

TRANSLATION AT THE CROSSROAD OF RHETORICAL TROPE: TRANSLATING METAPHOR IN THE LIGHT OF RELEVANCE THEORY

SAMUEL BABATUNDE MORUWAWON

Samuel Babatunde Moruwawon, PhD, associate professor,
Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti, Nigeria, West Africa,
email: babatunde.moruwawon@eksu.edu.ng

Samuel Babatunde Moruwawon holds the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Translation Studies from the University of Ibadan and teaches undergraduate and postgraduate courses in translation studies at Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti, Nigeria. He is the author of several papers, among them "Challenges and Opportunities of French Studies in a Post-colonial African State: Nigeria", published in "Talking about Learning", South East European University Language Center, Journal for Teaching and Learning, vol. 1, Issue 2, Tetovo, Republic of Macedonia. His scholarly works have also been published in "The Logos Foreign Language Center", University of Pitesti, Romania; "Michigan Sociological Review", Grand Valley State University, USA; "Concordia Discors vs Discordia Concors", published by Stefan cel Mare University Press, Suceava, Romania; "R-Evolutionary", University of West Indies at St. Augustin; "Language and Translation Research Institute", Sejong University, Seoul, Korea, Worcester State University, USA, University of Liberal Arts, Bangladesh and in other edited collections. Dr. Moruwawon works on complex connections between language, literature, culture and translation. He specializes in the theory and practice of translation, intercultural education, pedagogy in higher education and teacher training.

ABSTRACT

This present study discusses the translation of metaphor as a stylistic element in the light of Relevance theory. The data of the study consists of three assorted metaphors that have been used in French and their English translations. These texts have been taken from some published (Achebe "Things Fall Apart" (1958)) and unpublished literary material. The study focuses on the identification and analysis, from the perspective of relevance theory, of the metaphorical expressions used in the texts and explains the translation procedures resorted to by the translators in dealing with such expression. The study also adopts the operational framework of metaphor translation procedures based on the Source Text and Target Text approach developed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) and Showqi (2014). Although no single theory of translation is able to analyse the phenomenon of metaphor in translation, the article relies on Relevance theory in order to develop a view on the translatability of metaphors in literary texts. The metaphors analysed in this study reveal the thinking pattern of people in the society. It equally provides a step in the right direction to understanding the phenomenon of metaphor translation in the light of relevance theory. We do not propose that our theory is the only answer to all the challenges of translation. Despite the usefulness of the theory, the translator's competence and knowledge are equally necessary to faithfully render metaphorical expressions from one language into another.

Keywords: Relevance theory, metaphor, translation, faithfulness, context

INTRODUCTION

A metaphor is regarded as a rhetorical device. It makes comparison between two dissimilar elements but this comparison is implied rather than stated. It is a condensed simile. Generally, a metaphor describes one thing in terms of another. The contemporary study of the metaphor from the point of view of cognitive linguistics, considers human thought processes as largely metaphorical and that the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff, Johnson 1980, 3). A metaphor demonstrates a resemblance between two similar things: the image and the object, defined by cognitive linguistics as the target domain and the source domain respectively. The constraint that limits the production of a metaphor is that there must be a similarity between the two entities compared. If the two entities are not similar in some aspect, we cannot metaphorically use one to talk about the other (Lakoff, Johnson 1980, 12).

From a pragmatic point of view, metaphor has to do with conceptualising and understanding our surroundings. Since metaphoring is an attempt to conceptualize our world through wording, fundamentally, basic awareness of the structure of our environment is required to be able to properly represent it. The making of a metaphor is a pragmatic process that engages the mind and sets it in motion to draw from the resources of the environment to paint the picture of a phenomenon. When these social realities manifest themselves in metaphorical forms, the study of such forms requires a pragmatic approach which would help to unearth them for better understanding. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 3) affirm that metaphors structure the actions that we perform. The conceptual approach to metaphors presupposes that the conceptual system is provisionally restructured for the occasion and a new adhoc category is created.

The notion of a metaphor as a conceptual structure is a particularly valuable linguistic theory of metaphor, because it suggests a difference between having a metaphorical mapping of two disparate domains already existing as a unit in one's conceptual system and the mental act of putting together that same metaphor for the first time (Omotosho 2014, 108). From the above discussion, we can deduce that the notion of a metaphor gives us a systematic means of structuring conceptual domains by means of metaphor which can be used profitably for the analysis of both literary and non-literary discourse. Metaphorical concepts constitute a new way of thinking; they have the power to create a new reality that is meant to re-order the conceptual system (Omotosho 2014, 108). Metaphor

is culture-bound. The metaphor an author uses depicts the life experience and culture. It is not uncommon that speakers of one language find it difficult to understand the metaphors of another language. This is one of the problems of metaphor translation. Metaphor transforms the truth of an experience as the truth of knowledge to an established public world. Hence, those who do not live in the same established community usually have a different experience that results in a different conceptual understanding of the meaning of such metaphors. In view of these problems, the translator does not render the source text metaphor word because he probably realises that the most important information should be rendered in a way so as to make the target reader understand the meaning of this metaphor without too much processing efforts by mobilising the different translation strategies to render the metaphor functionally.

