

## **Magdalena Zofia Feret**

Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach  
Instytut Filologii Obcych  
ul. Świętokrzyska 21D, 25–406 Kielce, Polska  
E-mail: maga44@tlen.pl  
Research interests: Germanic linguistics, cognitive grammar, generative models, translatology

### **DIMENSIONS OF IMAGERY: TRANSLATION ANALYSIS ON THE EXAMPLE OF *THE LION, THE WITCH AND THE WARDROBE***

*The aim of this paper is to show how imagery, one of the most important human cognitive abilities, can be expressed. It considers the impact this ability can have on the process of text production and its understanding in translation. The cognitive grammar model by Ronald Wayne Langacker (1987, 1991) has formed the methodological perspective. The application of cognitive translation theory to translation analysis is presented on the example of the novel by Clive Staples Lewis “The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe” and its translation into Polish by Andrzej Polkowski and into German by Lisa Tetzner. First of all, the terms ‘conceptualisation’ and ‘imagery’ are introduced and explained from the cognitive perspective. Then, the dimensions of imagery – selection, abstraction and perspective – are described. Based on this, the examples selected from the novel “The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe” and its Polish and German translations are analysed and the results are discussed.*

**KEY WORDS:** *cognitive translation theory, conceptualisation, imagery, literary translation.*

## **Introduction**

This paper attempts to apply the cognitive theory by R. W. Langacker (1987, 1991) to translation studies and to demonstrate the potential of the cognitive approach for facilitating the research on literary translation. The idea of applying cognitive linguistics to translation comes from Elżbieta Tabakowska (2001). It has been developed by Magdalena Filar (2007a, 2007b, 2014), Monika Linke (2008), Magdalena Majcher (2008), Andrzej Pawelec (2012), Agnieszka Gawel (2013, 2016) and Magdalena Feret (2015). Other linguists dealing with this issue include Michaił Kotin (1996), Katarzyna Lukas (2008) and Wojciech Kubiński (2014).

Many researchers have separated literary and linguistic translation theories (cf. Culler 1982: 5). Tabakowska (2001) pointed out the importance of investigating literary translation from a linguistic perspective and the importance of an interdisciplinary perspective within translation studies. The cognitive model of language might bridge the gap between linguistics and literary theories. It differs from other linguistic theories in that it propounds

a holistic approach to language in the context of other cognitive phenomena and views it as being culturally and experientially grounded. Cognitive linguistics provides useful research tools for precise textual analysis, describing phenomena which could be overlooked if any other model was applied. Thus, the cognitive approach may prove to be a valuable source for research and practice of translation. Describing the original texts and their translated versions, it is necessary to find a model that accounts for the value of linguistic details and enables us to determine, at least approximately, the semantic potential of those aspects that might otherwise escape our attention. The cognitive theory by Langacker (1987, 1991) leads to informative conclusions in such aspects as precise word choices, grammatical structure of a sentence and the linear arrangement of its elements, which are often crucial for the interpretation of a text, more consciously words and constructions. It does not postulate a wholly arbitrary view of meaning, but recognises the role of subjective factors, individual mental processes, and experiences (cf. Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 30).

## Imagery

Langacker (1987: 12) describes language as “an integral part of human cognition”. In other words, language is closely related to other cognitive abilities such as perception, conceptualisation, imagining, categorising, etc. Therefore, all the cognitive abilities are reflected in linguistic expressions. When analysing and describing a language, the cognitive abilities, knowledge, as well as individual and social experiences of a language user should be taken into account (cf. Langacker 1987: 12–13).

A language user construes mental representations of any situation. “The meaning of an expression is equated with a conceptualisation in the mind of a language user” (Taylor 2002: 187). Conceptualisation means that in constructing a linguistic expression a language user is trying to give an appropriate conceptual structure to what he sees or imagines. That is, he is trying to find concepts that correspond with the given situation – the one the user is currently in – which also includes the communicative situation. Each language user is capable of continuously making new conceptualisations. Individual conceptualisations, however, are subject to conventionalisation with time.

What should be pointed out here is the fact that the number of expressions in a language is always smaller than the number of potential conceptualisations.<sup>1</sup> No language is able to express all of the mental experiences of its users. “Mental experience is the flow of cognitive events. Conscious experience proceeds concurrently in numerous domains. Typically it is a partially integrated blend of perceptual sensations <...>, kinesthetic and motor events, emotive factors, and autonomous processes that may be quite distinct from all of these <...>” (Langacker 1987: 114).

