* ideas *into* a sentence any old way.
8. The meaning is right there *in* the words.
9. Don't *force* your meanings *into* the wrong words.
10. His words *carry* little meaning.
11. The introduction *has* a great deal of thought *content*.
12. Your words seem *hollow*.
13. The sentence is *without* meaning.
14. The idea is *buried in* terribly dense paragraphs.

Dutch (*Leven in Metaforen* 1999:19)

TRANSPORT-metafoor

1. Zij heeft me een paar goede ideeën *aan de hand gedaan*.
2. Het nieuws *bereikte* haar binnen een uur.

3. Dat idee is niet eenvoudig *over te brengen*.
4. Hij *stopt* erg veel gedachten in een paragraaf.
5. *In* mijn brief *staat* precies wat ik bedoel.
6. Het *dringt* nu pas tot me *door* wat je bedoelde.
7. Het is moeilijk om je ideeën *in* woorden *te gieten*.
8. Je moet de boodschap in vriendelijke woorden *verpakken*.
9. Daar *zit* iets *in*.
10. Ik kan haar bedoelingen niet *uit* deze brief *halen*.
11. Het zijn grote woorden zonder veel *inhoud*.
12. Het zijn *holle* frasen.
13. D inleidende tekst *bevat* een aantal aardige ideeën.

4.2.1 Corpus analysis

As shown below very few of the examples could be found in the corpora. Only three of the phrases were found in the *Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands* and only two were found in the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*. This is very surprising because the survey showed very different results.

Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Conduit Metafoor		
Ideeën aan de hand gedaan	0	<i>Ideeën aanreiken 1</i>
Nieuws bereikte haar	0	0
Idee overbrengen	4	<i>Gedachte overbrengen 1</i>
Gedachten stoppen in	0	0
In brief staat	1	0
Dringt door wat je bedoelde	0	<i>Informatie doordringen 15</i>
Ideeën in woorden gieten	0	
Boodschap verpakken	15	

Daar zit iets in	0	
Bedoeling uit brief halen	0	
Woorden zonder inhoud	0	
Holle frasen	0	
Tekst bevat	0	

Table 1. Results Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands CONDUIT Metaphor

Corpus Gesproken Nederlands Conduit Metafoor	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Ideeën aan de hand gedaan	1	<i>Ideeën aanreiken 0</i>
Nieuws bereikte haar	0	
Idee overbrengen	0	<i>Gedachte overbrengen 0</i>
Gedachten stoppen in	0	
In brief staat	17	
Dringt door wat je bedoelde	0	<i>Informatie door dringen 1</i>
Ideeën in woorden gieten	0	
Boodschap verpakken	0	
Daar zit iets in	0	
Bedoeling uit brief halen	0	
Woorden zonder inhoud	0	
Holle frasen	0	
Tekst bevat	0	

Table 2. Results Corpus Gesproken Nederlands CONDUIT Metaphor

Few phrases were found even when searching for comparable phrases. What is striking is that some phrases were found several times in one of the corpora but had no hits in the other. This could be explained by the fact that spoken and written languages often differ. At this point it seems that this Conceptual Metaphor does not work in Dutch, even though the translator adapted most metaphors for the Dutch audience.

4.2.2 Survey

The survey results are very divergent from the corpus results. Most of the participants indicated that they would use the phrases themselves and expected others to use them as well. Some of the examples will now be discussed.

Dat idee is niet eenvoudig over te brengen	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	5	44	49
I think this is regularly used	6	43	49
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	45	4	49
More often used in spoken language	25	24	49
More often used in written language	22	21	49

Table 3 Survey Results Dat idee is niet eenvoudig over te brengen

As shown in Tables 1, 2 and 3 'idee overbrengen' had only four hits in the *Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands* and none in the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*. However, most participants would use the sentence 'dat idee is niet eenvoudig over te brengen' and considered it to be regularly used.

Door dringen	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	0	50	50
I think this is regularly used	1	49	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	48	2	50
More often used in spoken language	11	39	50
More often used in written language	43	7	50

Table 4. Survey Results Doordringen

‘Doordringen wat je bedoelt’ had no hits in either corpus, but the participants were confident to use it and thought it was a regularly used phrase. It is very odd that the results from the two researches differ so greatly.

Daar zit wat in	Disagree	Agree	Total
I think this is regularly used	0	50	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	0	50	50
More often used in spoken language	47	3	50
More often used in written language	7	47	50

written language			
I would use this myself	47	3	50

Table 5. Survey Results Daar zit wat in.

One of the most striking results was for ‘daar zit wat in.’ There were no hits in the corpora, yet all participants would use it and rendered it a regularly used phrase. This discrepancy might be explained by the fact that it is used in spoken language, yet it also has no hits in the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*. The participant unanimous about this phrase and therefore it could have been expected to have at least some hits in the corpora.

The phrase that had the most hits in the *Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands* ‘boodschap verpakken’ would be expected to be used often by the participants. However, there is a significant number of participants that do not consider it is a very commonly used phrase.

Boodschap verpakken	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	14	36	50
I think this is regularly used	15	35	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	38	12	50
More often used in spoken language	29	26	50
More often used in written language	30	20	50

Table 6. Survey Results Boodschap verpakken

The phrase that had most hits in the *Corpus Gesproken Nederland*: ‘in de brief staat’ shows a tendency in the survey that supports the results from the corpus. There was only one hit in the

Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands, but this can be explained by the fact that it is thought to be spoken language than written language.

In brief staat	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	2	48	50
I think this is regularly used	3	47	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	47	3	50
More often used in spoken language	18	32	50
More often used in written language	41	9	50

Table 7. Survey Results In de brief staat

What is surprising is that in general there is not a very significant difference between the thoughts on whether it is written or spoken language. The reason may be that if a participant did not regard it as either spoken or written language, the participant chose 'fully disagree' for both. When looking at these results it could be argued that this metaphor does exist in Dutch.

The specific results for all of the examples can be found in Appendix A. Table 8 below shows the combined results for all examples of the Dutch translation of the metaphor. This shows the percentage of the participants who selected 'fully agree or mostly agree' or 'fully disagree' or 'mostly disagree' to the questions for all the examples of the CONDUIT METAPHOR.

	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this	30,8%	69,2%	100%

metaphor			
I think this metaphor is frequently used in Dutch	23.1%	76.9%	100%
Theoretically this metaphor could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	76.9%	23.1%	100%
I think this occurs more often in spoken language than written Language	69,3%	30,8%	100%
I think this occurs more often in written language than spoken language	53.8%	46.2%	100%

Table 8. Combined results CONDUIT metaphor

Of only a few phrases the majority thought that they could only be used theoretically. What is striking is that even though some phrases that had few or no hits in the corpora, the participants were almost unanimous in agreeing that they were used in the Dutch language.

Conclusion CONDUIT Metaphor

The participants of the survey generally regarded the linguistic representations of the CONDUIT Metaphor as regularly used in Dutch. Furthermore the participants' interpretations did not differ greatly. Even though the corpora showed very few hits it can be argued that this Conceptual Metaphor works for Dutch.

