**Deanship of Scientific Research**

# The Translation of Animal Metaphors in Politics between English and Arabic

*Bashar Almaani* * iD

Department of English language and literature, Faculty of Arts, Zarqa University, Jordan.

**Abstract**

**Objectives**: This study aims to examine the conceptualization of animal metaphors in political speeches delivered by Abdullah II, the King of Jordan, and President Trump. Additionally, the research investigates the translatability of metaphors between English and Arabic in political speeches.

**Methods**: The study analyzes metaphors using the conceptual theory of metaphor. Translated metaphors are examined based on the triangulation of translation procedures suggested by Schäffner (2004) and Deignan et al. (1997).

**Results**: The study reveals that metaphors play a significant role in shaping political discourse and serve as influential devices used by politicians to persuade their audience and communicate complex political ideas, particularly in relation to topics such as terrorism. Regarding the translatability of metaphors, the study finds that the similarities outweigh the differences, primarily in terms of the correspondence in the number of conceptual domains.

**Conclusions**: It is widely acknowledged that metaphors are prevalent in politics and have been established as major linguistic devices. Therefore, many political figures extensively employ metaphors. The research recommends exploring other types of metaphors in different genres.

**Keywords**: Translation, political speeches, conceptual metaphor.

## ترجمة الاستعارات ذات العلاقة بالحيوانات في السياسة بين الإنجليزية والعربية

*بشار المعاني**

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وأدابها، كلية الآداب، جامعة الزرقاء، الأردن

ملخّص

**الأهداف**: يهدف هذا البحث الى دراسة الاستعارات المفهومية ذات العلاقة بالحيوانات في الخطاب السياسي وإلى تقصي إمكانية ترجمة الاستعارات بين الإنجليزية والعربية في الخطابات السياسية في إطار النظرية المفهومية للاستعارة التي ألفها كل من لاكوف وجونسون (1980)

**المنهجية**: يعتمد هذا البحث على دراسة النظرية المفهومية للاستعارة، تبحث هذه الدراسة في استخدام الاستعارة ذات العلاقة بالحيوانات في الخطابات السياسية التي ألقاها جلالة الملك الأردني عبد الله الثاني والرئيس ترامب. أما بخصوص ترجمة الاستعارات فقد استعان الباحث بنظريات ترجمة الاستعارات كنظرية (Schäffner 2004) و.(1997) Deignan et al.

**النتائج**: خلصت هذه الدراسة أن الاستعارات مهمة في تشكيل الخطاب السياسي، ويمكن أن تكون أدوات مؤثرة يستخدمها السياسيون في إقناع جمهورهم وإيصال الأفكار السياسية المعقدة المتعلقة بمواقف مختلفة. وخلصت الدراسة أيضًا بقضية الاستعارات للترجمة أن أوجه التشابه في استخدام نفس الاستعارات تفوق نقاط الاختلاف؛ من حيث التماثل في عدد المجالات المفهومية للاستعارات المستخدمة.

**الخلاصة**: تُعد الاستعارات أدوات لغوية رئيسة واسعة الاستخدام وخصوصًا في الخطابات السياسية، لذلك تَستخدِم العديد من الشخصيات السياسية الاستعارة من أجل طرح ومعالجة قضايا سياسية مختلفة مثل الإرهاب، يوصي البحث بدراسة أنواع أخرى من الاستعارات في نصوص أخرى.

**الكلمات الدالة**: الترجمة، الخطاب السياسي، الاستعارة المفهومية.

## 1. Introduction

The conceptual approach introduced by Lakoff and Johnson in their book Metaphors We Live By (1980) considered metaphor as a procedure of mapping one domain of experience into another domain. Lakoff argues that "the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one domain in terms of another" (1993:247). Metaphor based on this theory is basically conceptual rather than linguistic in nature. Linguistic expressions forming a metaphor are but surface manifestations or realizations of conceptual metaphor. Conceptual metaphor is a systematic mapping across domains: one domain of experience, the source domain, is mapped onto another domain of experience, the target domain. Metaphors are found to be very pervasive in politics. Researching metaphor in politics has drawn the attention of linguistics scholar. The literature shows that the use of metaphor in politics has become a major linguistic device, and a tool used by politicians. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:159) state that "[metaphors] play a central role in constructing social and political reality". Charteris-Black (2005) also confirms that major political figures such as, Clinton, Martin Luther King, Tony Blair, Margret Thatcher, Churchill, and George W Bush used metaphors extensively, and therefore it is a very key element of style in political discourse. Al Salem also argues that "Officials use metaphoric language in political discourse to give power to the language and to persuade people of a certain idea" (2014, p.102) According to this, we can argue that the use of metaphor in politics is not a mere occurrence. It has also been claimed that metaphors can be used to frame different topics in politics (Mio, 1997), and can affect the way people address political topics (Bougher, 2012; Mio, 1997). Metaphors in politics are used to portray politicians, their opponents, and their political agendas in different ways.

Regarding the issue of translating metaphor, this has become both a point of argument and central issue among translation scholars. Views regarding translating metaphor range from the extreme of the untranslatability of metaphor to the other view of that metaphor can be simply translated. One of the controversial issues is the necessity for a theory for the translation of metaphor. Mason, on one hand, argues that dealing with translating metaphor as one problem may cause confusion (1982). Mason adds that there are two set of problems when dealing with 'translation of metaphor' the first is that metaphor is a problematic concept, the second is the problem with translation. Mason concludes that some metaphors are translatable, others are not, and each case should be treated individually.