METAPHOR, CONTEXT AND MEANING IN LITERARY TEXT

There are different views on the place of context in meaning relations. This is why some linguists consciously or unconsciously exclude it. It is argued that the meaning of a sentence being ambiguous or anomalous can be ascertained without the knowledge of its context (Esimaje 2003, 233). All those who speak a language must know the meaning of a sentence before they use it in any meaningful context. Ogden and Richard (1949, 11) affirm that knowing that two sentences are similar in meaning means that they can be used in similar contexts and that in setting up abstract relationships between sentences without considering what they refer to, is like describing all the equivalencies in a measuring system without indicating what that system really is. Stating meaning equivalences is not stating meaning, and in fact there is no proof that knowing the meaning of a sentence excludes the context in which it is used (Ogden and Richard 1949, 11). The significance of context in meaning relation has been established in some works and differentiated from linguistic context, as context of situation. These works are credited to Malinowski (1923, 301) and Firth (1957, 11) both of whom were concerned with stating meaning in terms of the context in which language is used, even though in different ways. Malinowski (1923, 301) argues that living languages must not be treated as dead ones, torn from their context of situation but seen as used by people. Language as used in books is not at all the norm, it represents a far-fetched derivative function of language, for language of human experience which is

perceptual, biological and cultural and varies from one culture to another.

A metaphor is the difference between the intended and the stated meaning and the receiver of the message must rely on a set of principles to understand the statement. If, for example, at a funeral when someone says "she kicked the bucket" this is a reference to the person in the casket. But if while milking a cow, a person says "she kicked the bucket", the phrase will be understood differently (Freeda 2009, 23). The difference in comprehension exists in factors external to the utterance itself. This is what Grice (1989, 370) refers to as cooperative principle, which relies on speaker-listener cooperation in order to bridge or at least reduce the gap between the semantic meaning and contextual meaning. Sperber and Wilson describe the functioning of the cooperative principle thus: "When an utterance has several linguistically possible interpretations, the best hypothesis for the hearer to choose is the one that best satisfies the cooperative principle and maxims. Sometimes, in order to explain why a maxim has been (genuinely or apparently) violated, the hearer has to assume that the speaker believes and was trying to communicate more than explicitly said. Such implicitly communicated propositions or implicatures are widely seen along with presupposition's illocutionary force as the main subject matter of pragmatics" (Sperber and Wilson 1986, 471).

The above suggests that metaphor translation is context dependent. This accounts for the difficulty in the translation of metaphor. According to Barthes (1972, 11), to interpret a text is not to give it a more or less free meaning, but on the contrary, to appreciate what plural constitutes it. This is seen in the following examples: "Love is a journey.", "Time is money.", "Argument is war!", and "Eagles do not breed doves." among others. These texts are galaxies of signifiers that can be reversible.

Firth (1957, 11) sees the context of situation in the same light as grammar, as a means of linguistic description whose purpose was a statement of meaning, as one way through which a linguist handles a language. Sperber and Wilson (1986, 15) affirm that the context of an utterance is the set of premises used in interpreting an utterance. The context, therefore, is a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world. It is these assumptions, rather than the actual state of the world, that affect the interpretation of an utterance. Gutt (2001, 27) makes it clear that the context does not refer to some part of the external environment of the communication partners, be it the text preceding or following an utterance, situational circumstances or cultural factors, it rather refers to part of their

assumption about the world or cognitive environment. The cognitive environment of a person comprises a potentially huge amount of varied information. It includes information that can be perceived in the physical environment, including information derived from the preceding utterance and that of any cultural knowledge stored there as well as information that can be inferred from these two sources (Gutt 2001, 27).

Context is similar to schemata theory in which a person will understand the world based on how he views the world in schemas. Context forms the schemata of the translator's vision of his world and this context is not a complex one, hence it would be of little use to him. Because context plays such an indispensable role in inter-language communication, it is vital to set up a proper context to facilitate functional inter-language communication. As translation is a communication involving two languages and cultures, the identification of textual context is absolutely the first step to a faithful translation interpretation of a stylistic element such as metaphor in any literary text. For the convenience of the target reader, the translation of a metaphor as a stylistic innovation should provide the optimal relevance.