4.3 TIME IS MONEY

TIME IS MONEY is presented in the original book with sixteen examples. The Dutch translation has nineteen examples. Several English metaphors find a direct Dutch translation (translating ‘sensu stricto’ or direct translation), as for instance ‘You’re wasting my time’(no.1 EN) and ‘Daar wil ik mijn tijd niet aan verspillen’(no.1 Dutch), ‘This gadget will save you hours’ (no.2 EN) and ‘Dat foefje kan je uren besparen’(no.2 NL) and ‘I don’t have the time to give you’ (no.3 EN) and ‘Ik heb geen tijd voor je’ (no.3 NL). There are more examples that find fairly literal translations in this section, even though they have a different number. Especially ‘this gadget will save you hours’ has been translated literally word-for-word. For the translation of this metaphor the translator has opted for more direct translations of metaphor into same metaphor, even though there are minor grammatical changes. There are some metaphors added (‘geef me nog vijf minuten’, ‘dat was een tijdrovende klus), but most examples have been transferred to the TT fairly intact. It seems that this translation is more source oriented than target oriented, because the translations stay rather true to the English version, with only minor changes to accommodate for the Dutch readers. Yet, it is crucial to note that the Dutch translation has three extra examples, and thus leans more towards target oriented, because the translator provides more examples in the TT. Again it seems that the differences in metaphors occur merely on the linguistic level and not on the cognitive level.

English (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:7-8)

TIME IS MONEY

1. You’re *wasting* my time.
2. This gadget will *save* you hours.
3. I don’t *have* the time to *give* you.
4. How do you *spend* your time these days?
5. The flat tire *cost* me an hour.
6. I’ve *invested* a lot of time in her.
7. I don’t *have enough* time to *spare* for that.
8. You’re *running out* of time.
9. You need to *budget* your time.
10. *Put aside* some time for ping pong.
11. Is that *worth your while*?
12. Do you *have* much time *left*?
13. He’s living on *borrowed* time.

14. You don't *use* your time *profitably*.
15. I *lost* a lot of time when I got sick.
16. *Thank you for* your time.

Dutch (*Leven in metaforen* 1999:15-16)

TIJD IS GELD

1. Daar wil ik mijn tijd niet aan *verspillen*.
2. Dat foefje kan je uren *besparen*.
3. Ik *heb* geen tijd voor je.
4. *Geef* me nog vijf minuten.
5. Hoe ga jij je vrije dagen *besteden*?
6. Die leuke band *kostte* me al met al een uur.
7. Ik heb veel tijd in haar *geïnvesteed*.
8. Ik *beschik* niet over *voldoende* tijd.
9. Er is geen tijd te *verliezen*.
10. *Heb* je een ogenblikje *voor me*?
11. Je tijd *raakt op*.
12. Je moet *zuinig* met je tijd *omspringen*.
13. Zorg dat je tijd *overhoudt* om te gaan zeilen.
14. Die tijd is *welbested*.
15. *Heb* je nog veel tijd *over*?
16. Hij heeft veel vrije dagen *opgespaard*.
17. Gebruik je tijd *nuttig*.
18. Je *bent* een hoop tijd *kwijt* aan heen en weer reizen.
19. Dat was een *tijdrovende* klus.

4.3.1 Corpus analysis

The phrases marked bold are phrases that have a similar meaning as various others in the examples. This Conceptual Metaphor shows more results in the Corpora than the CONDUIT Metaphor.

Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands Tijd is geld	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Tijd verspillen	120	
Uren besparen	0	<i>Tijd besparen 65</i>
Geen tijd hebben	747	<i>Tijd hebben 9662</i>
minuten geven	0	<i>Tijd geven 1134</i>
Dagen besteden	0	<i>Tijd besteden 542</i>
Kostte een uur	0	<i>Kost tijd 22</i>
Tijd investeren	100	
Over tijd beschikken	0	<i>Tijd beschikken 44</i>
Tijd verliezen	934	
Ogenblik hebben	0	<i>Tijd hebben 9662</i>
Tijd raakt op	7	
Zuinig omspringen met tijd	0	0
Tijd overhouden	101	<i>Tijd te veel 74</i>
Tijd welbested	0	<i>Tijd besteden 542</i>
Tijd over hebben	64	<i>Tijd overhouden 101, tijd hebben 9662</i>
Opgespaarde dagen	0	<i>Tijd sparen 64</i>

		<i>Tijd besparen 65</i>
Tijd nuttig gebruiken	7	<i>Tijd gebruiken 143</i> <i>Tijd goed gebruiken 13</i> <i>Tijd nuttig besteden 23</i>
Tijd kwijt zijn	67	<i>Tijd verliezen 934</i>
Tijdrovende klus	0	<i>Tijdrovend 988</i>

Table 9. Results Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands TIME IS MONEY

Corpus Gesproken Nederlands Tijd is geld	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Tijd verspillen	12	
Uren besparen	0	<i>Tijd besparen 2</i>
Geen tijd hebben	74	<i>Tijd hebben 339</i>
minuten geven	2	<i>Tijd geven 13</i>
Dagen besteden	1	<i>Tijd besteden 63</i>
Kostte een uur	0	<i>Kost tijd 2</i>
Tijd investeren	5	
Over tijd beschikken	2	<i>Tijd beschikken 2</i>
Tijd verliezen	37	
Ogenblik hebben	0	<i>Tijd hebben 339</i>
Tijd raakt op	0	
Zuinig omspringen met tijd	1	

Tijd overhouden	5	<i>Tijd te veel 1</i>
Tijd welbested	0	<i>Tijd besteden 63</i>
Tijd over hebben	30	<i>Tijd overhouden , tijd hebben 339</i>
Opgespaarde dagen	0	<i>Tijd sparen 4</i> <i>Tijd besparen 4</i>
Tijd nuttig gebruiken	1	<i>Tijd gebruiken 3</i> <i>Tijd goed gebruiken 1</i> <i>Tijd nuttig besteden 3</i>
Tijd kwijt zijn	10	<i>Tijd verliezen 37</i>
Tijdrovende klus	0	<i>Tijdrovend 5</i>

Table 10. Results Corpus Gesproken Nederlands

The number of hits varies greatly between the phrases and corpora, but the majority has a large number of hits. Especially when searching for similar phrases it becomes clear that when looking at these corpora the TIME IS MONEY Conceptual Metaphor works in Dutch. The survey shows a similar tendency.

4.3.2 Survey

All participants agreed that they would use the sentence ‘daar wil ik mijn tijd niet aan verspillen’. This metaphor also appears in both corpora, even though it occurs ten times more often in the *Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands* than in the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*.

Daar wil ik mijn tijd niet aan verspillen	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	0	50	50
I think this is regularly used	0	50	50

Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	48	2	50
More often used in spoken language	13	37	50
More often used in written language	47	3	50

Table 11. Survey Results Daar wil ik mijn tijd niet aan verspillen

The participants were less unanimous about 'ik beschik niet over voldoende tijd' (Table 12). This phrase is also less commonly found in the corpora, where 'tijd hebben' occurs very frequently. Most participants would rephrase it as 'ik heb niet genoeg tijd'. It seems that the participants who would not use this phrase find the actual verb more problematic than the metaphorical expression. Since 'ik heb geen tijd voor je' (Table 13) shows extremely different results, even though the message is almost the same. Here it becomes apparent that linguistic nuances can influence the perception of the metaphor, this suggests that even if the Conceptual Metaphor works for the language the grammar of the linguistic representation should be chosen carefully in order to achieve the desired effect.