In disagreement with the above, Nida (1964), Vinay and Darbelnet (1959/1995), and Dagut (1987) oppose Mason's claim that some metaphors are untranslatable and in fact call for a theory for translating metaphor. Dagut, for instance, highlights several points opposing Mason's view. First: metaphor is generally regarded as an extraordinary linguistic experience; therefore, it is likely to give rise to exceptional problems in translation. Second: metaphor should be distinguished from other related and overlapping categories like idioms and proverbs; this distinction reflects an adequate understanding of the treatment of metaphor in translation.

The argumentations presented by Nida (1964), Vinay and Darbelnet (1959/1995), and Dagut are probably based on a traditional understanding of metaphor as a rhetorical device and as a linguistic expression which is substituted for another expression (with a literal meaning), whose primary function is to embellish the text. With the introduction of the cognitive approach to metaphor which has only recently been applied in Translation Studies, the problem of translating metaphor is transferred from linguistic understanding to a matter of cognition and thought, and it would be axiomatic now that a new hypothesis for translating conceptual metaphor is required. Similarly, Schäffner (2004) argues that translating metaphor is not a linguistic issue anymore but has become linked to conceptual systems in source and target cultures. Scholars adopting the cognitive approach to metaphor agree that the conceptual theory of metaphor has something to contribute to the study of translation.

One productive domain which is widely used by politicians, is the domain of animals. Kövecses points out that "much of human behavior seems to be metaphorically understood in terms of animal behavior" (2002, p.125). Not only this, but also animals metaphor can refer to difficult situations or crises. The significance of this study that it will provide a methodological analysis of the use of Animals' metaphors in political speeches delivered by Abdullah II the King of Jordan, and Presidents Trump. The study will also form an attempt to look into the translation of these metaphors between English and Arabic. This study in particular seeks to answer the following questions.

1.     What are the linguistic functions of animals' metaphor in political speeches?

2.     How are these metaphors translated in these political speeches? Does the translation maintain the meaning observed in the speeches?

3.     How can a translator render such metaphors accurately to give the same effect in TT with minimal loss of meaning?

## 2. Metaphor and/in Translation

Linguistic metaphor scholars regarded metaphor as a matter of language not thought, and as "a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish" (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980/2003). Metaphor according to classical theories is therefore considered as property of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or ideas. In contrast, the conceptual approach introduced by Lakoff and Johnson in their book *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) regarded metaphor not only as a linguistic and rhetorical device but also as a process of mapping one domain onto another. Lakoff argues that "the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one domain in terms of another" (1993).

According to (Lakoff, 1993), the basic tenets of the conceptual theory of metaphor can be summarised in the following points: (1) Metaphors are sets of systems through which we understand and comprehend abstract concepts; (2) metaphors can facilitate the comprehension of the most mundane and the most complex theories; (3) a metaphor is fundamentally conceptual, not linguistic, in nature; (4) linguistic metaphors are the surface manifestation and realizations of conceptual metaphor; (5) since most metaphors emanate from either our physical experience or our conceptual system, and as an important part of them is non- metaphorical, metaphorical understanding is based on non-metaphorical understanding; (6) metaphor let us understand a relatively abstract or inherently unstructured subject matter in terms of a more concrete subject matter.

In recent years, many scholars have discussed metaphor translation from a cognitive perspective "Al-Harrasi 2001, Kövecses 2014, Ahrens and Say 1999, Maalej 1999, Mandelblit 1995, Monti 2006, Samanieao Feniaiidez et al. 2005, Schäffner 2004, 2012, 2014, Steen 2014, Al-Zoubi, Al-Ali, and Al-Hasnawi. 2007, and others". This growing research interest indicates that the conceptual theory of metaphor can make a positive contribution to the study of translation. In this section, I will thus review some of the main contributions of the conceptual theory of metaphor in Translation Studies.

Mandelblit, for instance, argues that if the core of metaphors is not language but thought, and if metaphors are not merely linguistic units but conceptual systems, then the process of translating metaphor would involve not only a transfer from one language into another but also a transfer from one conceptual system into another. Mandelblit calls this the *Cognitive Translation Hypothesis*. According to this hypothesis, translating metaphors may involve, in addition to linguistic shifts, a conceptual shift. Mandelblit's study is focused on translation as a process not as a product, whereby he aims to show "the delay in reaction time [in the process of translating] is due to a conceptual shift that the translator is required to make between the conceptual mapping systems of the source and target languages" (1995). The scholar suggests two scenarios of cognitive mapping conditions: (I) "similar mapping condition" (SMC), and (II) "different mapping condition" (DMC). If the two languages use similar mapping, i.e., the same domain of experience, to express the topic of communication, the process of translation would be easy, and the translator would be able to find the target equivalent easily and naturally. On the other hand, if the two languages use different mapping, i.e., different domains to express the same idea, the process of translation can be hindered. In this scenario, the translator is required to switch between the conceptual systems of two languages. Mandelblit assumes that the process of finding the target equivalent is at least temporarily difficult. He refers to this difficulty as 'functional fixedness', a phenomenon commonly used in the problem-solving literature. It is in fact 'functional fixedness' that is the reason for the delay in translating different domains of metaphors. Based on this hypothesis, an Arabic-English cognitive metaphor framework was introduced by (Al-Zoubi, Al-Ali, and Al-Hasnawi, 2006). They incorporated Mandelblit's Cognitive Translation Hypothesis for a different purpose and into a different framework. They developed three sets of authentic English and Arabic examples of metaphors: (1) Metaphors of the same mapping conditions, (2) Metaphors with shared mapping conditions, but realised linguistically differently in the two languages, and (3) Metaphors of different mapping conditions with no equivalents in the TL.

