An Exploration of "Anger" Metaphor Translations Based on Cognitive Equivalence Hypothesis (CEH)

Wanfang Zhang

School of Foreign Languages, Wuhan Polytechnic University, Wuhan, China

Abstract—**Metaphor mapping is mainly embodied by the mapping of vehicles. Three cognitive relations exist in vehicles of metaphors in two different cultures: identical, similar and absent. Based on Nida's functional equivalence theory of translation, the paper tentatively proposes the cognitive equivalence hypothesis (CEH) as the criterion of metaphor translation. It means that a translator should, to the fullest extent, realize the cognitive equivalence of vehicles between readers of the original text and readers of the translated text. In this paper, the cognitive comparison of "anger" metaphors in English and Chinese and their translation strategies will serve as testifying the feasibility of CEH as the criterion of metaphor translation. The thesis has some values: it promotes the cultural exchange; it fills the gap in "anger" metaphor translations; it enriches the study of metaphor translation.**

Index Terms—**"anger" metaphors, cognitive comparison, translation strategies, cognitive equivalence hypothesis**

I. COGNITIVE EQUIVALENT HYPOTHESIS (CEH)

A. A Simple Appraisal of Previous Translation Theory of Metaphor

Metaphor has been traditionally categorized as a special form of rhetoric. Metaphor translation theory has been for a long time considered as an issue of inter-lingual transition on the rhetorical level.

The essence of metaphor is to experience one thing through another. Therefore, metaphor is also semantic interaction of two cognitive domains from the view of modern cognitive linguistics. The traditional translation theory on metaphor has obvious disadvantages: it neglects the essence of metaphor, i.e. semantic interaction of two cognition fields; it lacks the proper comprehension of translation. Language comes from people's organizing the experiences of the objective world. Linguistic symbols are not directly equivalent to the outside world; language is consistent with the interaction between human cognition and concrete reality. Traditional metaphor translation is restricted by aesthetic methodology and emphasizes the transfer of the macro-part, but it lacks scientific and systematic demonstration in the micro-level.

In recent years, some papers have delved into the essence of metaphor to present the techniques, strategies and cognitive process of metaphor translation in the cognitive linguistic framework. It is a great progress that researchers have made in metaphor translation, but no one has proposed a clear and effective criterion for metaphor translation from the cognitive approach. The paper will be a touchstone in this field.

B. CEH for Metaphor Translation

1) Functional Equivalence Theory (FET)

Nida (1964) put forward the concept of "dynamic equivalence" which focuses on the equivalence of the effect that source and target texts have on source and target receivers. At the end of the 1980s, Nida changed his "dynamic equivalence" into "functional equivalence", but he explained that the meaning of functional equivalence is the same as that of dynamic equivalence. As to the nature of functional equivalence, Nida proposed that the translation process has been defined on the ground that the receptors of a translation should comprehend the translated text to such an extent that they can understand how the original receptor must have in understanding the original text. It can be seen that Nida shifted his attention to the response of the receptor and to the comparison between the receptors of the source language and those of the target language.

As Nida (1993, p. 118) viewed: "No translation is completely equivalent. A number of different translations can in fact represent varying degrees of equivalence." This means that "equivalence" cannot be understood in its mathematical meaning of identity, but only in terms of proximity, i.e. on the basis of degrees of closeness to functional identity. So, in order to emphasize the flexibility of equivalence, Nida divided equivalence into two levels: the maximum equivalence and the minimum equivalence. In terms of "the maximum equivalence", the readers of the translated text should understand and appreciate the translated text in the same way as the readers of the original text. This is what a translator seeks. As the term "the minimum equivalence" suggests, the readers of the translated text should imagine how the readers of the original text understand and appreciate the original text by their understanding of the translated text. This

is what a translator must finish in a translation. It is of great practical significance to point out the degrees of equivalence.