Beschik niet over voldoende tijd	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	19	31	50
I think this is regularly used	10	40	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	41	9	50
More often used in spoken language	36	14	50

More often used in written language	16	34	50
-------------------------------------	----	----	----

Table 12. Results Ik beschik niet over voldoende tijd

The same may be true for ‘je moet zuinig met je tijd omspringen’.

Ik heb geen tijd voor je	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	2	48	50
I think this is regularly used	1	49	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	49	1	50
More often used in spoken language	9	41	50
More often used in written language	48	1	50

Table 13. Results Ik heb geen tijd voor je

This expression also has very few occurrences in the corpora and the participants seem somewhat divided. Several sentences in these examples seem to use verbs that are somewhat old-fashioned and therefore are not used as often as their modern counterparts, even when the message is the same.

Zuinig met je tijd omspringen	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	26	24	50

I think this is regularly used	18	32	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	32	18	50
More often used in spoken language	28	22	50
More often used in written language	26	24	50

Table 14. Results Zuinig met je tijd omspringen

The specific results for all of the examples can be found in Appendix B. The table below shows the combined results for all examples of the Dutch translation of TIME IS MONEY.

	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this metaphor	5.3%	94.7%	100%
I think this metaphor is frequently used in Dutch	0%	100%	100%
Theoretically this metaphor could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	100%	0%	100%
I think this occurs more often in spoken language than writtenn	15.8%	84.2%	100%

language			
I think this occurs more often in written language than spoken language	89.5%	10.5%	100%

Table 15. Combined Results TIME IS MONEY

Most of the participants would use the phrases themselves and almost all participants thought that it would be regularly used by others. Almost none of them thought that it would be used only theoretically. What is interesting is that most of the phrases were regarded as being more spoken language than written language. This is not shown by the results from the corpora, but most participants seemed to agree on this.

Conclusion TIME IS MONEY

Both the corpus analysis and the survey show that this Conceptual Metaphor works in Dutch. The phrases that had fewer hits or less participants that considered them regularly used language appeared to be caused by the chosen verb that may be considered old fashioned or less regularly used. This shows that the desired effect can suffer from poorly chosen words but the meaning and therefore Conceptual Metaphor stay intact.

4.4 ARGUMENT IS WAR

This Conceptual Metaphor has an equal number of examples in both books. Most of the English examples are translated in the Dutch version in sense, they are substituted by a similar metaphor, but some were not and some of the Dutch examples are added by the translator. For instance, ‘your claims are indefensible’ (no.1 EN) is literally translated into ‘Jouw stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar’ (no.1 NL). This is an example of direct translation or translating ‘sensu stricto’ for several other metaphors the same procedure is chosen. The second example in both versions is also similar. Yet, no.6 NL is an added metaphor, because there is no English equivalent in the original. Perhaps no.6 is similar in meaning but the realization(s) is (are) very different. The translator seems to have tried to stay as true to the ST as possible, but when necessary made changes for the Dutch audience. Overall it seems that the Dutch translator tried to include the ST as much as possible, while still focusing on the Target audience. Again it seems that the differences are linguistic rather than cognitive.

English (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:4)

ARGUMENT IS WAR

1. Your claims are *indefensible*.
2. He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.
3. His criticisms were *right on target*.
4. I *demolished* his argument.
5. I've never *won* an argument with him.
6. You disagree? Okay, *shoot*!
7. If you use that *strategy*, he'll *wipe you out*.
8. He *shot down* all of my arguments.

Dutch (*Leven in Metaforen* 1999:12)

DISCUSSIE IS OORLOG

1. Jouw stellingen zijn *onverdedigbaar*.
2. Hij *viel me aan* op elk *zwak punt* in mijn betoog.
3. Zijn kritiek heeft mij *zwaar getroffen*.
4. Haar oordeel was *vernietigend*.
5. Hij heeft zich in een *onhoudbare positie gemanoeuvreerd*.
6. Dat *bestrijd* ik.
7. Als je die *strategie* volgt zal hij je zeker *van de kaart vegen*.
8. Die opmerking *sloeg in als een bom*.

4.4.1 Corpus analysis

Similarly the CONDUIT metaphor to There were almost no results found for the examples of ARGUMENT IS WAR.

Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands Argument is war	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Jouw stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar.	0	Stelling verdedigen: 95
Hij viel me aan op elk zwak	0	

punt in mijn betoog		
Zijn kritiek heeft mij zwaar getroffen	0	0
Haar oordeel was vernietigend	0	Vernietigend oordeel: 173
Hij heeft zich in een onhoudbare positie gemanoeuvreerd	0	
Dat bestrijd ik	0	Punt/bericht bestrijden: 2
Als je die strategie volgt, zal hij je zeker van de kaart vegen	0	
Die opmerking sloeg in als een bom	0	

Table 16. Results Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands ARGUMENT IS WAR

Corpus Gesproken Nederlands Argument is war	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Jouw stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar.	0	Stelling verdedigen: 7
Hij viel me aan op elk zwak punt in mijn betoog	0	
Zijn kritiek heeft mij zwaar getroffen	0	0
Haar oordeel was	0	Vernietigend oordeel: 2

vernietigend		
Hij heeft zich in een onhoudbare positie gemanoeuvreerd	0	
Dat bestrijd ik	6	Punt/bericht bestrijden: 5
Als je die strategie volgt, zal hij je zeker van de kaart vegen	0	
Die opmerking sloeg in als een bom	0	

Table 17. Results Corpus Geproken Nederlands ARGUMENT IS WAR

What is remarkable is that ‘stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar’ and ‘oordeel is vernietigend’ had no results but ‘stelling verdedigen’ and ‘vernietigend oordeel’ occurred very often.

4.4.2 Survey

The participants seemed to disagree on the usage of these examples. Many examples were divided 50/50 on whether or not they were used, as can be seen in Tables 18 and 19. These were the phrases that were not found in the corpora, but when slightly rephrased have many hits. It might be that the specific linguistic representation is not very common. But then it is odd that this representation is chosen by the translator.

Stellingen onverdedigbaar	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this myself	23	27	50
I think this is regularly used	17	33	50
Theoretically this	32	18	50

could be used but I don't think it will			
More often used in spoken language	31	19	50
More often used in written language	24	26	50

Table 18. Results Survey Jouw stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar

Oordeel vernietigend	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this myself	16	34	50
I think this is regularly used	12	39	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	39	11	50
More often used in spoken language	36	14	50
More often used in written language	20	30	50

Table 19. Results Survey Haar oordeel was vernietigend

Since these phrases were not found in the corpora unless rephrased and the participants were also reluctant to mark them regularly used it seems that these linguistic representations do not work in Dutch. Yet, the participants did agree on how to rephrase the phrases, suggesting that the meaning was clear. This, again, is an example where the Conceptual Metaphor works but the chosen verbs in the linguistic representation seems to fail.

