Source Text Worldview as a Mediated Hybrid (Re)construction in Translation[1]

Anna Wyrwa
University of the National Education Commission, Kraków, Poland

Abstract

The study examines how linguistic worldviews encoded in metaphors used by Polish MEPs in EU parliamentary debates are reconstructed in their English translations. Drawing on cognitive linguistics and Underhill's five-dimensional model of worldview, it analyses deliberately used metaphors in the source texts and their target text renderings. While 60% of ST metaphors are translated with formally similar mappings, the findings show that such similarity does not guarantee full reconstruction of the speaker's worldview. The divergences that arise from differences in conventionality, stylistic markedness, and cultural associations frequently modify various dimensions of the ST worldview. The study argues the TT worldviews constitute hybrid formations shaped jointly by the speaker, translator and target recipient, and that translators primarily secure intelligibility by aligning metaphors with target-language patterns. The analysis affirms the value of Underhill's framework and stresses the need to further adapt it for cross-linguistic research involving more language pairs and genres.

Cette étude examine comment les visions du monde linguistiques, codées dans les métaphores des députés polonais au Parlement européen, sont reconstruites en anglais. S'appuyant sur la linguistique cognitive et le modèle des cinq dimensions de la vision du monde d'Underhill, elle analyse les métaphores délibérément utilisées dans les textes sources et leur traduction. Bien que 60 % des métaphores soient rendues par de correspondances formellement similaires, cette similarité ne garantit pas la reconstruction complète de la vision du monde de l'orateur. Les divergences liées à la conventionnalité, au marquage stylistique et aux associations culturelles modifient fréquemment plusieurs dimensions du texte source. L'étude montre que les visions du monde dans le texte cible sont des formations hybrides, façonnées par l'orateur, le traducteur et le destinataire, et que les traducteurs privilégient l'intelligibilité en alignant les métaphores sur les schémas de la langue cible. Ces résultats confirment la pertinence du cadre d'Underhill et la nécessité de son adaptation pour des recherches interlinguistiques élargies.

Keywords

linguistic worldview, worldview dimensions, world-perceiving, world-conceiving, cultural mindset, personal world, perspective

visions du monde linguistiques, dimension de la vision du monde linguistique, perception du monde, conception du monde, mentalité culturelle, monde personnel, perspective

Introduction

Translation is not merely a transfer of linguistic material; it is a cognitive and languacultural practice through which worlds and worldviews are built, negotiated, and reshaped (Głaz, *Linguistic Worldview(s)* 44). Seen from this perspective, translation can be defined as an act of linguistic worldview reconstruction: translators attempt to reconstitute in the target text (TT) the worldview encoded in the source text (ST), while working within the semiotic resources and cultural patterns available in the target languaculture (cf. Pieciul-Karmińska; Gicala; Głaz, *Linguistic Worldview(s)*). Translation often functions as a prism through which competing personal and ideological stances are refracted when brought into the target-culture settings. Understanding how such stances are processed, reframed, or subtly altered by translators becomes especially urgent (Munday, *Evaluation*; cf. Underhill, *Creating*).

This study, therefore, focuses on translation products as sites where the translator's decision-making and intervention become visible. It aims to identify those points in a text where the translator's or interpreter's subjectivity is most likely to surface. Far from acting as transparent

[1] DOI: 10.61736/alizes.590

conduits, translators and interpreters participate actively in communication, representing the source speaker's words from a position shaped by multiple extratextual constraints, such as the intended function of the TT or the target audience's expectations. Translators also bring their own sociocultural and educational backgrounds, ideological stances, phraseological habits, and stylistic preferences to the task (Munday, *Evaluation* 2). Because lexicogrammatical choices carry discursive weight, they can construe particular versions of reality, signal attitudes, index cultural mindsets, and negotiate readers' alignment with the speaker's views. In practice, each translation contains "critical" elements that require interpretative effort or even explicit intervention (Munday, *Evaluation* 2; cf. Agar 231–232). Such languacultural signals, especially when they reflect personal or idiosyncratic usage in the ST, may be difficult to transfer. Differences in linguistic repertoires, conventions, or evaluative systems between languages can lead to subtle shifts in attitudinal positioning. These shifts, in turn, can influence how a text is received in the target culture.

Against this backdrop, the present study tests the applicability of a worldview model as an analytical tool for translation analysis. It examines the extent to which translation can be viewed as a process of worldview reconstruction; and it explores the explanatory value of this lens in uncovering the interplay between source and target linguistic worldviews, an interplay that is often especially pronounced in translation. As Głaz points out, this interplay lies at the core of linguistic worldview research, and translation, concerning languacultural symbolisation, touches "the very fabric of what makes us cultural beings that entrust their worldviews to their languages" (*Linguistic Worldview(s)* 41). If translation difficulties persist, it is because languages encode distinct worldviews; if words in different languages referred to the same objective reality, translation would be unproblematic (Bynon 427, qtd in Głaz, *Linguistic Worldview(s)* 43). Nevertheless, translation is both possible and inevitably perspectival: each act of translation involves a shift in viewpoint and the coexistence of dual or multiple perspectives (43). As language itself is a "loaded weapon" (Bolinger), it becomes essential to understand how authors and translators wield it, how much they rely on the conventional resources of their languages, and how much they inject their own perspectives. Texts, literary and non-literary alike, reveal ongoing tensions between these collective and individual dimensions (Głaz, *Linguistic Worldview(s)* 44).