With the rapid development of translation studies, multi-perspectives to translation are inevitable. Nida's theory has attracted and will continue to attract attention with its great theoretical and practical values. On the premise of admitting Nida's FET, however, we must admit it is not perfect. When borrowing reasonable ideas from Nida's equivalence theory, we should pay attention to the study of different discourses. FET may have disadvantages when it is used to analyze some discourses; at least it may not be targeted. As for the discourse of metaphor, based on Nida's theory, the paper suggests CEH, which can reflect the essence of metaphor in the author's opinion.

2) The Formulation of CEH

a) The Description of CEH

Metaphor is a cognitive activity which explains or understands the experience in domain A using the experience in domain B (Shu Dingfang, 2000, pp. 28). Metaphors in English and Chinese have some differences in human cognition. So, while translating metaphors, the translator must consider different cognition in different cultures and translate metaphors in the original text into some cognitive contents that can be accepted by the readers of the target text. That is to say, the translator should take the receptors of the target text as orientation. Given the receptors' cognition about the world, the translator should translate cognitive contents of the original text so that the translator can, to the fullest extent, realize the cognitive equivalence of vehicles between readers of the original text and readers of the translated text. This is called "CEH".

b) Degree of CEH

Because of the different human cognition in different cultures, it is impossible for the translators to realize the absolute cognitive equivalence between the readers of the target language and the readers of the original language. So it is necessary to consider the "degree" of cognitive equivalence. Similar to the functional equivalence theory, CEH includes the maximal and minimum cognitive equivalence.

The former suggests readers of the target text can share the identical cognitive effects with readers of the original text. For example, "go to our separate ways" in the English sentence "We may have to *go to our separate ways*" can be translated into Chinese "分道扬镳". We can see that the metaphorical expressions in English and Chinese are equivalent. The two languages both use some words related with journey to describe love. There are a series of relations between the target domain LOVE and the source domain JOURNEY: lovers are regarded as partners traveling together; their shared aim in life is the final destination of their travel. The two languages share the same source domain, mapping and reasoning. This is an ideal state all translators should pursue but in most cases it doesn't exist.

The latter means readers of the target text can just share the similar cognitive effects with readers of the original text. For instance, "the apple of one's eyes" can be translated into "掌上明珠". They don't have the same source domain, but they share the same target domain: A PERSON (ESPECIALLY A DAUGHTER) LOVED BY THE PARENTS VERY MUCH. The receivers of TL don't misunderstand TL after the change from the source domain (or vehicle) of SL to the source domain (or vehicle) of TL. This is the task translators have to accomplish in the translation of metaphors.

According to CEH, the aim of metaphor translation is achieving the maximum cognitive equivalence. So when a translator deals with metaphor translation, he/she should consider the maximum cognitive equivalence in the first place. If it can't be found, then he/she can translate metaphors to match the lowest standard of metaphor translation, i.e. the minimum cognitive equivalence.

II. AN EXPLORATION OF "ANGER" METAPHOR TRANSLATIONS TO TESTIFY CEH

Different translators can provide different translation versions for a source text, and even the same translator can render several versions. How do we judge their translations? The author thinks that different discourses should have their own criterion. This thesis will mainly explore a criterion of metaphor translation by discussing the translation strategies of "anger" metaphors under the three conditions — identical mapping conditions in vehicle cognition; similar mapping conditions in vehicle cognition and absent mapping conditions in vehicle cognition.

A. Identical Mapping Conditions in Vehicle Cognition

People of different cultures have some identical bodily experience, so there are the same conceptual metaphors existing in English and Chinese. In this situation, the mapping conditions in vehicle cognition are identical. So it is very convenient for the translator to make a recurrence of vehicle cognition from SL to TL through the literal translation of vehicle from SL to TL.

By this method, the translator translates the source text to metaphorical expressions projected by the conceptual metaphors identical with those of the original text. The main reason is that when there are the same source domains between two languages for the given target domain, the mapping structure may be the same. This same mapping structure enables target receptors to understand the cognition of the expressions of the same conceptual metaphors.