The expression with the most widely accepted result was ‘die opmerking sloeg in als een bom’ Which is surprising because the corpora have no examples of this expression.

Sloeg in als een bom	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this myself	5	45	50
I think this is regularly used	6	44	50
Theoretically this could be used but I don't think it will	43	7	50
More often used in spoken language	17	33	50
More often used in written language	41	9	50

Table 20. Survey Results Die opmerking sloeg in als een bom

The participants are almost unanimous about the usage of this phrase and yet it no occurrences in the corpora.

The specific results for all of the examples can be found in Appendix C. The table below shows the combined results for all examples of the Dutch translation of TIME IS MONEY.

	Disagree	Agree	50/50	Total
I would use this metaphor	25%	75%		100%
I think this metaphor is frequently used in Dutch	12.5%	87.5%		100%
Theoretically this metaphor could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	100%	0%		100%
I think this occurs more often in spoken language than written language	87.5%	12.5%		100%
I think this occurs more often in written language than spoken language	37.5%	50%	12.5%	100%

Table 21. Combined results ARGUMENT IS WAR 50/50 shows that for some examples an equal number of participants selected 'agree' or 'disagree'

The participants thought that the phrases would be used in Dutch ,which again is surprising when regarding the Corpora results.

The tendency for all examples seems to be that even if the expressions are not found in the corpora, most examples are used in Dutch, and that when participants would not use the

phrase it is more likely that the verb in this particular representation is old-fashioned and not that the metaphor does not work. The translator generally tried to translate most metaphors as directly as possible and if necessary substituted them for very similar ones. If a metaphor could (according to the translator) not be transferred to Dutch, some Dutch examples that supported the argument were used. This is also a form of substitution. In some cases, extra Dutch examples were added. What is very interesting is that even the examples that were literally translated, were regarded as expressions regularly used in Dutch so either Dutch and English share many expressions or the metaphors work just as well in either language.

Conclusion ARGUMENT IS WAR

This Conceptual Metaphor works in Dutch even though some specific representations were rather unpopular with the participants of the survey. Like with the other Conceptual Metaphors the cause seemed to be the word-choice rather than the idea that was conveyed.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

Conclusion

What is very striking in the results of this research is that many of the metaphor translations do not occur in the corpora and if they do occur, it is often only to a very limited extent. This was unexpected. What is equally striking is that the participants of the survey often claim they do not use these metaphors themselves, but they do think that the metaphor is used by others and that it could occur in the Dutch language. This, together with the interpretations given by the participants, shows that even if the metaphor is not used often in Dutch, they still do understand what is meant by the phrase. This suggests that on a cognitive level the metaphor works for speakers of Dutch but that the way the metaphor is expressed linguistically differs greatly.

From this information it can be concluded that for the investigated Conceptual Metaphors the same CM's apply for speakers of English and speakers of Dutch. Not only do the same CM's work, even some similar representations work, even though they might not be regularly used in Dutch. Monti's results for the translations of French, Spanish and Italian were quite similar to this. The Romance languages and the Germanic languages thus showed no great difference in the productivity of the Conceptual Metaphors presented by Lakoff and Johnson. The results of these two researches shows that Conceptual Metaphors are productive on a cross-cultural level. The fact that metaphors that are not necessarily part of the idioms used in a certain language are still understood by its speakers shows that the cognitive level of metaphor understanding is more important than just the linguistic representation. This corresponds with the theories stating that metaphors are often derived from the same Source Domain, but differ in the linguistic details. In other words, the languages have 'partial similarity' (Ponterotto in Tabakowska et al. 2010).

This means that the ideal procedures for translating metaphors might be different to what is until now customary to think. While it is customary to try to translate a text with the closest equivalence to the Source Text, for metaphors it is often suggested that either a frequently used similar metaphor for the TT should be found, or that the metaphor should be discarded (converted into sense, or non-metaphorical language). When taking into account the results of the researches by Monti and in this paper it might be argued that the metaphor used in the ST could be transferred practically word-for-word to the TT, because on a cognitive level the metaphor can still be understood. This could result in TT's that are closer to the ST

with less loss of the original meaning and imagery of the text, which could affect the meaning of the TT a great deal.

Conceptual Metaphors can be productive on a cross-cultural level. This should call for a change in the approach of metaphors in translation. Rather than regarding them as idioms of a particular language or culture that should not be changed, it can be argued that because metaphors are processed according to a certain CM it is possible to create new representations of these metaphors in the TT in order to find the closest (working) equivalent to the ST.

Chapter Six

Limitations and further research

6.1 Limitations

Naturally this research does have its limitations and problems. The first is that this study only covers the translations into four languages and two language groups. Therefore it can hardly be claimed that this research holds truths for the cross-cultural productivity of CM on a global level. Secondly, the researched languages are all from Western cultures which obviously hold more similarities to each other than Western and, for instance, Middle Eastern cultures. Further research involving more languages from various cultures should be conducted to be able to make a statement about the global cross-cultural productivity of CMT.

6.2.1 The Corpora

Even though the Corpora both consist of an enormous number of texts and words, their scope is limited to certain text-types and does not show the complete Dutch language. The *Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands* mainly consists of texts from newspapers, magazines, news broadcasts and legal documents and the composition of the *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* is shown by the figure below.

label 3. Beoogde samenstelling van het kerncorpus (najaar 1998)

Component	Totaal aantal woorden in basiscorpus	Hoeveelheid materiaal voorzien van een		
		fonetische transcriptie en oplijning	syntactische annotatie	prosodische annotatie
1. conversaties ("face-to-face")	3.000.000	150.000	550.000	100.000
2. interviews	400.000	50.000	50.000	20.000
3. telefoondialogen	3.000.000	300.000	100.000	50.000
4. zakelijke onderhandelingen	175.000	15.000	15.000	10.000
5. interviews en discussies	750.000	75.000	75.000	10.000
6. discussies, debatten, vergaderingen	375.000	35.000	35.000	10.000
7. lessen	350.000	35.000	35.000	0
8. beschrijving van route of plaatjes	10.000	5.000	5.000	0
9. spontaan commentaar	250.000	27.500	27.500	10.000
10. actualiteitenrubrieken, reportages	250.000	25.000	25.000	10.000
11. nieuwsbulletins	250.000	27.500	27.500	10.000
12. beschouwingen, commentaren	200.000	25.000	25.000	10.000
13. lezingen, toespraken	275.000	30.000	30.000	10.000
14. voorgelezen tekst	625.000 (+ 375.000)	200.000	0	0
Totaal	10.000.000	1.000.000	1.000.000	250.000

http://lands.let.ru.nl/cgn/doc_Dutch/topics/design/design.htm#intro

Especially the *Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands* is first of all limited to written language, which differs greatly from spoken language and also consists mainly of more official text-

types which might rule out certain phrases all together. The *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands* does consist of various spoken forms of the Dutch language, but since it is not known what the conversations or other spoken items were about, it is difficult to determine how likely it is that the phrases used in the book were likely to occur in these specific discourses.

