CHAPTER FOUR

Metaphors in the Source Text and Their Translation: A Cognitive Approach

In this chapter we are going to discuss about metaphor, its various classifications, its cultural implication and also how metaphors are conceptualized. From the perspective of cognitive linguistics we will discuss the problems of translating metaphors and the strategies to tackle it. We are going to discuss some metaphorical expressions taken from *Udo Megh* to substantiate our arguments.

4.1 Defining Metaphor

Aristotle ("De Poetica," 322 B.C.) said:
"The greatest thing by far is to be a master of metaphor. It is the one thing that cannot be learned from others; it is also a sign of genius, since a good metaphor implies an eye for resemblance" (as cited in Nakamoto 2002: 31).

According to *Oxford English Dictionary* metaphor is a figure of speech “in which a name or descriptive term is transferred to some object different from, but analogous to, that in which it is properly applicable.” The word 'metaphor' comes from Greek *metapherein*, meaning 'to transfer' or to 'carry over.' Metaphors carry meaning from one word, image or idea to another. Here an implied comparison is made between two different things or ideas. For example, *he is the pillar of the state.* Here an implied comparison is made between ‘he’ and ‘pillar’. The metaphor is actually an implied simile. Here the words, as, so, like, etc., which are used in a simile to show clearly the
likeness between two things, different in kind, are dropped. A simile thus differs from a metaphor only in form and not in content. Thus a metaphor is, in fact, a compressed simile and in the same way a simile is an expanded metaphor. Thus the example, *the eldest son is the star of the family* can be expanded thus, *Just as a star is bright, so the eldest son is the bright member of the family.* Metaphor in its narrow sense may be defined as a figure of speech in which one thing is described in terms of another. But in its broad sense it may refer to any figurative expression, including the transferred sense of a physical word, personification of an abstraction, and application of a word or collocation to what it does not literally denote. We know that a polyseme is a word or phrase with multiple, related meanings and hence are possibly metaphorical in nature.

The earliest definition of metaphor, quoted from Aristotle’s *The Poetics* by Richards (1965:89) is a “shift carrying over a word from its normal use to a new use”. Under this quite broad definition all other instances of semantic extensions like allegory, synecdoche, metonymy etc might be categorized as being metaphoric. The metaphor, according to I.A. Richards in *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1965) consists of two parts: the *tenor* and *vehicle*. The tenor is the subject to which attributes are ascribed. The vehicle is the subject from which the attributes are borrowed. In the sentence, “Love is a rose”, rose is the vehicle for love, the tenor.
4.2 Classification of Metaphor

The most common classifications of metaphor are extended metaphor, dead metaphor and mixed metaphor.

An extended metaphor sets up a principal subject with several subsidiary subjects or comparisons. Shakespeare's extended metaphor in his play *As You Like It* is a good example ("All the world's a stage / and all the men and women merely players: / They have their exits and their entrances; / And one man in his time plays many parts, / His acts being seven ages."). First, the world is construed as a stage; and then men and women are introduced as subsidiary subjects that are further elaborated by the theater metaphor.

A mixed metaphor is one that leaps, in the course of a figure, to a second identification inconsistent with the first one. Example: *He stepped up to the plate and grabbed the bull by the horns*, Here, the baseball and the activities of a cowboy are implied where two commonly used metaphors are confused to create a nonsensical image.

A dead metaphor is one in which the sense of a transferred image is not present. Example: ‘money’, so called because it was first minted at the temple of Juno Moneta. To most people though, "money" does not evoke thoughts of the temple at Juno Moneta. Dead metaphors, by definition, normally go unnoticed. People are typically unaware of the origin of words. For instance, ‘mantel’ means "cloak or hood to catch smoke", ‘gorge’ means throat, and so forth for thousands more.

