NOTES ON METAPHORICAL SCHEMATA AND THE SEARCH FOR EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATING ENGLISH AND SPANISH

Ana Mª Piquer Píriz
Universidad de Extremadura

Resumen

El desarrollo de la traducción como disciplina científica ha estado estrechamente vinculado a los avances en la lingüística general. Como consecuencia de estos avances, el concepto de traducción ha pasado de estar supeditado a las diferencias estructurales entre las lenguas de origen y de llegada, a ser entendido como un acto comunicativo en el que el traductor actúa como mediador entre ambas culturas. Este nuevo enfoque tiene importantes repercusiones para la traducción de la metáfora, sobre todo si se considera este fenómeno desde un punto de vista cognitivo. Desde esta perspectiva, la metáfora como proceso es un mecanismo mental universal que estructura nuestros pensamientos y nuestro lenguaje. Además, existen esquemas mentales metafóricos que pueden ser compartidos por más de una cultura, o incluso universales. Sin embargo, la metáfora como producto, es decir, las realizaciones lingüísticas de estos esquemas mentales reflejan, en gran medida, rasgos socio-culturales propios de la comunidad lingüística en la que se originan. En este sentido, es importante que el traductor sea consciente de esta doble faceta de la metáfora en los planos mental y lingüístico.

Este artículo se centra en analizar las aportaciones de la lingüística cognitiva, los estudios comparativos interculturales y los enfoques basados en corpora lingüísticos a esta concepción de la metáfora y sus implicaciones para el ámbito de la traducción.

Palabras clave: Metáfora, traducción, expresiones idiomáticas.

Abstract

The development of Translation as a scientific discipline have been closely linked to the advances in Linguistics as a general science. Due to the latter, the concept of translation has shifted from a highly constrained one of structural contrasts between the source and target language to the consideration of the translation act as a communicative process in which the translator is the mediator between the target and the source language cultures. This view is particularly relevant to the translation of metaphor, especially when this phenomenon is considered from the cognitive linguistic scope. According to this approach, metaphor is a universal capacity that structures the way we think and our language, pre-

senting metaphorical schemata that are shared or universal. However, metaphor as a product, i.e., the linguistic realisations of these mental schemata, are very often culture-specific. In this sense, it is very important for translators to be aware of the double nature of the role of metaphor in discourse and thinking. This paper deals with the contribution of Cognitive Linguistics, Cross-cultural studies and Corpus-based approaches to our conception of metaphor and the implications for translation.

Keywords: Metaphor, translation, idiomatic expressions.

The development of translation as a scientific discipline has been closely linked to and influenced by the advances in linguistics as a general science. As a result of these advances, the concept of translation has shifted away from being highly constrained to the structural contrasts between the source and target language to the much more unrestricted consideration of the translation act as a communicative process in which the translator is the mediator between the target and the source language cultures. Consequently, a clear change of direction is observed: translation studies have developed from focusing mainly on the differences between the two language systems involved to highlighting and taking advantage of the similarities between them. The former view is illustrated by the *Contrastive Linguistics* approach, which is mainly concerned with dividing and classifying the interdependent constituents of a given language in order to determine their behaviour. Within this framework, problematic areas for translation would derive from the lack of correspondence of certain formal categories in the source and target language. Current views, on the other hand, draw attention to translation as an act of communication in which, as Hatim and Mason point out, not only communicative but also pragmatic and semiotic factors are taken into account and in which the translator is placed at the centre of that communicative activity:

> «[T]he translator takes on the role of mediator between different cultures, each of which has its own visions of reality, ideologies, myths and so on»[1].

This view is particularly relevant to the translation of metaphor, especially when this phenomenon is considered from a cognitive linguistic perspective. According to this approach, metaphor is a universal capacity that structures the way we think and act[2] and some conceptual metaphors are held to be

---

[1] B. Hatim and I. Mason, *Discourse and the translator*, London, Longman, 1990, p. 236.