THE RELEVANCE THEORY

The Relevance theory involves verbal communication not only when encoding, transferring and decoding, but also crucially involves inference (Gutt 2001, 41). The basis of inference is our understanding of the world we live in, our cognitive interpretation of the universe. Man's universe can be described in terms of space, physical and psychological dimensions. When engaged in any form of communication, this knowledge of his surroundings will be activated and used as the means of interpreting the message of a discourse, whether oral or verbal. Thus, relevance theory highlights the contribution of context, the relationship between context and discourse as well as the interconnection of discourse. Relevance theory expounds the relevant principle in a convincing way from the perspective of human cognition, advocating that man has relevant cognisance in communication. The act of communication is relevance (Wu, Xuxihua 2008, 3). Such relevance leads the translator to effect functional inter-language inferences from the information in the source text in order to properly understand the sense of the original author of the text. The level of relevance relies so heavily on both the contextual and interpretative competence of the translator. The relevance of a text depends on the objective, the social function and the style and rhetoric

flavour of the writer. Generally speaking, literary works whose objective is to entertain are usually rich in content and implication, thus, the relevance is subtle, leaving the reader a lot of room for imagination and inference. This is why literary works are much more complex to render than scientific texts.

In contrast, pragmatic texts, which aim at conveying information with comparatively explicit message, tend to provide clear relevance to avoid misleading the target reader. As a result it is not very difficult for the target reader to understand the meaning of the target text. As a general rule, it is however, necessary to provide the optional relevance for the reader regardless of the function and style of the text to facilitate the reader's comprehension (Fang 2004, 30). We should note however, that literary texts that aim at entertaining are usually rich in content and implications, thus, usually the context gives the translator the opportunity for imagination and inferences. This is why fictional text is very difficult to translate. Context plays a powerful role in the translation of a metaphor. The notion of context entails that translation is being looked at as a part of communication (Gutt 2001, 22). The success of any inter-language communication depends on whether or not the author's intentions and the target reader's expectations are met. The translator is under obligation to coordinate his intentions with the target reader's expectations so that the product of his translation resembles the original text in terms of style and sense. If we ask how the translation should be expressed, the answer is: it should be expressed in such a manner that it yields the intended meaning without putting the target reader into unnecessary processing effort (Gutt 2001, 101).

PRESUPPOSITION OF THE STUDY

In the present study, which explores the translations of metaphor discourse, the target context is especially important for a proper understanding of the metaphorical expressions in the texts. The reason is that when translating metaphors in texts, normally the translators will consider the target reader's reaction within their specific context and in this regard, we will consider context as the source of presuppositions. Similar illustrations regarding the relationship between presupposition and context can be found in Givon (1989, 135–137), where presupposed information is traced back to the major subdivisions of context. The major subdivisions of context are open-ended; however, three foci under which specific categories get grouped are "highly stable and well attested in the traditional linguistic

literature" (Givon 1989, 137). First, the generic focus covers the shared world and culture, and refers to something universal to a great degree and remains the same across different cultures (Cui and Wang 2010, 57). It comprises, on the one hand, knowledge and beliefs concerning the real world, and on the other hand, people's ways and capacities to make sense of the world. The second covers what can be known about the speech situation, social personal relations between participants including their respective conditions such as status, power, obligations, needs and expectations and goals of communication (Cui and Wang 2010, 57). In this study, we will explore the presuppositions behind the ways of handling metaphors in texts with reference to contextual consideration.

ANALYSIS OF METAPHOR USING THE RELEVANCE THEORY

This section is analytical and takes as its starting point several source language French texts and their English translations. The study focuses on the identification and analysis of metaphorical expressions used in these texts from the perspective of relevance theory. Let us consider the following texts:

Text A

"Things fall Apart" by Achebe (1958)

Le monde s'effondre. (1966).

In Text A, Achebe derived the title of his novel "Things Fall Apart" from the poem, "The Second Coming Written by Irish Poet W. B. Yeats". "Things Fall Apart" is about a clan that once thought like one, spoke like one, shared a common awareness and acted like one. The white man came and his coming broke this unity. In the process, many heads rolled; new words, new usages and new applications gained entrance into men's heads and hearts and the old society gradually gave way. The process continues even today. This is why (Ohaegbu 2000) finally concludes his essay with the following statement on the nature of African literature:

"African literature therefore, can be seen as creative writings skilfully done in indigenous African languages or in foreign languages by African nationals or, if one prefers, bona fide citizens of the African continent (regardless of colour), whose works spring from African sociocultural background, deal with the problems of the African and offer to the rest of the world African perception of the human condition. [...] Even though its primary audience is the Africans, non-

Africans do and should have access to it. Only those who have profound knowledge of its cultural background and the language of the work should be qualified to undertake its criticism" (Ohaegbu 2000, 12).