(Schäffner, 2004) argues that the conceptual approach to metaphor can contribute new perspectives to Translation Studies. In fact, one of the consequences of this approach is that it allows a reconsideration of traditional translation procedures for metaphor in regard to their usefulness for conceptual metaphors. Schäffner based her identification cases on examples from political texts in German and English, Schäffner argues that there are five cases in translating metaphors: (1) conceptual metaphor is identical in ST and TT at the macro-level, (2) the conceptual schema in the ST is replaced in the TT by expressions that make entailments explicit, (3) A metaphor is more elaborate in the TT, (4) ST and TT employ different metaphorical expressions which can be combined under a more abstract conceptual metaphor, and (5) The expression in the TT reflects a different aspect of the conceptual metaphor.

(Schäffner, 2004) suggests that these observational data, resulting from a comparative analysis of STs and TTs of political discourse, can extend the horizon for potential translation strategies if they make use of more elaborated analysis based on a larger corpus. Schäffner 's findings are similar to those of( Deignan et al., 1997) who conducted a study to test the comprehension of English metaphors by Polish learners of English. They put forward four types of variations:

1.     Same conceptual metaphor and equivalent linguistic expression: metaphorical transfer seemed identical in the two languages, i.e., slightly or no difficulty in finding acceptable translation equivalence.

2.     Same conceptual metaphor but different linguistic expression: similar conceptual metaphor transfer, but different correspondence between all words and expressions used.

3.     Different conceptual metaphors used: In some cases, a different conceptual metaphor was preferred.

4.     Words and expressions with similar literal meanings but different metaphorical meanings.

### 3 Metaphor in politics

In the past, metaphor was often primarily studied by rhetoricians, but over time it has attracted interest from a multiplicity of subject areas. In fact, increasing research suggests that metaphor is central in fields such fields as culture (Kövecses 1999, 2004), medicine (Condit et al. 2001; Shafer 1995; Sontag 1989), religion (Campbell & Kudler 2003; El-Sharif 2011; Zahri 1990; Najjar 2012), and politics. This section will review and discuss the research of the use and role of metaphor in politics.

Many linguists investigated the use of metaphors in politics (Chilton, 1996; Charteris- Black, 2005; Lakoff 2001, 2003, 2005) and suggest that metaphors have become a significant linguistic device and a rhetorical tool used by many politicians. Seth Thompson also underlines this in his article "Politics without metaphor is like a fish without water", in which he states that "humans need metaphors to do and think about politics" (1996, p.185). (Kövecses, 2002) highlights that "politics in general is rife with conceptual metaphors". Focussing on important political figures such as Winston Churchill, Martin Luther King, Margaret Thatcher, Bill Clinton, Tony Blair, and George W Bush who have made or continue to make extensive use of metaphors, Charteris-Black (2005) confirms that metaphors appear to be a crucial aspect of style in political discourse. Accordingly, we can argue that the use of metaphors in politics is not mere coincidence, but that they have an important role to play. They can be used as a persuasive device to influence people's perceptions of reality or can be used to justify political actions; they can also ease interpersonal control of political leaders as metaphors sometimes can leave room for manoeuvring. In short, politicians use metaphors, hoping that their metaphors can change public opinion. When politicians use metaphors, it enables them to represent their policies, ideas, and thoughts as positive ones, while they can reframe those of their opponents as negative. Metaphors can therefore be seen as a device to legitimise one's policies, and to delegitimize other politicians' policies. The terms 'legitimisation' and 'delegitimization' have been introduced in this context by Chilton (2004), the author argues that legitimisation occurs when "political speakers [...] imbue their utterances with evidence, authority and truth". Defining delegitimization, (Chilton, 2004) argues that delegitimization can appears as presenting others negatively by blaming, scapegoating, marginalising, excluding, attacking other political characters.

Similarly, (Charteris-Black, 2005) asserts: "Indeed metaphor is often used both to legitimise and to delegitimise in the same text". Another significant aspect of the use of metaphor in politics has been pointed out by (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 2003) and by (Kövecses, 2010). They suggest that some aspects of the source domains can be highlighted or hidden in the mapping process. This process of highlighting and hiding has in fact made conceptual metaphors ideological, since

metaphors can influence our perception or decision-making processes. Thus, by using the aspect of highlighting and hiding, metaphors, when used by politicians, can produce a biased view of a situation. This idea is echoed in other studies. Teeffelen, for example, argues that "[w]hen applied skilfully, metaphors can have a strong impact due to their 'literary' quality and visual concreteness. This rhetorical thrust allows them to emphasize particular elements [...]" (1994, p.385).

Due to its nature, linguists have described the use of metaphor in politics as a rich resource to achieve ideological aims. The ideological importance of metaphor is, for example, highlighted by Fairclough (1989: 114): "The metaphorical transfer of a word or expression from one domain of use to another is ideologically significant." Charteris-Black also confirms this by saying: "I will propose that metaphor is a very important linguistic and cognitive resource employed by political leaders for achieving this goal" (2005: 21). Van Dijk points out that metaphor can function as an ideological tool that mitigates unfavourable information or emphasizes negative information. Furthermore, he indicates that "the semantic operations of rhetoric, such as hyperbole, understatement, irony and metaphor, among others, have a closer relation to underlying models and social beliefs." (1995: 29)

### 4 Methodological Procedures

This section presents the methodology and the data used in the current study. It will begin by providing a description of the data used in the study, then will move on to the methodological procedures, analysing the STs metaphors using the conceptual theory of metaphor. TTs metaphor will then be examined in the light of the triangulation of translation procedures suggested by Schäffner (2004) and Deignan et al. (1997).

