Metaphoricity of perception adjectives: a translation perspective

Percepcinių būdvardžių metaforiškumas vertimo aspektu

EDITA VALIULIENĖ, Vilnius University Šiauliai Academy, Lithuania

Abstract

The paper aims to examine the metaphorical uses of English adjectives denoting perceptual qualities (taste, temperature and touch) and ways of rendering them in Lithuanian. Based on the data of the *Parallel Corpus*, the types of translation are identified and discussed in relation to cross-linguistic variation as well as other factors affecting translation. The study is carried out in the framework of cognitive approach to metaphor and its translation: individual metaphorical expressions are linked to conceptual metaphors underlying them, with the focus on the source domain exploited in the source and target languages. From this view, metaphorical rendering of English adjectives in Lithuanian falls into two types: the original metaphor is either retained (if the same perceptual quality is expressed, directly or indirectly) or replaced by another metaphor (if a different source domain is introduced, usually a quality perceived through a different sense or some physical sensation). Other types of translation include cases of non-metaphorical rendering: loss of metaphoricity due to paraphrase (literal expression) and omission of the metaphorical meaning. The findings show that the original metaphor is preserved in around 30% of all cases. Other types of translation are mainly determined by two factors: cross-linguistic asymmetry (a different range of the metaphorical meanings of English adjectives and their equivalents in Lithuanian, differences in connotation, specific lexical and syntactic patterns of the target language) and the subjective choice of the translator (individual preference for a certain expression).

KEYWORDS: perception, adjective, metaphor, cognitive approach, translation, English, Lithuanian.

Introduction

Perception as a way of knowing the world through sensory experience plays a major role in human life and its understanding. The vast majority of our actions and the workings of our mind rely on perceptual guidance (Nanay, 2024). According to Ibarrethe-Antunano (2019, p. 43), "[t]he senses are not just our channels to gather information about the physical world; they provide us with the necessary information to talk about things that cannot be apprehended in a physical way". This aligns with the ideas of cognitive linguistics and the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980),

which defines metaphor as a conceptual mapping, a strategy of cognition by which abstract, non-tangible things are perceived through those that are physical and experienced directly.

The metaphorical productivity of different sensory modalities has been attested in many studies. For example, temperature metaphors were analysed by Shindo (1998, 1999), Bergström (2010), Valiulienė (2015), Rasulić (2015); cross-linguistic studies of taste metaphors were carried out by Zawisławska and Falkowska (2018), Torres Soler (2021); the metaphorical mappings of tactile properties were discussed by Kashkin and Vinogradova (2015), Trojszczak (2019). One of the most recent and comprehensive accounts on the diversity of perceptual language and its metaphorical potential is found in the volume *Perception metaphors* (Speed et al., 2019). Comprising different approaches and the data of diverse languages, it reveals the complexity of perception metaphors and recognizes the importance of cross-cultural variation: "We find that while some metaphors have widespread commonality, there is more diversity attested than should be comfortable for universalist accounts" (O'Meara et al., 2019, p. 1).

To contribute to further analysis of perception metaphors, this paper explores the metaphoricity of perception adjectives in English and discusses it from the point of view of translation (rendering it in Lithuanian as the target language), which is the novelty of the current research. The metaphorical uses of perception adjectives are viewed as linguistic expressions of conceptual mappings involving perception as a source domain. Such metaphors are mostly attributive (a term proposed by Baldauf (1997)), since a source concept (a perceptual quality) does not structure a target domain (some abstract entity) but provides it with a certain attribute. For example, the concept of heat metaphorises the intensity of emotions, activities, as in *a hot issue, in the heat of the moment*, *a heated argument*. Linguistic forms of such metaphors are not restricted to adjectival expression; however, the fact that adjectives are by nature words denoting attributes makes them inherently suitable for expressing abstract qualities conceptualised via metaphor.

To cover a broader range of perception adjectives, there are three sense modalities selected for this study: taste, temperature and touch. Temperature is singled out here separately, even though it is closely connected to the sense of touch, and its treatment, therefore, differs: thermal perception can be considered a component of the sense of touch (Fulkerson, 2015) or viewed as distinct from it (Gray, 2023). The latter approach is preferred here, alongside the tendency to treat temperature as a separate domain in the discussion of its lexicalisation and metaphorical extensions (Bergström, 2010; Koptjevskaja-Tamm, 2015).

Translation analysis in this paper is based on the data of the *Parallel Corpus*[1], providing English texts and their translation into Lithuanian, aligned at the sentence level. The aim of the research is to identify the metaphorical uses of perception adjectives in English and ways of rendering them in Lithuanian and discuss these types of translation in relation to cross-linguistic variation as well as other factors affecting translation. The object of the study is limited to the metaphoricity of adjectives; its analysis from a translation point of view, however, takes a broader perspective: individual metaphorical expressions are linked to metaphors as conceptual mappings, embedded in the metaphorical systems of the source and target languages. Such a perspective known as the cognitive approach to metaphor and its translation has been widely applied in metaphor research, involving translation data of different languages (e.g., Schäffner, 2004; Schmidt, 2015; Bystrov & Tatsakovych, 2023).

In English–Lithuanian translation, conceptual metaphors and their linguistic forms have also been studied. Most of the contributions deal with metaphors in legal discourse: Gražytė and Maskaliūnienė (2009) analysed the translation of conceptual metaphors in the legal discourse of EU white papers; Šeškauskienė et al. (2016) examined metaphors related to criminal activities; Kamandulytė (2019) described the translation of metaphorical terms with the lexeme "green"; Šeškauskienė (2022) studied spatial metaphors in legal translation. Metaphorical language in the translation of a literary work was also discussed: Marcinkevičienė (2006) analysed ways of rendering metaphorical collocations with the noun *thought* in the translation of Orwell's novel *1984*. In addition, it is worth mentioning that Lithuanian authors have significantly contributed to the methodological aspect of metaphor research, discussing issues of metaphor identification in Lithuanian (Urbonaitė, 2015; Urbonaitė et al., 2019).

---

[1] The English-Lithuanian part of the English-Lithuanian-English and Czech-Lithuanian-Czech Parallel Corpus, available at sitti.vdu.lt/lygiagretus-tekstynas.