[2] This conception is the foundation stone of Cognitive Linguistics:
«[M]etaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature» (G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1980, p. 3).

shared by different cultures. The assumption that metaphor is a universal capacity has been dealt with by anthropologists and cultural linguists. Basso (1967)[3], for example, points out how the Apache Indians use the names of the body parts to refer to the parts of a car[4]. This is a clear illustration of the function of metaphor in making coherent the understanding of unknown phenomena by means of familiar concepts (the *cognitive* function of metaphor). Metaphor helps us to understand concepts, particularly abstract ones, in a systematic or coherent way, that is, it ties things together, as argued by Lakoff in his *Invariance Hypothesis* theory[5]. According to this scholar, our abstract reasoning is based, for example, on our understanding of basic spatial concepts via a metaphorical projection from the source, concrete domain to the target, abstract domain. In order to illustrate this, Lakoff provides data that include the metaphorical understanding of such basic domains as time, states, events, actions, purposes, means, causes, modalities, linear scales, or categories.

Even though it seems that the abstract understanding of these domains, which are fundamental in most languages, is achieved via metaphor (process), the way those metaphors (products)[6] are realised linguistically is, very often, culture-specific. The awareness of the balance between universality, on the one hand, and culture-specificity, on the other, is fundamental if it is to shed any light on the translator's work when approaching the difficult task of interpreting and translating metaphor. Coherence is the key element in this balance. In this sense, Hatim and Mason's notion of the role of coherence and cohesion in the process of translation is very revealing. For Hatim and Mason, coherence relations (cause-effect, problem-solution,

---

[3] Quoted in G.B. Palmer, *Lingüística Cultural,* trad. Enrique Bernárdez, Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 2000.

[4] In this suggestive example, the members of this tribe use a whole set of related terms which are familiar to them and which they usually employ to describe a specific reality (body parts) to refer to something which they have seen for the first time (the parts of a car) but that they perceive as similar to that original reality. Thus, the *lights* of the car become the *eyes* (*bidáá*), the *bonnet* is the *nose* (*bichih*), the *windscreen* is the *forehead* (*bita'*), the *wheels* become the *legs* and *arms* (*bigan*), all the elements under the bonnet become the guts (*bibiye'*) and so on.

[5] G. Lakoff, «The Invariance Hypothesis: is abstract reason based on image-schemas?», *Cognitive Linguistics* I/1, 1990, pp. 39-74.

[6] The importance of distinguishing the process and products of metaphor has been pointed out by Gibbs:

«*A major problem with current theories of metaphor is that many researchers fail to distinguish between how metaphor is processed and the meanings that are produced once a metaphor has been understood... [T]he processes of metaphor understanding are different from the products that we consciously think about when we read or hear metaphors. We need to be quite careful to distinguish between the processes and products of metaphor understanding*» (R.W. Gibbs, «Researching metaphor», in *Researching and Applying Metaphor*, L. Cameron and G. Low (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 37).

temporal cohesion...), are universals in meaning and remain constant in translation from the source to the target text. However, the ways these universal relations are expressed, that is, the cohesion, is more likely to be language specific. Thus, a relationship may be established in the task of translation between process (coherence) as underlying mental schemata, and product (cohesion) as the linguistic instantiations of this coherence. In this sense, just as culture-specificity may be more salient in linguistic metaphors in text, the underlying schemata may be shared, or universal. Translators, then, need to be aware of the two-faceted nature of the role of metaphor in discourse and in thinking.

In terms of metaphor, it should be recognised that cross-domain mappings of the type described above will contribute in important ways to the coherence of the source text and its interpretation by the receiver. This contention has, however, been refined by the analysis of linguistic data. In this sense, corpus-based approaches have significantly contributed to the description of linguistic metaphors by supplementing intuition with analysis of language in use. From her examination of data from a large corpus (the Bank of English), Deignan[7] observes that there are collocational patterns used in both the source and the target domains, but there are also collocates that are exclusive to the target domain. That is, the tendency to map creatively across domains is, for Deignan, restrained by a conflicting principle to fix specific collocations —Sinclair's idiom principle[8]. Thus, a nonliteral multiword expression may arise from two different processes: a transfer from the source domain which lexicalises an experiential gestalt or bodily experience (in the way that Lakoff and Johnson have argued) or by means of a process of fossilization in the target domain of expressions that were originally transferred as part of larger semantic field:

> «Some collocations may become associated with a target domain sense of their component words, and speakers then avoid using these collocations in the source domain (...) Thus the tendency to map creatively and intellectually from source to target domains is restrained by a conflicting tendency —to fix and reuse conventionalised strings»[9].