By using this translation method, the translated text keeps the basic structure of the original language, which can show both the source and target language's vehicle cognition. This kind of version does not have the culture barriers for communication. In addition, it can convey the source text's cognitive information of vehicles.

We may find that many expressions of "anger" metaphors which derive from a conceptual metaphor in the source language can be translated by equivalent metaphorical expressions in vehicle cognition which derive from the same conceptual metaphor in the target language. We know that both English and Chinese have the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE. The vehicle of this kind of metaphor both in English and Chinese is something like a "fire". That is to say, the English and Chinese people have the same cognition of vehicle for this kind of metaphor. So the "anger" metaphors in English can be translated into the same "anger" metaphors in Chinese as follows:

ANGER IS FIRE

(1) Heathcliff's black eyes *flashed.* / 赫斯克利弗的黑眼睛 *冒着怒火*。 (Bronte, 2005, pp. 211-212)

(2) They were consumed in the *flames* of thy wrath. / 被愤怒的 *火焰* 吞噬。 (Goethe, 2005, pp. 201-202)

In the above translations, "anger" is conceived as an object that is like a "fire" or an action that appears when there is a "fire". The words "冒着怒火",and "火焰" are just the metaphorical expressions equivalent to "flash" and "flame". They all derive from the same conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE. The following are more examples:

ANGER IS COLOR

(3) Boxtel's face was *red* with anger. / 波泰尔顿时气得 *脸色通红*。 (Dumas, 2005, pp. 109-110)

(4) 老通宝气得 *脸都紫了*。 / The old man's face turned *purple* with rage. (Mao Dun, 2001, pp. 171-172)

These expressions are all derived from the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS COLOR. In these translations, "anger" is understood in terms of "color". The appearance of "color" in someone's face is the appearance of "anger". In the two examples, "脸色通红" and "脸都紫了" are a small hint of anger. They correspond to their English equivalents "face was red" and "face turned purple".

ANGER IS KEEPING (FAILING TO KEEP) THE PRESSURE BACK

(5) Her temper was getting *beyond her control*. / 已经 *难以控制* 自己的脾气。 (Bronte, 2005, pp. 73-74)

(6) 麻威把一肚子气用力 *压制* 着。 / Ma Wei *held* in his anger. (Lao She, 2001, pp. 84-85)

In example (5), "beyond her control" is used to refer to a person's pressure. However, in the original sentence, it is used in metaphorizing "anger". The concept of pressure is used to describe what we will be like when we are angry. We can actually control or lose control of our anger. So the translator can easily find its equivalent vehicle in Chinese word "难以控制". In example (6), "held" is also the vehicle expression equivalent to the Chinese words "压制" respectively.

ANGER IS A NATURAL PHENOMENON

(7) Hareton grew black *as a thunder-cloud.* / 脸阴沉得 *像暴雨之前的阴云* 一样。 (Bronte, 2005, pp. 121-122)

(8) The wrath was *as the storm.* / 你的愤怒 *像呼号的狂风*。 (Goethe, 2005, pp. 201-202)

Obviously, both the original sentences and the translated sentences involve the metaphor ANGER IS A NATURAL PHENOMENON. In the translation, the expressions "像暴雨之前的阴云" and "像呼号的狂风" used in the domain of natural phenomena are used here to collocate with "as a thunder-cloud" and "as the storm". We can see from the examples people like to conceive of a natural phenomenon as the state when a person is angry. Thus it gives rise to the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A NATURAL PHENOMENON. As this metaphor is also common in Chinese, the translator just employs the equivalent vehicle expressions "像暴雨之前的阴云" and "像呼号的狂风".