Rhetorical theorists and other scholars of language have discussed numerous dimensions of metaphors and these are,

**Absolute or paralogical metaphor**: It is one in which there is no discernible point of resemblance between the idea and the image. Example: *The couch is the autobahn of the living room*.
**Active metaphor**: It is one which by contrast to a dead metaphor, is not part of daily language and is noticeable as a metaphor. Example: *You are my sun.*

**Complex metaphor**: It is one which mounts one identification on another. Example: *That throws some light on the question. Throwing light* is a metaphor: there is no actual light.

**Compound or loose metaphor**: It is one that catches the mind with several points of similarity. Examples: "He has the wild stag's foot." This phrase suggests grace and speed as well as daring.

**Dying metaphor**: It is a derogatory term coined by George Orwell in his essay *Politics and the English Language*. Orwell defines a dying metaphor as a metaphor that isn't dead (dead metaphors are different, as they are treated like ordinary words), but has been worn out and is used because it saves people the trouble of inventing an original phrase for themselves. In short, a cliche. Example: *Achilles' heel*. Orwell suggests that writers scan their work for such dying forms that they have 'seen regularly before in print' and replace them with alternative language patterns.

**Implicit metaphor**: It is one in which the tenor is not specified but implied. Example: *Shut your trap!* Here, the mouth of the listener is the unspecified tenor.

**Implied or unstated metaphor**: It is a metaphor not explicitly stated or obvious that compares two things by using adjectives that commonly describe one thing, but are used to describe another comparing the two.

An example: *Golden baked skin*, comparing bakery goods to skin or *leafy golden sunset* comparing the sunset to a tree in the fall.

**Simple or tight metaphor**: It is one in which there is but one point of resemblance between the tenor and the vehicle. Example: *Cool it.* In this example, the vehicle, "Cool", is a temperature and nothing else, so the tenor, "it", can only be grounded to the vehicle by one attribute.
Submerged metaphor: It is one in which the vehicle is implied, or indicated by one aspect. Example: *my winged thought*. Here, the audience must supply the image of the bird.

Root metaphor: It is the underlying personal attachments that shape an individual's understanding of a situation. It is different to the other types of metaphor in that it is not an explicit device in language but merely a part of comprehension. Religion is considered the most common root metaphor since birth, marriage, death and other life experiences can convey a very different meaning to different people based on their level or type of religious adherence.

Metaphors are a wonderful vehicle for escaping common language and redefining words and concepts in terms of other things. Metaphors pave the way for us to equip the language into new meaning, stretching and enhancing its usage. According to Lakoff, Lakoff (1980) metaphor is deeply embedded in our language, culture and the way we think. They shape and sound what we intend to signify. In use, metaphors may run through the gamut of fashion, with some remaining obscure whilst others rising into popular use and eventually becoming hackneyed clichés and nobody realizes any more that they are metaphors. Newspapers, television and other media play a significant role in popularizing various metaphorical usages.

Newness in metaphor is always expected for better impact. Familiarity in the case of metaphors breeds cliché. With repetition it loses its effect. But by recombining with other metaphors or by ironic inversion it is possible to renew or reinvent metaphors. As metaphors are used to make unfamiliar concepts understandable we learn new and complicated ideas quickly. We should not be stuck to use same metaphors for long. Instead in the long run they should be modified or abandoned or else they interrupt true understanding and communication. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:221) wrote, “Successful functioning in our daily lives seems to require a constant shifting of metaphors.” Language is embedded in culture and culture plays an important role in shaping language. The metaphors present in a language therefore are intrinsically related to its culture. In the following section we elaborate the relationship between language and culture.
4.3 Language as an Index of Culture

According to famous anthropologist Edward B. Tylor (1924), culture is “that complex whole, which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs and other capabilities and habits acquired by the man as a member of society” (as cited in Muller 2005:49). Culture, on the other hand, has also been defined as a “design for living” and as the “shared understandings that people use to co-ordinate their activities” (Gelles and Levine 1995:80). Members of a society must share certain basic ideas about the world around, what is important in life, how technology is used, and what their actions and artifact mean. In recent years the definition of culture that is preferred by many anthropologists is that culture is “an abstraction from behavior”. Cultural models are a “great variety of human institutions that are the projections of conventional understandings of reality set in time and space, for all to experience as artifacts of a community’s life” (Shore, 1996:44). For example, the palpable entities, such as houses, pottery, tools, paintings, songs, dances and types of clothing give us an idea of material culture in the world. On the other hand, conventional styles of speech exist in the minds of people which are impalpable.