---

[7] A. Deignan, «Linguistic Metaphors and Collocation in Nonliterary Corpus Data», *Metaphor and Symbol*, XIV/1, 1999, pp. 19-36.

[8] *«The principle of idiom is that a language user has available to him or her a large number of semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices, even though they may appear to be analysable into segments. To some extent, this may reflect the recurrence of similar situations in human affairs; it may illustrate a natural tendency to economy of effort; or it may be motivated in part by the exigencies of real-time conversation. However it arises, it has been relegated to an inferior position in most current linguistics, because it does not fit the open-choice model»* (J. Sinclair, *Corpus, Concordance and Collocation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991, p. 110).

[9] A. Deignan, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

Corpus evidence is, then, needed by the translator to make decisions about whether a metaphorical schema informs a particular use of a linguistic expression or whether the degree of fossilization of a term or terms in the target domains makes the process aspect of this usage irrelevant. Furthermore, it seems that these fossilised expressions that only occur in the target domain would be more culture-specific because each linguistic community may choose a specific feature of the component word to fossilise.

With regard to metaphor and translation, to determine to what extent metaphor is universal and to what extent it is culture-specific can shed some light on the issue. In this sense, several factors, most of which have already been discussed above, need to be taken into account. In the first place, metaphor as a process, that is, the metaphorical capacity is considered to be universal. Furthermore, there are a number of domains (those that according to Lakoff comprise the data for the Invariance-Principle) —time, states, events, actions, purposes, means, etc., that are present in all languages— and the abstract understanding of them seem to arise universally via metaphor (process). However, the linguistic products of this metaphorical process are very often culture specific, as pointed out by corpus-approaches.

Thus, apart from the product-process distinction, a further division between the mental and the linguistic levels also needs to be taken into account. In cognitive terms, a conceptual metaphor is the mental representation of how a concept is understood in terms of something else. A typical example would be TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY. In fact, the conceptual metaphor would be the speakers' mental representation of *time* as *a valuable commodity* which would not be expressed linguistically but mentally. The A IS B formula which was first used by Lakoff and Johnson and has been widely employed later on, is simply a way of representing this mental operation.

Grady, Taub and Morgan[10] develop Lakoff and Johnson's approach introducing the concept of primitives. According to these authors, primitives are taken to be the metaphors with the most direct motivation, and the least arbitrary structure, and should therefore be the most common cross-linguistically. Establishing a typology of these primitives across cultures would make a significant contribution not only to translation studies but also to other disciplines such as second language acquisition, since it would clarify the analogies and differences in the mental ways of conceptualising of two given linguistic communities. If this mental behaviour influences our linguistic patterns to the extent it has been claimed, cross-cultural studies of this sort would cer-

---

[10] J. Grady, S. Taub and P. Morgan, «Primitive and Compound Metaphors», in *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*, A.E. Goldberg (ed.), Standford, Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1996.

tainly aid translation, teaching or any activity that involves the interaction of two languages. However, until such a typology has been refined, translators must use the findings available.

The real data we have access to (the metaphorical products) are found on the linguistic level and although it is on this level where cross-cultural variation is more likely to arise, analogy is also possible. For example, some possible linguistic realisations of TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY would be *you are wasting my time* or *no hay tiempo que perder*. These examples illustrate an insightful point in relation to our universality/culture-specificity dilemma: the linguistic instantiations of a metaphor are not necessarily restricted to a given language but can be shared by two different cultures. In the case of English and Spanish, this conclusion may be supported by further examples such as *she drives me out of mind* and *está loca por él* (LOVE IS MADNESS), *he attacked every weak point in my argument* and *el contrincante más capacitado ganó el debate* (ARGUMENT IS WAR), or *don't let him get you down* and *tiene la moral por los suelos* (SAD IS DOWN), which are only a small illustration of the numerous possibilities.