The data in this study consists of political speeches delivered by President Trump, and King Abdullah II of Jordan. King Abdullah II speeches and their translations were extracted from the website of the royal Hashemite court, President Trump speeches were extracted from Politico website, and their translation were extracted from the BBC website. The researcher will highlight animal metaphors in these speeches using several procedures to extract linguistic expressions that realize conceptual mapping in the domain of animals. These procedures can be summarized as follows:

1. Manual searching: here, the researcher reads through the corpus to extract all candidate metaphors of the concerned domain.

2. Searching for source domain vocabulary: this entails selecting a potential source domain, then searching for individual lexical items in this domain.

3. Searching for expressions containing lexical items from the source domain and the target domain: this procedure is a combination of the previous two.

4. Searching for metaphors based on markers of metaphors: these are devices that indicate the existence of metaphor.

### *4.1 Analysis of metaphors in the TTs*

This section is concerned with the translation strategies used to manage both linguistic and conceptual metaphors. After matching the translated metaphors to their original forms, I will consider the similarities and differences of the two, which will involve an examination of whether both linguistic and conceptual metaphors are preserved, altered, or omitted. The translated metaphors will be examined against a triangulation of the typology of translation procedures discussed by scholars from different disciplines and backgrounds; see, for example, Schaffner (2004), Deignan et al. (1997), Mandelblit (1995), and Al-Zoubi, Al-Ali, and Al-Hasnawi (2006). The potential outcomes of translating conceptual metaphors can be summarised as follows:

1. Both the conceptual and linguist metaphors are retained in the target language

2. Shift in the linguistic expressions, while the conceptual metaphor is retained. Such shift could be explication, elaborated, addition, or omission.

3. ST and TT differ in the metaphorical expressions, with no correspondence in the mappings.

4. STs metaphors are translated non-metaphorically in the TTs

In summation, these procedures seek to show which metaphorical expressions appear in Arabic and English.

**5- DATA ANALYSIS**

*5.1 Conceptual Metaphors in the Source Texts*

The basis of animal metaphors is that they convey animal attributes or behaviours to humans; take for example the Biblical metaphor "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." (Matthew 7.15) Such metaphors can be realized by the conceptual metaphor PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS[1]. However, according to Charteris-Black (2005:109), animal metaphors can also be realised by either nominal forms, such as 'fox' and 'lion', or in verbal forms denoting animal behaviour, such as 'howl' or 'gnaw'. The animal metaphor in example (1) below is realised by the use of the verb 'to prey'. In this example, it is the behaviour of the animal that forms the basis of the metaphor which implies depicting the radicals as predators and the vulnerable people as their prey.

Example 1: "South-South partnership can and must also help address the economic conditions that extremists exploit. *Radicals prey on the vulnerable*. Our countries must be champions of inclusion, creating new opportunities for young people, and giving everyone a stake in a peaceful society". (*King Abdullah II Official Website*, 2015.)

Example 2: "When we examine the motives of these outlaws, the khawarej – and indeed, the motives of extremists on all sides – we find hunger for power and control: of people, of money, of land. They use religion as a mask. Is there a worse crime than twisting God's word to promote your own interests? Is there a more despicable act than *feeding on the vulnerable and innocent,* to recruit them to your ranks?" (*King Abdullah II Official Website*, 2015.)

In example (2) above, King Abdullah draws a similarity between the Khawarej (extremists) and wild animals. The extremists, in this example, are depicted as predators feeding on vulnerable and innocent people. Examples (1) and (2) above relate to the conceptual metaphor of EXTREMISTS ARE PREDATORS[2]. In the previous two examples, animals can be either predators or prey. Those who target and exploit innocents are presented as predators, with their victims depicted as prey for predator animals. The use of the animal metaphor in these two examples is intended to cast the extremist groups in a negative light. This negative implication implies that these groups are violent, uncontrollable, and willing to use any means necessary to achieve their goals. The mapping of these two examples can be drawn as follows:

Mapping of the conceptual metaphor of EXTREMISTS ARE PREDATORS

| Khawarej / radicals | → | Predator animals |
|---|---|---|
| The exploitation of innocent people | → | The act of feeding |
| Vulnerable and innocent people | → | Preys , victims of predators |

The same conceptual metaphor, EXTREMISTS ARE PREDATORS, is realised in the following example: Example 3: "We must also work together to address the core crisis in our region the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. *Extremism everywhere has grown fat off this crisis. It is time to stop feeding its growth.* The Arab Peace Initiative points the way forward. Now we need to help the parties get on the path" *King Abdullah II Official Website*, 2019.

In example three above, the metaphor is realized by the use of the verbs "has grown fat" and "stop feeding its growth". Extremism is depicted as an animal which grew fat on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. King Abdullah urges both sides to find a solution, as the continuation of this conflict will result in complicating the situation – or, as the metaphor puts it, growing a bigger and stronger animal. The mapping of this example can be drawn as follows:

---

[1] Conceptual metaphors like (PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS) will be presented in capital letters. This is in keeping with the standard system in cognitive linguistics (see for example Lakoff and Johnson 1980).

Mapping of the conceptual metaphor of EXTREMISTS ARE PREDATORS.

| Extremism | → | Animals |
|---|---|---|
| Not finding a solution | → | Feeding the animal |
| The continuity of the conflict | → | The animal will grow fat |

A similar conceptualisation is realised in the following example. This metaphor is realised by the keyword 'breed', which is generally used to describe animals or plants, notably a group within a species that is maintained by controlled propagation.