Theoretical Background

The metaphoricity of perception vocabulary is well understood in the framework of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and embodiment as the key idea in cognitive linguistics, extensively explored and supported by empirical evidence (Johnson, 1987, 2015; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Gibbs, 2005). Metaphors are not just words but conceptual mappings structuring the human conceptual system, which is metaphorical in nature (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 4). Particular importance here is attached to bodily or physical experience, which largely affects the way people conceptualise themselves and the world around them. Human mind is thus said to be embodied: "understanding is profoundly embodied, in so far as our conceptualization and reasoning recruit sensory, motor, and affective patterns and processes to structure our understanding of, and engagement with, our world" (Johnson, 2015, p. 1).

Perception of temperature and tactile properties experienced through the sense of touch allows us to know our physical environment, function in it and protects us from harm. As claimed by Bremner and Spence (2017, p. 227), "[t]ouch is the first of our senses to develop, providing us with the sensory scaffold on which we come to perceive our own bodies and our sense of self". According to Johnson's theory of conflation (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p. 46), at the beginning of human life, sensorimotor experiences are regularly conflated with associated subjective experiences, for example, an infant does not differentiate the feeling of affection from the sensation of warmth when being held. Later, the differentiation of the two occurs, but cross-domain associations persist, forming the bodily basis of conceptual metaphors such as AFFECTION IS WARMTH. A close mental connection between temperature and psychological warmth has been confirmed in experimental research. For example, a study reported by Williams and Bargh (2008) showed that even brief experiences of physical warmth (holding a hot cup of coffee) activated feelings of interpersonal warmth and positively influenced participants' judgments of a target person. In general, it has been acknowledged that warm–cold opposition is an important dimension in social judgement when people described as warm associate with friendliness, trust, whereas people referred to as cold are perceived less favourably (ibid., p. 606).

Evaluative aspect is also observed in the metaphorical mappings of taste properties. The main function of taste is to evaluate our food for toxicity and nutrients (distinguishing between safe and harmful, useful and not). As such, it "drives a primal sense of 'acceptable' or 'unacceptable' for what is sampled" (Breslin, 2013, p. R409), which is an opposition naturally mapped onto abstract notions perceived metaphorically (cf. *sweet home – bitter disappointment*). Taste preferences and clear positive–negative associations regarding different tastes are considered to be inborn: the liking of sweet associated with pleasure and the rejection of bitter as bad and undesirable reflect our basic biology and determine our choices from the beginning of our lives (Mennella & Bobowski, 2015).

The bodily basis of perception metaphors and universal tendencies of metaphorisation as a conceptual phenomenon explain the widespread use of perception metaphors in different languages. However, the universality of metaphors based on physical experience is only potential. The way we use our bodily experience is much affected and modified by sociocultural background or, to put it metaphorically, "filtered through a culture-specific sieve" (Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2019, p. 46). This results in a different degree of cultural specificity in metaphorical mappings, which Kövecses (2005, p. 68–86) summarises as four major types of metaphors regarding cross-cultural variation: 1) congruent metaphors – metaphors that are filled out in congruence with the generic schema but may have some unique cultural content at a specific level; 2) alternative metaphors – kinds of variation mainly involving differences in the range and scope of conceptual metaphors; 3) preferential conceptualisation – cases when languages or cultures may have the same conceptual metaphor but prefer using other metaphors for a certain target domain; 4) unique metaphors – metaphors that have both a culturally unique source domain and a culturally unique target domain.

From the perspective of cross-linguistic research and translation, it is essential to note that even when languages share the same metaphor at a conceptual level, its linguistic expression is often language specific. Differences at a linguistic level include a number of aspects such as the degree of linguistic elaboration, kinds of metaphorical expressions differing in terms of their grammatical status and degree of conventionality, the scope of metaphor, i.e. a number of distinct uses of the expression in different target domains (Barcelona, 2001;

Kövecses, 2005). More recent accounts of metaphorical language (Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2019; Schmidt, 2015) put a lot of emphasis on the salience or prominence of metaphors in a particular language, their frequency of use and conventionality. This is also relevant in translation, when decisions are made as to which ways of rendering metaphorical meaning should be chosen to translate a metaphorical expression from one language into another.

The cognitive account of metaphor as a conceptual mapping, underlying a metaphorical expression in language, has brought another dimension to metaphor analysis in translation: "Translatability is no longer a question of the individual metaphorical expression, as identified in the ST[2], but it becomes linked to the level of conceptual systems in source and target culture" (Schäffner, 2004, p. 1258). When metaphorical expressions exploit the same cognitive domain in the source and target languages, metaphoricity is preserved in translation; when cognitive domains differ, metaphoricity manifests itself in a different domain or is lost altogether (Gražytė & Maskaliūnienė, 2009, p. 71). More variation occurs at the level of language. Even when metaphors of the source language are preserved in translation, "they either keep the same or similar wording or choose a different wording, which, presumably, often reflects different conceptualisation" (Šeškauskienė et al., 2016, p. 86). In addition to culture-specific elements in the realisation of metaphor, variation in metaphoric expressions is determined by lexical and grammatical patterns of the target language. Hence, a full account of metaphor translation should encompass analysis at both conceptual and linguistic levels, which are inextricably intertwined: conceptual metaphors take shape in the form of linguistic units, which in turn serve as cues for metaphor activation; conceptualisation, on the other hand, is largely dependent on language that imposes restrictions on the selection of construal operations used for conceptualisation (Bystrov & Tatsakovych, 2023, p. 691).

A two-level approach is reflected in typologies proposed to classify different ways of rendering metaphors in the target language. For example, a model presented by Schmidt (2015) consists of the following ways of metaphor translation referred to as translation procedures:

1 CM → CM: a metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphorical expression of the same conceptual metaphor with: a) the same mapping and the same meaning (m → m) or b) a different mapping and a similar meaning (m → m');

2 CM → CM1: a metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphorical expression of a different conceptual metaphor with a different mapping and a similar meaning (m → m1);

3 m → non-m: a metaphorical expression is translated by a non-metaphorical expression with a similar meaning (a paraphrase);

4 m → Ø: a metaphorical expression is translated by a zero-element (deletion);

5 non-m → m: a non-metaphorical expression is translated by a metaphorical expression with a similar meaning;

6 Ø → m: a zero-element is translated by a metaphorical expression (ibid., p. 257).