It is self-evident that the closer[11] the languages and cultures, the more likely they are to share conceptual metaphors. However, this similarity cannot be extended to every language and every metaphor. Taking into account the mental-linguistic distinction, on the one hand, and cross-language differences, on the other, M. Hiraga[12] and A. Deignan, Gabrys and Solska[13] established a very similar classification of the possible combinations that can be observed in two languages, Japanese and English and Polish and English, respectively. This classification seems likely to be extended to other languages. The possible combinations they consider are four. The first is where the same conceptual metaphor is common to both languages and is instantiated in equivalent linguistic expressions. In the second possible combination, the conceptual metaphor is still shared but it is linguistically realised by different expressions.

---

[11] The proximity between languages is a complex issue. Depending on the aspects we are focusing on, two languages can be considered to be close or distant. For the purpose of this analysis, languages with a common Indo-European ancestry are considered to be close. Most of these languages have a clearly different more direct origin (Germanic, in the case of English, or Romance for Spanish). If more specific aspects related to these direct origins are taken into consideration, English and Spanish, for example, can be argued to be quite distant. However, in terms of metaphorical conceptualisation these languages seem to be quite close when compared, for example, with metaphorical concepts in Asian or African languages. For an interesting view on metaphors in different cultures see P. Mühlhäusler «Metaphors others live by», *Language and Communication.* xv/III (1995), pp. 281-288.

[12] M. Hiraga, «Metaphor and comparative cultures», in *Cross-cultural communication: East and west,* vol. III, P. Fendos (ed.), National Cheng-Kung University, Taiwan, 1991.

[13] A. Deignan, D. Gabrys and A. Solska, «Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities», *ELT Journal,* LI /IV, 1997, pp. 352-360.

The third is where words and expressions have similar literal meanings in both languages but these meanings are metaphorically extended in different ways. And the final case is where two different conceptual metaphors are used.

Examples of these general combinations can be found when comparing English and Spanish. Due to the closeness of these two linguistic systems, it is not difficult to find examples of common basic conceptual metaphors. Reddy's «conduit metaphor»[14], which represents our understanding of language as a process of communication, is an illustration of this. As Reddy has shown, we see IDEAS as OBJECTS, and WORDS as the CONTAINER of these ideas/thoughts. Thus, COMMUNICATION is seen as a process of sending where the speaker puts the ideas into words (containers) and sends them along a conduit to the listener whose task would be to extract them in order to understand the message[15]. On the mental level, this conceptual metaphor prevails in English and Spanish and there are also some common linguistic instantiations in both languages: *You know very well I gave you that idea*[16], *Sabes muy bien que fui yo quien te dio la idea; You have to absorb Plato's ideas a little at a time, los niños son como esponjas, lo absorben todo.* However, there are also realisations of the conduit metaphor which are specific to one of the languages. For example, the idiomatic expression *spill the beans*[17] does not work in Spanish. In order to convey the same meaning in Spanish, it is necessary to use either the literal phrase *contarlo todo* or the metaphorical idiom *irse de la lengua* which does not derive from the conduit metaphor and which would be, perhaps, more closely matched by the English idiom *your tongue runs away with you.*

The third case, words or expressions with similar literal meaning but with different metaphorical extensions, can be illustrated with a particularly interesting example, the term *green. Green* obviously has the primary literal meaning in both languages:

> «adj. De color semejante al de la hierba fresca, la esmeralda, el cardenillo, etc. Es el cuarto color del espectro solar» (DRAE).

[14] M. Reddy, «The conduit metaphor. A case of frame conflict in our language about language», in *Metaphor and Thought*, A. Ortony (ed), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

[15] *«[I]f language transfers thought to others, then the logical container, or conveyer, for this thought is words, or word-grouping like phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and so on. In the framework of the conduit metaphor, the listener's task must be one of extraction. He must find the meaning «in the words» and take it out of them, so that it gets into his head»* (M. Reddy, *op. cit*, p. 168).