Example 4: "It is time to think about the future, and *how this ongoing conflict will breed further hate*, violence and terror across the world. How can we fight the ideological battle, if we do not chart the way forward towards Palestinian-Israeli peace?" According to the metaphor in this example, the ongoing conflict between the Arabs and the Israelis is a wild animal. Unless this conflict is resolved, there will be severe repercussions for the international community; similarly, unless this animal is tamed, it will reproduce, making the situation more difficult to deal with. The offspring of this animal will be an undesirable result for the whole world.

Although it can be argued that the metaphors in examples three and four can relate to other living organisms, the researcher opted to classify them as animal metaphor because they draw negative evaluation which can be seen in "*It is time to stop feeding its growth*" in example 3 and "*breed further hate*" in example 4. In this case it would be appropriate to assign these negative evaluations to negative attributes of animals that is "predators" and "breeding hate". The mapping of example four can be drawn as follows:

Mapping of the conceptual metaphor of EXTREMISTS ARE PREDATORS.

| The Arab-Israeli conflict | → | Animal |
|---|---|---|
| The continuity of the conflict | → | The animal will breed |
| Unresolved conflict | → | Undesirable offspring of the animal (hate, violence, terror) |

Building on the previous metaphorical expression, the conceptual metaphor THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT IS AN ANIMAL is realised. The function of this metaphor is to draw the world's attention to the severe consequences of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Example 5: "Overseas, ISIS has carried out one unthinkable atrocity after another. *Children slaughtered,* girls sold into slavery, men and women burned alive. Crucifixions, beheadings and drownings. Ethnic minorities targeted for mass execution." (Trump)

In example 5 above, the animal metaphor has been realised by the verb "slaughtered". In English, the verb slaughter usually collocates with animals. President Trump used this metaphor to indicate the brutality of ISIS actions. In this metaphor, the children are depicted as helpless victims, and their killers as vicious and merciless killers. The function of this metaphor is delegitimizing the actions of ISIS, and to shed light and attract the universal attention to these crimes.

Another widely used animal metaphor by Trump is IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS, this metaphor appeared both in his speeches and in his Twitter account. By using the metaphor in example 6 below, Trump intents at constructing a strong connotation in the minds of his electors that immigrants are harmful for their society.

Example 6: "Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight *roaming free* to threaten peaceful citizens… *They are being released* by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources. One such border-crosser *was released* and made his way to Nebraska. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root." This metaphor is realized by "*roaming free, being released, was released*". Trump depicts immigrants as animals, once "released" those immigrants are freely roaming which

poses risk and fear on the citizens. When Trump speaks about 'releasing' immigrants, his words may trigger the image of a cage, which, once opened, lets out wild animals that pose danger to people. According to this metaphor immigrants are animals that present some form of danger on the citizens. Trump uses this metaphor to construct negative evaluations on immigrants while those threatened by the animals are depicted as passive or docile.

### 5.2 Conceptual Metaphor in the Target Texts: Translation Strategies

This section explores the translation strategies used in rendering the ST metaphors. It will discuss the typology of translation strategies and the shifts in conceptual domains and linguistic structures, providing relevant examples.

The following analysis of the translated metaphors involves three steps. Initially, the translated metaphorical expressions will be matched to the previously identified STs metaphors. The next step is to look at the similarities and differences between the metaphor categories in the two languages; this involves examining whether the conceptual metaphors and their linguistic realizations in the ST are retained, explicated, modified, paraphrased or omitted. Throughout this section, the term 'literal translation' will be used to refer to the translation of examples where the denotative meaning is used out of context. According to Dickins et al. (2016:14) "In literal translation proper, the denotative meaning of words is taken as if straight from the dictionary (i.e., out of context), but TL grammar is respected". The last step is to consider particular translation patterns that can be identified through both the similarities and differences between metaphor categories and their expressions in the two languages. For this purpose, the pre-selected domains will be examined according to the typology of translation strategies discussed in the methodology section. These strategies have been modified and expanded to serve the purpose of this study. The translation strategies are as follows:

1. Similar conceptual metaphor with similar lexical realizations.
2. Similar conceptual metaphor with similar linguistic realization and an addition.
3. Similar conceptual metaphor with similar linguistic realization and an omission.
4. Similar conceptual metaphor with different lexical realizations.
5. Different conceptual metaphor.
6. Non-metaphorical rendition.

Example 1: Source Text: "South-South partnership can and must also help address the economic conditions that extremists exploit. *Radicals prey on the vulnerable.* Our countries must be champions of inclusion, creating new opportunities for young people, and giving everyone a stake in a peaceful society".

Target Text:

"وعلى الشراكة بين دول الجنوب ان تساعد في معالجة الأوضاع الاقتصادية الصعبة التي يستغلها المتطرفون الذين يستهدفون الضعفاء.."

In example 1, above, the ANIMAL metaphor is conveyed by the phrase 'radicals' prey on the vulnerable'. This is translated into Arabic by a different metaphorical expression 'المتطرفون الذين يستهدفون الضعفاء' [radicals who targets the vulnerable]. This translation is probably meant to avoid the literal translation that may produce an incomprehensible and unfamiliar expression in the Arabic TT. It can be argued that the new metaphor may belong to a different domain, for example SPORTS metaphor that is realized by the expression 'يستهدف' to target, which is an archery metaphor. However, this rendition did not convey the complete image of the ST metaphor. The use of the verb 'prey on' in the ST diffuses images of violence and harm caused by radicals when they target civilians, and these images are not transferred into the TT.