Munday claims that evaluation is present behind every utterance (*Evaluation* 155). Booth asserts that "the author's judgement is always evident to anyone who knows how to look for it" (20, qtd in Głaz, *Linguistic Worldview(s)* 44). Thus, in translation, the translator's judgement is equally inescapable, whether acknowledged or not (cf. Munday, *Style* 14). However, as Głaz asks, do translators recognise the extent to which they reveal themselves in their choices? How do target readers interpret or accept these traces of subjectivity? (44). This study poses similar questions. If the translator's agency is expressed through the linguistic decisions they make, then whose worldview is ultimately reconstructed in the TT: that of the original speaker, that of the translator, or the worldview familiar to and expected by the target audience, namely the one encoded in the target language? What, then, is the outcome of the translation process, in which the worldviews of these three speaking subjects converge, and what is the nature of the inevitable shifts that arise from this interplay?

Theoretical Framework: Underhill's Model of Worldview

To address the questions outlined above, the study investigates linguistic worldviews that emerge from metaphorical expressions deliberately used in debates by Polish Members of the European Parliament and compares them with those encoded in their English translations. The corpus of EU parliamentary speeches was compiled between 2013 and 2015, during which transcripts of speeches and their interpretations were collected, annotated and analysed for a

prior research project. The corpus comprises approximately 400,000 words jointly in Polish and English. The speeches were delivered and interpreted during European Parliament debates held between 1 January and 31 December 2011.[2] Anchored in a cognitive linguistics approach, the analysis rests on two key assumptions: (1) translation constitutes an act of reconstructing a linguistic worldview (Pieciul-Karmińska; Gicala; Głaz, *Linguistic Worldview(s)*); (2) linguistic worldview is an interpretation of reality encoded in, or emergent from, language (Bartmiński; Głaz et al.; Underhill, *Humboldt*).

Metaphor has been chosen as the central focus of the analysis because it offers an entry point into the worldview our language presents (Underhill, *Creating* 13). Specifically, deliberate metaphors are argued to be intentionally employed by the speaker to mark their stance, enhance persuasiveness, evoke a particular response, etc. (cf. Steen). As creative or non-standard uses of language, they function as especially powerful tools for guiding recipients' attention and shaping their perspective (cf. Hart; Musolff; Charteris-Black). These rhetorical effects are closely linked to the personal and ideological dimensions of worldview, which are highly salient in political debate and therefore expected to be prioritised in translation.

However, such deliberate creativity often leaves room for broader interpretation, increasing the likelihood of divergence from the original worldview. The study examines this divergence, arguing that the speaker's worldview is rarely reconstructed in its full complexity. Even metaphorical expressions in the TT that appear to be closely analogous may fail to preserve the conceptual, personal, cultural, or ideological nuances encoded in the ST. While the translator is intuitively expected to reconstruct the ST worldview in the TT, this task is inevitably mediated by the constraints and affordances of the target language and by the translator's own knowledge, experience, and perspective. Consequently, it is more accurate to view the outcome as a hybrid construction in which the worldviews of the speaker, the translator, and the target audience intersect and leave discernible traces – traces that manifest as semantic shifts between the ST and TT (cf. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk).

To examine these shifts, Underhill's worldview model is applied. Underhill understands worldview as a multidimensional complex embracing *world-perceiving*, *world-conceiving*, *cultural mindset*, *personal world*, and *perspective*. Beyond the conceptual dimensions of world-perceiving and world-conceiving, the model integrates personal (personal world and perspective) and ideological (cultural mindset) dimensions of worldview, both of which are central to analysing how deliberately used metaphors and their translations express the speaker's stances and convictions in the ST and TT.

Although Underhill's model provides a comprehensive framework, he presents it as a proposal, with the five dimensions highlighting concepts that are not transparent in the English term *worldview* (*Humboldt* 136). The model is applied in a pilot translation analysis, reported in Wyrwa ("Traces"),[3] which also offers guidance for identifying worldview dimensions in actual language use (304). These guidelines are recapitulated in Table 1.

---

[2] The transcripts are available online: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/debates-video.html (for Polish) and https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/debates-video.html (for English). Rather than compiling more recent material, the present study relies on this previously prepared dataset. Although the use of older data may be seen as a shortcoming, it is not consequential, as the study does not address temporal variation. Instead, it seeks to identify general tendencies in the reconstruction of linguistic worldview in translation, particularly as encoded in deliberate metaphor use. These tendencies are assumed to be independent of time of delivery or individual speakers involved. Accordingly, the analysis prioritises underlying translational patterns over external variables such as recency or speaker agency. Also, transcriptions of originally interpreted parliamentary debates undergo editorial revision prior to publication on the EU website (based on personal communication with EU translators during the EU Open Day in 2016). The present analysis uses these edited transcriptions; consequently, its findings are primarily indicative of translation understood as written practice. Patterns specific to interpreting would require separate investigation.

[3] Wyrwa is a more robust application (*Linguistic Worldviews*).

Table 1: Underhill's worldview dimensions and directions for analysis

Worldview dimensions	Distinguishing worldview dimensions in the speaker's metaphorical expression
World-perceiving (perception through senses)	The speaker perceives analogies between two distinct conceptual domains.
World-conceiving (forming concepts)	The speaker conceives (an aspect) of one conceptual domain in terms of (an aspect of) the other conceptual domain – this is the conceptual metaphor underlying the metaphorical expression used.
Cultural mindset (system of beliefs)	The selection of conceptual domains hints at a particular system of beliefs underpinning the speaker's verbal behaviour.
Personal world (individual stance)	The speaker selects a non-conventional/novel metaphor – their personal world is marked. The speaker selects a conventional metaphor – their personal world is unmarked.
Perspective (individual response)	The speaker selects emotional/loaded language or a non-conventional/novel metaphor – their perspective is that of a mentally engaged observer. The speaker selects neutral language, a conventional metaphor, or a non-metaphor – their perspective is that of a mentally detached observer.