---

<sup>1</sup> What in a way limits us while making linguistic phrases and texts is that some linguistic phenomena are conventionalised to such extent – that is the way to capture them with the language – that one cannot express the given conceptualisation freely, just like a particular language uses images so. This refers to features of some language types, e.g. the fact that in English one must comply with the fixed order of elements in a sentence, while in Polish it is free to a great extent.

The terms ‘conceptualisation’ and ‘imagery’ are closely related to each other. Imagery is a natural human ability “to construe a conceived situation in alternative ways – by means of alternate images – for purposes of thought or expression” (cf. Langacker 1987: 110). Producing mental representations is also described as scene visualising. Two scenes of the same situation may differ with regard to the following dimensions: the level of abstractness or specificity, the perspective from which the scenes are perceived, the selection of elements of the given scene, i.e. entities, features which are favoured for attention, possible salience of these elements, features.

Each scene contains a definite number of entities, which are linked and related to one another. A language user that produces the given scene – from this point forward referred to as a conceptualiser – chooses one or more entities that he especially focuses on. The entity or entities which are brought to attention become the profile, the focal point of the given scene. The other entities, which provide the context that is necessary for the characterisation of the profile, are referred to as its base (cf. Langacker 1987: 110–123; Linke 2008: 151–152). When a relationship is made the focus of attention, both the connected entities are profiled, one of them usually makes a primary focus and the other a secondary one. The primary focal participant in a profiled relationship is called the trajector. The secondary focal participant is called the landmark (cf. Langacker 2005: 24).

In a sentence, the relations between the profile and the base, between the trajector and the landmark are shaped so that the subject is a nominal expressing of the trajector and an object expresses the landmark. If a sentence contains a prepositional phrase, its landmark is expressed by the noun phrase following the preposition. The base may comprise an object, an attribute or a possessive pronoun that refer to the noun determining the profile.

Two mental representations of the same situation may also differ in the level of abstractness or specificity. This means that the conceptualiser, while producing the given scene, can select ideas that are more or less general (cf. Taylor 2002: 57–58; Langacker 2005: 21).

While depicting a scene, it is essential to choose the perspective from which this scene can be perceived. Depending on how the conceptualiser perceives the situation, whether all its elements are recalled at the same time or in a sequence, results in summary scanning or sequential scanning, respectively.

Another term associated with the perspective is viewpoint or a vantage point; i.e. the position conceptualiser selects to observe a situation plays an important role in how he perceives the elements of the situation, e.g. what order they emerge in. That covers both the conceptualiser’s location (orientation) in physical space and in time as well (Taylor 2002: 62; Linke 2008: 154–155).

The capability of imagery has an enormous influence on producing and understanding texts. “Linguistic expressions pertain to conceived situations, or scenes” (Langacker 1987: 116). “Every linguistic expression, at its semantic pole, structures a conceived situation (or scene) by means of particular image” (Langacker 1987: 128). That means all the above-mentioned dimensions of imagery will find their output in expressions and texts in the given language. Which expression will be selected by a language user conceiving a text reflects,

according to Langacker, the way the user perceives the situation and how, on this basis, he produces its mental representation.

## Analysis

In the following section, the results of the analysis of the examples selected from the novel *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and its Polish and German translations are presented. All extracts were analysed with regard to the question how particular dimensions of imagery – selection, abstraction and perspective – are realised and reflected in the respective language. For each case, the translations of the extract in Polish and German are compared to the original one in English. The descriptions of the chosen extracts only take into consideration the differences between the source and the respective target. The presentation of the results of our analysis proceeds as follows: first, the extracts which differ in terms of selection are described, next – the ones that feature different levels of abstraction are considered, finally those where differences in perspective are observed.

As for the selection of elements, the extracts were highlighted in terms of the differences between the English original and its Polish and German translations.

In the first example selected for analysing, the extract translated into Polish features the narrator in the foreground: [Ja]<sup>2</sup> *Opowiem wam o tym, co im się przydarzyło.* [I'll tell you what happened to them.] (Lewis 1996: 9), while in both the original and the German texts there is no direct reference to the narrator. In the English extract, the focal point is *the story*: *This story is about something that happened to them <...>* (Lewis 2010: 4), and it is the same in the German translation: *Unsere Geschichte erzählt bloß etwas von dem, was den vier Kindern dort widerfuhr.* (Lewis 1992: 4). However, in the latter there appears the possessive adjective *unsere Geschichte* [our story], thus introducing the figure of the narrator indirectly, making the base for the primary focus.

