

Ana Rojo and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano, eds. 2013. *Cognitive Linguistics and Translation. Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 420 pp. ISBN: 978-3-11-030199-1. ISSN: 1861-4078.

BRIAN MOTT

Universitat de Barcelona

mott@ub.edu

The work here reviewed begins with a foreword by Mona Baker, Professor of Translation Studies at the University of Manchester (xi-xii), in which she recognizes the publication as “one of the few sustained attempts to explore the interface between Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies from a range of perspectives” (xi), and an introduction by the editors (1-30). It is then divided into five parts, each consisting of two or three articles, amounting to thirteen contributions in all (30-414). Two indexes (415-420) complete the volume, the first being an author and subject index, and the second a language index.

In the introduction the editors trace the gradual rapprochement of Translation and Linguistics up to the so-called “cultural turn” (5) of the 1980’s and 90’s, after which more attention is paid to “adequacy” (5) of the target text (i.e. translation of the pragmatics of the source-language text with correct interpretation of the author’s intention) and less to invariant meaning equivalence. Section 4 of the introduction (13-18) lists important considerations in linking Cognitive Linguistics (henceforth CL) to Translation Studies (henceforth TS), and these provide the backbone for the layout of the book, whose content is summarized chapter by chapter (15-18). In view of this summary, section 5 of this initial chapter (18-26) seems redundant.

Part I, entitled “Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Theory,” opens with a paper by Sandra L. Halverson, “Implications of Cognitive Linguistics for Translation Studies,” who supports the idea that words and sentences do not have meaning, but are subject to “the dynamic construal of meaning” (36) (see Croft and Cruse 2004, 97). Due importance is given to the probable activation of both languages in the language production of bilinguals (41) and to the relevance of this for a cognitive theory of translation. Section 2 of this paper (42-54) outlines “a small selection of key translational issues” (without making the criteria for this selection explicit), while section 3 (54-59) describes the work of several research groups using psycholinguistics as a basis to study the translation process. The relative merits of corpus-based and

experimental research are explained, but definite conclusions are apparently difficult to draw, though it is stated that CL may illuminate how different members of different cultures draw on a common cognitive apparatus (64).

In “More than a way with words. The interface between Cognitive Linguistics and Cognitive Translatology,” Ricardo Muñoz Martín concentrates on prototype semantics, conceptual metaphor and Frame Semantics. Relevance Theory is also applied, but it is different in that it is mentalistic and generative. The problem with Prototype Theory is that translatologists try to impose limits on fuzziness (76-80). After ten pages of theory, we finally encounter some examples (85). The processes of “simplification” and “explicitation” (Mauranen and Kujamäki 2004) are mentioned and Muñoz accepts House’s argument that some translators’ choices are imposed externally by readers, revisers, etc. (House 2008, 11). Muñoz hits the nail on the head regarding the importance of the competence of the translator (88).

In “Who cares if the cat is on the mat? Contributions of cognitive models of meaning to translation” (99-122), Celia Martín looks at meaning construction processes and examines the contribution of theories like Connectionism, Prototype Theory and Frame Semantics to the interpretation of meaning. The aims are stated clearly from the start and there are many references, but little personal opinion is adduced. Moreover, there is much insistence on the need for further research instead of an attempt to reach some conclusions.

Like Part I, Part II, “Meaning and translation,” contains three papers. The first paper, by Hans C. Boas, “Frame Semantics and translation,” shows how Frame Semantics (henceforth FS) can be used in translation and in the compilation of dictionaries. It also considers the universal vs. culture-specific nature of frames. The author links FS with its origins in Fillmore’s Case Grammar and illustrates its use well with the THEFT frame. We are shown how meanings may cut across frame distinctions made on the basis of English data (e.g., German *fabren* translates both English *drive* and *ride* [143]). Conversely, translation equivalents may simply be lacking: the Brazilian legal system has no exact equivalent of the American NOTIFICATION OF CHARGES frame (145). This is a very sound paper with well-chosen examples and a fair exposition of controversies.