Another similar ANIMAL metaphor is translated non-metaphorically in example 2, below. The metaphor is conveyed by the rhetorical question 'Is there a more despicable act than feeding on the vulnerable and innocent [...]?' which is translated into Arabic by 'وهل هناك أدنى من استغلال الضعفاء والأبرياء لتجنيدهم' [Is there anything meaner than exploiting the weak and the innocent to recruit them]. As can be seen in the previous example, this non-metaphorical translation is probably meant to avoid the literal translation that may produce an incomprehensible and unfamiliar expression in the Arabic TT.

Example (2) Source Text: "When we examine the motives of these outlaws, the khawarej – and indeed, the motives of extremists on all sides – we find hunger for power and control: of people, of money, of land. They use religion as a mask. Is there a worse crime than twisting God's word to promote your own interests? *Is there a more despicable act than feeding on the vulnerable and innocent, to recruit them to your ranks*?"

Target Text:

"فعندما ننظر الى دوافع هؤلاء الخوارج، الخارجين عن الإسلام، بل الى دوافع المتطرفين في جميع أنحاء العالم، نجد ان شهوة السلطة والسيطرة على الناس والأموال والأرض هي محركهم. انهم يستخدمون الدين كقناع، وهل هناك ما هو اسوأ من تحريف كلام الله لخدمة أجنداتهم؟ وهل هناك أدنى من استغلال الضعفاء والأبرياء لتجنيدهم"

The metaphor in example 3 below, refers to the concept of TERRORISTS ARE ANIMALS, which is conveyed by the use of phrases such as 'grown fat' and 'feeding its growth'. This metaphor is translated into Arabic with a similar conceptual metaphor, plus an addition. This addition 'زاد التطرف' [extremism has increased] is probably meant to provide the reader with a clearer image of the metaphor's suggestion of growth and fattening which conveys the sense of an increase in numbers. .(زاد التطرف ) Depicting extremists as a growing animal is further explicated by including (زاد التطرف) We can explain this addition as a way to explain the metaphorical sense behind the expression 'Extremism everywhere has grown fat'.

Example 3: Source Text: "We must also work together to address the core crisis in our region the Palestinian-Israeli conflict *Extremism everywhere has grown fat off this crisis. It is time to stop feeding its growth*. The Arab Peace Initiative points the way forward. Now we need to help the parties get on the path."

Target Text:

"لقد زاد التطرف في كل مكان، ونما على هذه الأزمة. وقد حان الوقت لوقف تغذيته. ان مبادرة السلام العربية تحدد الطريق للمضي قدما. ويجب علينا الآن مساعدة الطرفين على المضي في المسار الصحيح."

We have argued earlier, (section5.1) that the metaphor in example 4 below, belongs to the domain of ANIMALS. This metaphor is realized by the underlined expression to depict the ongoing conflict between the Arab and the Israelis as an animal. As can be seen in TT this metaphor is replaced with another metaphor

Example 4: Source Text: "It is time to think about the future, and *how this ongoing conflict will breed further hate*"

Target Text:

"الصراع المستمر سوف يولد مزيدا من الكراهية والعنف والإرهاب في جميع أنحاء العالم"

Back Translation: conflict will generate more hatred, violence, and terrorism all over the world.

The ST metaphor is shifted to a different metaphorical expression that belongs to a different domain. This shift is probably meant to avoid literal translation that could produce unfamiliar expression for the TT reader. In the next example, the ANIMAL metaphor is conveyed by [children slaughtered] as we have argued earlier the animal metaphor has been realised by the verb "slaughtered" since this verb usually collocates with killing of animals. This verb however translated into Arabic with an its equivalent (ذبح) which produces a similar metaphor at both linguistic and conceptual levels. The translated metaphor does not show any cases of elaboration, explication, or shifting to different TT metaphorical expressions.

Example 5: Source Text: "Overseas, ISIS has carried out one unthinkable atrocity after another. *Children slaughtered*, girls sold into slavery, men and women burned alive. Crucifixions, beheadings and drownings. Ethnic minorities targeted for mass execution". (Trump)

Target Text:

"وفي أماكن اخرى، نفذ داعش فظائع لا يمكن تصورها تلو الأخرى *ذبح الأطفال*، وبيع الفتيات كعبيد، وحرق الرجال والنساء أحياء والصلب وقطع الرؤوس واغراق الناس احياء. واستهداف الأقليات العرقية بالإعدام الجماعي."

Example 6: "Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight *roaming free* to threaten peaceful citizens… *They are being released* by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources. One such border-crosser *was released* and made his way to Nebraska. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root."

Target text:

ما يقرب من 180.000 مهاجر غير شرعي لديهم سجلات جنائية، أمر بترحيلهم من بلدنا، يتجولون الليلة بحرية لتهديد المواطنين المسالمين ... عشرات الآلاف أطلق سراحهم في مجتمعاتنا دون أي اعتبار لسلامة العامة أو الموارد. تجرى إطلاق سراح المتسللين عبر الحدود وشق طريقه إلى نبراسكا. هناك، أنهى حياة فتاة بريئة تدعى سارة روت."

In example 6 above, the metaphor IMMIGRANTS ARE ANIMALS has been identified, this metaphor is realized by "*roaming free, being released, was released*".  We can argue that this metaphor is translated non-metaphorically to Arabic. This non-metaphorical translation results from the distinction between the verb "roam" in English and "يتجول" in Arabic, as the "roam" can be attributed to animals, whereas "يتجول" is more likely to collocate with humans. By the same token, the verb "being released" can also collocate with both animals and humans, while the Arabic translation "اطلق سراحه" probably collocates with humans. this non-metaphorical translation is probably meant to avoid the literal translation that may produce an incomprehensible and unfamiliar expression in the Arabic TT.