In the next example, in both the English and German extracts the main characters of the novel *they / sie* make the primary focus: *<...> they were sent away from London <...>*. (Lewis 2010: 4) / *Im Krieg wurden sie wegen der vielen Luftangriffe von London fortgeschickt <...>* (Lewis 1992: 4). However, in the Polish translation, instead of passive voice, a non-personal form *wysłano* was used, which results in the characters being perceived as the secondary focus, while a person or people who the characters were sent by appears conjecturally as the trajector: *Podczas wojny wysłano je z Londynu na wieś <...>* (Lewis 1996: 9).

When analysing the example: *He <...> lived in a very large house with a housekeeper <...> and three servants. (Their names were <...>)* (Lewis 2010: 4), it can be observed that the German translation – *Er <...> lebte in einem sehr großen Haus mit einer Wirtschafterin*

---

<sup>2</sup> All abridgements, additions, explanations, translations and comments in square and angle brackets are made by the author of this paper.

In the Polish language, nominative personal pronouns are not usually used. To express the grammatical categories constituting the concord relation between a subject and a predicate, the inflectional verb suffix is sufficient. At some points the pronouns were added by the author of this paper in order to show the analogies between the examples in Polish and those in German or English.

<...> *und drei Zimmermädchen, die <...> hießen <...>* (Lewis 1992: 4) is much closer to the original than the Polish – *Profesor <...> mieszkał w wielkim starym domu ze swoją gospodynią <...> i jej trzema pomocnicami. (Jeżeli już chcecie wiedzieć, to nazywały się <...>)* (Lewis 1996: 9). Here, the Polish translation contains as many as three additional elements.

First, the possessive adjectives *ze swoją gospodynią* [with his housekeeper] and *jej trzema pomocnicami* [her three servants]. The third extra element is a whole sentence *Jeżeli już chcecie wiedzieć <...>* [If you want to know...], introducing to the situation being described the figure of the reader, who in this sentence becomes the primary focus.

In another example, in both the English and Polish versions the trajector is designated by the pronoun and the noun referring to the characters of the novel: *they / dzieci* and the landmark – the professor *him / go*: *<...> they liked him almost at once <...>* (Lewis 2010: 4) / *Dzieci szybko go polubiły <...>* (Lewis 1996: 9). In the German extract, however, the relationship is reversed: *Er gefiel ihnen auf den ersten Blick*. [He appealed to them from the first sight] (Lewis 1992: 4).

Considering the example: “*No there won’t*”, said Peter. “*I tell you this is the sort of house where <...>*” (Lewis 2010: 4) – *Nie będzie żadnej awantury – powiedział Piotr. – Mówię wam, że to taki dom, w którym <...>* (Lewis 1996: 10). – “*Nein, uns hört keiner*“, sagte Peter. “*In diesem Haus <...>*” (Lewis 1992: 5). The German translation again differs from the original. In the source and in Polish *row / awantura* is profiled in the first sentence. In the English extract, the word appears in the sentence prior to the discussed example, where the ellipsis was applied. In the German translation, in the first sentence “*Nein, uns hört keiner*” [No, no-one will hear us], there are two extra elements – the trajector *keiner* [no-one] and the landmark *uns* [us], while in the next sentence the figure of Peter (*I tell you*), which is the primary focus in the original and in Polish, is missing.

In the case of the next extract selected for analysis, it is the Polish translation that is far from the original version in terms of the number of the elements in the presented scene: *<...> a long, low room with two windows looking out in one direction and two in another* (Lewis 2010: 5). – *Es war ein langer Raum mit zwei Fenstern nach der einen und zwei nach der andern Seite* (Lewis 1992: 6). – *Był to długi, niski pokój z dwoma oknami wychodzącymi na dwie różne strony świata* (Lewis 1996: 10–11). According to the Polish translation, there are only two windows, while in the other versions (the source and German) there are four of them, thus there are more profiled elements. In this example, *direction* was translated as *strony świata* [lit. two different sides of the world] in Polish, which introduces *świat* [world – grammatically as object in Polish] as an additional element forming the base for *strony* [sides].