The question is whether this last statement also holds true for translation and its translators. The analysis of the creative use of European languages in African literature shows that there are two forms of translation present. The first one is the common translation practice, whereby one language is translated into another language. The second one is the translation without the original, whereby African authors have to translate their thoughts in a different language. The first sense is important for understanding African literature, as the number of translated African works grows exponentially every year. The work of the translator "enable[s] many people of different cultural backgrounds to know, understand and appreciate African culture" (Gyasi 1999, 106). But Gyasi also states that translating African literature can be a struggle. That is why the translator needs more than "a certain linguistic competence" (Gyasi 1999, 106). "The translator, in addition to his/her linguistic competence, must be able to show proof of certain extra-linguistic abilities that consist in analyzing and interpreting the context in which the African literary text is embedded" (Gyasi 1999, 106).

From the above, the translator requires the exercise of contextual and socio-cultural judgement to choose the functional equivalent for the target reader with the guidance of relevance theory. Lack of information about the context of the original metaphor does not prevent it from being translated but it will leave the translator with no more than a direct analysis of the metaphor and its subsequent rendering in the target language. Without contextual clues, it is very difficult to establish the relevant ties within the text. This is the reality that the translator has to face due to the dynamic change of language use. The translator here explores feasible modulation procedure of translation to transfer the sense of Achebe into the target language. However, this metaphorical expression is analysed bearing in mind the benefit of source text's context. Conversely, the context of the text in which the metaphor is found is of utmost relevance to the translator in order to acquire all the information that contributes to the implicit meaning of the metaphor.

The translator shows the role played by relevance theory as an important cognitive theory that helps the translator to determine the relevant target language equivalence in a given context. For the sake of successful communication, the original text builds up the proper schemata in which the speech event in the text can be

appropriately interpreted. From the point of view of relevance theory, translation falls naturally under the interpretive use of language: translation is intended to restate in one language what someone else said or wrote in another language (Gutt 2001, 46). Just as a speaker reporting a speech, the translator in his effort of interpretive use of an utterance or a text should aim at faithfulness. The only difference between an intra-language quoting or reporting and a translation is that the source text and the target text belong to different languages (Gutt 2001, 46). No doubt, the translation of this metaphor challenges the patience and intelligence of the translator. As demonstrated above, the translation in the target language fulfils the need of optimal relevance, thus, the translation is faithful to the original metaphor.

Text B

“Okonkwo was well known throughout the nine villages and even beyond. His fame rested on solid personal achievement. As a young man of eighteen, he had brought honour to his village by throwing Amalinze the Cat” (Achebe 1958, 3).

«Okonkwo était bien connu a travers les neuf villages et même au delà. Sa réputation reposait sur de solides réussites personnelles. Jeune homme de dix-huit ans. Il avait apporté honneur et gloire a son village en terrassant Amalinze le Chat» (Achebe 1958, 9).

From Text B, Amalinze was called the Cat because from Umofia to Mbaino, he was unbeaten as a wrestler, not only that his back would never touch the earth during wrestling. From here, the translator has to play the role of an interpreter of the source text in the light of relevance theory in order to provide optimal relevance in his translation and guide his target reader to the intention of the original author. The complexity is locating the word (image) that is accurate in this particular case to provide the optimal relevance and achieve the desired metaphorical effect in the target language. The context sets the image processing, highlighting the direction to correct interpretation, which helps the translator to anchor the text.

Text C

Do not play with fire
Il ne faut pas jouer avec le feu

From Text C, the connotative value of the original text reflects that of the target text. This is so because before a metaphor can be interpreted, there must be a connotative value shared by both the target and the source language. The linguistic meaning of “do not

play with fire” presupposes that fire burns, causes pains. It equally suggests that you should avoid things or individuals that are harmful and dangerous. From the above text, it is shown that information derived from studies of relevance theory in relation to translation proves invaluable to validate the choice of the translator in his pursuit of equivalence and faithfulness. In some cases, the source text metaphor is understandable to the translator without the text as is the case here because the translator is familiar with the metaphor having had exposure to it in various contexts prior to the situation of the original text. The translator’s competence to understand and render this metaphor into the target language is born out of the translator’s cognitive and linguistic knowledge.