## 6 Discussion and findings

### 6.1 Metaphors in STs

This section presents an analysis of the animal metaphors encountered in the source texts. This section will also provide an answer to question 1 in this study. In line with the methodology presented in section 3, linguistic metaphors have been identified using several steps. Supported by representative examples, it was shown how political ideas are mapped onto these source domains. An analysis of the source texts revealed that the use of conceptual metaphor is abundant and diverse in politics, and that political ideas can be conceptualised in a variety of ways based on categories of metaphor. This was verified by highlighting the significant presence of metaphors in the source texts.

Most of the ANIMALS metaphors in our data have the target domain of TERRORISTS. The use of this target domain is commonplace in politics. For example, George Bush Jr, former President of the USA (7 October 2001, cited in Charteris-Black, 2005:182), used animals' metaphor to describe terrorists: 'Initially, the terrorists *may burrow deeper into caves* and other entrenched hiding places. Likewise, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher also used animal metaphors to describe the presence of extreme left wingers in the Labour Party: 'Mr Wilson has at last discovered that his own Party is infiltrated by extreme left-wingers – or to use his own words it is infested with them' (October 1975). Although this verb ('infested') is more commonly associated with insects, Charteris-Black argues that the ANIMALS domain can include either harmful insects or animals.

The use of ANIMAL metaphors in our data accords with Charteris-Black's conceptual metaphor of TERRORISTS ARE ANIMALS, which is used to create a negative evaluation of these extremists. In our data, we identified two conceptual metaphors that share the same target domain: EXTREMISTS ARE PREDATORS and TERRORISTS ARE ANIMALS. These conceptual metaphors are realised by metaphorical expressions such as 'radicals prey on the vulnerable', and, 'Extremism everywhere has grown fat off this crisis. It is time to stop feeding its growth'. The use of these conceptual metaphors sheds light on the dangers posed by these groups. Another conceptual metaphor in this domain is THE ARAB–ISRALIE CONFLICT IS AN ANIMAL, as realised by, 'It is time to think about the future, and how this ongoing conflict will breed further hate, violence and terror across the world'. The function of this metaphor is to highlight the severe consequences of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Animal metaphors in the political speeches are usually employed to invoke negative associations with the extremist groups. These negative implications imply that the groups are violent, uncontrollable, and willing to use any means necessary to achieve their aims. By using these metaphors, politicians highlight the dangers posed by the terrorist groups in the region. The negative associations of the animal metaphor point to the severe consequences of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

### 6.2 Metaphors in TTs

Analysis of the metaphors in the TT addressed the second and third research question of the study: How are these metaphors translated in these political speeches? Does the translation maintain the meaning observed in the speeches? The

present section discusses and evaluates the main findings of the comparative study of ST and TT conceptual metaphors. This section also addresses the implications of translating metaphors between the two languages, with regard to both linguistic and conceptual differences. Based on comparative analysis of ST and TT metaphors, the following cases have been identified:

1- Correspondence of ST and TT conceptual and linguistic metaphor, as can be seen in example 5.

2- Correspondence of conceptual metaphor, the linguistic metaphor is elaborated in the TT. This instance has been identified in example 3.

3- Metaphors rendered with different conceptual metaphors, this case has been realized in examples 1 and 4.

4- Non-metaphorical renditions, as can be seen in example 2.

Analysis of metaphors in the TT shows that this study's procedures for handling conceptual metaphor in translation echo traditional linguistic approaches to translating metaphor. For example, our first procedure (Correspondence of ST and TT conceptual and linguistic metaphor) is similar to Newmark's procedure, reproducing the image of the SL metaphor in the TL. This procedure is also similar to Chesterman's ST trope X ⇒ TT trope X. Similarly, the second procedure (similar conceptual metaphor with similar linguistic realization, plus an addition) is similar to Newmark's procedure, translating metaphor using a metaphor plus sense.

It has also been noticed that similar conceptual metaphor comes first among the translation techniques identified in the TT, i.e., metaphors are being retained in the TT, at both the conceptual and linguistic levels. This strategy also involves that some metaphors being translated into different linguist expressions. In this strategy it has been noticed that linguistic metaphors can be translated with either additions or omissions while retaining the same domain. The non-metaphorical renditions come second among the translation techniques identified in the TT. The least frequent translation technique is the provision of a different conceptual metaphor.

The prominence of the first translation procedure (similarity in conceptual and linguistic metaphors) suggests that metaphors are, to a great extent, translatable between Arabic and English in political discourse. Similarities in the categories of metaphors between English and Arabic can be explained by three factors. First, the same source domain, animals in this study, exist in both languages/cultures. Second, the conceptual system in each language has a role in the translatability of metaphor into the TT. Both languages entail many similar conceptualisations that aid transference of most ST metaphors into the TT. Third, the similarities in metaphor can be attributed to common experiences, stemming from either experiential co-occurrence or experiential similarity.

## 7 Conclusion and Future Research

The main aim of this research was to investigate the use of linguistic and conceptual metaphors in political speeches delivered by different political figures, and to investigate the translation of these metaphors between English and Arabic. This research has attempted to answer the research questions by examining the points of symmetry and variation across both languages and cultures in relation to the translation of metaphors. The research confirms previous findings and contributes additional evidence to suggest that the translation of metaphors needs to be handled carefully and accurately in order to prevent misunderstanding between cultures. This study has found that metaphors are instrumental in shaping the structure of political discourse as an influential device used by politicians to persuade their audience of their points of view regarding different political issues, and to communicate complex political ideas pertaining to situations such as terrorism.