In the next example, both in English and Polish, the noun *shoulder – ramię* – appears, which is missing in German: *She looked back over her shoulder <...>* (Lewis 2010: 6). – *[Ona] spojrzała przez ramię za siebie* (Lewis 1996: 13). – *Sie schaute zurück <...>* (Lewis 1992: 8). However, as similar as the Polish and English examples seem to be, they are not identical. In both versions, the person who plays the role of a trajector appears one more

time. In the English example, it emerges for the second time as a base for *shoulder*, while in Polish as another landmark, which in a way is a reference point for *spojrzenie*. The order of elements is also different in Polish and English. In the former, the order presents ‘the movement of the gaze’, the virtual direction of the gaze, passing the shoulder first to get behind the profiled person. In the latter, because of the fixed order of phrases in English sentences, it is not possible to capture the order of this conceptualisation in the same way.<sup>3</sup> The original of another extract features one of the characters – Lucy – as the primary focus: *In about ten minutes she reached it <...>* (Lewis 2010: 6). This is also the case in Polish: *Kiedy po blisko dziesięciu minutach doszła [ona] do światła, <...>* (Lewis 1996: 14) (*she* – *ona*). However, in the German translation, this extract is divided into two clauses: *Es dauerte eine Zeitlang, dann erreichte sie das Licht* (Lewis 1992: 8). In the first part of the sentence, *es*, referring to the activity of *reaching the light*, is the trajector. It is not until the second clause that the character becomes the primary focus.

In one more example, in the original language and in the translation into Polish the trajector is *a very strange person* – *bardzo dziwna postać*: *And soon after that a very strange person stepped out from among the trees into the light of the lamp-post* (Lewis 2010: 6). – *Wkrótce potem bardzo dziwna postać z parasolem wynurzyła się spośród drzew i weszła w krąg światła rzucany przez latarnię* (Lewis 1996: 14). The same example in German features this element as the landmark, *ein seltsames Wesen*, while the character mentioned in the previously presented extracts becomes the primary focus: *[Sie] sah ein seltsames Wesen unter den Bäumen auf die Laterne zukommen* (Lewis 1992: 8). In the same example, one more difference can be noticed. Namely, the last profiled element in the German sentence is *Laterne* [lamp-post]. In the English and Polish versions, it is not the lamp-post, but its light: *the light of the lamp-post* – *krąg światła rzucany przez latarnię*. In the original text, the lamp-post is the base for the light, while in the Polish one it becomes the landmark for the light.

In the next English extract, the primary focus is *his legs*: *<...> but his legs were shaped like a goat's <...>* (Lewis 2010: 6), and this is also the case of the Polish translation: *<...> ale jej nogi były nogami kozła <...>* (Lewis 1996: 14). *A very strange person* – *bardzo dziwna postać* (Lewis 1996: 14), designated further on in the English text by the personal pronoun *he*, comprises the base in both of the extracts. In the German translation of the same text, *<...> aber nach unten zu hatte es Ziegenbeine <...>* (Lewis 1992: 8), this very element is the trajector, and is designated in this extract by the personal pronoun *es*, and previously in the text as *ein seltsames Wesen*, while *Ziegenbeine* [goat legs] are the secondary focus.

A very similar situation occurs in another fragment of the book, where in a clause of cause in German the primary element is also *es*, referring to *ein seltsames Wesen*: *Es hatte auch einen Schwanz, den Lucy aber nicht gleich bemerkte, weil es ihn über den Arm, der den Regenschirm trug, geschlungen hatte, <...>* (Lewis 1992: 8). *Schwanz* [tail] here becomes the secondary element, profiled in the clause by the pronoun *ihn* [him], while in the original

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 2.

and Polish texts *tail – ogon* is the trajector: *He also had a tail, but Lucy did not notice this at first because it was neatly caught up over the arm that held the umbrella <...>* (Lewis 2010: 6). – *Miała też ogon, choć w pierwszej chwili Łucja go nie zauważyła, ponieważ był elegancko przewieszony przez trzymającą rozłożony parasol rękę <...>* (Lewis 1996: 14).