Undoubtedly one of the basic principles of translation is to be faithful to the original. According to this principle, translation should first of all be faithful to the content of the original, with literal translation on how to convey in a precise way the original cultural connotation and how to interpret it on the basis of the native cultural perspective. For scholars interested in translation of literary texts are inevitably linked to the study of the value of culture in language. Robertson (1981) says, “Culture consists of all the shared product of human society” (as cited in Scupin, 1998:39). This means culture includes not only material things such as cities, organizations and schools, but also non-material things, such as ideas, customs, family patterns and languages. In a word culture refers to the entire way of life of a society. “Culture hides much more than it
reveals, and strangely enough, what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants” (Hall 1990:29). It is just like an iceberg, with a big part of its real substance hidden in the sea.

Language is part of culture and plays an important role in it. On the other hand, language is influenced and shaped by culture. In a broader sense, language is the symbolic representation of people and it comprises their historical and cultural backgrounds as well as their approach to life and their ways of living and thinking. Since lexicon is the most active component of a language, due attention must be given to the analysis and comparison of the cultural connotation of words.

Translation is a difficult task and subject to countless misinterpretations. One thing may be unique in one country and the equivalent word reflecting this object may not be found in other countries. Language and its cultural influence are exemplified in the theoretical formulations of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which in essence states that language is a guide to “social reality”. This hypothesis implies that language is not simply a means of reporting experience, but more important it is a way of defining experience. Example of Sapir-Whorf concept in practice would be: if a language has only one term brother-in-law that is applied to one’s sister’s husband, her husband’s brother, and her husband’s sister’s husband, she is led by his language to perceive all of these relatives in a similar way. That means there are things or concepts which are represented by one or perhaps two terms in one language, but by many more terms in the other language, that is finer distinction exists in the other language.

There are terms that have more or less the same primary meaning but which have secondary or additional meanings that may differ considerably from each other. Sometimes we can’t translate color words from one language to another without introducing subtle changes in meaning.

The English phrase ‘red-blooded’ does not necessarily mean ‘Lal raktolipto’ in Bengali rather it is another way of saying that someone of their behavior is confident and strong. English phrase ‘red-eyed’ just mans ‘having red eyes due to lack of sleep or an affected
eye’. But in Bengali the equivalent of it ‘rakto chokku’ means to look at someone with anger.

Words that people utter refer to common experiences. Words reflect their author’s attitude and beliefs. In both the cases language expresses cultural reality. If we consider culture as a variable in the process of abstracting meaning, the problems become more critical because culture teaches us both the symbol and that, the symbol represents. When one communicates with someone from his or her own culture, the process of using words to represent one’s experiences is much easier as within a culture people share many similar experiences. But when communication is between people from distinct cultures, different experiences are involved and the process is more acute. For example if a Bengali speaker says that he or she got married amidst the barber hurling abusive words, someone from another cultural background would be unable to make any connection. In an auspicious event like marriage people cast evil eyes to the bride or the groom and hence the barber calls names to drive away those negative forces. In Bengali culture this act by the barber is called gourbachan. Thus we see that cultural gap hinders the process of understanding things which are very integral to a particular culture.

Intercultural awareness can not grow naturally. It has to be trained. For example when a child grows up in India and learns the word ‘dog’ he will normally learn the cultural meaning of dog: faithful and man’s best friend. A child brought up in the Chinese culture may be taught that the dog is a dirty and dangerous animal. In the temple of Karni Mata (Deshnoke, Rajasthan) rats are considered holy animals and people travel great distances to pay their respects. Even monkeys are worshipped in many parts of India as the incarnation of Hanuman. But this behavior can seem to be weird in many cultures as people always try to be at safe distance from these carriers of various diseases.