The dimensions of world-perceiving and world-conceiving are encoded in language and are identifiable in the speaker's linguistic patterns, including metaphorical expressions (analysed in this study). In contrast, a cultural mindset is not tied to any specific linguistic system. Similar mindsets can manifest across languages, migrating beyond lexical or grammatical boundaries (cf. Underhill and Gianninoto; Głaz "Koncepcja"). One may debate or adopt various belief systems (e.g. concerning the existence of God), but this presupposes knowledge of relevant linguistic concepts. As Underhill notes, belief systems are conceptually constrictive but linguistically flexible (*Humboldt* 55). A speaker's cultural mindset is expressed through concept choice, labelling, and contextual deployment (cf. Haynes; Wolf and Polzenhagen).

A personal world reflects the speaker's stance on reality. It can be understood through the lens of evaluation, defined by Thompson and Hunston (5) as "the expression of the speaker's or writer's attitude or stance towards…entities or propositions." Evaluation is realised through adjectives, adverbs, nouns, verbs, and novel or creative linguistic forms (including non-conventional metaphorical expressions), exhibiting comparison, subjectivity, and social value (Thompson and Hunston 13; cf. Munday). These resources reveal the speaker's stance on reality.

Perspective, as defined by Underhill (*Humboldt* 135), reflects the speaker's response to a changing world and is closely related to the dimension of personal world, differing mainly in its dynamism. Unlike the stable personal world, perspective fluctuates. It can be correlated with mental distance from reality: a greater distance affords a wider, more objective overview, while proximity entails a personal, engaged reaction. When the speaker is "mentally close to the perceived object," they have "a very personal or engaged relationship with that object." On the other hand, if the speaker and the object are mentally distant, "the object can be viewed in an 'aloof,' detached manner" (Głaz, *Extended* 46). Linguistic cues signalling engagement or detachment include evaluative adjectives, adverbs of attitude (e.g. *certainly, clearly, at last*),

augmentatives, diminutives, explicit reaction phrases (e.g. *I'm glad, I can't stand*), and metaphorical choices that selectively highlight aspects of reality (Munday, *Evaluation*; Wiraszka). All these can indicate the speaker's perspective.

Application of the Model to Worldview Analysis

Underhill's model of worldview has been applied to the analysis of emergent worldviews in the translation of EU parliamentary debates. A series of examples is presented below to illustrate the principal findings and demonstrate the model's applicability to such comparative analysis. The examples selected from the corpus data demonstrate the model's usefulness for the close analysis of worldviews in translation, especially in revealing the factors that account for worldview shifts and shape the reconstruction of the ST worldview in the TT, such as the translator's agency, target language constraints, or target recipients' expectations. The subsequent conclusions synthesise the observations drawn from these examples.

Consider example (1):

(1)

ST and TT metaphors: (CONDUCTING) POLITICS IS THREATENING WITH A STICK AND REWARDING WITH A CARROT; A STICK IS PUNISHMENT; A CARROT IS REWARD

ST: …powinnyśmy zastąpić prowadzoną do tej pory wobec reżimu *politykę kija i marchewki polityką „kija dla reżimu, marchewki dla społeczeństwa"*

TT: …let us replace *the carrot-and-stick policies* directed towards the regime so far with *'stick to regime and carrot to society'*

(Debate: Situation in Belarus, Strasbourg, 19 January 2011)

In example (1), the speaker uses the metaphor-based idiom *polityka kija i marchewki* [policy of stick and carrot], rendered in the TT as *carrot-and-stick policies.* The expressions in both texts are closely aligned in form, meaning, and function, allowing for full reconstruction of the speaker's worldview.

Both the ST and TT draw an analogy between the domain of abstract ideas of reward and punishment and that of physical objects: carrot and stick (world-perceiving). The ST extends the metaphor to *polityka kija dla reżimu, marchewki dla społeczeństwa* [policy of a stick for the regime, a carrot for the society]. The TT mirrors this with *stick to regime and carrot to society*. This rendering reconstructs the speaker's world-perceiving and world-conceiving as well as the other dimensions of their worldview. Arguably, it reconstructs their cultural mindset: politics is seen as a domain in which firm measures and moral distinctions (punishing the regime, supporting freedom) are justified. The speaker's extension of a conventional metaphorical expression into a more creative one highlights their evaluative stance (personal world) and engagement (perspective). Rather than using neutral language (e.g. "Radical measures should be adopted…"), they opt for a vivid metaphor, reinforcing their personal view and engagement. The TT achieves the same effect through analogous metaphorical structures. Thus, in example (1), the ST metaphor is rendered by a near-identical TT metaphor, based on a cross-domain mapping present in the two cultures, ensuring reconstruction of all dimensions of the speaker's worldview.

Now consider example (2):

(2)

ST metaphor: BEING ATTRACTED (TO SOMETHING) IS BEING HIT ON ONE'S NOSE BY A SMELL (THAT OF MONEY)

TT metaphor: BEING ATTRACTED (TO SOMETHING) IS CATCHING THE SCENT (OF MONEY)

ST: *Zapach petrodolarów uderza w nozdrza* zarówno przedstawicieli obu części kraju, jak i zagranicznych koncernów [lit. the smell of petrodollars hits alike the nostrils of the representatives of both parts of the country and of foreign concerns]
TT: Both foreign concerns, (…), and the representatives of the two parts of the country *have caught the scent of petrodollars*.
(Debate: Referendum on the future status of Southern Sudan, Brussels, 2 February 2011)

