Tikrit University

College of Education for Humanities

English Department

Forth Stage/ Translation

TRANSLATING THE METAPHOR

Dr. Ashwaq J. Mohammed

2024

TRANSLATING THE METAPHOR

Metaphor is the key figure of rhetoric that usually implies a reference to figurative language in general. Therefore, it has always been attended to carefully by linguists, critics and writers. Traditionally, being originally a major aesthetic and rhetorical figure, it has been analysed and approached in terms of its constituent components (i.e. image, object, sense, etc.) and types (such as cliché, dead, anthropomorphic, recent, extended, compound, etc. metaphors). However, recently, and in the light of the latest developments of cognitive stylistics, metaphor has received yet greater attention from a completely different perspective of conceptualization and ideologization. Consequently, this change of perspective has its immediate effect on translation theory and practice, which has to be approached equally differently now with respect to translating metaphor.

Introduction

The translation of metaphor makes it necessary to start with investigating the concept of metaphor, past and present, with focus being on contemporary conceptual approaches to metaphor. There has been in recent years rapid and revolutionary changes not only in communications, computer and Internet technologies, but also, and surprisingly, in conceptual studies of metaphor. Metaphor is the process of 'transporting' qualities from one object to another, a person to another, a thing to a person or animal, etc. A metaphor was originally a Greek word for 'transport'. Understanding a metaphor as a sort of transport implies that it transports a concept from its normal location, to somewhere else where it is not usually used. Traditionally, metaphor was defined in aesthetic and rhetorical terms as the fundamental figure of speech and major form of figurative language, or trope. It has been analysed and approached in terms of its rhetorical constituent components (i.e. image, object, sense, etc.) and types (such as dead, recent, extended, compound, etc. metaphors). Now this approach no longer holds in the light of the latest developments of cognitive conceptual stylistic and ideological approaches to

metaphor. Nowadays, metaphor has received yet greater attention from an entirely different perspective of conceptualization and ideologization.

This paper attempts to investigate metaphor from a mainly cognitive stylistic perspective which views it basically as a matter of conceptualization of topics, objects and people in terms of certain ideologies. All metaphors are in principle reflections and constructions of concepts, attitudes, mentalities and ideologies on the part of the speaker. Hence, any metaphor is conceptualized in terms of target domain and source domain in different types of context and discourse, both literary and non-literary.

2. Definitions: Conventional vs. Conceptual Approaches to Metaphor

A new, enlightening trend in the approaches to the study of metaphor is already established now. A surge of tremendous work has been done to come out with many new explorations about conceptual metaphor. In the past twenty years or so, much has changed in the world of metaphor, which is no longer seen as "an ornamental aspect of language, but a fundamental scheme by which people conceptualize the world and their own activities" (Gibbs, ibid.: 3). Also, Semino (2008: 1) defines it as follows: "by metaphor, I mean the phenomenon whereby we talk and, potentially, think about something in terms of something else". Geary (2011) declares that metaphor "shapes the way we see the world".

Hence, the conventional approaches to metaphor that viewed it as an aesthetic and rhetorical formal structure of language in the first place are history now. Traditional works on metaphor were conducted within traditional disciplinary frameworks with the aim to locate it more as a part of language and culture than mind, and "a mere decorative device, simply involving the substitution of a literal term for a concept with a nonliteral one (Semino, 2008: 9). These approaches were unproductive. They failed to go through metaphor in depths and consider their conceptual implications and mental representations, and how they reconstruct our thoughts, attitudes and ideologies in a new, insightful way (see also Gibbs, 2008.: 5). By the same token, and in the light of recent approaches to metaphor, classifying metaphors traditionally into 'dead', 'fossilized', 'cliché', 'mixed, 'standard',

etc. is not very useful, superficial and lacks in depth with regards to language analysis as much as translation. (For conventional types metaphor, see, for example, Newmark, 1988; Thornborrow and Wareing, 1998: 99-110; Leech 1969; Ghazala, 2011; Richards, 1936, in Wales, 1989/2001; and others. In contrast, the new types of conceptual metaphor are sharply insightful. Conceptual metaphoric studies pay due respect to all types of conceptual metaphor which are set in terms of conceptualization of the world.