These were some of the limitations created by the content of both corpora, but also searching the corpora had its difficulties. Since the phrases were very specific, it makes sense that these exact phrases would not occur very often in these corpora. This is why also similar phrases were searched. The other problem was that sometimes the results did include the words, but were not at all the phrase that this research needed, therefore it was necessary to check the results.

6.2.2 The survey

The survey had its own limitations. First of all the number of participants, the data of fifty participants hardly covers the ideas of all speakers of the Dutch language. Secondly most participants were female and it is not within the scope of this research to investigate the differences between the language use of men and women. Thirdly there is the age and education of the participants: Most of them were either between the age of 20-30 or 50-70 and most of them either had finished higher education (University/HBO) or were enrolled in this type of education. This shows that the respondents were divided into two quite homogenous groups age-wise and very homogenous education-wise. This may have influenced the results, since Dutch speakers of other ages and educational backgrounds may use different metaphors. Again this is beyond the scope of this research.

6.3 Suggestions further research

As stated above in order to be able to obtain a better idea of the cross-cultural similarities between conceptual metaphors, a study involving more language groups should be conducted. Also research regarding different ages and educational levels of participants might give some interesting results.

References

- Alvarez, Antonia. "On Translating Metaphor." *Meta Meta: Journal Des Traducteurs* 38.3 (1993): 479. Web.
- Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere. *Translation, History, and Culture*. London: Pinter, 1990. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. Print.
- Broeck, Raymond Van Den. "The Limits of Translatability Exemplified by Metaphor Translation." *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1981): 73. Web.
- Cameron, Lynne, and Graham Low. "Metaphor." *Language Teaching LTA* 32.02 (1999): 77. Web.
- Cameron, Lynne, and Robert Maslen. *Metaphor Analysis: Research Practice in Applied Linguistics, Social Sciences and the Humanities*. Oakville, CT: Equinox Pub., 2010. Print.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius, and Harry Mortimer Hubbell. *De Inventione*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U, 1960. Print.
- Deeney, John J. "Biculturalism and Translation." *The Asian Messenger*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (1977), pp. 30-35.
- Deignan, Alice. "Linguistic Metaphors and Collocation in Nonliterary Corpus Data." *Metaphor and Symbol* 14.1 (1999): 19-36. Web.
- Deignan, Alice, and Liz Potter. "A Corpus Study of Metaphors and Metonyms in English and Italian." *Journal of Pragmatics* 36.7 (2003): 1231-252. Web.
- Deignan, Alice. *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub., 2005. Print.
- Dickins, James. "Two Models for Metaphor Translation." *Target Target International Journal of Translation Studies* 17.2 (2005): 227-73. Web.
- Dobrzyńska, Teresa. "Translating Metaphor: Problems of Meaning." *Journal of Pragmatics* 24.6 (1995): 595-604. Web.
- Fellini, Federico. *Federico Fellini: Working Drawings, 1952-1982: For the Films La Dolce Vita, Satyricon, Amarcord, Il Casanova and Others: 15 November to 13 December 1986*. New York: Pierre Matisse Gallery, 1986. Print.

- Gibbs, Raymond W., and Gerard Steen. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics: Selected Papers from the Fifth International Cognitive Linguistics Conference, Amsterdam, July 1997*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1997. Print.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford UP, 2010. Print.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. "Language, Figurative Thought, and Cross-Cultural Comparison." *Metaphor and Symbol* 18.4 (2003): 311-20. Web.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1980. Print.
- Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson, and Monique Van. Dam. *Leven in Metaforen*. Nijmegen: SUN, 1999. Print.
- Lefevere, André. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Maalej, Zouhair A. "Translating Metaphor between Unrelated Cultures: A Cognitive-pragmatic Perspective." *Sayyab Translation Journal* 1 (2008): n. pag. Print.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Monti, Enrico. "Translating The Metaphors We Live By." *European Journal of English Studies* 13.2 (2009): 207-21. Web.
- Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International, 1988. Print.
- Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford UP, 1936. Print.
- Schäffner, Christina. "Finding Space under the Umbrella: The Euro Crisis, Metaphors, and Translation." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 17 (2012): n. pag. Print.
- Schäffner, Christina. "Metaphor and Translation: Some Implications of a Cognitive Approach." *Journal of Pragmatics* 36.7 (2003): 1253-269. Web.
- Selver, Paul. *The Art of Translating Poetry*. London: Jon Baker, 1986. Print.
- Sin-Wai, Chan. *An Encyclopedia of Translation: Chinese-English, English-Chinese*. Hong Kong: Chinese U, 1995. Print.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol, and Stefan Thomas Gries. *Corpus-based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*. Berlin: M. De Gruyter, 2006. Print.

- Tabakowska, Elżbieta, Michał Choiński, and Łukasz Wiraszka. *Cognitive Linguistics in Action: From Theory to Application and Back*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 2010. Print.
- Toury, Gideon. "Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond." *Benjamins Translation Library* (1995): n. pag. Web.
- Vermeer, Hans J. (1996). A Skopos Theory of Translation (Some arguments for and against). TEXTconTEXT, Heidelberg

Appendix A

CONDUIT METAPHOR

English

15. It's hard to get that idea across to him.
16. I gave you that idea.
17. Your reasons came through to us.
18. It's difficult to put my ideas into words.
19. When you have a good idea, try to capture it immediately in words.
20. Try to pack more thought into fewer words.
21. You can't simply stuff ideas into a sentence any old way.
22. The meaning is right there in the words
23. Don't force your meanings into the wrong words.
24. His words carry little meaning
25. The introduction has a great deal of thought content.
26. Your words seem hollow.
27. The sentence is without meaning.
28. The idea is buried in terribly dense paragraphs.

Dutch

14. zij heeft me een paar goede ideeën aan de hand gedaan
15. het nieuws bereikte haar binnen een uur
16. dat idee is niet eenvoudig over te brengen
17. hij stopt erg veel gedachten in een paragraaf
18. in mijn brief staat precies wat ik bedoel
19. het dringt nu pas tot me door wat je bedoelde
20. het is moeilijk om je ideeën in woorden te gieten
21. je moet de boodschap in vriendelijke woorden verpakken
22. daar zit iets in
23. ik kan haar bedoelingen niet uit deze brief halen
24. het zijn grote woorden zonder veel inhoud
25. het zijn holle frasen
26. de inleidende tekst bevat een aantal aardige ideeën

Corpus analysis

Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Conduit Metafoor		
Ideeën aan de hand gedaan	0	<i>Ideeën aanreiken 1</i>
Nieuws bereikte haar	0	0

Idee overbrengen	4	<i>Gedachte overbrengen 1</i>
Gedachten stoppen in	0	0
In brief staat	1	0
Dringt door wat je bedoelde	0	<i>Informatie door dringen 15</i>
Ideeën in woorden gieten	0	
Boodschap verpakken	15	
Daar zit iets in	0	
Bedoeling uit brief halen	0	
Woorden zonder inhoud	0	
Holle frasen	0	
Tekst bevat	0	