In example (2), both the ST and TT draw analogies between SMELL and MONEY (world-perceiving); and the idea that the prospect of profit can help resolve a long-standing conflict is conceptualised through the metaphor of detecting the smell of money (world-conceiving). However, a close comparison of the ST and TT reveals subtle grammatical and lexical shifts with meaningful implications for the emergence of each worldview.
In the ST, the active construction makes *zapach petrodolarów* [the smell of petrodollars] the subject (agent) and *nozdrza przedstawicieli…* [the nostrils of the representatives…] the object (patient) of the verb *uderza* [hits/strikes], which implies that the smell actively affects the representatives, who are portrayed as passive and seduced by the promise of gain. In contrast, the active verb phrase *have caught* in the TT reverses these roles: *foreign concerns and the representatives…* are the subjects, and *the scent of petrodollars* is the patient. Here, the representatives are not passive but more in control, sensing potential profits and responding to the opportunity rather than being struck by it. The lexical choice of *scent* further reinforces this shift in the world-conceiving dimension in the TT. Beyond the meaning 'pleasant smell,' *scent* also refers to a trail followed by animals, and the collocation *catch a scent* evokes pursuit or tracking, a nuance absent in the Polish *zapach*, which typically collocates with verbs like *czuć* 'to smell,' *wąchać* 'to sniff,' or *wyczuć* 'to sense,' but not with equivalents of *catch* or *pick up*. Thus, while both texts rely on the same underlying metaphor, they differ in how they frame the participants' roles. Despite these shifts in world-conceiving, the speaker's cultural mindset, personal world, and perspective remain largely unchanged in the TT.
Thus, in both the ST and TT, the same conceptual metaphor links the domains of SMELL and MONEY, because money is conceived as an attractant, comparable to a desirable scent. This metaphor reflects a shared system of beliefs (cultural mindset): money, or the prospect of obtaining it, exerts a strong appeal and is perceived as an effective means of resolving problems or conflicts. Likewise, both the ST and TT encode the speaker's stance (a dimension of the personal world). Although the money-as-smell metaphor is present in both Polish and English, the specific ST expression *zapach petrodolarów uderza w nozdrza* is relatively uncommon. The phrase *zapach uderza* (*w nozdrza*) is absent from dictionaries and occurs infrequently in the NJKP corpus, mainly in non-metaphorical contexts. The phrase *zapach pieniędzy uderza* (*w nozdrza*) [lit. the smell of money hits/strikes (the nostrils)] does not appear at all, which suggests that the ST expression is deliberately innovative. As such, it signals the speaker's clearly critical (or even derisive) attitude towards the foreign companies and Sudanese parties for whom financial gain appears to be the primary incentive for resolving the Sudanese conflict. The TT expression *have caught the scent of petrodollars* is likewise unconventional. Corpus searches show no occurrences of *catch the scent of money* in either the British National Corpus (BNC) (Davis) or Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) (Davis), while *smell of money* appears only sporadically. The rarity of this phrase indicates that it, too, functions as a deliberate metaphor with rhetorical significance. Like the ST expression, it conveys the speaker's critical stance and, through its animal-tracking imagery, strengthens emotional intensity. The implicit analogy between profit-seeking agents and hunting animals further emphasises the speaker's emotional engagement, marking the dimension of perspective.
Overall, the emergent worldviews in both the ST and TT are closely comparable in the dimensions of cultural mindset, personal worldview, and perspective. In each case, the

metaphor reflects the speaker's critical stance and involvement as an emotionally engaged observer rather than a neutral commentator.

Let us now consider the next example:

(3)

ST and TT metaphors: SOLVING A PROBLEM IS UNTYING A COMPLEX KNOT

ST: Dziękuję bardzo za tę debatę, bo wierzę, że pomoże mi ona *rozsupłać gordyjski węzeł zawiązany 28 listopada 2008 r.*

TT: I would like to thank you for this debate, because I am sure it will help me *release the Gordian knot tied on 28 November 2008*.

(Debate: "Food for Free" programme, Strasbourg, 28 September 2011)

In example (3), the GORDIAN KNOT metaphor appears in both the ST and TT. This conventional metaphor, common to Polish and English, originates from the ancient legend of Alexander the Great, who cut through the intricate knot tied by Gordius. According to the legend, whoever untied the knot would rule Asia. Alexander's decisive act fulfilled this prophecy, symbolising a bold and unconventional solution to an intractable problem (Worthington 87–88).

In both languages, the expressions *przeciąć węzeł gordyjski* and *cut the Gordian knot* conventionally denote the resolution of a complex issue through radical action (cf. USJP; OED). However, neither text employs these standard forms. The Polish speaker, instead, uses *rozsupłać gordyjski węzeł* [lit. unknot the Gordian knot] to emphasise the intricacy of the "Food for Free" debate, while the TT renders this as *release the Gordian knot*. Thus, the conventional verbs *przeciąć* in Polish and *cut* in English are replaced by *rozsupłać* [unknot] in the ST and *release* in the TT. The lexical shift from *rozsupłać* to *release* subtly differentiates the world-conceiving dimension of the speaker's worldview in the ST and TT.

In its literal sense, the ST verb *rozsupłać* denotes manually unknotting or untangling something, evoking notions of patience, time, and dexterity, qualities necessary for such a meticulous task. By contrast, the TT verb *release* carries meanings such as 'set free' or 'allow to move or act freely' (OED), which evoke ideas of liberation, reduced tension, and restored movement. Consequently, the ST metaphor *rozsupłać gordyjski węzeł* suggests a gradual, careful process requiring perseverance, whereas *release the Gordian knot* implies swift, possibly radical action leading to relief and freedom. This divergence in world conception extends to other dimensions of worldview, particularly the personal world and perspective.