A more precise classification, including terminology of specific translation techniques (preservation, modification, replacement, omission) applied to both the conceptual metaphor and its linguistic form, is proposed by Bystrov and Tatsakovych (2023, p. 691). With the two levels combined, it includes the translation techniques as follows: 1) preservation of the metaphor and the metaphorical expression; 2) preservation of the metaphor, modification of the metaphorical expression; 3) replacement with another metaphor; 4) modification of the metaphor and the metaphorical expression; 5) omission of the metaphor (ibid., p. 700).

A different typology, more oriented towards conceptual metaphors (their level of abstraction, elaboration, different elements or entailments) is described by Schäffner (2004). Her findings are summarised as five types of metaphor translation: 1) a conceptual metaphor is identical in the ST and the TT at the macro-level, although a specific metaphorical expression is not rendered in the same way at the micro-level; 2) structural components of the base conceptual schema in the ST are replaced in the TT by expressions that make entailments explicit; 3) a metaphor is more elaborate in the TT; 4) the ST and the TT employ different metaphorical expressions,

[2] ST – the source text, TT – the target text.

but they can be combined under a more abstract conceptual metaphor; 5) the expression in the TT reflects a different aspect of the conceptual metaphor (ibid., p. 1267).

Schäffner's (2004) analysis demonstrates the complexity of metaphor as a cognitive and linguistic phenomenon, yet the types of translation presented are not meant as a systematic account of translation procedures. Due to limitations of her study, they are referred to as "observational data" or "candidates for potential translation strategies" rather than "translation procedures as ready-made solutions" (loc. cit.). This approach towards findings and hence the term *types of translation* have been also adopted in this study, as further explained in the subsequent *Methodology* part.

Methodology

Methodological considerations of the study are discussed here in relation to different stages of the research: the selection of perception adjectives to be analysed, the identification of their metaphorical uses in the *Parallel Corpus*, and the analysis of translation into Lithuanian to examine different ways of rendering metaphorical meanings in the target language.

Initially, a list of adjectives denoting perceptual qualities of selected sensory modalities (taste, temperature and touch) was compiled, and the use of each adjective was examined in the *Parallel Corpus*. The size limitations of the corpus determined that some adjectives (e.g., *sour*, *coarse*) were excluded from the analysis, if their metaphorical occurrences were very few or none. The final list of adjectives included *sweet, bitter, cold, hot, warm, cool, rough, smooth, soft, hard, sharp*.

To identify the metaphorical uses of English adjectives (and later metaphoricity of Lithuanian expressions in translation), Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP)[3], proposed by Pragglejaz Group (2007) was employed. It is outlined as follows:

1 Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.

2 Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse.

3 **a** For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.

b For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be:

- more concrete; what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste;
- related to bodily action;
- more precise (as opposed to vague);
- historically older.

Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

c If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

4 If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical (Pragglejaz Group, 2007, p. 3).

Establishing a more basic meaning, which is an important stage in the identification of metaphoricity, can be facilitated by dictionary use: "A more basic meaning of a lexical unit is defined as a more concrete, specific, and human-oriented sense in contemporary language use. Since these meanings are basic, they are always to be found in a general users' dictionary" (Steen et al., 2010, p. 35). In this study, the following dictionaries were consulted: *Oxford Dictionary of English* (ODE), *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (LDCE), *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (DLKŽ, *Dictionary of Contemporary Lithuanian*) and *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (LKŽ,

---

[3] Also known as MIPVU, an updated version of MIP, developed at Vrije University (Steen et al., 2010).

Dictionary of Lithuanian). Basic meanings of English adjectives were considered in the initial stage of research: it served as a basis to include them in the list of perception adjectives to be analysed. For the Lithuanian part, basic meanings were examined to decide whether expressions used in translation are metaphorical or not (the specificity of applying MIP to Lithuanian as an inflecting language was discussed by Urbonaitė (2015), Urbonaitė et al. (2019)).

To study the ways of rendering English adjectives in Lithuanian, a comparative translation analysis was performed: each case of translation was examined in relation to the respective fragment of the source text. The data of both languages were studied in the framework of the cognitive approach to metaphor and its translation, with the focus on the source domain exploited in the source and target languages. More precisely, expressions in Lithuanian were analysed along the following lines: whether they are metaphorical or not; what source domain is employed in translation and how exactly it is realised, i.e., which aspect or element of the domain is represented in translation; what other lexical means are chosen if the meaning of the English adjective is rendered non-metaphorically.

To account for all cases observed in the data, the following types of translation were distinguished (combining ideas and elements of typologies presented by different authors: Gražytė & Maskaliūnienė (2009), Šeškauskienė et al. (2016), Schmidt (2015), Schäffner (2004), Bystrov & Tatsakovych (2023) rather than choosing a particular one in advance):

1   Metaphoricity preserved by exploiting the same source domain (the original metaphor retained):

  • the same aspect of the source domain;
  • a different aspect of the source domain.

2   Metaphoricity preserved by exploiting a different source domain (the original metaphor replaced by another one).

3   Metaphoricity lost due to non-metaphorical rendering (paraphrase).

4   Metaphoricity lost due to omission of the metaphorical meaning expressed by the adjective (deletion).

The quantitative aspect of analysis involved calculating occurrences of each type of translation to compare their frequency rates as certain tendencies in translation and draw parallels with the findings of other authors (Schmidt, 2015; Kalda, 2020). As a final point, it must be noted that types of translation described in this study refer to ways of rendering the metaphorical meanings of perception adjectives only; manifestations of other metaphors involved, for example, the image of sinking added in the translation of *where the Martians were cool* as *Marsiečiams skendint rimtyje* (*lit.* 'while the Martians were sinking in calmness')[4], were not within the scope of this paper.

Results and Discussion

The *Parallel Corpus* yielded 754 uses of adjectives selected for this analysis: *sweet* (58), *bitter* (37), *cold* (141), *hot* (85), *warm* (55), *cool* (41), *rough* (25), *smooth* (43), *soft* (69), *hard* (143), *sharp* (57). 390 occurrences (52% of all uses) appeared to be metaphorical and were further analysed in comparison to their translation into Lithuanian. The data regarding individual adjectives (their overall frequency and number of metaphorical uses) is quite diverse, showing that metaphorical potential of perception adjectives, even within the same sensory modality, is different. The highest proportion of metaphorical uses is observed in the occurrences of the adjectives *bitter* and *hard* – 89% and 88%, respectively. The following is a list of all adjectives, provided in the descending order of their metaphoricity (percentage of metaphorical use): *bitter* (89%), *hard* (88%), *sweet* (74%), *rough* (72%), *sharp* (67%), *cool* (56%), *cold* (40%), *hot* (21%), *smooth* (21%), *soft* (20%), *warm* (20%).