The method of "literal translation of vehicle from SL to TL" has the highest degree of cognitive equivalence. The translated text keeps the basic structure of the original language. The same cognitive mechanism and experience enables the receivers of SL and TL to have the same vehicle cognition. The target language receivers not only understand the content as clearly as the source language receivers do, but also produce a cognition response very close to that of the original receivers. That is to say, the target language receivers are able to understand and appreciate the translated text in the same cognitive manner as the original receivers do.

The same conceptual metaphors or the identical mapping conditions in vehicle cognitions provide great convenience for metaphor translation. The translator should try his best to keep the cognition of SL. Thus the translated text can be loyal to the source language in meaning and trigger off the readers' imagination, and at the same time, keep the cultural character of SL.

B. Similar Mapping Conditions in Vehicle Cognition

Since metaphors of similar mapping conditions refer to those which exist in both SL and TL but have different degrees of typicality, the translations of this kind of metaphors may contain three situations: (i) some metaphorical expressions projected by a conceptual metaphor exist in both languages; (ii) some metaphorical expressions projected by a conceptual metaphor only exist in one language; (iii) there is the same source domain in the TL as the one in SL, but it cannot express the target domain "anger" as the source domain does in SL.

Let's talk about situation (i). Because there are conceptual metaphors in TL identical to the conceptual metaphors in SL, "the literal translation of vehicle from SL to TL" can be used so that the translators can realize an absolute recurrence of vehicle cognition from SL to TL. Then we come to situation (ii). Since we fail to find their equivalent expressions in the other language and "the literal translation of vehicle from SL to TL" will not follow the cognitive habits of the receptors of TL, the translators can transfer the vehicle expression of SL with the one in TL under the same conceptual metaphor. This method will produce a vehicle cognition being consistent with the habits of target language and the receptors of TL will get a feeling of vehicle cognition similar to what the readers of SL have. The reason is that

although the concrete expressions are different, they all belong to the same source domain used to express the target domain ANGER. Now, let's discuss situation (iii). Because the source domain cannot express the target domain "anger", we will find another source domain to indicate the target domain "anger" in TL. By this method, we will substitute a different conceptual metaphor in TL for the vehicle cognition of SL. This method will also produce a vehicle cognition coinciding with the target language's habits and the receptors of TL will also get a feeling of vehicle cognition similar to what the readers have in SL. The reason is that although the two conceptual metaphors involved in the source language and the target language differ in their source domains, they share the same target domain ANGER.

The metaphorical expressions with similar mapping conditions in vehicle cognition are frequently observed in reality. Look at the following examples:

ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL

(9) *Roared* Silver. / 薛佛*吼*了起来。(Steven, 2005, pp. 237-238)

(10) She shook Amy *fiercely*, crying in sorrow and anger. / 她*凶猛地*摇晃艾美，伤心而生气地喊道。(Alcott, 2005, pp. 71-72)

(11) … increased the force of my *wild* rage and humiliation. / 更增加了我的*愤怒*和屈辱。(Bronte, 2005, pp.13-14)

(12) … and generally avoided awakening her *fierce* temper. / 平常也避免激起她的*怒气*。(ibid, pp. 57-58)

In (9) and (10), we can find the equivalents of English in Chinese. It belongs to **situation (i)**. The vehicle expressions "roar" and "fiercely" in English have their equivalents "吼" and "凶猛地" in Chinese and all these expressions can be used to express the target domain "anger". So here the translators employ "a literal translation of vehicle from SL to TL". As mentioned above, metaphorical expressions projected by the same conceptual metaphors keep the original cognition of the source language, so the target receptors can understand and respond to the target language as those of SL. The translations in (9) and (10) achieve the maximum cognitive equivalence.