In another example in English, the primary focus is also the creature designated by the personal pronoun *he*: *<...> in the other arm he carried several brown-paper parcels* (Lewis 2010: 6–7). Such is the case in the Polish translation: *<...> w drugiej [on trzymał] – kilka paczek owiniętych w brązowy papier <...>* (Lewis 1996: 14). Yet in the German translation, the trajector is *Hand* [hand]: *<...> die andere [Hand hielt] sorgfältig verschnürte Pakete* [the other hand was holding carefully fastened parcels] (Lewis 1992: 9).

A similar situation appears in another part of the book, where in the English and German versions the primary focus is constituted by a creature designated by the personal pronoun *he – er*: *<...> that he dropped all his parcels* (Lewis 2010: 7). – *<...>, daß er alle seine Pakete zu Boden kollern ließ* (Lewis 1992: 9). The corresponding extract in Polish, however, includes something different, as *parcels – paczki*: *<...>, że wszystkie paczki wypadły mu z rąk* (Lewis 1996: 14) make the trajector here.

In the translations of the novel *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* by C. S. Lewis, numerous examples of differences in the level of abstractness can be found. The German samples below feature a higher level of abstractness than those of the original or the Polish version:

*“Was ist das?”* (Lewis 1992: 5). – *Co to za dziwny odgłos?!* (Lewis 1996: 10). – *“What’s that noise?”* (Lewis 2010: 5).

*Es dauerte eine Zeitlang <...>* (Lewis 1992: 8). – *Kiedy po blisko dziesięciu minutach <...>* (Lewis 1996: 14). – *In about ten minutes <...>* (Lewis 2010: 6).

*Lucy erschrak und fürchtete sich, <...>* (Lewis 1992: 8). – *Łucja trochę się przestraszyła, <...>* (Lewis 1996: 13). – *Lucy felt a little frightened, <...>* (Lewis 2010: 6).

The first of the presented examples contains a very generalised interrogative sentence: *“Was ist das?”* [What is it?]. The difference between the Polish translation and the original text is, however, slight: *noise* was translated as *dziwny odgłos* [strange sound]. Thus the Polish example features the highest level of specificity.

The other example selected for analysis was translated into German as *Es dauerte eine Zeitlang <...>* [it lasted for some time]. Yet, both the original version and the Polish translation contain the same phrase *ten minutes – dziesięć minut*.

The third of the examples above in the German translation features the use of two verbs to describe the same emotional state of a female character (namely, the previously mentioned Lucy): *erschrak und fürchtete sich* [lit. fell in fear and had a sense of foreboding]. In the source language as well as in the Polish translation we only have one expression, which is rather general compared to the in German: *felt a little frightened – trochę się przestraszyła* [got scared a little].

On the other hand, the following examples feature a higher level of specificity than those in the original or Polish language:

<...> *grollte Edmund* (Lewis 1992: 5). – <...> *powiedział Edmund* (Lewis 1996: 10). – <...> *said Edmund*. (Lewis 2010: 5).

<...> *des unbewohnten Zimmers* <...> (Lewis 1992: 8). – <...> *pustego pokoju* <...> (Lewis 1996: 12). – <...> *the empty room* <...> (Lewis 2010: 6).

In the first example, the past tense of the verb *say* was used in English. It was translated into Polish using the equivalent lexeme. However, in German the more specific verb *grollen* [grumble] was chosen.

In the second example above the adjective *pusty* used in Polish is the exact equivalent of the English word *empty*. It was translated into German as *unbewohnt* [uninhabited].

In another selected abstract, the Polish translation features a higher level of specificity than in the original language or German: <...> *uspokoila się* (Lewis 1996: 13). – <...> *dachte Lucy*. (Lewis 1992: 8). – <...> *thought Lucy* (Lewis 2010: 6). In English the past tense of the verb *think* is used, which was translated into German using the equivalent lexeme. The Polish version is more specific, using the verb *uspokoila się* [calmed herself down].

In the following example, it is the original that features the highest level of specificity: <...> *a very strange person* <...> (Lewis 2010: 6). The word *person* was translated into German as *Wesen* [being]: <...> *ein seltsames Wesen* <...> (Lewis 1992: 8). The noun *Wesen* covers what exists in a way, in some form. Therefore, it is a relatively general term. The similar choice was made by the translator into Polish, who also uses a more abstract term than what is conveyed by *a very strange person*: <...> *bardzo dziwna postać* <...> [a very strange figure] (Lewis 1996: 14).

Finally, below there are presented the differences in the perspective between the original text of Lewis's novel and its translations.