The overall data on rendering the metaphorical uses of these adjectives in Lithuanian are presented in Table 1, showing different types of translation and their frequency.

---

[4] Literal translation of the Lithuanian expression.

Table 1 Types of translating the metaphorical uses of perception adjectives

Adjective	Metaphoricity preserved		Metaphoricity lost		Total number
	Original metaphor retained: the same source domain	Original metaphor replaced: a different source domain	Paraphrase: non-metaphorical rendering	Omission of the metaphorical meaning	
sweet	3	7	27	6	43
bitter	12	5	13	3	33
cold	43	2	10	2	57
hot	2	2	13	1	18
warm	5	0	5	1	11
cool	11	1	11	0	23
rough	2	3	12	1	18
smooth	2	1	5	1	9
soft	10	1	2	1	14
hard	9	78	31	8	126
sharp	13	2	21	2	38
Total number	112	102	150	26	390
Percentage	29%	26%	38%	7%	100%

The data show that generally metaphoricity was preserved in about half of the cases: the metaphorical uses of English adjectives were rendered metaphorically by exploiting the same or a different source domain in the target language (29% and 26%, respectively). Paraphrase as non-metaphorical rendering was also a frequent choice, accounting for 38% of all cases, while the omission of the metaphorical meaning in translation was rare (7%).

Cases when metaphoricity is preserved in translation are of two types. In the first type, the original metaphor is retained by exploiting the same source domain, i.e., the same perceptual quality such as sweetness or cold-ness, expressed in Lithuanian. Based on the way the source domain is represented in the target language, such examples fall into two subtypes. Most frequently (92% of instances within this type), the source domain is identifiable in the same quality as denoted by an English adjective. In Lithuanian, it is also expressed by perception adjectives, e.g., *sweet madness – saldi beprotybė, a warm wave of relief – šilta palengvėjimo banga, sharp conflicts – aštrūs konfliktai,* or manifested through the use of adverbs, verbs, nouns referring to the same quality, e.g., *the next sentence might be rough – ji prabils jau daug šiurkščiau* (*lit.* 'she will speak more roughly'), *contempt fell cool on Mr. Rochester – panieka atvėsino misterio Ročesterio pyktį* (*lit.* 'contempt has cooled Mr. Rochester's fury'), *not a bitter or a sad smile – šypsenoje nebuvo nei kartėlio, nei liūdesio* (*lit.* 'there was no bitterness or sadness in the smile'). Such variation in form is natural due to differences in the linguistic patterns of English and Lithuanian; it was also observed in other types of translation.

A few cases of preserving the same metaphor in translation (8%) reveal specific ways of metaphor realisation when a different aspect of the source domain is highlighted. Sometimes it is done through reference to the prototype, i.e., material typically associated with a certain quality, cf.:

> **Ex 1**   *... Olivetti's whisper was cold –... lediniu balsu sušnabždėjo Olivetis (lit.* 'Olivetti whispered in an icy voice');

> **Ex 2**   *Olivetti levelled his captain with a cold stare – Olivetis įsmeigė į kapitoną ledinį žvilgsnį (lit.* 'Olivetti pierced the captain with an icy stare');

> Ex 3   *... the mood of the revolted slave was still bracing me with its bitter vigour ... – ... sukilusio vergo įniršis tebedegino pulsuojančia tulžinga ugnim ... (lit.* 'the fury of the revolted slave was still burning me with pulsating bilious fire').

Examples **1** and **2**, where the metaphorical meaning of *cold* is rendered through the image of ice, come from the translation of the same novel, so the decision to use *ledinis* 'icy' rather than *šaltas* 'cold', which is used in Lithuanian to describe someone's voice or look, might be considered the subjective choice of the translator. In Example **3**, reference to bile as a prototype of bitterness is made through the use of the adjective *tulžingas* 'bilious'.

The same source domain is also activated when metaphoricity is expressed through the action or state related to the quality in the source domain. For example, *a sharp shrilly sound* is translated as *veriantis riksmas* (*lit.* 'a piercing scream') or *one's blood running/creeping cold* is rendered by the verb *stingti* 'freeze', cf. *my blood crept cold through my vein – kraujas sustingo gyslose* (*lit.* 'blood froze in my veins'). Similarly, the English idiom *get cold feet* is translated as *šiurpsta kailis* (*lit.* 'fur gets goosebumps'), a different idiomatic expression in Lithuanian, motivated by the same metaphor of cold: getting goosebumps is a physical reaction of the body to cold as well as fear, which is the target domain of the metaphor.

Some cases of preserving metaphoricity in Lithuanian reveal specific differences in the lexicalisation of metaphors as well as asymmetry in connotation. These are instances of translating *cool* as *šaltas* 'cold', which denotes a different quality on a temperature scale in Lithuanian, but also metaphorises low intensity of emotions, cf.:

> Ex 4   *This, spoken in a cool, tranquil tone ... – Šitie žodžiai, ištarti šaltu, ramiu tonu ... (lit.* 'These words spoken in a cold, tranquil tone');

> Ex 5   *Cool-tempered but naive – Šaltakraujiškas, bet naivus (lit.* 'Cold-blooded but naive').

Translation choices in the above cases reveal a different role the concept of coolness plays in the metaphorical systems of Lithuanian and English. As shown in a cross-linguistic study of temperature metaphors by Valiulienė (2015), lexemes denoting coolness in Lithuanian are rarely used metaphorically; in English, however, metaphorical expressions with *cool* are frequent, diverse, and conventional. They denote reserve, calmness, rationality, e.g., *keep/lose one's cool, cool-headed*, which contrast with negative features metaphorised through the concept of cold: hostility, cruelty, e.g., *cold-hearted, cold inhumanity*. In Lithuanian, this opposition is not maintained, and coldness metaphors express both positive and negative qualities, for example, *šaltakraujiškas* 'cold-blooded' describes both someone who is cool-headed and someone who is cruel, inhumane. Therefore, many uses of *cool* are rendered as *šaltas* 'cold' in Lithuanian.