However, examples (11) and (12) have something different. They can be put under the **situation (iii)** we talked about above. When we want to express someone is very angry in English, we may say "wild rage" and "fierce temper". But when we translate them into Chinese, we would write them as "野蛮的愤怒" and "凶猛的脾气". Obviously, the difference is from their different conceptual metaphors in different cultures. Here, English sentences conform to the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL, but if we translate the sentences by the same conceptual metaphor "更增加了我野蛮的愤怒和屈辱" and "平常也避免激起她的凶猛的脾气", it will sound very strange in Chinese. That is to say, the source domain "A DANGEROUS ANIMAL" can't always be used to express the target domain "anger". For the two English sentences, we will fail to find their equivalents in Chinese. In order to make sense, the Chinese versions provided in examples (11) and (12) leave out the expressions "野蛮的" and "凶猛的". Of course, it is a better way than using the same source domain in Chinese to translate the English sentences, because at least meanings of the sentences can be easily understood by Chinese readers. But we have to admit that the receptors of TL will lose the cognition of the degree of anger. Here the author suggests employing a different conceptual metaphor "ANGER IS AT ITS MAXIMUM (愤怒是极点)". So the two English sentences will be translated into the following ones:

更增加了我极大的愤怒和屈辱。

平常也避免激起她极大的怒气。

In fact, this method transfers or substitutes the vehicle of SL with the one in TL and will produce a vehicle cognition being consistent with the target language's habits and the receptors of TL will get a similar vehicle cognition to what the readers have in SL. Although the two conceptual metaphors involved in SL and TL differ in their source domains (one being A DANGEROUS ANIMAL, and the other being AT ITS MAXIMUM), their target domains (both being ANGER) are identical or similar. By the way, there is another reason for the receptors of TL to get the similar vehicle cognition to what the readers have in SL. In English, there is also the conceptual metaphor "ANGER IS AT ITS MAXIMUM", for example, "He was crying with *sheer* (全然的/绝对的/彻底的) rage". The author of this thesis thinks that this will be helpful to activate the same or similar vehicle cognition between the readers of SL and the readers of TL.

ANGER IS BURDEN

(13) *Wash away* your anger. / *冲掉*你的怒气吧。(Bronte, 2005, pp. 173-174)

The translator in example (13) also employs "a literal translation of vehicle from SL to TL". But the author thinks that it is not a good way to translate the English sentence. Although there is the equivalent expression "冲掉/洗掉" in Chinese and the sentence "冲掉你的怒气吧" can be understood by the Chinese people, it does not follow the Chinese people's cognitive habits. The author of this thesis likes to translate it into: "*消消气吧*". The English expression "wash away" and the Chinese expression "消" belongs to the same source domain "BURDEN". Their difference only lies in the lexical expression. So this will come to **situation (ii)** above. Because the English and Chinese versions share the same source domain with different lexicons and the same target domain, the receptors of TL will get the vehicle cognition similar to what the readers have in SL.

C. Absent Mapping Conditions in Vehicle Cognition

The metaphorical mappings in SL do not exist in TL, so sometimes the literal translation of SL will not trigger off the readers' cognition. So the translator will translate the metaphorical expressions of SL into non-metaphorical expressions or find out another conceptual metaphor that corresponds to the TL readers' cognition. Of course, sometimes the literal translation of conceptual metaphors in SL can also trigger off the TL readers' cognition.

When a metaphor in English is translated into Chinese, the translator often takes the strategy to maintain the cognition of SL. If a metaphor in Chinese is translated into English, the translator is more inclined to substitute the cognition of SL. One of the reasons is that the Chinese people are more familiar with western culture and sometimes have to accept it in the case that Chinese culture is at a disadvantage at present time. So sometimes we hope the translation will be to the westerners' taste while the western people will not do as we do.

In a word, the translator will adopt different translation strategies according to different cases so that the target receptors can receive the same or similar cognition of TL in an appropriate way as the source language readers do in SL.