Corpus Gesproken Nederlands Conduit Metafoor	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Ideeën aan de hand gedaan	1	<i>Ideeën aanreiken 0</i>
Nieuws bereikte haar	0	
Idee overbrengen	0	<i>Gedachte overbrengen 0</i>
Gedachten stoppen in	0	
In brief staat	17	
Dringt door wat je bedoelde	0	<i>Informatie door dringen 1</i>
Ideeën in woorden gieten	0	
Boodschap verpakken	0	
Daar zit iets in	0	
Bedoeling uit brief halen	0	
Woorden zonder inhoud	0	

Holle frasen	0	
Tekst bevat	0	

Survey

Zij heeft me een paar goede ideeën aan de hand gedaan

	disagree	agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	28	22	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	21	29	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	33	17	50
More spoken language than written language	28	22	50
More written language than spoken language	27	23	50

Most used interpretation: goede ideeën gegeven

Most divergent interpretation: ze kwam met goede tips

Het nieuws bereikte haar binnen een uur

	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	6	43	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	46	49
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't	42	46	48

think it actually does			
More spoken language than written language	33	16	49
More written language than spoken language	20	29	49

Most used interpretation: ze hoorde het nieuws binnen een uur

Most divergent interpretation: binnen een uur bij haar bekend

Dat idee is niet eenvoudig over te brengen

	Disagree	agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	5	44	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	6	43	49
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	45	4	49
More spoken language than written language	25	24	49
More written language than spoken language	22	21	49

Most used interpretation: niet eenvoudig uit te leggen

Most divergent interpretation: moeilijk in begrijpelijke taal uit te leggen

Hij stopt erg veel gedachten in een paragraaf

	Disagree	agree	total
I would use this	34	16	50

phrase myself			
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	35	15	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	23	27	50
More spoken language than written language	35	15	50
More written language than spoken language	22	28	50

Most used interpretation: probeert veel te zeggen

Most divergent interpretation: geen idee, veel zeggen met weinig woorden

note: veel mensen leken hier moeite mee te hebben

In brief staat wat precies wat ik bedoel

	Disagree	agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	2	48	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	47	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	47	3	50
More spoken language than written language	18	32	50
More written language than spoken language	41	9	50

Most used interpretation: ik heb precies geschreven wat ik bedoel

Most divergent interpretation: ik snap de metafoor niet

note: veel mensen gaven aan het precies zo te zeggen en niet anders

Dringt nu pas tot me door wat je bedoelde

	Disagree	agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	0	50	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	1	49	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	48	2	50
More spoken language than written language	11	39	50
More written language than spoken language	43	7	50

Most used interpretation: ik begrijp nu pas wat je bedoelde

Most divergent interpretation: niet anders zeggen

Het is moeilijk om je ideeën in woorden te gieten

	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	35	15	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	30	20	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	23	27	50
More spoken language than written	33	17	50

language			
More written language than spoken language	20	30	50

Most used interpretation: moeilijk ideeën uit te leggen

Most divergent interpretation: om te zetten in woorden

Je moet de boodschap in vriendelijke woorden verpakken

	Disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	14	36	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	15	35	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	38	12	50
More spoken language than written language	29	26	50
More written language than spoken language	30	20	50

Most used interpretation: vriendelijk overbrengen

Meest afwijkend: subtiel brengen / de pil vergulden

Daar zit iets in

	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	0	50	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	0	50	50

Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	47	3	50
More spoken language than written language	7	47	50
More written language than spoken language	47	3	50

Most used interpretation: daar heb je een punt/gelijk hebben

Most divergent interpretation: niet anders zeggen/daar kan ik mij in vinden

Ik kan haar bedoelingen niet uit deze brief halen

	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	13	37	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	6	44	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	43	7	50
More spoken language than written language	28	22	50
More written language than spoken language	29	21	50

Most used interpretation: ik snap niet wat ze bedoeld

Most divergent interpretation: opmerken

Het zijn grote woorden zonder veel inhoud

	Disagree	agree	total
--	----------	-------	-------

I would use this phrase myself	11	39	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	12	38	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	41	9	50
More spoken language than written language	22	28	50
More written language than spoken language	32	18	50

Most used interpretation: in de strekking van het betekent niet veel

Most divergent interpretation holle vaten klinken het hardst, het is bokito taal, eerst zien dan geloven, holle frasen

Het zijn holle frasen

	Disagree	agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	33	16	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	32	17	49
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	22	27	49
More spoken language than written language	38	11	49
More written language than spoken	19	30	49

language			
----------	--	--	--

Most used interpretation: geen betekenis/ er wordt niet gezegd

Most divergent interpretation: geen idee wat dit betekend, stereotype zinnen die niets betekenen.

Tekst bevat ideeën

	Disagree	agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	3	46	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	1	47	48
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	45	4	49
More spoken language than written language	38	10	48
More written language than spoken language	18	30	48

Most used interpretation: in de tekst staan een aantal aardige ideeën

Most divergent interpretation: de inleiding is een interessant verhaal

CONDUIT METAPHOR all phrases

Percentage of Questions most answerde with agree or disagree.

	disagree	Agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	30,8%	69,2%	100%
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	23.1%	76.9%	100%
Theoretically this	76.9%	23.1%	100%

phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does			
More spoken language than written language	69,3%	30,8%	100%
More written language than spoken language	53.8%	46.2%	100%

Appendix B

TIME IS MONEY

English

17. You're wasting my time
18. This gadget will save you hours
19. I don't have the time to give you
20. How do you spend your time these days?
21. The flat tire cost me an hour
22. I've invested a lot of time in her
23. I don't have enough time to spare for that
24. You're running out of time
25. You need to budget your time
26. Put aside some time for ping pong
27. Is that worth your while?
28. Do you have much time left?
29. He's living on borrowed time
30. You don't use your time profitably
31. I lost a lot of time when I got sick
32. Thank you for your time

Dutch

20. Daar wil ik mijn tijd niet aan verspillen
21. dat foefje kan je uren besparen
22. ik heb geen tijd voor je
23. geef me nog vijf minuten
24. hoe ga jij je vrije dagen besteden?
25. die lekke band kostte me al met al een uur
26. ik heb veel tijd in haar geïnvesteerd
27. ik beschik niet over voldoende tijd
28. er is geen tijd te verliezen
29. heb je een ogenblikje voor me?
30. je tijd raakt op
31. je moet zuinig met je tijd omspringen
32. zorg dat je tijd overhoudt om te gaan zeilen
33. die tijd is welbested
34. heb je nog veel tijd over?
35. hij heeft veel vrije dagen opgespaard
36. gebruik je tijd nuttig
37. je bent een hoop tijd kwijt aan heen en weer reizen
38. dat was een tijdrovende klus