The second type of preserving metaphoricity in translation covers cases of replacing the original metaphor with another one in the target language, as indicated by a different source domain employed in metaphorical expressions in translation. It is most evident in the translation of *hard:* nearly all cases of its metaphorical uses denoting difficulty (hard work, something that it is hard to understand, accept, believe, say, etc.) are rendered in Lithuanian through the concept of heaviness. It is mainly expressed by *sunkus* 'heavy' or its antonym *lengvas* 'light' in a negative construction, e.g.,

> Ex 6   *How hard it was to reiterate firmly, "I am going." – Kaip sunku man buvo tvirtai pakartoti: „Išeinu!" (lit.* 'How heavy it was for me to reiterate firmly: "I'm leaving"');

> Ex 7   *My task was a very hard one ... – Uždavinys pasirodė ne toks lengvas ... (lit.* 'The task appeared not so light').

Rarely, a different metaphor is introduced, for example, *a lot of hard work* is translated as *daug įtempto darbo* (*lit.* 'a lot of tense/stretched work') or *this is hard to hear* is rendered as *tau skaudu girdėti* (*lit.* 'it is painful for

you to hear'). These choices seem to reflect the translator's individual preference, as the use of *sunkus* 'heavy' in these expressions would be adequate and rather conventional.

There are quite a few cases when the metaphorical uses of sweet are rendered in translation through a different domain. In most cases, what is sweet in English becomes soft (*švelnus*) in Lithuanian, e.g.,

> **Ex 8** *As long as I' m sweet, loving Bonnie you are here for me … – Kol esu mylinti, švelni Bonė, tu būni čia su manimi …* (*lit.* 'As long as I' m loving, soft Bonnie you are here with me');

> **Ex 9** *… she is talking to me with her sweet voice … – Ji kalba su manimi švelniu balseliu …* (*lit.* 'she is talking to me with her soft voice').

Conceptualising pleasant as sweet is characteristic of both English and Lithuanian, and the same metaphor was preserved in a few expressions, e.g., *sweet, fresh pleasure – smagumai saldūs ir malonūs* (*lit.* 'fun things sweet and pleasant'). In most cases, however, the metaphorical uses of *sweet* were either rendered through the concept of softness or paraphrased: 16% and 64%, respectively. Such choices are indicative of cross-linguistic variation concerning two interrelated aspects of adjectives denoting sweetness in English and Lithuanian. First, the collocability of *saldus* 'sweet' in the meaning 'pleasant' is rather limited: it usually modifies abstract nouns denoting feelings or states, as in *saldus miegas* (*lit.* 'sweet sleep') (DLKŽ). The English *sweet*, in contrast, collocates with a wide range of nouns, including those referring to people, their voice, look, etc. Second, the range of the target domains metaphorised through the concept of sweetness is broader in Lithuanian; in addition to the meaning 'pleasant', *saldus* also denotes the excess of pleasant, affectionate behaviour associated with false manner and insincerity, which is usually undesired, e.g., *saldus balsas* ('sweet voice'), *saldi šypsena* ('sweet smile'). Similarly, *saldus* has some negative connotation when describing things that are pleasant but too sentimental and not having much value: music, songs, films, e.g., *saldi dainelė* (*lit.* 'a sweet songDIM'), where the negative meaning is strengthened by the diminutive form of the noun modified (DLKŽ).

Other cases of employing a different source domain, which signals replacement of the original metaphor in translation, are rather diverse and might be due to several reasons: the absence of the same metaphor in Lithuanian, a different degree of conventionality of certain linguistic forms, other transformations involved in translation. For example:

> **Ex 10** *… be cool or be cast out … – … būk kietas arba būsi atstumtas …* (*lit.* 'be hard or you'll be pushed away');

> **Ex 11** *… one of the most bitter conflicts in the history of science and religion – …. vieną aštriausių konfliktų mokslo ir Bažnyčios istorijoje* (*lit.* 'one of the sharpest conflicts in the history of science and church');

> **Ex 12** *Russian moves are in sharp contrast with the principles of international communication – Rusijos veiksmai yra grubus bendravimo tarptautiniu lygiu pažeidimas* (*lit.* 'Russian moves are a rough violation of international communication').

In **Example 10**, a different metaphor is used to render the meaning 'attractive, fashionable', which is not expressed by *vėsus* 'cool' in Lithuanian. For the translation of *bitter* (Example 11), sharpness as a source domain is employed: *kartus* as the lexical equivalent of *bitter* collocates with nouns denoting difficult, unpleasant situations, e.g., *kartus pralaimėjimas* (*lit.* 'bitter defeat'), but its use with *konfliktas* 'conflict' would not make a conventional phrase in Lithuanian. In **Example 12**, a different metaphor is chosen due to a noun change: the Lithuanian noun *pažeidimas* 'violation' is introduced in translation and it requires another adjective in collocation.

Translation choices show a clear preference towards metaphors grounded in bodily experience, which usually refer to perceptual qualities or some physical sensation, reaction experienced by the body, e.g., *this is*

bitter – tai skaudu (*lit.* 'it hurts'), *sharp hunger – kankinantis alkis* (*lit.* 'torturing hunger'), *my head grew hot – galva ėmė suktis* (*lit.* 'head started spinning'). In a few cases only, metaphors are based on some general knowledge or cultural elements, as seen in a metaphorical idiom in the translation below:

Ex 13 ... *Palenque's path to prominence was not a smooth one – ... Palenque'ės kelias į šlovę nebuvo rožėmis klotas* (*lit.* 'Palenque's path to fame was not laid with roses').

A considerable number of translation cases (38%) reveal the loss of metaphoricity due to non-metaphorical rendering, when the metaphorical uses of English adjectives are paraphrased in Lithuanian. The proportion of paraphrases is highest in rendering the metaphorical uses of *hot*, *rough* and *sweet;* 72%, 67% and 64%, respectively.

Heat metaphors are productive in both English and Lithuanian, but some uses of *hot* manifest specific conceptual mappings that are not realised in Lithuanian (Valiulienė, 2015). For example, *hot* metaphorises popularity, which is not expressed by *karštas* 'hot' in Lithuanian and, therefore, needs to be rendered otherwise, cf. *a hot spot of the Italian literati – mėgstama Italijos literatų susibūrimo vieta* (*lit.* 'a well-liked meeting place of the Italian literati').