ANGER IS INSANITY

(14) …became almost *frantic* when he heard that he might be called to testify against the man. / 特别是当他听说那个青年如今矢口否认一切，法庭可能叫他去作证时他几乎*气疯了*。(Goethe, 2005, pp. 169-170)

The English versions derive from the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS INSANITY. This conceptual metaphor is absent in Chinese. If the translator translates "frantic" to "疯狂的", the cognition of "anger" will not be expressed. Here the translator translates the English sentence by putting the words "气" and "疯" together. In Chinese, the word "疯" itself can't express persons' cognition of "anger", but "气疯" will make sense. Obviously, the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS INSANITY in English will be changed into ANGER IS GAS in Chinese. By means of using the target domain "气" which corresponds to the Chinese people's cognition and maintaining the word "疯" under the source domain "insanity" of SL, the receptors can get a similar cognitive feeling to what the readers do in SL.

ANGER IS ANOPPONE (IN A STRUGGLE)

(15) Then followed a *battle* of looks between them. / 接着两个人彼此*怒目相视*。(Steven, 2005, pp. 5-6)

(16) Said Jo, rather *offended*. / 乔有点*生气*地说。(Alcott, 2005, pp. 91-92)

In example (15), the literal translation of "a battle of looks" into "战斗的目光" is not in accord with the Chinese people's cognition. So the translator gives up the metaphorical expressions of SL and uses another conceptual metaphor "ANGER IS A CHANGE IN FACIAL EXPRESSION" to express "anger" metaphor in TL. On one hand, readers understand the cognition of TL with the help of the tenor "愤怒" which is seen by the word "怒". On the other hand, the word "look" in the vehicle of SL has something in common with the word "相视" in the vehicle of TL. All this helps readers to understand the cognition of TL and SL. But we can only say readers of TL receive the minimum cognitive equivalence.

In example (16), the translator employs the unique conceptual metaphor "ANGER IS GAS" in Chinese to substitute the conceptual metaphor "ANGER IS ANOPPONE (IN A STRUGGLE)" in English. Of course, this kind of metaphor agrees with the Chinese people's cognition because most metaphorical expressions concerning with "anger" in Chinese are expressed by "ANGER IS GAS". But the author of this thesis thinks it is not the best translation. Here the author holds that the literal translation of "offended" into "*被冒犯了*" is better than "生气". The reason is that "被冒犯了" not only can trigger the Chinese people's cognition but also can agree with the cognition habit of SL. Besides this, this kind of translation method can promote the cultural exchange between the two different languages.

ANGER IS BOUNDED SPACES

(17) It seems as if I could do anything when I'm *in* a temper. / 好像我*在暴怒中*任何事都能做得出来。(ibid, pp. 79-80)

(18) Hindley's expressions of scorn roused his father *to* fury. / 辛德利一旦表现出对赫斯克利弗的轻蔑，他的父亲就极为*愤怒*。(Bronte, 2005, pp. 29-30)

Although preposition is not flexible to metaphorize other domains in Chinese, the translator in example (17) uses "a literal translation of the conceptual metaphor in SL", which can be seen by the recurrence of vehicle from "in" to "在……之中". That is to say, the conceptual metaphor in TL is also formed by ANGER IS BOUNDED SPACES. Three reasons why the translator adopts this method can be suggested: the cultural gap among persons of different cultures is closing up; Chinese culture is open to foreign culture; the translator wants to promote the cultural exchange. This translation method achieves the maximum cognitive equivalence.

The translator in example (18) gives up the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS BOUNDED SPACES and translates it into a non-metaphorical expression "愤怒" by omitting the vehicle "to". There is no doubt that this method causes some loss of vehicle cognition in SL. But we know that the emotion of "anger" can be expressed non-metaphorically both in English and Chinese. In the corpus of this thesis, the proportion of non-metaphorical "anger" expressions in English and in Chinese is about 15 percent and 13 percent respectively. This similarity helps the receptors of TL receive the similar cognitive feelings to what the readers have in SL.

ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER

(19) Injustice makes my blood *boil*. / 不公正的行为使我*非常气愤*。(ibid)

The English sentence derives from the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER. This conceptual metaphor is absent in Chinese. Here the translator can not translate the original sentence literally into "不公正的行为使我达到沸点" because it has no sense of anger. In order to keep the cognition of the original sentence, the translator chooses another conceptual metaphor ANGER IS GAS in Chinese, which is shown by the words "非常气愤". This method corresponds to the target receptors' cognition habit. On the premise of understanding the cognition of TL, the target receptors will receive the partial cognition of SL.

ANGER IS DEATH.

(20) The captain was *dead.* / 因为船长已经*气绝身亡*了。(Steven, 2005, p. 23)

The English people can directly use the target domain "death" to express the original domain "anger" but the Chinese people cannot do. That is to say, the Chinese and English people will not have the same cognition of "某人死了" and "someone is dead" respectively. So the translator cannot translate the sentence into "船长已经死了", which has no sense of anger. Here the translator maintains the domain "death" indicated by the word "亡" but uses it with the word "气" together. In Chinese, "death" and "Qi" are always put together, such as "气死", to express the sense of anger. So the translation corresponds to the Chinese people's cognitive habit. Readers understand the cognition of SL with the aid of understanding the cognition of TL. So the translator completes the minimum cognitive equivalence.

ANGER IS A SENSE OF TASTE

(21) The old man was very *peppery* and sometimes without rhyme or reason flew into a passion. / 这位老头性情暴躁，有时无缘无故地*大发雷霆*。(http://dj.iciba.com/search?s=peppery)

The conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A SENSE OF TASTE in English is absent in Chinese. In Chinese, "peppery" originally means "辣的". But the subject of the sentence is a person. Although to say a person is "辣的" in Chinese has some meaning, there is no doubt that it has nothing to do with the cognition of "anger". So the author adopts another conceptual metaphor ANGER IS AN EXPLOSIVE FORCE instead of a literal translation. This conceptual metaphor also exists in English like "Tom *exploded* with anger". The translation method of using another conceptual metaphor in TL will serve as a bridge for the target receptors to achieve similar cognitive response to what the readers have in SL.

In the above part, the author analyzes the translation methods of English "anger" metaphors which are absent in Chinese. Next the paper will deal with the translation of Chinese "anger" metaphors which are absent in English.

ANGER IS GAS

(22) 中国人，挨打的货！就不会*生气*! / Chinese can be toyed with and not get *angry.* (Lao She, 2001, pp. 84-85)

(23) 四大娘*气哄哄地*回答。/ She replied *hotly.* (Mao Dun, 2001, pp. 168-169)

About fifty percent of Chinese "anger" metaphors are expressed by the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS GAS because of Chinese philosophy and Chinese Medicine Theory. But in the English people's eyes, *Qi* has no connections with anger. That is to say, if "气" is translated into something like "gas", it will reach beyond the English people's cognition. These two aspects serve as the reason why we can't see the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS GAS in English. In example (22), the translator gives up the unique conceptual metaphor ANGER IS GAS and translates it into a non-metaphorical expression. In example (23), the translator adopts another conceptual metaphor: ANGER IS HEAT. Both of these two translation methods cause cognition loss. But readers of TL receive most of the cognition that readers of SL do in SL. As for the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS HEAT, it also exists in Chinese. The difference lies in the form of heat. In Chinese, "heat" often comes from a solid. However, in English, it often has a relation with a liquid. But in any case, their essence is similar. Moreover, here "hotly" is more direct and can reduce the differences between solid heat and liquid heat. All this helps the readers get the minimum cognitive equivalence.

III. CONCLUSION

A. A Summary of the Contents

This paper makes a comparative study of English and Chinese "anger" metaphors and analyzes the translations between them, which serves as finding a criterion of metaphor translation. Conceptual metaphors are based on human cognition and experience of the world. Sometimes the English and Chinese people have the same cognition and experience, so there exist the same conceptual metaphors in English and Chinese. However, English and Chinese belongs to two totally different language families, so there are many differences. Some conceptual metaphors exist in one language but not in the other and some conceptual metaphors, although existing in both languages, are sometimes lexically different.