So people, who have thus been initiated into the culture associated with their mother tongue, are naturally inclined to interpret things with their own cultural references. So it is important to be familiar with the cultural background of the words. When creating an artistic image, a writer not only takes the description and portray of the image but also projects his own thoughts and feelings into the image.
So far we have discussed how language functions as an index of culture. In the following section we will discuss the conceptual theory of translation in the light of Lakoff and Johnson’s *Metaphors We Live By* (1980).

**4.4 Conceptual Theory of Metaphors and Its Relevance to Translation**

In the Classical theories of language, metaphor was considered a matter of language not of thought. It was assumed that metaphor has no connection with everyday language. It was thought that all subject matter can be comprehended literally, without metaphor. The classical theory was taken so much for granted that over the centuries that people believed metaphors to function outside the realm of conventional ordinary daily language. But no theory can be close-ended or definitional. The cognitive approach towards metaphors proved classical theories to be inadequate. The cognitive approach to metaphor, largely initiated by Lakoff and Johnson’s *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) give us new insights in this field. Metaphors help people understand concepts which are difficult to grasp:

“Because so many of the concepts that are important to us are either abstract or not clearly delineated in our experience (the emotions, ideas, time, etc.), we need to get a grasp on them by means of other concepts that we understand in clearer terms (spatial orientations, objects, etc.)” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:115).

In this view, metaphor is a medium through which abstract concepts are made more comprehensible, in order to make them easier to talk or think about.

Lakoff and Johnson define metaphor as a means to understand one domain of experience (the target domain) in terms of another, a familiar one (source domain). This usually takes the form of analogy or comparison between two existent entities or one existent entity and another one assumed to exist. For example, to say that someone is a fox as a symbol of cunningness reveals that a link has been established between that individual
(tenor) and the ‘fox’ (vehicle) as a symbol of cunningness. Thus metaphors are conceptual phenomena in which the source domain is mapped onto the target domain. Here the structural components of the source conceptual schema are transferred to the target domain. To put it differently, the structural components of the source conceptual schema are transferred to the target domain. Lakoff and Johnson say that metaphor is ‘pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action’ and that our ‘ordinary conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in nature’. Cognitive linguistics came up with a revolutionary revelation that metaphorical expressions are not in language, but in thought. There are metaphors in virtually every utterance. The locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another and in this process, everyday abstract concepts like time, states, causation, and purpose also turn out to be metaphorical. Thus metaphor instead of being a poetic device becomes central to ordinary language. In contemporary research of metaphor the word, metaphor means a cross domain mapping in the conceptual system. The discovery of this enormous metaphor system has destroyed the traditional literal-figurative distinction, since the term ‘literal’ carried with it all those false assumptions and overlooked the cognitive aspect of metaphor. The classification, identification, comprehension as well as the translation essence and methods of metaphor have been marvelously changed since metaphor is looked at as a cognitive process facilitating human conceptual system. Here one should deter the crucial role of culture in this process of symbolization and conceptualization.
4.5 Understanding Schema

Schema is the cognitive framework or concept that helps to organize and interpret information. Schemas can be useful because they allow us to take shortcuts in interpreting a vast amount of information. However, these mental frameworks also cause us to exclude pertinent information in favor that confirms our pre-existing beliefs and ideas. Schemas can contribute to stereotypes and make it difficult to retain new information that does not conform to our established schema. We use our understanding of schema and the relationship between the elements of the schema, to make sense of new concepts.

To elaborate this let us take an example *He would rather have his teeth pulled than face the interview*. In understanding this metaphor we use our knowledge of visiting a dentist and see how all those information entail the situation of facing a job interview. Here the source domain is the ‘visit to a dentist’ and the target domain is the ‘job interview’.