A similar case, i.e., a broader range of metaphorical meanings of an English adjective, is observed in the translation of *rough*. A number of different paraphrases are chosen to render its metaphoric uses in the meaning 'a lack of accuracy', e.g., *very rough statistical indicators – apytikriai statistiniai rodikliai* (*lit.* 'approximate statistical indicators'), *a rough sketch of the piece – apibendrintas eskizas* (*lit.* 'a generalised sketch'), *a rough quadrilateral – netaisyklingas keturkampis* (*lit.* 'an irregular quadrilateral'), *have a rough idea – daugmaž įsivaizduoti* (*lit.* 'to more or less imagine'). It must be noted, however, that *grubus* 'rough' is sometimes encountered in similar expressions in Lithuanian, e.g., *grubus palyginimas* (*lit.* 'a rough comparison'), yet it is more characteristic of informal language and is not frequent in standard Lithuanian.

Paraphrasing is also frequent in the translation of *sweet*, which is rarely translated literally due to cross-linguistic differences mentioned before. Words used to render its meaning in Lithuanian differ in qualities denoted, but are all clearly positive in meaning, e.g., *sweet was that evening – tai buvo mielas vakaras* (*lit.* 'that was a lovely evening'), *her sweet supple waist – jos gražus lieknas juosmuo* (*lit.* 'her pretty supple waist'), *this sweet Rosamond – žavioji Rozamunda* (*lit.* 'the charming Rosamond'). As *sweet* modifies different nouns in English, the choice of non-metaphorical adjectives to express its meaning is also affected by their collocates, showing what exactly is described as sweet (e.g., time, people, their appearance). In general, the adjective is closely connected to the noun: it names the entity which possesses a quality expressed by the adjective, whether used literally or metaphorically. The adjective and the noun have to be adequately rendered in translation, following the rules of collocability of the target language. Thus, specific lexical means are chosen as different ways of translating the same adjective, e.g., *the bitter winter wind – žvarbus žiemys* (*lit.* 'a very cold winter wind'), *that bitter hour – ta baisi valanda* (*lit.* 'that terrible hour'), *Jack's voice sounded in bitter mimicry – piktai pamėgdžiojo jį Džekas* (*lit.* 'Jack mimicked him angrily').

Different forms of literal expression rather than metaphorical rendering might also indicate a search of a more precise description of the quality revealed in a particular context, especially when the adjective translated has a broad range of meanings. For example, in both English and Lithuanian coldness metaphors express a lack of emotions, but their specific realisations differ in meaning and have been rendered by different adjectives in translation, e.g.,

Ex 14 *I am sorry that I became so cold – Man nesmagu, kad buvau toks nejautrus* (*lit.* 'I feel bad/ awkward that I was so insensitive');

Ex 15 *The cold-faced young officer stepped into the cell ... – Į kamerą įėjo tas pats ramaus veido karininkas ...* (*lit.* 'Into the cell walked the same officer with a calm face');

Ex 16 *Jane Eyre, who had been an ardent, expectant woman …, was a cold, solitary girl again – Toji Džeinė Eir, kuri su džiaugsmu žvelgė į ateitį …, dabar vėl buvo vieniša, liūdna mergaitė* (*lit.* 'That Jane Eyre, who had looked at the future with joy …, now was a solitary, sad girl again').

The last type of translation is the loss of metaphoricity due to the omission of the metaphorical meaning, i.e., there is no word in Lithuanian referring to the quality denoted by an English adjective. Such instances are rare (7% of all cases) and quite diverse. Sometimes omission might be chosen to avoid redundancy: when a perception adjective goes with another adjective having a similar meaning (**Example 17**) or the noun used in Lithuanian denotes a more intense state and thus incorporates the meaning of the adjective (**Example 18**), e.g.,

Ex 17 *More than ever before effective and smooth operation of the European Union … is necessary today – Šiandien, kaip niekada anksčiau, būtina, kad Europos Sąjunga veiktų efektyviai* (*lit.* 'Today, more than ever before, it is necessary that the European Union functions effectively);

Ex 18 *… without fearing that anyone else is suffering the bitter pain … – nesibaimindama, kad kitas žmogus kenčia sielvartą …* (*lit.* 'not fearing that another human is suffering grief').

Quantitative data regarding the frequency of translation types show the dominance of two ways to render metaphoricity of English adjectives in Lithuanian: preserving the original metaphor, expressed through the same source domain in the target language, and paraphrasing, i.e., using non-metaphorical expressions in Lithuanian. Compared to previous studies with comparable findings (Schmidt, 2015; Kalda, 2020), the types of translation described in this paper show some differences in the frequency of occurrence: the loss of metaphoricity through paraphrase and omission are generally more frequent (45% of all cases), which might be due to the type of metaphorical expressions analysed.

Conclusions

Perception is primary bodily experience, which guides our physical existence and shapes our patterns of thought. The links between things which are physical and mental, objective and subjective, concrete and abstract are established in our conceptual system as metaphorical mappings, manifested in language through metaphorical expressions. Metaphoricity in language takes a range of forms, which can vary across languages, since metaphors may be culture-specific and languages have their own ways to encode metaphorical meanings.

In this paper, an attempt was made to examine the metaphorical uses of perception adjectives in English and ways of translating them into Lithuanian. The analysis, based on the data of the *Parallel Corpus*, has led to the following conclusions.

1 Metaphoricity is a significant feature of English adjectives denoting qualities perceived through the senses of taste, temperature and touch, as identified in a substantial part of their uses (52%) in the *Parallel Corpus*. Despite the general tendency, the metaphorical potential of individual adjectives is quite different, as seen from a varying proportion of metaphorical uses, ranging from 20% to 89%. It means that different perceptual qualities (even within the same sensory domain) are exploited in metaphorical mappings to a different extent.