The similarities of conceptual metaphors in two languages provide convenience and easiness for metaphor translation, but the differences make it difficult. In different situations, the translator will resort to different translation methods: (i) literal translation through recurrence of the same vehicle cognition in TL; (ii) domestication through transference or substitution of vehicle cognition of SL in TL; (iii) foreignization through retention of vehicle cognition of SL in TL; (iv) giving up vehicle cognition of SL and using non-metaphorical expressions in TL.

Method (i) produces metaphorical expressions projected by the same source domain with the same lexicons in vehicle, thus it achieves maximal cognitive equivalence; While methods (ii), (iii) and (iv) can not project the identical

cognition because part of cognition of SL will be deviated or lost. The aim of metaphor translation is to achieve the maximum cognitive equivalence, so translators should try their best to adopt method (i). Only when the target language does not have the same source domain with the same lexicons in vehicle, will the translator use methods (ii), (iii) and (iv). However, although methods (ii), (iii) and (iv) may partly lose the cognition of SL, they will not lead to misunderstanding of the cognition of SL. In fact, they are also some effective ways to help receivers understand the cognition of SL. We call them as the minimum cognitive equivalence.

To sum up, this paper studies "anger" metaphors and the translations within the framework of cognitive linguistics. It concludes three situations of similarities and differences of English and Chinese "anger" metaphors, analyzes and evaluates their translation methods, and puts forward a criterion of metaphor translation.

B. The Values of the Study

The study has the following theoretical and practical values: (i) CEH is a tentative attempt at describing and interpreting metaphor translation by combining cognitive linguistics and Nida's FET. The study not only exerts positive influences on metaphor, metaphor translation, and cognitive linguistics but also benefits the readers' ability in interdisciplinary research; (ii) this thesis tries to develop Nida's FET by remedying its defects. CEH can greatly promote and enrich people's understanding of FET; (iii) it is more applicable to analyze metaphor translation by CEH than by FET. FET was proposed to analyze the translation of all kinds of discourses. After all, every theory is not omnipotent. Since the mapping of metaphor embodies cognitive style, metaphor translation should embody human cognition, too. Compared with FET, CEH can analyze metaphor translation on a more microscopic level, that is, human cognition; (iv) the comparative study of "anger" metaphors can promote cultural exchange. The thesis analyzes the reasons for forming the different "anger" metaphors mainly from a cultural perspective.

REFERENCES

[1]   Alcott. (2005). Little Women (translated by Xiao Jie). Beijing: Chinese Publishing House.
[2]   Bronte. (2005). Wuthering Heights (translated by Zhang Tianhua). Beijing: Chinese Publishing House.
[3]   Dumas. (2005). The Black Tulip (translated by Ma Juntao). Beijing: Chinese Publishing House.
[4]   Goethe. (2005). The Sorrows of Young Werther (translated by Zhang Xiang). Beijing: Chinese Publishing House.
[5]   Laoshe. (2001). Mr. Ma and Son (translated by Jimmerson). Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.
[6]   Mao Dun. (2001). The Shop of Lin Family (translated by Sha Boli). Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.
[7]   Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
[8]   Nida, E. A. (1993). Language, Culture, and Translation. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
[9]   Shu Dingfang. (2000). Studies in Metaphor. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
[10] Steven. (2005). Treasure Island (translated by Bi Yu). Beijing: Chinese Publishing House.

Wanfang Zhang earned his MA in Translation Theory and Practice from Ningbo University, China, in 2006. He is currently a lecturer in the School of Foreign Languages, Wuhan Polytechnic University, Wuhan, China. His research interests cover translation studies, cultural studies, intercultural communication and cognitive linguistics.