[16] All the English examples derived from the conduit metaphor quoted here come from Reddy, *op. cit.*

[17] *Spill the beans* is an «abnormally decomposable» idiom, to use Gibbs's terminology, in the sense that the relationship between the component and its idiomatic referent is metaphorical. In this case the «beans» are ideas which when «spilled» are extracted and thus «revealed».

«The adjective denoting the colour which in the spectrum is intermediate between blue and yellow; in nature chiefly conspicuous as the colour of growing herbage and leaves» (OED).

As well as the basic literal meaning, one of the semantically extended meanings of *green,* namely, that related to the environment, is also shared in both languages[18]. However, the metaphorical extension of *green* conveyed in the English idiomatic expressions *to have green fingers* or *a green thumb*[19] is not present in the Spanish *verde.* Interestingly enough, this very sense would be expressed in Spanish with another metonymic expression *tener buena mano con la jardinería* which also makes reference to the other semantic field that is present in *to have green fingers/thumb:* hand.

As can be seen in these latter examples, source domains, or cross-domain mappings generally, may be verbally signalled metonymically. So, for example, in the English idiom *to make the feathers fly,* the underlying metaphoric schema drawing on the source domain cats as predators of smaller animals (thus upsetting other orders) is barely perceptible in the linguistic metaphor itself. However, the coherence of this phrase with others that draw on the MAN IS AN ANIMAL schema would lead the translator to attempt to find an equivalent expression respecting the underlying metaphor.

Finally, the fourth case, different conceptual metaphors, is harder to illustrate in English and Spanish due to the proximity of both languages. This possibility may occur more frequently in distant linguistic systems such as, for instance, in a cross-language comparison between Asian and European languages. Thus, the fact that IDEAS are perceived to be in the HARA (belly) in Japanese, while for most of the western world IDEAS are in the MIND (conduit metaphor), is a clear example of this that has been widely quoted in the literature. There are also examples of different conceptual metaphors even within the same linguistic community. Lakoff and Johnson, for instance, discuss how within the American culture, there is a monastic order (the Trappist) that would not share the mainstream orientational metaphor MORE IS BETTER // BIGGER IS BETTER with respect to material possessions even though they would still share VIRTUE IS UP, and MORE IS BETTER regarding virtue[20].

Translators need to be careful when identifying a particular expression with an underlying conceptual metaphor. For example, it might be easy to

---

[18] «*Green is used metaphorically to talk about issues which concern the earth, the environment and nature*» (A. Deignan, *Collins Cobuild English Guides 7: Metaphor,* London, Harper Collins, 1995). «*[adj.] Se aplica a ciertos partidos ecologistas y a sus miembros*» (DRAE).

[19] *Phr. to have green fingers (or a green thumb), to be unusually successful in making plants grow; also transf.; hence green-fingered adj* (OED).

[20] Lakoff and Johnson, *op. cit.,* p. 24.

think that a metaphor such a MORALE IS FOODSTUFF underlies a phrase such as *comer la moral.* However, this is simply a metaphorical subset of the understanding of morale or spirits as something that can be lowered or raised (UP/DOWN orientational metaphor). This conceptual metaphor, common to both English and Spanish, is instantiated, for example, in expressions such as *«to lower or to raise one's morale»*[21], *«to be in high spirits»*, *«to lift one's spirits»* or *«levantarle la moral/el ánimo a alguien»* or *tener la moral por los suelos o por las nubes».* *Comer la moral* is not seen to be as directly motivated by the basic conceptual metaphor as these examples, but can, nevertheless, be related to it via MORE IS UP, LESS IS DOWN: in eating part of something, less remains, therefore, «eating» someone's morale, results in a diminished morale.