2 Metaphorical uses of perception adjectives are rendered in Lithuanian texts as both metaphorical and non-metaphorical expressions. In case of metaphorical rendering or preserved metaphoricity, the original metaphor is either retained (if the same source domain is exploited) or replaced by another one (if a different source domain is employed). On closer inspection, the first type can be realised in two ways: through the same aspect of the source domain (expressing the quality, as denoted by an English adjective, directly) or a different one (referring to the prototype, some action or state related to the quality). If the original metaphor is replaced by a new one, the source domain is usually a perceptual quality of a different sense (e.g., tactile property rather than taste) or some physical sensation experienced by the body. Other types of

translation cover non-metaphorical rendering: loss of metaphoricity due to paraphrase (use of literal forms) or omission of the metaphorical meaning expressed by the adjective (deletion).

3   Most cases of translation when the original metaphor is not preserved in the target language reveal cross-linguistic variation. Some metaphors expressed by English adjectives (e.g., *hot, cool*) are not present in Lithuanian and could be considered culture specific. In other cases, a range of entities to which a metaphorised quality applies is narrower, as indicated by the restricted collocability of the equivalent adjective in Lithuanian (e.g., *sweet – saldus*). In general, translation of metaphorical expressions is largely dependent on lexical and syntactic patterns of the target language: a particular adjective (whether in a metaphorical or literal use) is chosen according to the noun modified, or other forms of expression are used to conform to the syntactic structure of the sentence.

4   In addition to cross-linguistic asymmetry as an objective factor, rendering metaphorical expressions in the target language seems to be governed by the subjective choice of the translator. It is most evident in cases when changes are introduced, even though retaining the original metaphor through preserving the same source domain, expressed in the same way, would be adequate in the target language, (e.g., *cold – ledinis* 'icy' vs. *šaltas* 'cold'). In other instances, different lexical forms to render the meaning of the same English adjective might indicate the translator's search of a more precise expression of the quality, metaphorised in a specific context.

Overall, the study reported in this paper attests to the metaphorical potential of perception language and confirms the general tendencies of metaphor translation. Some findings, however, are more specific due to the object of this research, i.e., perception adjectives expressing attributive metaphors and ways to render them in translation, which have not been much discussed previously. In spite of the limitations of the study (particular adjectives analysed and the amount of translation data), the types of translation examined reveal different aspects of variation in the metaphorical patterns of English and Lithuanian, which contributes to further knowledge of metaphor in different languages and translation.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

References

1   Baldauf, Ch. (1997). Metapher und Kognition: Grundlagen einer neuen Theorie der Alltagsmetapher. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

2   Barcelona, A. (2001). On the systematic contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors: Case studies and proposed methodology. In Pütz, M. (Ed.), Applied Cognitive Linguistics. Language Pedagogy. Vol. 2 (pp. 117-146). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

3   Bergström, A. (2010). Temperature in language and mind. A comparative semantic study of temperature adjectives in Swedish. Summary of doctoral dissertation. Gothenburg: Gothenburg University.

4   Bremner, A. J., & Spence, C. (2017). The Development of Tactile Perception. Advances in Child Development and Behavior, 52, 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2016.12.002

5   Breslin, P. A. S. (2013). An Evolutionary Perspective on Food and Human Taste. Current Biology, 23, R409-R418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2013.04.010

6   Bystrov, Y., & Tatsakovych, U. (2023). Metaphorical conceptualization of beauty in Donna Tartt's The Secret History: translation perspectives. Neohelicon, 50, 687-703. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11059-023-00697-7

7   DLKŽ - Keinys, S. (Ed.) (2021) Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. https://doi.org/10.35321/dlkz

8   Fulkerson, M. (2015). Rethinking the senses and their interactions: The case for sensory pluralism. Frontiers in Psychology, 5, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01426

9   Gibbs, R.W. (2005). Embodiment and Cognitive Science. New York: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805844

10   Gray, R. (2023). Thermal Perception and Its Relation to Touch. Philosophers' Imprint, 23, 25, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3998/phimp.2547

11 Gražytė, R., & Maskaliūnienė, N. (2009). Translation of conceptual metaphor in the legal discourse of EU white papers. Vertimo studijos, 2, 71-87. https://doi.org/10.15388/VertStud.2009.2.10604

12 Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (2019). Perception metaphors in cognitive linguistics. Scope, motivation, and lexicalization. In Speed, L. J., O'Meara C., Roque, L. S., Majid, A. (Eds.), Perception metaphors (pp. 43-64). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.19.03iba

13 Johnson, M. (1987). The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226177847.001.0001

14 Johnson, M. (2015). Embodied understanding. Frontiers in Psychology, 6, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00875

15 Kalda, A. (2020). Translating perception metaphors. A process-based approach. Philologia Estonica Tallinnensis, 5, 109-133. https://doi.org/10.22601/PET.2020.05.04

16 Kamandulytė, A. (2019). Metaforiniai terminai su žalios spalvos leksema. ES dokumentų vertimo iš anglų kalbos į lietuvių ir italų kalbas atvejo analizė. Vertimo studijos, 12, 51-70. https://doi.org/10.15388/VertStud.2019.4

17 Kashkin, E., & Vinogradova, O. (2015). The Domain of Surface Texture. Higher School of Economics Research Paper WP BRP 30/LNG/2015. Kashkin, Egor and Vinogradova, Olga, The Domain of Surface Texture (December 2, 2015). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2698127

18 Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (Ed.) (2015). The Linguistics of Temperature. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.107

19 Kövecses, Z. (2005). Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614408

20 Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

21 Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought. New York: Basic Books.

22 LDCE - Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2014). https://www.ldoceonline.com.

23 LKŽ - Naktinienė G. (Ed.) (2017) Lietuvių kalbos žodynas. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. www.lkz.lt.

24 Marcinkevičienė, R. (2006). Konceptualioji metafora vertime. Darbai ir dienos, 45, 109-118. Retrieved December 2023 from https://www.lituanistika.lt/content/24728. https://doi.org/10.7220/2335-8769.45.7

25 Mennella, J. A., & Bobowski, N. K. (2015). The sweetness and bitterness of childhood: Insights from basic research on taste preferences. Physiology & Behavior, 152, 502-507. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2015.05.015

26 Nanay, B. (2024). Perception: The Basics. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032639536

27 ODE - Oxford Dictionary of English (2006). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

28 O'Meara, C., Speed, L. J., Roque, L. S., & Majid, A. (2019). Perception metaphors: A view from diversity. In Speed, L. J., O'Meara C., Roque, L. S., Majid, A. (Eds.), Perception metaphors (pp. 1-16). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.19.01ome

29 Pragglejaz Group (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. Metaphor and Symbol, 22(1), 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752

30 Rasulić, K. (2015). What's hot and what's not in English and Serbian. A contrastive view on the polysemy of temperature adjectives. In Kopjevskaja-Tamm, M. (Ed.), The Linguistics of Temperature (pp. 254-299). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.107.09ras

31 Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach. Journal of Pragmatics, 36(7), 1253-1269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.012

32 Schmidt, G. (2015). Applying Conceptual Metaphor Theory in cross-linguistic and translation research. In Belaj, B. (Ed.), Dimenzije značênja (pp. 243-265). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet sveucilista u Zagrebu.