The Polish expression *rozsupłać gordyjski węzeł* is a conventional collocation, unlike its TT equivalent. Although *rozsupłać* is absent from the USJP, the WSJP lists it among typical verbs that collocate with *węzeł gordyjski*, such as *przeciąć* 'cut,' *rozciąć* 'slit,' *rozplątać* 'untangle,' and *rozwiązać* 'untie.' Consequently, the ST phrase is less suggestive of the speaker's personal stance than the TT *release the Gordian knot*. The latter is not a conventional English collocation; corpus searches (BNC, COCA) confirm its absence, with *cut* and *untie the Gordian knot* being the established forms. The TT, therefore, constitutes deliberately unconventional usage that foregrounds the speaker's stance (personal world). By using the term *release*, the translator implicitly frames the resolution of the food aid issue as an act of liberation, freeing the European Parliament from political deadlock and enabling further progress. This creative lexical choice positions the speaker (or translator?) as an engaged observer (perspective), underscoring the urgency of resolving the matter. The ST metaphor, however, may also be interpreted as a deliberate choice in light of its immediate linguistic context: *rozsupłać gordyjski węzeł* is followed by *zawiązany 28 listopada 2008 r.* [tied on 28 November 2008], which explicitly evokes the knot-tying scenario. Thus, the metaphor can be seen as indicative of the speaker's stance and emotional engagement. Nevertheless, while the ST does convey aspects of the speaker's personal world and perspective, these are less pronounced due to the high conventionality of the phrase *rozsupłać gordyjski węzeł*. In contrast, the TT's nonstandard

release the Gordian knot, reinforced by the same contextual reference to the knot-tying scenario, renders these worldview dimensions more salient.

Let us discuss example (4):

(4)

ST and TT metaphors: (HANDLING POLITICAL RELATIONS) GENTLY IS (HANDLING POLITICAL RELATIONS) IN GLOVES

ST: jak delikatnie *w aksamitnych rękawiczkach dbamy* o dobre stosunki z Chińczykami

TT: and *wearing kid gloves* as *we tactfully nurture* our good relations with China

(Debate: Tibet, in particular self-immolation by nuns and monks, Strasbourg, 27 October 2011)

Example (4) comes from a debate on human rights violations in Tibet. The speaker urges the EU Parliament to vote on a resolution condemning the Chinese government's severe restrictions on Tibetan Buddhist monasteries. The metaphorical expression *w aksamitnych rękawiczkach* [in velvet gloves] describes the EU's delicate and conciliatory approach to its relations with China, which contrasts sharply with China's treatment of Tibetans. In the TT, this phrase is translated as *wearing kid gloves*. In both the ST and TT, an analogy is drawn between the domain of international diplomacy and the wearing of gloves (world-perceiving); the delicate handling of relations is conceived as wearing gloves made of a specific material (world-conceiving). The world-perceiving and world-conceiving dimensions in both texts remain broadly comparable; however, the substitution of *velvet* with *kid* in the TT introduces a subtle semantic variation. While this shift may appear minor, it nonetheless marks a nuanced difference in the world-conceiving dimension of the speaker's worldview. Let us look at it in more detail.

The ST expression *w aksamitnych rękawiczkach* [in velvet gloves] is a fixed phrase meaning 'discreetly and diplomatically' (WSJP). It is a less common variant of *w białych rękawiczkach* [in white gloves], alongside rarer forms of *w jedwabnych rękawiczkach* [in silk gloves] and *w rękawiczkach* [in gloves]. In the TT, it is rendered as *wearing kid gloves*. The English phrase *with kid gloves* is conventionally understood as 'in a gentle, delicate or gingerly manner' (OED), a meaning broadly corresponding to that of the ST phrase. However, when the source-domain referents are considered independently, the two expressions trigger distinct associations. *Aksamitny* connotes softness and refinement, while *kid* (as in *kid leather*) implies delicacy and thinness. Corpus evidence (NKJP) suggests that *w białych/aksamitnych rękawiczkach* often co-occurs with verbs such as *robić* 'to do' and *działać* 'to act,' frequently describing discreet or diplomatic actions that may conceal morally ambiguous intentions. Consequently, the ST expression implies that the EU manages its relations with China both gently and tactfully, yet also with a degree of calculated craftiness.

Historical data further supports this subtle distinction. Kid gloves were originally used as aristocratic accessories, symbolised refinement and social privilege, and later came to be used to handle delicate objects, hence their association with servants' gloves. When the expression entered American English, it lost its class-bound associations and developed its modern metaphorical sense of 'gentle, careful treatment.' Early figurative uses extended to contexts of timidity or excessive tact ("kid-glove"). Thus, while both the ST and TT metaphors draw on the conceptual domain of delicate handling, the Polish phrase retains a note of calculated diplomacy; the English expression foregrounds caution and care.

Despite this subtle difference in world-perceiving, both the ST and TT encode a similar cultural mindset, personal worldview, and perspective. The shared underlying belief is that tactfulness and diplomacy are valued in politics, and radical measures in international relations are less desirable or effective. In the ST, *w aksamitnych rękawiczkach* is paired with the verb *dbać* 'to take care of,' a deliberate metaphorical usage that starkly contrasts EU caution towards China with China's forceful handling of Tibet, implying that stronger measures might be warranted.

Similarly, in the TT, *wearing kid gloves* occurs with *nurture*, modified by *tactfully*, forming a non-conventional metaphor that signals critical irony: the EU's cautious approach is inadequate compared with the urgency of supporting Tibetan resistance. These critical undertones and irony signal the speaker's stance (personal world), and are equally manifest in the ST and TT. Likewise, both the ST and TT encode the perspective of an engaged observer, using ostensibly positive evaluative terms, such as *dbać* 'to take care,' *delikatnie* 'delicately,' and *dobre* 'good' in the ST, and *nurture, tactfully, and good* in the TT, which create irony and convey emotional engagement.

Another example, no. (5), illustrates how stylistic divergence produces a shift in worldview.