Eva Samaniego Fernández’s contribution, “The Impact of Cognitive Linguistics on Descriptive Translation Studies: Novel metaphors in English-Spanish newspaper translation as a case in point,” laments the fact that the few studies dealing with the translation of metaphor from a cognitive perspective often show a prescriptive bias (159). Section 2.1 of the article (162-168), which discusses the translatability of metaphor, seems largely obvious, while section 2.2 (168-175), “Cognitive approaches to metaphor translation,” requires exemplification, although it does provide a useful review of the papers published in this field. Unfortunately, the topic of novel metaphors is not reached until pages 175-194, where Samaniego comments on examples found in the newspaper *El Mundo* in a one-year period. The sampling methodology is adequately explained and the results satisfactorily articulated. However, the idea that

creativity in the translation of metaphor justifies linguistic error (188) is unconvincing. Moreover, the contention that "... by making intentional or unintentional use of literal translations, translators are in fact enlarging the target conceptual world" should also be viewed with caution.

Finally, Mario Brdar and Rita Brdar Szabó offer an interesting paper on the use of metonymy in translation, "Translating (by means of) metonymy" (199-226). The shorter conceptual difference between metonymic source and target explains why metonymy translates more easily than metaphor (206).

Part III, "Constructions and translation," consists of three papers, the first being "(Cognitive) grammar in translation: Form as meaning," by Elżbieta Tabakowska. Like the previous paper, this one unadvisedly brackets part of the title. The author first discusses the conceptualization of images, in particular the principle of area (figure vs. ground) (231). This leads to the presentation of a case study in Section 3, which is the analysis of the translation of a poem by Emily Dickinson into Polish, and which could have been the focus for the whole article. Nevertheless, the author successfully shows how the Polish translation "prompts an interpretation different from that imposed upon the reader by the original poem" (237). The conclusions (247-248) are concordant with the aims: "... verbal expression is an interpretation rather than a reflection of things," and the Polish translation is not necessarily an inaccurate rendering.

In "Lexicalization patterns and translation," Ibarretxe-Antuñano and Filipović explain that translations may be either manipulations of original texts to suit the target language or may make use of different lexicalization patterns so that the concept of path is expressed with varying attention to certain details—Talmy refers to *verb-framed* and *satellite-framed* languages (1991; 2000). On the whole, the facts of this theory are expressed accurately, but it is wrong to say that "John went out running ..." and "John exited the house running ..." could be acceptable grammatically correct variants of "John rushed out ..." (253). The chapter rightly emphasizes the fact that Manner is not an *either/or* feature in different languages, and also makes the important point for translators into English that "the Manner of motion can be spontaneously added since it is the most natural way to lexicalize motion events in English" (270-271).

Ana Rojo and Javier Valenzuela offer the title "Constructing meaning in translation: The role of constructions in translation problems," but it is not clear whether the second half of this title means "in *producing* translation problems" or "in *resolving* translation problems." The authors are in favour of construction as "a suitable meeting point for linguistic and semantic equivalence" (286), so the chapter looks at the possible application of Construction Grammar to translation, in particular the resultative construction, and gives details of a study conducted by the authors involving eye-tracking in a translation task.

Part IV, "Culture and translation," consists of two papers. Enrique Bernárdez's "A cognitive view on (sic) the role of culture" (313-338) begins with reference to certain "untranslatable" terms, like Portuguese *saudade* (313-314), whose cultural content is

difficult to transfer. The problem of translating figurative language is commented on, and culture is shown to be present at the most linguistic level of translation, as in forms of address and use of pronouns in different languages. Interesting data and examples are offered from various sources.

In “Cultural conceptualisations and translating political discourse” (339-371), Farzad Sharifian and Maryam Jamarani show how manipulative political discourse can be and how conflicts can be aggravated by nations (e.g., the USA and Iran) demonizing one another. Translation into Persian of the terms *compromise* and *concession* is examined in some detail, along with the complex semantics of *jihad* (346-350). As figurative language looms large in political discourse, many good examples of this are quoted and much of Lakoff and Johnson’s theory of metaphor (1980) is appropriately applied. All in all, this is an excellent contribution underlining the dangers lurking in the misinterpretation of metaphors.