33 Šeškauskienė, I. (2022). Metaphor in legal translation: Space as a source domain in English and Lithuanian. In Šeškauskienė, I. (Ed.), Metaphor in Legal Discourse (pp. 114-145). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

34 Šeškauskienė I., Talačka M., & Niunka V. (2016). How dirty is dirty money in English and Lithuanian? Metaphors in EU Directives on Some Criminal Matters: a cross-linguistic analysis. Žmogus ir žodis, 18, 3, 80-102. https://doi.org/10.15823/zz.2016.19

35 Shindo, M. (1998). An analysis of metaphorically extended concepts based on bodily experience: A case study of temperature expressions (1). Papers in Linguistic Science, 4, 29-54.

36 Shindo, M. (1999). An analysis of metaphorically extended concepts based on bodily experience: A case study of temperature expressions (2). Papers in Linguistic Science, 5, 57-73.

37 Speed, L. J., O'Meara C., Roque, L. S., & Majid, A. (Eds.) (2019). Perception Metaphors. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.19

38 Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: from MIP to MIPVU. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.14

39 Torres Soler, J. (2021). Variation in embodied metaphors: A contrastive analysis of taste metaphors in Spanish and English. Complutense Journal of English Studies, 29, 21-23. https://doi.org/10.5209/cjes.71511

40 Trojszczak, M. (2019). Grounding mental metaphors in touch: A corpus-based study of English and Polish. In L. J. Speed, C. O'Meara, L. S. Roque, & Majid, A. (Eds.), Perception Metaphors (pp. 209-230). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.19.11tro

41 Urbonaitė, J. (2015). Metaphor identification procedure MIPVU: an attempt to apply it to Lithuanian. Taikomoji kalbotyra 7, 1-25. https://doi.org/10.15388/TK.2015.17497

42 Urbonaitė, J., Šeškauskienė I., & Cibulskienė, J. (2019). Linguistic metaphor identification in Lithuanian. In Nacey, S., Dorst, A. G., Krennmayr, T., Reijnierse, W. G. (Eds.) Metaphor Identification in Multiple Languages: MIPVU around the world (pp. 159-181). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.22.08urb

43 Valiulienė, E. (2015). Temperatūros metaforos lietuvių ir anglų kalbose: turinys ir raiška. Daktaro disertacija. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas. https://doi.org/10.15388/Verb.2015.6.8819

44 Williams, L. E., & Bargh, J. A. (2008). Experiencing physical warmth promotes interpersonal warmth. Science, 322, 606-607. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1162548

45 Zawisławska, M. A., & Falkowska, M. H. (2018). All my sour-sweet days I will lament and love - a comparative analysis of metaphors with the basic taste adjectives in Polish and English. Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives, 18, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.1675

Source

1 *The Parallel Corpus* (Lygiagretusis tekstynas) – The English-Lithuanian-English and Czech-Lithuanian-Czech Parallel Corpus. https://sitti.vdu.lt/lygiagretus-tekstynas/

Santrauka

Edita Valiulienė

Percepcinių būdvardžių metaforiškumas vertimo aspektu

Straipsnyje siekiama išanalizuoti metaforinę anglų kalbos būdvardžių, žyminčių skonio, temperatūros ir lytėjimo ypatybes, vartoseną ir jos perteikimą vertime į lietuvių kalbą. Pristatant vertimo būdus, nustatytus remiantis lygiagrečiojo tekstyno duomenimis, aptariami juos nulėmę kalbų skirtumai ir kiti veiksniai, darantys įtaką vertėjo (-os) pasirinkimui. Analizei pasirinkta kognityvinė prieiga: atskiri metaforiniai pasakymai siejami su jais realizuojamomis konceptualiosiomis metaforomis, pagrindinį dėmesį skiriant ištakos sričiai, kuri pasitelkiama metaforizacijai originalo ir vertimo kalbose. Šiuo požiūriu atvejai, kai vertime taip pat pasitelkiama metaforinė raiška, yra dviejų tipų: originalo teksto metafora išlaikoma, kai lietuvių kalbos metaforiniuose

pasakymuose tiesiogiai ar netiesiogiai reiškiama ta pati percepcinė ypatybė, arba pakeičiama kita metafora, būdinga lietuvių kalbai, kai metaforiškumas remiasi kita ištakų sritimi – dažniausiai kitomis percepcinėmis ypatybėmis, fiziniais kūno pojūčiais. Kiti vertimo būdai apima tiesioginę raišką – metaforinė anglų kalbos būdvardžio reikšmė lietuvių kalboje perfrazuojama ar visai praleidžiama. Analizės rezultatai rodo, kad anglų kalbos būdvardžių vertimas išlaikant originalo kalbos metaforiškumą sudaro apie 30 proc. visų atvejų. Kitų vertimo būdų pasirinkimą daugiausia lemia du veiksniai: kalbų skirtumai (nevienodas metaforinių anglų kalbos būdvardžio ir jo ekvivalento lietuvių kalboje reikšmių diapazonas, konotacijos skirtumai, leksiniai ir sintaksiniai vertimo kalbos ypatumai) ir subjektyvus vertėjo (-os) pasirinkimas, pirmenybę teikiant vienai ar kitai raiškos formai.

About the Author

EDITA VALIULIENĖ

Dr., Institute of Regional Development,
Vilnius University Šiauliai Academy, Lithuania.

Research interests
Cognitive linguistics, metaphor studies,
contrastive linguistics, translation.

Address
Vytauto g. 84, Šiauliai, Lithuania

E-mail
edita.valiuliene@sa.vu.lt

Orcid ID
0000-0002-6454-3800