(5)

ST and TT metaphors: POLITICAL CORRECTNESS IS A PERSON (WHO IS NOT IN FAVOUR OF CONSERVATIVE VIEWS/HAS LIBERAL VIEWS)

ST: *Europejska poprawność polityczna nie potrafi zdzierżyć*, że jest taki kraj, w którym triumfuje konserwatyzm,

TT: *European political correctness cannot bear* the fact that there is a country in which conservatism is triumphing,

(Debate: Revised Hungarian Constitution, Strasbourg, 8 June 2011)

Similar to (4), example (5) illustrates a lexical shift that nuances the ST and TT worldviews, though here the divergence is more pronounced. The speaker's metaphorical use of the stylistically marked Polish verb *zdzierżyć* 'to bear/stand/tolerate' is rendered in the TT with the verb *bear*, producing subtle but meaningful distinctions in respective worldviews.

According to USJP, *zdzierżyć* is an obsolete verb, typically appearing in negative clauses, denoting 'to resist, defy, withstand, persevere or endure.' The ST targets MEPs who criticise the revised 2011 Hungarian Constitution for failing to comply with EU law and fundamental human rights. The speaker's stance (personal world), aligned with conservative values, is foregrounded through this deliberate use of stylistically marked metaphorical expression, which personifies political correctness as incapable of tolerating such values. The choice of the verb *bear* in the TT attenuates the original's rhetorical and stylistic force. Consequently, while the ST foregrounds the speaker's personal world and engaged perspective, these dimensions are muted in the TT, resulting in a less distinct projection of the speaker's worldview in translation.

The last example, no (6), has been qualified as indeterminate.

(6)

ST and TT metaphors: THE EU IS A PATIENT (WHO HAS UNDERGONE AN OPERATION)

ST: Ubiegłej nocy *Europa przeszła ciężką „operację na otwartym sercu". Były bardzo trudne chwile, wątpiono nawet w powodzenie operacji. Ale dzisiaj pacjentka czuje się – jak na stan pooperacyjny – dobrze. Jeśli nie będzie powikłań, wyzdrowieje*, czego jej z całego serca życzę. „*Terapia szokowa*" zmusiła państwa członkowskie do konkretnych decyzji. (…) Przewodniczący Rady Europejskiej Herman Van Rompuy ma ambicje *wprowadzenia Grecji na „ścieżkę zdrowia"*, tak by do 2020 r. *odchudziła* swój dług publiczny do poziomu 120% (z obecnych 162%).

TT: Last night, *Europe underwent major 'open heart surgery'. There were some very difficult moments, and even doubts as to the outcome of the operation. However, today the patient feels well, or as well as possible following an operation. If there are no complications it will recover*, which is what I wholeheartedly wish. *'Shock therapy'* urged the Member States to take concrete decisions. (…) The President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, intends *to steer Greece to 'the road to health'*, so that by 2020 it can *reduce* its national debt to the level of 120% (as opposed to the current level of 162%).

(Debate: Conclusions of the European Council meeting (23 October 2011), Strasbourg, 27 October 2011)

In example (6), an extended metaphor is deliberately used for rhetorical purposes. The ST metaphorical patterns, based on the PATIENT metaphor, are transferred to the TT. The conceptualisation of an institution as a patient is evident in both the ST and TT, which may suggest, at first glance, that they share a similar worldview. However, a closer analysis reveals that the extent of the ST worldview's reconstruction in the TT is indeterminate.

In (6), the speaker refers to the European Council meeting of 23 October 2011, when European leaders made critical decisions to stabilise the euro zone against the backdrop of the debt crisis. Measures included writing off 100 billion euros of Greek debt and recapitalising banks to ensure fiscal sustainability, support economic growth, and bolster the banking sector. In the ST, these interventions are conceptualised metaphorically as medical treatment, specifically open-heart surgery: *Europa przeszła ciężką operację na otwartym sercu* [lit. Europe has undergone a hard operation on the open heart]. This metaphor runs throughout the speech: the EU is described as a recovering patient, negotiations as shock therapy, and Greece's debt reduction as a fitness programme.

In the TT, the extended PATIENT metaphor is preserved: Europe undergoes open-heart surgery, recovers if no complications arise, receives shock therapy, and Greece is steered towards the road to health to reduce its debt. While the ST and TT worldviews initially appear similar, subtle differences, particularly between *wprowadzenie Grecji na ścieżkę zdrowia* and its TT equivalent *to steer Greece to the road to health*, raise questions about the reconstruction of the speaker's worldview in the TT, explained as follows.

The ST phrase *ścieżka zdrowia* literally means 'an outdoor trail for running, open to the public, usually in a park, with equipment for exercise to maintain physical fitness' (USJP). Comparable English terms, such as *fitness trail, trim trail,* or *parcourse*, are not used in the TT. The TT metaphorical equivalent *road to health* overlaps with the ST phrase in conveying a process aimed at improving one's fitness or recovery after an illness, but invokes broader associations beyond physical exercise, potentially including diet, sleep, rest, and medical care. Unlike the ST, which implies a single, specific activity, the TT metaphor may suggest a wider range of health-promoting measures.

The overall messages of the ST and TT are closely aligned. However, these nuanced differences make it difficult to assess the similarity of their worldviews, particularly at the foundational levels of world-perceiving and world-conceiving. Whereas the ST evokes a concrete scenario – performing physical exercise on a designed trail – the TT metaphor may elicit a more general image of health-promoting actions, leaving the precise reconstruction of the ST worldview in the TT indeterminate.