It has also been argued in this study that despite the difference between the two languages, points of similarity exceeded those of difference mainly in terms of the correspondence in the number of conceptual domains. While some differences were shown in the number of linguistic metaphors in each domain, very few metaphors were shifted to other domains. The discussion in this paper revealed that conceptual metaphors and their linguistic realizations are translatable between English and Arabic.

The research into the translation of metaphors in political texts is still a burgeoning field of study for translations across English and Arabic. This study has endeavoured to contribute to the field of Translation Studies by introducing a number of questions in relation to translating metaphors in the political context between English and Arabic and attempting to

answer them. While there are still some gaps in this present study, these can be addressed by future research. My recommendation for future research is that more engagement in the metaphorical language of political discourse in translation is required which can be achieved by focussing on other domains and elaborating on them further. Another recommendation is to incorporate other models with the conceptual metaphor theory, for example, the schematic-non-schematic metaphors model proposed by Dickins (2005). Finally, future research may benefit from comparing metaphors in Arabic with translations in languages other than English.

**References**

Ahrens, K., & Say, A. L. (1999). Mapping image-schemas and translating metaphors. In *Proceedings of the 13th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation* (pp. 95-102).

Al Salem, M. N. (2014). The translation of metaphor from Arabic to English in selected poems of Mahmoud Darwish with a focus on linguistic issues. University of Leeds.

Al-Harrasi, A. N. K. (2001). *Metaphor in (Arabic-into-English) translation with specific reference to metaphorical concepts and expressions in political discourse* (Doctoral dissertation, Aston University).

Campbell, J., (2003). *Myths of light: Eastern metaphors of the eternal.* (6th ed.). New World Library.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis.* Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric. The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* . John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice.* London and New York. Routledge.

Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (2002). *Politics as Text and Talk:* Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse. John Benjamins.

Condit, C.M., & Condit, D.M. (2001). Blueprints and Recipes: Gendered Metaphors for Genetic Medicine. *Journal of Medical Humanities,* 22(1), 29-39.

Dagut, M. (1976). Can "Metaphor" Be Translated? *Babel,* 22(1), 21-33.

Deignan, A., Gabryś, D., & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities. *ELT Journal,* 51(4), 352-360.

Deignan, A.H. (1997). *A Corpus-Based Study of Some Linguistic Features of Metaphor. PhD thesis*, The University of Birmingham.

Dickins, J. (2005). Two models for metaphor translation. *International Journal of Translation Studies,* 17(2), 227-273.

Dickins, J., Hervey, S.G.J., & Higgins, I. (2016). *Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Arabic to English.* Routledge.

El-Sharif, A. (2011). *A Linguistic Study of Islamic Religious Discourse: Conceptual Metaphors in the Prophetic Tradition. PhD thesis*, Queen Mary University of London.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power.* (1st ed.). London: Longman Group UK Limited

Gibbs, R.W. (2011). Evaluating Conceptual Metaphor Theory. *Discourse Processes*. 48(8), 529-562.

Group, P. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. Metaphor and symbol, 22(1), 1-39.

*King Abdullah II Official Website*. (2015). https://kingabdullah.jo/en/speeches/asian-african-conference-summit-%E2%80%9Cstrengthening-south-south-cooperation-promote-world-peace.

Kittay, E. F. (1989). *Metaphor: Its cognitive force and linguistic structure*. Oxford University Press.

Knowles, M. and Moon, R. (2006). *Introducing Metaphor.* Oxon: Routledge.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling.* Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction.* Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z., & Benczes, R. 2010). Metaphor: a practical introduction.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M (1993). *The contemporary theory of metaphor*. In *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980/2003). *Metaphors We Live By.* University of Chicago Press.

Maalej, Z. (1999). Metaphoric Discourse in the Age of Cognitive Linguistics, with Special Reference to Tunisian. Arabic *Journal of Literary Semantics,* 28, 189-206.

Mandelblit, N. (1995). The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory. *Translation and meaning*, *3*, 483-495.

Mason, K. (1982). Metaphor and Translation. *Babel,* 28(3), 140-149.

Mohammad, Q. A. Z., Mohammed, N. A. A., & Ali, R. A. H. (2007). Cogno-cultural issues in translating metaphors. Perspectives: Studies in translatology, 14(3), 230-239.

Monti, E. (2006). Dwelling upon Metaphors: The Translation of William Gass's Novellas. *Nordic Journal of English Studies,* 5(1), 117-132.

Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21(1), 23-38.

Najjar, S.A. (2012). *Metaphors in Translation: An investigation of a sample of Quran metaphors with reference to three English versions of the Quran. PhD thesis*, Liverpool John Moores University.

Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation.* State University of New York Press.

Nida, E.A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating.* E.J. Brill.

Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 36(7), 1253-1269.

Schäffner, C., & Shuttleworth, M. (2013). Metaphor in translation. *Target,* 24(3), 93-106.

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse.* Cambridge University Press.

Shafer, M.D.A. (1995). Metaphor and Anesthesia. *Anesthesiology,* 83(6), 1331- 1342.

Steen, G. (2002). Towards a procedure for metaphor identification. *Language and Literature,* 11(1), 17-33.

Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries, S.T. (2007). *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy.* Walter de Gruyter.

Thompson, S. (2018). Politics without metaphors is like a fish without water. In Metaphor (pp. 185-201). Psychology Press.

Van den Broeck, R. (1981). The Limits of Translatability Exemplified by Metaphor Translation. *Poetics Today.* 2(4), 73-87.

Van Dijk, T. (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. *Discourse in society,* 17- 33.

Van Teeffelen, T. (1994). Racism and metaphor: the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in popular literature. *Discourse & Society,* 5(3), 381-405.

Vinay, J.P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English.* John Benjamins.