Although a more detailed analysis is necessary, the examples discussed so far seem to lead to two suggestive conclusions. First, the real data give the impression of being more flexible and complex than the four-part classification of metaphorical equivalents proposed. All the instances shown above illustrate that the same linguistic utterance can be fitted in more than one of the categories. For example, the same shared conceptual metaphor can instantiate different and equivalent linguistic expressions, and a word with a similar literal meaning in both languages may also have both an equivalent and a different metaphorical extension.

Secondly, while entrenchment in a language is an indication of the conceptual status of a metaphor, the more idiomatic an utterance is (e.g. *to have green fingers, to spill the beans*) the more culturally bound it seems to be. It is a well known fact that idiomatic expressions have a strong socio-cultural component. In Spanish, for example, there is a whole set of idioms related to bull-fighting. In this sense, MacArthur's discussion on the use of animal terms is pertinent:

> *«The use of animal names, along with other elements associated with them, are conventional and stereotypical within that particular culture and may vary a great deal even within a community that shares the same language. For example, there are many differences in the way this metaphor operates in US E and Br E, and within Spain ... the animal names may be used quite differently in the North or South»*[22].

Furthermore, there are some other typical features of metaphor, as they become progressively entrenched or idiomatic in a language, that need to

---

[21] Further linguistic instantiations of this orientational metaphor are: *Many pilots are suffering from a low morale, they hope to boost the morale of their troops, morale-booster, morale boosting* (*Collins Cobuild English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*) or *Harry raised our morale by telling jokes* (Lakoff and Johnson, *op. cit.,* p. 172).

[22] F. MacArthur, «Making semantically opaque metaphors transparent in FL instruction: descriptive vs explanatory adequacy of the concept of attribute saliency», paper presented at RAAM IV, Tunis, 2001.

be borne in mind. First of all, idiomatic language in general is characterised by its affective stance. Unlike literal language, metaphorical discourse usually has an evaluative component, that is, when used, it is not neutral but rather chosen for a particular reason[23]. It is self-evident that expressions like, for example, (2) *to die*, (3) *to kick the bucket* or (4) *to pass away*, even though they express the same general meaning are used in different situations. While *to die* expresses the most neutral meaning, *to kick the bucket*, which is the most idiomatic, would convey very specific connotations[24]. Thus, it is very important that the translator bears in mind these differences in order to render appropriately the meaning of the idiomatic expression into the target language. Frequency is another key element in the translation of idiomatic expressions. If, as has been discussed above, idioms convey an affective stance and one of the reasons for their usage is that they are ready-made chunks understood by the speaker and listener and, therefore, are a quick and efficient way of communicating, translating them into the target language with an expression which is infrequent would counteract both effects.

In this sense, register and, above all, frequency are two notions that have been given a great importance in corpus-based dictionaries of idiomatic expressions in English. The *Collins Cobuild Dictionary of Idioms*[25], for example, gives explicit information about the levels of formality of the items listed, as well as their frequency. For this latter purpose, which is the most directly derived from the use of a corpus, a system of frequency bands, which mark the relative frequency of each entry, has been devised. This is a clear, simple way of guiding the translator's search for appropriately entrenched metaphorical idioms. In contrast, however, this kind of lexical guidance is only just beginning to appear in Spanish dictionaries. Even though specialised in recording idiomatic phrases, for example, Varela and Kubarth's *Diccionario fraseológico del español moderno*[26], Buitrago's *Diccionario Espasa. Dichos y frases hechas*[27],

---

[23] «*Affect: Idioms are typically used to imply a certain evaluation or affective stance towards the things they denote. A language doesn't ordinarily use idioms to describe situations that are regarded neutrally*» (G. Nunberg, I. Sag and T. Wasow, «Idioms», *Language*, LXX/III, 94, pp. 491-573).

«*The selection of a fixed expression is nearly always significant with respect to the interpersonal component, either directly, because it lexicalises a mitigation of the message or pre-emption of disagreement: by choosing to use a stereotyped formula, the speaker/writer can be deliberately vague, less directly assertive, but less open to question or refutation by appealing to shared cultural values*» (R. Moon, «The analysis of fixed expressions in text», in M. Coulthard, *Advances in written discourse*, London, Routledge, 1994, p. 127).