3. Types of Contemporary Conceptual Metaphor

As argued above, the contemporary scholarship of conceptual metaphor has revolutionized the whole traditional literature about metaphor in language and style. Therefore, new types of metaphor are put forward in terms of cognitive conceptualization in the first place. Here is a crude account of major types of them:

1) Primary conceptual metaphors (i.e. Universal metaphors: e.g. PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS) (Kövecses, 2005 and Yu, 2008).

2) Complex conceptual metaphors (cultural metaphors: e.g. A PURPOSEFUL LIFE IS A JOURNEY; ACTIONS ARE MOTIONS) (Gibbs, 1999, 2003; Kövecses, 2005 and Ning Yu, 2008, and Kintsch, 2008).

3) Complex (vs. simple) metaphor (e.g. THE WORLD IS A SMALL VILLAGE; THE UNIVERSE IS A COMPUTER) (see Kintsch, 2008)

4) Simple metaphors (e.g. SOME SURGEONS ARE BUTCHERS; MY LAWYER IS A SHARK (see ibid.).

5) Simple analogy based metaphor (e.g. SHE SHOT DOWN ALL MY ARGUMENTS) (see ibid.)

6) Novel / newly created conceptual metaphors (see ibid.)

7) Ideology-loaded conceptual metaphors (Semino, 2008: ch1 & 3).

8) Ideology-free conceptual metaphors (e.g. 'emotion metaphors'. See also below) (Kövecses, 2008 . See also Semino, 2008: 4.5).

9) Neutral conceptual metaphors (Driven *et al*: 2003, and Semino, 2008: ch. 1)

10) Culturally sensitive metaphors (and the notion of 'paradox of metaphor' (Gibbs, 2008: 5)

11) Master / superordinate metaphor (e.g. 'anger' and 'love' emotion metaphors) (Kövecses, 2008. See also Eliot's cat-fog metaphor above).

12) Dominant / central metaphors (see master metaphor above).

13) Global metaphors (Cameron, in Semino, 2008: 34. See primary / universal metaphors above).

14) Ubiquitous / perverse metaphors (see Gibbs, 2008: 4; and Nogales, 1999: 3)).

15) Monomodal metaphor: either verbal, or nonverbal metaphor (see pictorial metaphor below. See Forceville, 2008)

16) Multimodal/complex concept metaphor (e.g. 'Remote control pad is Swiss army knife'. See ibid.)

17) Verbalized metaphor (contrasted with non-verbalized metaphor) (e.g. exchanging business cards is a knife duel'. See ibid.)

18) 'Meta-metaphor': a key metaphorical notion that functions as a backbone of a whole text e.g. 'a battle of metaphors' (as a title of an article indicating a series of related 'war metaphors'). See Semino, 2008: 32).

19) Vitalized metaphors: reconceptualised conventional metaphors (see 3 above, and Semino: ch. 1).

20) Recurrence metaphors: a series of related metaphors (Semino, 2008: ch. 1))

21) Master / superordinate metaphor (e.g. 'anger' and 'love' emotion metaphors) (Kövecses, 2008. See also Eliot's cat-fog metaphor above).

etc. (See especially, Gibbs, 2008; Semino, 2008; Steen, 2007; and Nogales, 1999 for further types and details).

Obviously, these types need further elaboration. However, they are intended here to stand for a sketchy representation of the complex reticulum of the new corpus of conceptual metaphor today rather than an exhaustive account of its new types. They are primarily deeply conceptual-based types (i.e. master, dominant, culturally sensitive, ideology-loaded, ideology-free, neutral, primary, universal metaphors). More specifically, conceptual metaphors are sets of 'mappings', across conceptual domains, whereby a 'target' domain ... is partly structured in terms of a different 'source' domain ..." (Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) (in ibid.: 5). The Target Domain (TD) is defined as the concept to be described by the metaphor; whereas the Source Domain (SD) is identified as the concept drawn upon, or used to create the metaphorical construction. Thus, in the metaphor MISERY IS A VACUUM, the target domain (TD) is MISERY, and the source domain (SD) is VACUUM.