The kinds of things we associate with a visit to the dentist are: making an appointment, visit the doctor, brush before the visit, go to the exam room and wait, the dentist pokes and prods the teeth, the adrenaline rises as one feels worried expecting anything bad from the dentist and so on and so forth. The listing shows how we understand a structure and contents of a particular concept. Such a framework to understand a concept is called a ‘schema’. The individual elements of the schema can be called ‘slots’. In understanding a metaphor what we do is that we map one schema to a new concept in order to build an understanding of the concept. If we draw a parallel between the experiences of visiting a dentist and facing the job interview we’ll see that the individual elements or slots of the source domain entail the target domain slots. The person going to face the interview has a scheduled time of interview like the appointment of the dentist, he practices assiduously in front of the mirror as one brushes his or her teeth before showing them to the dentist,
he sits in the lobby room and wait as one waits in the dentist’s clinic, the interviewer grills him on his resume as the dentist pokes and prods one’s teeth, after interview one keeps on worrying expecting some bad news as one feels nervous after the check up to a dentist.

Thus it becomes clear that schemas are powerful because they are the instruments to organize characteristics, information and things into recognizable structures which are manipulative according to the situation. Metaphors are powerful because they provide shortcuts to concepts and help us get meanings of less understood concepts. Mappings are not arbitrary, but grounded in the body and in everyday experience and knowledge. A conceptual system contains thousands of conventional metaphorical mappings, which form a highly structured subsystem of the conceptual system. Sometimes a single word can ring a bell to a broad and complicated topic. Abstract concepts and phenomena like life and death which appear to be beyond analyses can be approached through metaphors. The interesting fact is that we constantly use schemas and metaphors with no noticeable effort to generate meaning though most of the times we are unconscious about them and also expect that other will easily get the subtle hints embedded in the metaphors.

The book *Metaphors We Live By* comes with the convincing argument that everyday metaphors that shape our thought and speech are coherent and culturally bound cognitive structures. They systematically order and clarify our world. Lakoff and Johnson illustrate a common metaphor ‘TIME IS MONEY’ and we live by it. Time can be spent, saved, wasted etc. But here we have to remember that this particular way of structuring our understanding of time reveals only some aspects of time. People having more immediate understanding about money may get confused as they have vague understanding about time. Looking at the phrase ‘TIME IS MONEY’ one should not think that time is one’s personal property. One can not hoard it and die rich. So understanding a particular metaphor one has to imply his world knowledge and should not be misled by any false understanding. Because a metaphor does not necessarily speak about its every aspect. A metaphor may conceal aspects of its source domain which means mappings are asymmetric and partial. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:109) write “…the less clearly
delineated (and usually less concrete) concepts are partially understood in terms of the more clearly delineated (and usually more concrete) concepts, which are directly grounded in our experience.” So it ultimately depends on the individual and his or her understanding a metaphor. If we create a new metaphor TIME IS DOG it looks odd. Time can never be domesticated, we can not feed it, and it can not destroy our shoes with its sharp teeth. Thus we see that in understanding a metaphor we use our body of knowledge and see which metaphor is justified and which one is largely unmapped.

4.6 Mapping

In *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:3) argue that a metaphor is not a literary device; it is a fundamental mechanism of human cognition. In a metaphor, the "target domain" is structured by the "source domain." This structuring is called "mapping." The source domain is typically something more clearly understood, often through physical experience. On the contrary the target domain is typically more abstract. Thus we always attempt to structure the abstract in terms of something more clearly understood i.e. the source domain. "Mappings are asymmetric and partial" (Lakoff 1992:35), which draws attention to the structural similarities between two different entities while hiding or suppressing certain other aspects. Mappings have a conventional character, being a fixed part of the human conceptual system. Mapping is the set of correspondences. We can elaborate this point by the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR where our knowledge about war is mapped onto the knowledge about arguments. When we refer at ‘ARGUMENT IS WAR’ the persons involved correspond to opponents, their words correspond to weapons, their plan of arguing correspond to war strategies, the win or loss of argument correspond to the victory or defeat of war and so on and so forth. One should not take ‘Argument is war’ as mapping itself; it is the name of the mapping. The mapping is done through setting our knowledge about war onto knowledge about argument. But one can not expect the exact knowledge to be same for
everyone. These examples clearly show how abstract experience of arguing with another person or a group of people is structured by the more basic concept of WAR, although the actions themselves are different in nature: "It is in this sense that the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is one that we live by in this culture; it structures the actions we perform in arguing [...], what we do and how we understand what we are doing when we argue" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 4). As part of cognitive and metaphorical processes, such mappings arise more or less automatically and unconsciously, and thus affect the way we experience, think and interact within our environment. Thus the correspondence between the domains, ARGUMENT and WAR, for example, “arises from a correlation in our normal everyday experiences” (Lakoff & Johnson 1999: 47). Nonetheless, the source domain does not necessarily have to be logically connected to the target domain. Taken literally, many metaphorical expressions would sound absurd, contradictory and false. For example, arguments cannot be shot down in a literal sense - whereas others presuppose a context bound interpretation holding as well a regular, true literal sense.