Corpus analysis

Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands Tijd is geld	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Tijd verspillen	120	
Uren besparen	0	<i>Tijd besparen 65</i>
Geen tijd hebben	747	<i>Tijd hebben 9662</i>
minuten geven	0	<i>Tijd geven 1134</i>
Dagen besteden	0	<i>Tijd besteden 542</i>
Kostte een uur	0	<i>Kost tijd 22</i>
Tijd investeren	100	
Over tijd beschikken	0	<i>Tijd beschikken 44</i>
Tijd verliezen	934	
Ogenblik hebben	0 (metaforisch)	<i>Tijd hebben 9662</i>
Tijd raakt op	7	
Zuinig omspringen met tijd	0	0
Tijd overhouden	101	<i>Tijd te veel 74</i>
Tijd welbested	0	<i>Tijd besteden 542</i>
Tijd over hebben	64	<i>Tijd overhouden 101, tijd hebben 9662</i>
Opgespaarde dagen	0	<i>Tijd sparen 64</i> <i>Tijd besparen 65</i>
Tijd nuttig gebruiken	7	<i>Tijd gebruiken 143</i> <i>Tijd goed gebruiken 13</i> <i>Tijd nuttig besteden 23</i>
Tijd kwijt zijn	67	<i>Tijd verliezen 934</i>
Tijdrovende klus	0	<i>Tijdrovend 988</i>

--	--	--

Corpus Gesproken Nederlands	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Tijd is geld		
Tijd verspillen	12	
Uren besparen	0	<i>Tijd besparen 2</i>
Geen tijd hebben	74	<i>Tijd hebben 339</i>
minuten geven	2	<i>Tijd geven 13</i>
Dagen besteden	1	<i>Tijd besteden 63</i>
Kostte een uur	0	<i>Kost tijd 2</i>
Tijd investeren	5	
Over tijd beschikken	2	<i>Tijd beschikken 2</i>
Tijd verliezen	37	
Ogenblik hebben	0	<i>Tijd hebben 339</i>
Tijd raakt op	0	
Zuinig omspringen met tijd	1	
Tijd overhouden	5	<i>Tijd te veel 1</i>
Tijd welbested	0	<i>Tijd besteden 63</i>
Tijd over hebben	30	<i>Tijd overhouden , tijd hebben 339</i>
Opgespaarde dagen	0	<i>Tijd sparen 4</i> <i>Tijd besparen 4</i>
Tijd nuttig gebruiken	1	<i>Tijd gebruiken 3</i> <i>Tijd goed gebruiken 1</i> <i>Tijd nuttig besteden 3</i>
Tijd kwijt zijn	10	<i>Tijd verliezen 37</i>

Tijdrovende klus	0	<i>Tijdrovend 5</i>
------------------	---	---------------------

Survey

Daar wil ik mijn tijd niet aan verspillen

	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	0	50	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	0	50	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	48	2	50
More spoken language than written language	13	37	50
More written language than spoken language	47	3	50

Most used interpretation: zonde van tijd

Most divergent interpretation: dat vind ik onzin, niet anders zeggen

Dat foefje kan je uren besparen

	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	7	43	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	9	41	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	44	6	50

More spoken language than written language	15	35	50
More written language than spoken language	42	8	50

Most used interpretation: tijd besparen, tijd schelen

Most divergent interpretation: tijd winnen

Ik heb geen tijd voor je

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	2	48	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	1	49	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	49	1	50
More spoken language than written language	9	41	50
More written language than spoken language	48	1	50

Most used interpretation: te druk hebben

Most divergent interpretation: ik wil je niet zien

Geef me nog vijf minuten

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	0	50	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in	0	50	50

Dutch			
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	49	1	50
More spoken language than written language	5	45	50
More written language than spoken language	46	3	49

Most used interpretation: ik ben over 5 minuten klaar, heb nog vijf minuten nodig

Most divergent interpretation: niet anders zeggen

Hoe ga jij je vrije dagen besteden?

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	6	44	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	4	46	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	46	4	50
More spoken language than written language	24	26	50
More written language than spoken language	30	20	50

Most used interpretation: wat ga je doen tijdens je vrije dagen?

Most divergent interpretation: allemaal iets in de strekking van meest geïnterpreteerde

Die leuke band kostte me een uur

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	4	45	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	46	49
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	46	3	49
More spoken language than written language	14	35	49
More written language than spoken language	42	7	49

Most used interpretation: uur bezig geweest met

Most divergent interpretation: het duurde heel lang

Ik heb veel tijd in haar geïnvesteerd

	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	5	45	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	47	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	48	2	50
More spoken language than written language	18	32	50
More written language than spoken	34	16	50

language			
----------	--	--	--

Most used interpretation: veel tijd aan haar besteed

Most divergent interpretation: gestopt (wat betekent dat), niet anders zeggen

Ik beschik niet over voldoende tijd

	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	19	31	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	10	40	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	41	9	50
More spoken language than written language	36	14	50
More written language than spoken language	16	34	50

Most used interpretation: heb niet genoeg tijd

Most divergent interpretation: mijn agenda is vol

Er is geen tijd te verliezen

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	5	45	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	2	48	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't	46	4	50

think it actually does			
More spoken language than written language	15	35	50
More written language than spoken language	38	12	50

Most used interpretation: opschieten/haast, snel zijn

Most divergent interpretation: het is vijf voor twaalf

Heb je een ogenblikje voor me?

	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	8	42	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	2	48	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	45	5	50
More spoken language than written language	9	40	49
More written language than spoken language	43	7	50

Most used interpretation: heb je even/tijd/moment?

Most divergent interpretation interpretatie: wil je even wachten

Je tijd raakt op

	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	17	32	49

I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	12	37	49
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	40	49	49
More spoken language than written language	16	33	49
More written language than spoken language	47	12	49

Most used interpretation: niet veel tijd meer

Most divergent interpretation: niet anders zeggen, gaat voorbij

Je moet zuinig met je tijd omspringen

	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	26	24	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	18	32	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	32	18	50
More spoken language than written language	28	22	50
More written language than spoken language	26	24	50

Most used interpretation: tijd goed gebruiken/besteden

Most divergent interpretation: bewuste keuzes maken over hoe lang je met iets bezig bent en wat je wel en niet kunt doen

Zorg dat je tijd overhoudt om te gaan zeilen

	Disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	6	43	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	47	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	45	5	50
More spoken language than written language	16	34	50
More written language than spoken language	42	8	50

Most used interpretation: zorg dat je genoeg tijd hebt om te gaan zeilen

Most divergent interpretation: zorg dat je alles goed plant

Die tijd is welbested

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	18	21	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	18	21	49
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	32	16	48
More spoken language than written language	34	15	49

More written language than spoken language	18	31	49
--	----	----	----

Most used interpretation: tijd nuttig/goed gebruikt

Most divergent interpretation: die tijd hadden we echt nodig gehad

Heb je nog veel tijd over?