The idea of relevance theory is that a translation must deliver the message that is as closely equivalent as possible to the original text; however, the goal is to arrive at this outcome by relating the same meaning and message if possible, on the same level of generalization (Freeda 2009, 95–96). From the analysis, we note that presupposition as produced by the generic and situational context in the original text is the same with that of the target text. However, differences in terms of discourse, contextual presuppositions or the different characteristics of the target language determine what surface structure is used in the translated text. In some instances, a metaphor is realised through a surface linguistic structure. Some metaphorical expressions in the original text cannot be reproduced in the target language and as such, creative strategies in accordance with target linguistic features may be adopted in the target language. In the above example, the target reader appreciates the subject “fire” that is being talked about. Readers appreciate the creativity of the translator in the transfer of this metaphor into the target language and culture. We have introduced the notion of presupposition based on the fact that the translator works with his presupposition. In order to ensure successful translation of metaphors in a literary text, translators create their presuppositions in a way to arouse the target audience’s interest and desire.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of metaphors in literary texts shows that context and meaning contribute to the choice of the translator in the transfer of equivalence into the target language. The analysis of metaphors in the study is grounded in the idea that metaphor is a substitution and functions to improve literal language. In order to guarantee the seam-

less occurrence of this substitution, similarity must exist between the object compared and the literal expression. This similarity becomes the vehicle for transferring the meaning and message of a particular utterance from one language to another (Freeda 2009, 18). The study also reveals the multiple cognitive activities which involve analysis, interpretation, comparison, analogy, inferences, weighing of possibilities, planning, combing, and these processes are interactively united. Considering a metaphor as a complex entity, the study helps us to understand the unique characteristics that contribute to its make-up. Although no single theory is capable of explaining or analysing the phenomenon of metaphor in translation, the article relies on relevant theory in order to develop a view on the translatability of metaphors in literary texts. Metaphors that are chosen from Achebe's text reveal the thinking pattern of the Igbo socio-cultural society. We do not propose that our theory is the only answer to all the challenges of translation. We believe that it provides a step to understanding the phenomenon of metaphor translation in the light of relevance theory. Despite the usefulness of the theory, the translator's competence and knowledge are equally necessary to faithfully render a metaphorical text from one language into another.

REFERENCES

- Achebe, Ch. (1958). *Things Fall Apart*. London: Heinemann Educational Book. Ibadan-Nairobi. Trans. M. Ligny (1966). *Le Monde s'effondre*. Presence Africaine.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Le Degré Zéro de l'écriture*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Cui, Y. and Wang, Q. (2010). "Differences in the Transference of Humor and Personification in Advertisement Translation." *Journal of Language and Translation* 11 (2), 47–69.
- Esimaje, A. U. (2009). "Proverbs in Context: A Study of John Munonye's 'The Only Son'". *Nsukka Journal of the Humanities* 18.
- Fang, M. (2004). *A Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in Linguistics*. Oxford University.
- Freeda, C. W. (2009). *A Model for Translating Metaphors in Proverbs (French and English): A Cognitive Descriptive Approach*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The University of British Columbia, August 2009.
- Givon, T. (1989). *Mind, Code and Context: Essays in Pragmatics*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.

Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.

Gutt, E.-A. (2000). *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Gutt, E.-A. (2001). "Pragmatic Aspects of Translation: Some Relevance Theory Observations." In: Hickey, L. (ed.) *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Gyasi, K. A. (1999). "Writing as Translation: African Literature and the Challenges of Translation." *Research in African Literatures* 30.2, 75–87.

Jackson F. and Smith M. (eds.) (2005). *Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Philosophy*. Oxford.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Malinowski, B. (1923). "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages." In: Richards I. A. *The Meaning*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ogden, Ch. K and Richards, I. A. (1949). *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*. 10th ed. London: Routledge. 1–302.

Ohaegbu, A. U. (2000). "Defining African Literature." In: Opatá, D. U. and Ohaegbu, A. U. (eds.) *Major Themes in African Literature*. Nsukka, Nigeria: AP Express Publishers, 2000, 1–14.

Showqi, B. (2014). "A Cognitive Study to Business Metaphors in English-Arabic Translation: Implications for Translation Pedagogy." *International Journal of Translation* 26:1, 5–37.

Sperber, D and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Vinay, J.-P. and Darbelnet J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Trans. J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Wilss, W. (1994). "A Framework for Decision-Making in Translation." *Target* 6, 131–150.

Wu, F. and Xihua, Xu (2008). *Evaluation of the Pragmatic Value of Relevant Theory in the Light of Acronym Translation. A Translation Analysis Case Study from the Compilation of Pragmatic Translation: Theory and Practice*.

——— (2001). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press and Blackwell Ltd.