Part V, “Beyond translation,” contains two contributions. The first, “Experimental lexical semantics at the crossroads between languages” (375-394) by Michele I. Feist, discusses ways in which insights from experimental lexical semantics may help to delimit meaning and assist the translator in interpreting the cognitive content of the text. The article is a comprehensive review of the existing body of work on the topic with particular reference to spatial relations, and includes comments on the author’s own experiments with the prepositions *in* and *on* (e.g., Feist 2010).

In “A cognitive approach to translation: The psycholinguistic perspective” (395-414), Anna Hatzidaki criticizes the *Think Aloud Protocol* for being too subjective to give reliable results in TS, claiming that there are better experimentally controlled methods. The effect of extra-linguistic factors in conceptual and lexical access during translation of lexis is also reported on, and the article provides a detailed account of functional magnetic resonance imaging (407-408).

On the whole, this book presents an interesting collection of articles, but a volume on translation should be especially punctilious as regards language editing to avoid the many howlers in this volume. Part 5 of the introduction (18-26) is particularly plagued with solecisms, such as “the desire to describing” (18), “quite on the contrary” (19), “can contribute to enlighten” (24), “associated to” (25), “a testing field” (26), use of “both” where *the two* is correct (26), and note the convoluted syntax of the sentence “[f]or instance, the question of how the translator decides what and how is to be decoded from the source text and recorded in the target text” (21). There are also many instances in the book of *as* where *like* or *such as* is required, false collocations, such as “deviate the attention” (8), “swerve the attention” (9) and “results into” (259), and note the verb form “unbalance” for the noun form *imbalance* (260). Some attention could also have been devoted to the arbitrary word division at the ends of lines and to general consistency: in Martín’s paper, besides the various errors in the English, we have “frames semantics” (110) as opposed to “Frame Semantics” (108). Muñoz’s paper, apart from grammatical mistakes (“a couple examples” [85], “a dozen of Western languages”

[86], “the most amount” [86], “it might find it worth” [89], “objection against” [89]), gives both “saliency” and “salience” within four lines of each other (87). Presumably, translators are expected to be a model in this respect.

A final criticism that could be levelled at the work is the lack of exemplification in some of the papers (for example, in Halverson’s and Martín’s articles) and overlapping of topics. More meticulous editing would have avoided unnecessary repetition in the presentation of well-known theories.

#### WORKS CITED

- CROFT, William and D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- FEIST, Michele I. 2010. “Inside *in* and *on*: Typological and Psycholinguistic Perspectives.” In *Language, Cognition and Space: The State of the Art and New Directions*, edited by Vyvyan Evans and Paul Chilton, 95-114. London: Equinox.
- HOUSE, Juliane. 2008. “Beyond Intervention: Universals in Translation?” *Trans-kom* 1 (1): 6-19.
- LAKOFF, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The U of Chicago P.
- MAURANEN, Anna and Pekka Kujamäki, eds. 2004. *Translation Universals: Do they Exist?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- TALMY, Leonard. 1991. “Path to Realization: A Typology of Event Conflation.” *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 17: 480-519.
- . 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Received 15 November 2014

Revised version accepted 17 December 2014

Brian Mott teaches Phonetics, Semantics and Translation in the English Department of the University of Barcelona. He also taught in the Escola d’Idiomes Moderns for thirty years, and has tutored on the Summer Course in English Phonetics at UCL. He has an MA in Spanish Studies (Aberdeen, 1969) and a PhD in Aragonese Dialectology (Barcelona, 1978). He has published some twenty books.

Address: Departament de Filologia Anglesa i Alemanya. Facultat de Filologia. Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585. 08007, Barcelona, Spain. Tel.: +34 934037217. Fax: +34 933171249.