Depending on how the conceptualiser perceives the situation, i.e. whether its elements are recalled simultaneously or in a sequence, one after another, we experience either summary scanning or sequential scanning, respectively.

One more term associated with perspective is viewpoint or vantage point, i.e. the selected position from which the conceptualiser observes the situation plays an important role in how the elements of the situation are perceived, e.g. what order they emerge in. That refers to both the conceptualiser's location in physical space as well as in time.

In the case of the first extract selected for analysis, the differences between the original text and its translations is noticed at once in the way and the order in which the information is revealed. In the German version, all pieces of information are included in one sentence, holistically, while in English and Polish they are divided into two sentences:

*This story is about something that happened to them when they were sent away from London during the war because of the air-raids. They were sent to the house of an old Professor who lived in the heart of the country* <...> (Lewis 2010: 4).

*Im Krieg wurden sie wegen der vielen Luftangriffe von London fortgeschickt in das Innere des Landes, in das Haus eines alten Professors* <...> (Lewis 1992: 4).

*Podczas wojny wysłano je z Londynu na wieś, aby były bezpieczne w okresie bombowych nalotów na miasto. Zamieszkały w domu pewnego starego Profesora, który żył w głębi kraju, na wsi* <...> (Lewis 1996: 9).

The original version first reveals where the characters were sent from, then when it happened and why, and not until the end does it explain where to and that this destination was the countryside. These pieces of information appear in the German text in a different order – first when it took place, next for what reason, and in the end where the characters were sent from<sup>4</sup>, whereas in the Polish translation the sequence of the information is as follows: when, where from, where to. The purpose, which corresponds with the English and German expressions stating the cause of their leave, is revealed last.

Disclosing the information in a specific order reveals what was the author or translator focused on first, what seemed most important to them, what they directed their attention to. What was regarded as more important was put first in the text, with less important pieces presented later on.<sup>5</sup>

The next case in the English text is an extract with all pieces of information presented holistically in one sentence: *He himself was a very old man with shaggy white hair which grew over most of his face as well as on his head, and they liked him almost at once <...>* (Lewis 2010: 4), whereas there are two sentences in the Polish translation: *Profesor był bardzo stary i miał krzaczastą białą brodę, która łączyła się z równie siwą czupryną, a rosła tak gęsto i obficie, że na twarzy pozostawało już niewiele wolnego miejsca. Dzieci szybko go polubiły <...>* (Lewis 1996: 9), and even three in the German one: *Der Professor war ein alter Mann mit struppigen weißen Haaren. Sie wuchsen nicht nur auf seinem Kopf, sondern auch auf seinem Gesicht. Er gefiel ihnen auf den ersten Blick* (Lewis 1992: 4), thus sequential scanning is applied here.

Another example in English contains the information that a female character (namely, the previously mentioned Lucy) was walking through the forest like the one before the last piece in the first sentence of the analysed extract: *She began to walk forward, crunch-crunch over the snow and through the wood towards the other light. In about ten minutes she reached it and found it was a lamp-post. As she stood looking at it, wondering why there was a lamp-post in the middle of a wood and wondering what to do next, she heard a pitter patter of feet coming towards her* (Lewis 2010: 6). The same pattern appears in German: *Sie lief weiter – knirsch ... knirsch ... über den Schnee und durch den Wald auf das andere Licht zu. Es dauerte eine Zeitlang, dann erreichte sie das Licht. Es war eine Straßenlaterne! Sie blieb stehn und schaute sich um. Wieso brennt mitten im Wald eine Straßenlaterne? fragte sie sich. Da hörte sie plötzlich trappelnde Schritte <...>* (Lewis 1992: 8). This is not the case of the Polish translation: *i zaczęła iść przez las, skrzyp-skrzyp po śniegu, ku dziwnemu światłu przed sobą. Kiedy po blisko dziesięciu minutach doszła do światła, przekonała się, że to świeci latarnia na słupie. A kiedy tak stała i patrzyła na nią,*

<sup>4</sup> It is likely to assume at this point that what we are dealing with here may be a kind of conventionalised order that German adverbials are subject to.

<sup>5</sup> We cannot, however, acknowledge that the order in a sentence is determined only by what the author or the translator of the text was focused on and what seemed unimportant. As it has been mentioned above, some linguistic phenomena are conventionalised to some extent and the order of sentence components is not always free (see footnote 1). It also does occur sometimes (in German or in Polish) that it is the end of a sentence where the author places the piece of information he or she wants to emphasise.