[24] The affective value of metaphorical language could explain, to some extent, why idiomatic expressions cannot be literally paraphrased. (R. Gibbs, «What do idioms really mean?», *Journal of Memory and Language*, XXXI, 1992, pp. 485-506).

[25] *Collins Cobuild Dictionary of Idioms*, London, Harper Collins, 2000.

[26] F. Varela and H. Kubarth, *Diccionario fraseológico del español moderno*, Madrid, Gredos, 1994.

[27] A. Buitrago Jiménez, *Diccionario Espasa. Dichos y frases hechas*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe, 1995.

Martín's *Diccionario del español coloquial. Dichos, modismos y locuciones populares*[28] are useful sources for such phrase searches, frequency accounts based on corpus data are not included. Indeed, the translator's task would be much facilitated by a conceptual dictionary which combined both the concepts regularly understood and structured through metaphor with the corresponding linguistic instantiations. However, this type of dictionary has still to be produced, and, in the meantime, the translator must search for the kind of equivalence of the type outlined above, at the process and product levels, with the aid of a growing bibliography that illuminates both the mental and linguistic phenomena.

References

BUITRAGO JIMÉNEZ, A., *Diccionario Espasa. Dichos y frases hechas,* Madrid, Espasa Calpe, 1995.

Collins Cobuild Dictionary of Idioms, London, Harper Collins, 2000.

Collins Cobuild Dictionary for Advanced Learners, London, Harper Collins, 2001.

DEIGNAN, A., *Collins Cobuild English Guides 7: Metaphor,* London, Harper Collins, 1995.

—«Linguistic Metaphors and Collocation in Nonliterary Corpus Data», *Metaphor and Symbol,* XIV/I, 1999, pp. 19-36.

DEIGNAN, A., GABRYS, D. and SOLSKA, A., «Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities», *ELT Journal,* LI/IV, 1997, pp. 352-360.

DRAE, *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española,* CD-ROM Edition, 1995.

GIBBS, R.W., «Researching metaphor», in *Researching and applying metaphor,* L. CAMERON, and G. Low (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

GIBBS, R.W., «What do idioms really mean?», *Journal of Memory and Language,* XXI, 1992, pp. 485-506.

GRADY, J., TAUB, S. and MORGAN, P., «Primitive and Compound Metaphors», in *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language,* A.E. GOLDBERG (ed.), Standford, Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1996.

HATIM, B. and MASON, I., *Discourse and the translator,* London, Longman, 1990.

HIRAGA, M., «Metaphor and comparative cultures», in *Cross-cultural communication: East and west,* vol. III, P. FENDOS (ed.), National Cheng-Kung University, Taiwan, 1991.

LAKOFF, G., «The Invariance Hypothesis: is abstract reason based on image-schemas?», *Cognitive Linguistics* I/1, 1990, pp. 39-74.

LAKOFF, G. and JOHNSON, M., *Metaphors we live by,* Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1980.

MARTÍN SÁNCHEZ, M., *Diccionario del español coloquial. Dichos, modismos y locuciones populares,* Tellus, 1997.

---

[28] M. Martín Sánchez, *Diccionario del español coloquial. Dichos, modismos y locuciones populares,* Tellus, 1997.

MOON, R., «The analysis of fixed expressions in text», in *Advances in written discourse*, M. COULTHARD (ed.), London, Routledge, 1994, p. 127.

NUNBERG, G., SAG, I. and WASOW, T., «Idioms», *Language*, LXX/III, 1994, pp. 491-573.

OED, *Oxford English Dictionary*, CD-ROM Edition, 1994.

PALMER, G.B., *Lingüística Cultural*, trad. Enrique BERNÁRDEZ, Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 2000.

REDDY, M., «The conduit metaphor. A case of frame conflict in our language about language», in *Metaphor and Thought*, A. ORTONY (ed.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979, pp. 284-324.

SINCLAIR, J., *Corpus, Concordance and Collocation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991.

VARELA, F., and KUBARTH, H., *Diccionario fraseológico del español moderno*, Madrid, Gredos, 1994.