Conclusion

60% of the ST metaphors identified in the corpus as deliberately used are rendered in the TT with a similar metaphor. This strategy would be expected to reconstruct the speaker's world-perceiving and world-conceiving dimensions in translation. However, the analysis also demonstrates that such formal similarity does not guarantee the reconstruction of all dimensions of the speaker's worldview in the TT. Instead, the degree of similarity between emergent ST and TT worldviews forms a continuum. At one end, certain cases exhibit a reconstruction of all worldview dimensions in the TT (example 1). Other cases show minor, potentially communicatively insignificant modifications to these dimensions (examples 2–5), while in others the overall shape of the emergent TT worldview remains difficult to define, despite the metaphorical pattern being imported from the ST (example 6). The six examples thus illustrate that although similar metaphors generally yield broadly comparable worldviews in the ST and TT, such similarity varies in scope: grammatical shifts may introduce subtle nuances that affect only the fundamental dimensions of world-perceiving and world-conceiving (example 2);

lexical shifts may alter these fundamental dimensions and, in turn, influence the speaker's personal world and perspective (example 3); other lexical shifts may affect only the fundamental dimensions (example 4) or only the personal dimensions (example 5). Finally, certain cases resist clear interpretation even when the ST metaphorical pattern is preserved almost verbatim in the TT (example 6).

Thus, the analysis demonstrates that the presence of a similar metaphor in the TT does not in itself ensure the full reconstruction of the speaker's worldview. This is so because the linguistic realisations of the metaphorical mapping in the ST and TT may diverge significantly. These divergences include differences in the degree of conventionality, stylistic markedness (e.g. formal, informal, literary, or archaic uses), and culturally specific connotations. A speaker's metaphorical choice (conventional or unconventional, stylistically marked or neutral, emotionally charged, or associated with positive or negative values) not only evokes particular images or scenarios that reflect particular ways of perceiving and conceptualising the world, but also indexes their individual stance and perspective. Such choices further signal the speaker's cultural mindset, revealing the beliefs and values that shape their linguistic behaviour. Consequently, even when the ST and TT metaphors activate broadly similar conceptual images or scenarios, they may nonetheless be associated with different beliefs and values, approached with distinct attitudes, or viewed from divergent perspectives. Unless the TT metaphor aligns closely with the ST expression not only in its underlying image or scenario but also in its degree of conventionality, stylistic profile, and evaluative load, the reconstruction of the ST worldview cannot be considered complete. As widely noted in prior research (cf. e.g. Schleiermacher or Jakobson), achieving such full congruence is virtually impossible; hence, the translation of a speaker's worldview is, following Whorf, a matter of calibration rather than exact reproduction. Also, reconstructing the ST worldview in translation necessarily involves the minds of at least three speaking subjects: the speaker, the translator, and the TT recipient. On this basis, it has been assumed that the TT encodes neither the Polish speaker's worldview nor the target recipient's. Rather, it constitutes a hybrid formation in which elements of both the speaker's and the target recipient's worldviews, mediated through the translator's own knowledge and experience, are reflected in the TT. The translation shifts identified in the analysis provide compelling evidence that the translator adapts the ST's metaphorical patterns to those available in the target language. This process may be understood as accommodating the speaker's worldview to the worldview embedded in the target-language patterns familiar to TT recipients. When analogous patterns exist in both languages, reconstruction of the speaker's worldview in the TT is largely achievable (see example 1). As the analysis demonstrates, however, even closely corresponding target-language patterns often exhibit subtle differences that ultimately give rise to a nuanced TT worldview.

It may be argued that the translator's principal concern is the intelligibility of the TT, which is secured by reconstructing the fundamental dimensions of world-perceiving and world-conceiving that are accessible to TT recipients, that is, encoded in the target language itself. This necessarily entails a shift towards the target recipient's conceptual patterns, which may or may not facilitate the reconstruction of other dimensions of the speaker's worldview. While such "distortions" in the world-perceiving and world-conceiving dimensions do not compromise TT intelligibility, they may affect the ST's originally intended rhetorical or affective impact. The speaker's stance and perspective may become attenuated (example 5) or, conversely, more pronounced in the TT (example 3).

Another conclusion can be drawn concerning Underhill's five-dimensional model of worldview. The model enables the integration of dynamic aspects of a speaker's linguistic behaviour by treating the dimensions of personal world, perspective, and cultural mindset as integral components of worldview. Personal world and perspective typically "surface" through creative, affective, or evaluative language use and are often central to the speaker's

communicative intent. They select particular metaphors to project these dimensions, thereby shaping how an issue is depicted. The dimension of cultural mindset, by contrast, may be less immediately visible; nevertheless, the choice of metaphor is invariably influenced by the speaker's value system and beliefs. Underhill's model, by distinguishing these dimensions of worldview, provides a systematic framework for identifying divergences between the worldviews emerging from the ST and TT metaphors, and for articulating what aspects of worldview are reconstructed in translation. Although these dimensions constitute a complex, interconnected whole, distinguishing them for analysis is methodologically justified. Admittedly, the model's complexity presents certain challenges, and refinement is possible. Nonetheless, it remains sufficiently flexible to be applied, and where necessary modified or adjusted, to studies of worldview reconstruction in other language pairs and across diverse written and spoken genres beyond the EU parliamentary debate. It would be interesting to see how a similar study would unfold if conducted among Dutch-, French-, or German-speaking MEPs. How are their worldviews reconstructed in translation into English or other languages? Such comparative studies would further advance research on worldview in translation, potentially corroborating or refuting claims put forward here.

Bibliography

Agar, Michael. "The Intercultural Frame." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1994, p. 221-237.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. 2009. Translated by Adam Głaz, edited by Jörg Zinken, Equinox, 2012.