*rozmyślając, skąd się wzięła latarnia w środku lasu i co robić dalej, usłyszała odgłos zbliżających się kroków* (Lewis 1996: 13–14). The information concerning the wood emerges at the beginning of the first sentence, which evidently shows that the translator's attention was first turned to this element.

The next sentences of the analysed extract feature the summary scanning in English. In the second sentence, all pieces of information are contained in one sentence of coordinate clauses linked with the conjunction *and*, in the case of the third sentence there is a participle construction with the present participle *wondering* and the conjunction *as* (which emphasises the parallelism of events). Translated into German, the second sentence is divided into two, the first containing two clauses, the other one single, while the third sentence is divided into several ones, which employs sequential scanning. In the Polish translation, the pieces of information are disclosed sequentially, though the last sentence for example contains a present participle *rozmyślając* [wondering] as well as the conjunction *kiedy* [when], which are the evidence of the summary scanning. In the original version, a part of the third sentence in the analysed text mentions the lamp post first and later where it can be found <...> *why there was a lamp-post in the middle of a wood* <...>. It is the same in Polish: <...> *skąd się wzięła latarnia w środku lasu* <...>. In the German translation, however, it is contrary: *Wieso brennt mitten im Wald eine Straßenlaterne?*<sup>6</sup>

The last extract selected for analysis features sequential scanning in English: <...> *he carried over his head an umbrella, white with snow* (Lewis 2010: 6), while its translation into German is the summary one: <...> *und hielt über seinem Kopf einen weißbeschnittenen Schirm*. (Lewis 1992: 8). The information that the umbrella (*Schirm*) was white (*weiß*) and covered with snow (*beschnitten*) is given in the German example in one lexeme *weißbeschnitten*, as a prenominal attribute, while in the original language the umbrella is mentioned first, then described as white and finally what made it white (snow) is mentioned. The adjective *white* and the noun *umbrella* are additionally separated with a comma, which is often the index of the sequential scanning. The Polish text, however, lacks the translation of this fragment.

## Concluding reflections

The result of the analysis of the selected extracts from the book is that texts which are seemingly identical in fact differ from one another. Each of them is indeed a parallel translation of the same extract and should be at least close in meaning. The discrepancies are linguistic manifestation of differences in various dimensions of imagery and become apparent while comparing how these imagery dimensions are expressed in particular extracts in the original language as well as in the translations.

As for the selection of elements, most of the extracts selected for analysis in English and Polish differ in the elements selected for the primary focus. The focal point in most of the German excerpts corresponds with the primary focus in the original versions. The other difference appears in extracts in which two elements, the primary focus and a secondary one,

<sup>6</sup> See footnote 5.

are profiled. In the original language and in the Polish translation, the trajector is constituted by the same element. The same example in German features this element as the landmark. There are also examples, in which an element of a given scene is missing in German.

In the translations of C. S. Lewis' novel *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, numerous examples of differences at the level of abstractness can be found. There are German samples which feature a higher level of abstractness than those of the original or the Polish version. On the other hand, there are extracts in German which also feature a higher level of specificity than those in the original or in the Polish language.

The differences between the original text and its translations, the differences concerning the way and the order in which the information is revealed can also be noticed.

As already mentioned, imagery abilities have an enormous influence on the creation and comprehension of texts. While reading a text, which reflects the way its creator's imagery works in his mind, a reader creates his own subjective image on the basis of it, and this image may, but need not, be an equivalent of the primary image. This is one of the reasons why translations differ from the original. The aim of this paper is not, however, to insist on the impossible, i.e. on a completely faithful translation. The aim of this paper is to make it clear that each act of translation should be preceded by a thorough analysis of linguistic manifestations of imagery in a text. If the image is treated as a unit of translation, it would allow translators to avoid potential obscurities, discrepancies, or even mistakes in their translations.

In this paper, an attempt was made to apply the cognitive theory of Langacker (1987, 1991) to translation studies and to demonstrate how the cognitive approach can be adopted for translation criticism and practice. It is useful for describing the processes of reading and analysing the source text and of reconstructing its meaning potential while producing the target text with the use of cognitive concepts and terminology.