4.7 Elaborating Conceptual Metaphor

We have already discussed that the metaphor is not just a matter of language, but of thought and reason where the mapping is primary and language is secondary. It functions basing on the use of source domain language and inference patterns for target domain concepts. Lakoff & Johnson points out (1980:139) that these are “conventional metaphors, that is, metaphors that structure the ordinary conceptual system of our culture, which is reflected in our everyday language.” The mapping is conventional, which means, it is a fixed part of our conceptual system, one of our conventional ways of conceptualizing things. This view of metaphor is thoroughly at odds with the view that metaphors are just linguistic expressions. If metaphors were merely linguistic expressions, we would expect different linguistic expressions to be different metaphors.
We can elaborate this point through an example. *Love* has always been conceptualized as *journey*. One has to understand the domain of love in terms of the domain of journeys. Lakoff (1986: 217) writes about the scenario of travel:

“Two travelers are traveling somewhere in a vehicle, and it hits some impediment and gets stuck. If they do nothing, they will not reach their destinations. There are a limited number of alternatives for action: a) They can try to get the vehicle moving again, either by fixing it or by getting it past the impediment that stopped it; b) they can remain in the stuck vehicle and give up on getting to their destinations in it; and c) they can abandon the vehicle. The alternative of remaining in the stuck vehicle takes the least effort, but does not satisfy the desire to reach the destination.”

We can map this scenario about travel onto a corresponding love scenario which results from applying the correspondences to this knowledge structure: the lovers are travelers on a journey together, with their common life goals seen as destinations to be reached. The relationship is their vehicle, and it allows them to pursue those common goals together. The relationship is seen as fulfilling its purpose as long as it allows them to make progress toward their common goals. The journey will not be smooth. There will be impediments and crossroads where a decision has to be made about which direction to go in and whether to keep traveling together. The metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience, love, in terms of a very different domain of experience, journeys.

English has many such everyday expressions which are based on a conceptualization of love as a journey for example: *Look how far we have come, It's been a long, bumpy road, We can't turn back now, We're at a crossroad, Our relationship is off the track, We may have to choose our separate ways, The relationship isn't going anywhere, We've hit a dead-end street* and so on and so forth. One can notice that the ontological correspondences, according to which entities in the domain of love (e.g., the lovers, their common goals, their hardships, the love relationship, etc.) correspond systematically to entities in the domain of a journey (the travelers, the vehicle, ultimate destination, etc.). These are not rhetorical but very much everyday expressions. If metaphors were mere linguistic expressions as the classical theory perceived we would
have expected different linguistic expressions to be different metaphors. And if it was so ‘We've hit a dead-end street’ would constitute one metaphor and ‘We can’t turn back now’ would constitute another totally different metaphor. But we don’t see such innumerable different metaphors. We have one metaphor ‘LOVE IS A JOURNEY’ and the conceptualization of love is realized.