Bolinger, Dwight. *Language – The Loaded Weapon. The Use and Abuse of Language Today*. Longman, 1980.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bynon, Theodora. "Leo Weisgerber's Four Stages in Linguistic Analysis." *Man 1*, 1966, p. 468-483.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Politicians and Rhetoric. The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Davis, Mark. *British National Corpus (BNC)* (from Oxford University Press), 2004, www.english-corpora.org/bnc.

Davis, Mark. *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA).* Brigham Young University, 2008-, www.english-corpora.org/coca.

Gicala, Agnieszka. *Translating a Worldview: Linguistic Worldview in Literary Translation*. Peter Lang, 2021.

Głaz, Adam. *Extended Vantage Theory in Linguistic Application. The Case of the English Articles*. Wydawnictwo UMCS, 2012.

Głaz, Adam. "Koncepcja etnolingwistyki według Jamesa Underhilla." *Etnolingwistyka 26*, 2014, p. 141-154.

Głaz, Adam. *Linguistic Worldview(s): Approaches and Applications*. Routledge, 2022.

Głaz, Adam, David S. Danaher, and Przemysław Łozowski, editors. *The Linguistic Worldview: Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture.* Versita, 2013.

Hart, Christopher. *Language, Image, Gesture. The Cognitive Semiotics of Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2025.

Haynes, John. *Introducing Stylistics.* Hyman, 1989.

Jakobson, Roman. “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation.” 1959. *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, p. 113-118.

“Kid-glove.” Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/kid-glove. Accessed 23 November 2025.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara. “Re-conceptualisation and the Emergence of Discourse Meaning as a Theory of Translation.” *Meaning in Translation*, edited by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Marcel Thelen, Peter Lang, 2010, p. 105-147.

Munday, Jeremy. *Style and Ideology in Translation*. Routledge, 2008.

Munday, Jeremy. *Evaluation in Translation. Critical Points of Translator Decision-Making*. Routledge, 2012.

Musolff, Andreas. *Metaphor and Political Discourse. Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

NKJP. *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego* [The National Corpus of Polish], nkjp.pl.

OED. *Oxford English Dictionary*, www.oed.com.

Pieciul-Karmińska, Eliza. *Językowy obraz Boga i świata. O przekładzie teologii niemieckiej na język polski*. Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2007.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. “On the Different Methods of Translating.” 1813. *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*, edited by Douglas Robinson, Routledge, 2015, p. 225-238.

Steen, Gerard. “When is Metaphor Deliberate?” *Selected Papers from the Stockholm 2008 Metaphor Festival*, edited by Nils-Lennart Johannesson and David Minugh. University of Stockholm, 2013, p. 47-63.

Thompson, Geoff, and Susan Hunston. “Evaluation: An Introduction.” *Evaluation in Text. Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, edited by Susan Hunston and Geoff Thompson, Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 1-26.

Underhill, James. *Humboldt, Worldview and Language*. Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Underhill, James. *Creating Worldviews. Metaphor, Ideology and Language*. Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Underhill, James W., and Mariarosaria Gianninoto. *Migrating Meanings. Sharing Keywords in a Global World*. Edinburgh University Press, 2019.

USJP. *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* [Universal Dictionary of Polish], usjp.pwn.pl.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. *Language, Thought, and Reality. Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, edited by John B. Carroll, The MIT Press, 1956.

Wiraszka, Łukasz. *Kategoria punktu widzenia w przekładzie ustnym z perspektywy językoznawstwa kognitywnego*. Universitas, 2015.

Wolf, Hans-Georg, and Frank Polzenhagen. “Conceptual Metaphor as Ideological Stylistic Means: An Exemplary Analysis.” *Cognitive Models in Language and Thought. Ideology, Metaphors and Meanings*, edited by René Dirven, Roslyn Frank, and Martin Pütz, De Gruyter Mouton, 2003, p. 247-275.

Worthington, Ian. *Alexander the Great. Man and God.* 2004. Routledge, 2014.

WSJP. *Wielki słownik języka polskiego* [Great Dictionary of Polish], wsjp.pl.

Wyrwa, Anna. *Linguistic Worldviews in Translation: Personal and Ideological Dimensions of EU Parliamentary Debate*. 2022. UMCS, Lublin, Poland. Ph.D.

Wyrwa, Anna. “Traces of Speaker’s Worldview in Translations of EU Parliamentary Debate.” *Languages – Cultures – Worldviews. Focus on Translation*, edited by Adam Głaz, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, p. 293-318.

Anna Wyrwa

Anna Wyrwa (anna.wyrwa@uken.krakow.pl) is affiliated with the University of the National Education Commission (UKEN) in Kraków, Poland. She researches in linguistic worldview, metaphor, and meaning (re)construction in translation. Her academic background is in linguistics, in particular cognitive linguistics, and translation studies. Apart from working as an academic teacher, running courses in linguistics and translation studies, she works as a freelance translator in linguistics as well as in other fields, including biographical books, tourist guides, and technical texts. She has published articles on linguistic worldview, metaphor, translation strategies, and Polish-English contrastive grammar.

Anna Wyrwa (anna.wyrwa@uken.krakow.pl) est affiliée à l’Université de la Commission nationale de l’éducation (UKEN) de Cracovie, en Pologne. Ses recherches portent sur la vision linguistique du monde, la métaphore et la (re)construction du sens en traduction. Sa formation universitaire est en linguistique, plus particulièrement en linguistique cognitive, et en traductologie. Outre son poste d’enseignante, où elle dispense des cours de linguistique et de traductologie, elle travaille comme traductrice indépendante. Elle a traduit des travaux en linguistique ainsi que des textes dans d’autres domaines, notamment des biographies, des guides touristiques et des ouvrages techniques. Elle a publié des articles sur la vision linguistique du monde, la métaphore, les stratégies de traduction et la grammaire contrastive polonais-anglais.