## References

CULLER, J., 1982. Literature and Linguistics. In: Eds. J. P. Barricelli, J. Gibladi. *Interrelations of Literature*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1–24.

FERET, M., 2015. Zu Dimensionen der Bildhaftigkeit. Eine Analyse anhand Thomas Manns Herr und Hund und seiner Übersetzung ins Polnische. In: Eds. Z. Berdychowska, R. Kołodziej, P. Zarychta, M. Duś. *Zeitschrift des Verbandes Polnischer Germanisten*, 4. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 261–272.

FILAR, M., 2007a. Bedeutungsveränderungen in der literarischkünstlerischen Übersetzung – eine kognitive Studie. In: Eds. A. Radzik, A. Wichert. *Sprache und Literatur im Dialog*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej, 95–102.

FILAR, M., 2007b. Podmiot liryczny w tekście poetyckim i jego przekładzie – rozważania na temat zjawiska subiektywizacji. In: Ed. M. Piotrowska. *Współczesne kierunki analiz przekładowych. Język a komunikacja*, 18. Kraków: Tertium, 59–68.

FILAR, M., 2014. *Kategoria nieokreśloności w perspektywizacji tekstu i jego przekładu. Studium kognitywne*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego.

GAWEL, A., 2013. Dimensionen der Bildhaftigkeit in der literarischen Übersetzung. Eine Analyse von ausgewählten Auszügen aus Ernst Jüngers Roman "Auf den Marmorklippen" und seiner polnischen Übersetzung von Wojciech Kunicki. In: Eds. I. Bartoszewicz, A. Małgorzewicz. *Kompetenzen des Translators. Studia Translatorica*. Vol. 4. Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza Atut – Wrocławskie Wydawnictwo Oświatowe; Dresden: Neisse Verlag, 235–248.

GAWEL, A., 2016. Zur Anwendbarkeit der Kognitiven Linguistik in der Übersetzungswissenschaft. Bisherige Erkenntnisse der polnischen Germanistik und Perspektiven. In: Eds. E. Żebrowska, M. Olpińska-Szkielko, M. Latkowska. *Zwischen Kontinuität und Modernität. Metawissenschaftliche und wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse der germanistischen Forschung in Polen*. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Germanistów Polskich, 117–126.

KOTIN, M., 1996. Das Weltbild und das Sprachbild in der gotischen Bibel-Übersetzung. In: Ed. K. Sroka. *Kognitive Aspekte der Sprache. Akten des 30. Linguistischen Kolloquiums Gdańsk 1995*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 141–145.

KUBIŃSKI, W., 2014. *Obrazowanie a komunikacja. Gramatyka kognitywna wobec analizy dyskursu*. Gdańsk: Fundacja Terytoria Książki.

LAKOFF, G., JOHNSON, M., 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LANGACKER, R. W., 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

LANGACKER, R. W., 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 2. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

LANGACKER, R. W., 2005. *Wykłady z gramatyki kognitywnej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

LEWIS, C. S., 1992. *Der König von Narnia*. Trans. L. Tetzner. Moers: Brendow.

LEWIS, C. S., 1996. Lew, czarownica i stara szafa. In: *Opowieści z Narnii*. Vol. 1. Trans. A. Polkowski. Warszawa: Świat Książki, 5–147.

LEWIS, C. S., 2010. *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. London: Harper Collins.

LINKE, M., 2008. *A Cognitive Approach to Equivalence in Literary Translation*. Toruń: Grado.

LUKAS, K., 2008. *Obraz świata i konwencja literacka w przekładzie. O niemieckich tłumaczeniach dzieł Adama Mickiewicza*. Wrocław: ATUT.

MAJCHER, M., 2008. Sposoby obrazowania w polskich i niemieckich fragmentach tekstów biblijnych. In: Ed. A. Kątny. *Kontakty językowe i kulturowe w Europie*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 283–294.

PAWELEC, A., 2012. Myśl twórcza a obrazowanie. In: Eds. H. Kardela, Z. Muszyński, M. Rajewski. *Empatia, obrazowanie i kontekst jako kategoria kognitywistyczne*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 217–221.

TABAKOWSKA, E., 2001. *Językoznawstwo kognitywne a poetyka przekładu*. Kraków: Universitas.

TAYLOR, J., 2002. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pateikta / Submitted 2016 09 23

Priimta / Accepted 2017 01 09