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	3	46	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	46	49
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	46	3	49
More spoken language than written language	6	43	49
More written language than spoken language	47	1	48

Most used interpretation: heb je nog genoeg tijd/tijd vrij

Most divergent interpretation: meerdere zouden het niet anders zeggen

Hij heeft veel vrije dagen opgespaard

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	5	45	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	47	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in	47	2	49

Dutch but I don't think it actually does			
More spoken language than written language	17	33	50
More written language than spoken language	43	7	50

Most used interpretation: hij heeft nog veel vrij dagen (over/gespaard/bewaard) Gebruik je tijd nuttig

	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	5	35	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	46	49
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	46	4	50
More spoken language than written language	14	36	50
More written language than spoken language	39	10	49

Most used interpretation: zinvol/verdoe je tijd niet/besteed tijd nuttig

Most divergent interpretation: doe alleen dingen die belangrijk zijn en geen dingen die leuk zijn/houd op met lanterfantten

Je bent een hoop tijd aan heen en weer reizen

	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	0	50	50

I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	1	49	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	49	1	50
More spoken language than written language	5	45	50
More written language than spoken language	47	3	50

Most used interpretation: kost tijd/neemt hoop tijd in beslag/verliest tijd

Most divergent interpretation: lange reistijd

Note: meeste lijken op eerdere metaforen uit de enquête!

Dat was een tijdrovende klus

	disagree	Agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	9	41	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	3	43	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	44	6	50
More spoken language than written language	21	29	50
More written language than spoken language	32	18	50

Most used interpretation: kostte veel tijd/tijd kwijt/duurde lang

Most divergent interpretation: -

Percentage of questions answered with agree or disagree

	disagree	agree	Total
I would use this phrase myself	5.3%	94.7%	100%
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	0%	100%	100%
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	100%	0%	100%
More spoken language than written language	15.8%	84.2%	100%
More written language than spoken language	89.5%	10.5%	100%

Appendix C

ARGUMENT IS WAR

English

9. Your claims are indefensible.
10. He attacked every weak point in my argument.
11. His criticisms were right on target.
12. I demolished his argument.
13. I've never won an argument with him.
14. You disagree? Okay, shoot!
15. If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.
16. He shot down all of my arguments.

Dutch

9. Jouw stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar
10. Hij viel me aan op elk zwak punt in mijn betoog
11. Zijn kritiek heeft mij zwaar getroffen
12. Haar oordeel was vernietigend
13. Hij heeft zich in een onhoudbare positie gemanoeuvreerd
14. Dat bestrijd ik
15. Als je die strategie volgt zal hij je zeker van de kaart vegen
16. Die opmerking sloeg in als een bom

Corpus analysis

Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands Argument is war	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Jouw stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar.	0	Stelling verdedigen: 95
Hij viel me aan op elk zwak punt in mijn betoog	0	
Zijn kritiek heeft mij zwaar getroffen	0	0
Haar oordeel was vernietigend	0	Vernietigend oordeel: 173
Hij heeft zich in een onhoudbare positie gemanoeuvreerd	0	
Dat bestrijd ik	0	Punt/bericht bestrijden: 2

Als je die strategie volgt, zal hij je zeker van de kaart vegen	0	
Die opmerking sloeg in als een bom	0	

Corpus Gesproken Nederlands Argument is war	Number of hits	Similar metaphor
Jouw stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar.	0	Stelling verdedigen: 7
Hij viel me aan op elk zwak punt in mijn betoog	0	
Zijn kritiek heeft mij zwaar getroffen	0	0
Haar oordeel was vernietigend	0	Vernietigend oordeel: 2
Hij heeft zich in een onhoudbare positie gemanoeuvreerd	0	
Dat bestrijd ik	6	Punt/bericht bestrijden: 5
Als je die strategie volgt, zal hij je zeker van de kaart vegen	0	
Die opmerking sloeg in als een bom	0	

Survey

Jouw stellingen zijn onverdedigbaar

	disagree	Agree	total
--	----------	-------	-------

I would use this phrase myself	23	27	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	17	33	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	32	18	50
More spoken language than written language	31	19	50
More written language than spoken language	24	26	50

Most used interpretation: dingen in strekking van kloppen niet

Meest afwijkend: je praat onzin, wat jij zegt daar sta ik niet achter, jouw stellingen zijn dusdanig schofferend dat ik me niet voor kan stellen hoe je ze met een goed hard {sic} kan verdedigen

Hij viel me aan op elk zwak punt in mijn betoog

	disagree	Agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	13	37	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	12	38	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	38	12	50
More spoken language than written language	28	12	50

More written language than spoken language	29	20	49
--	----	----	----

Most used interpretation: veel kritiek (op zwakke punten), wees op zwakke punten

Most divergent interpretation: pakte me aan, legde op alle slakken zout

Zijn kritiek heeft mij zwaar getroffen

	disagree	Agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	21	29	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	15	35	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	38	10	48
More spoken language than written language	29	21	50
More written language than spoken language	25	25	50

Most used interpretation: kritiek kwam hard aan/ heeft mij geraakt

Most divergent interpretation interpretatie: ik heb veel last van zijn kritiek, ik was erg geschrokken van zijn kritiek

Haar oordeel was vernietigend

	disagree	Agree	total
--	----------	-------	-------

I would use this phrase myself	16	34	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	12	39	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	39	11	50
More spoken language than written language	36	14	50
More written language than spoken language	20	30	50

Most used interpretation: haar oordeel was negatief,

Most divergent interpretation: de ene partij kreeg gelijk in bijna alles, ze vond het helemaal niets

Hij heeft zich in een onhoudbare positie gemanoeuvreerd

	disagree	Agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	22	27	49
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	17	33	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	34	16	50
More spoken language than written language	38	12	50

More written language than spoken language	18	22	50
--	----	----	----

Most used interpretation: hij heeft het zich moeilijk gemaakt, in een onmogelijke positie geplaatst, kan geen kant op

Most divergent interpretation: niet anders zeggen, hij heeft zich in de hoek geverfd

Dat bestrijd ik

	disagree	Agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	28	22	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	22	28	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	32	18	50
More spoken language than written language	33	17	50
More written language than spoken language	32	28	50

Most used interpretation: daar ben ik het niet mee agree

Most divergent interpretation: ik vecht er tegen

Als je die strategie volgt, zal hij je zeker van de kaart vegen.

	disagree	Agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	29	21	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	26	24	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	26	24	50
More spoken language than written language	32	18	50
More written language than spoken language	25	25	50

Most used interpretation: in de strekking: als je het zo aanpakt zal hij zeker winnen

Most divergent interpretation: als je dat doet zal hij je afschieten

Die opmerking sloeg in als een bom

	disagree	Agree	total
I would use this phrase myself	5	45	50
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	6	44	50
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	43	7	50
More spoken language than written language	17	33	50

More written language than spoken language	41	9	50
--	----	---	----

Most used interpretation: kwam hard aan kwam onverwacht

Most divergent interpretation: iedereen had het erover, dat wat gezegd werd was heftig

Percentage of questions answered with agree or disagree

	disagree	Agree	50/50	total
I would use this phrase myself	25%	75%		100%
I think this phrase is regularly used in Dutch	12.5%	87.5%		100%
Theoretically this phrase could occur in Dutch but I don't think it actually does	100%	0%		100%
More spoken language than written language	87.5%	12.5%		100%
More written language than spoken language	37.5%	50%	12.5%	100%