4.8 Conceptual Metaphor Theory: Culture and Translation

Following Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 12), "a culture may be thought of as providing, among other things, a pool of available metaphors for making sense of reality"; "to live by a metaphor is to have your reality structured by that metaphor and to base your perceptions and actions upon that structuring of reality" (ibid). However, the universe we are living in is made up of things, and we are constantly confronted with them, obliged to communicate about them, and to define ourselves in relation to them. This is a characteristic of all human societies, and due to this fact various language systems are not easily translatable. Different cultures conceptualize the world in different ways and therefore, metaphors are characterized as being culture-specific. Here we can discuss the matter of association and deviation. People often associate certain qualities with certain creatures or objects. These qualities often arouse certain reactions or emotions. Though there is little or no scientific ground for such association. The qualities that are associated or the emotions that are aroused are not always same with different people. In the Chinese culture the dragon stands for the emperor. All Chinese people regard themselves as descendants of dragon. But to English speakers the dragon is often a symbol of evil. In the Indian context white is associated with someone’s death and a color of the attire worn by the deceased’s wife. But in the Western culture this is the color of the bride’s gown. Again here an 'owl' is often conceptualized as a sign of bad omen but it is a symbol of wisdom in the West. So the translator should attach great importance to cultural equivalence.
In the cognitive study of metaphor an emphasis is made on the psychological as well as on the socio-cultural and linguistic aspects of metaphor. Metaphorical concepts vary from culture to culture, sometimes even from subculture to subculture. However, compared to culturally variable concepts, some tend to be more universal than others. The next sections comment on the more universal concepts as opposed to the culturally variable ones.

The connection between metaphor and culture is elucidated within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued that we do not just speak with metaphors but understand the world through them. Hence shared understanding can also be taken as metaphorical understanding when the focus of understanding is on some intangible entity such as time, mental processes, emotions, abstract qualities, moral values, social or political institutions etc. Most basic concepts of the world are comprehended through metaphorical mappings. In such a situation the metaphors one uses to understand these intangibles may become crucially important in the way one actually experiences the intangibles in a particular culture. In this light of thought metaphors become an inherent part of culture.

Here a question may arise that to what extent people around the globe share their understandings of aspects of the world they live in. According to the ‘standard’ view of metaphor in the Conceptual Metaphor Theory metaphors are based on embodied human experiences. For example we metaphorically view affection as warmth. The very idea of affection reminds of our childhood experiences of the loving embraces of our parents or near and dear ones and the comforting bodily warmth that follows it. Perhaps this gives answer to why affection is universally conceptualized as warmth rather than coldness. These are ‘primary’ metaphors which happen to us unconsciously and automatically. As this is a universal bodily experience, the metaphor corresponding to it will also be universal.

Orientational metaphors, for example, tend to be based on universal concepts that are derived from the fact that human beings are shaped as they are and perceive the world in a similar way, namely by using their senses.
Within this group of metaphors, the body itself and our sense of spatial orientation plays an important role. The central concepts emerging from this concern orientations like UP-DOWN, IN-OUT, FRONT-BACK, NEAR-FAR (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 57), expressing either the posture of our body (UP-DOWN), seeing our body as a container (IN-OUT) or correlating the body and the space around us (FRONT-BACK). Since these concepts also represent metaphorical concepts, we can assume that they are used universally.

Again the conceptual metaphor MORE IS UP (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 23) reflects a mapping process, in which quantity is associated with vertical movement, such as prices are high, the demand fresh fruit is rising or I am feeling up.

The metaphorical concept HAPPY IS UP, for example, can be supported by the assumption that an erect posture means self-confidence, well-being and happiness, while a bent position means the opposite (cf. Lakoff & Johnson 1980:15.). If we feel confident, we show a tendency to keep our head up high. This is universal as it represents the natural human reaction to emotion. However, as emotion is not as sharply delineated as our physical posture is, we choose to think in orientational metaphorical concepts to conceptualize emotion. That means universal primary experiences produce universal primary metaphors. There are many such primary metaphors. For example,

EVENTS ARE MOTIONS (What’s going on here?)

CAUSES ARE FORCES (You are driving me crazy).

Such "basic ontological metaphors are [therefore] grounded by virtue of systematic correlations within our experience"(Lakoff &Johnson 1980: 58). When we say that keep this in mind or my life is empty, we have the concept LIFE IS A CONTAINER in mind.

In addition, embodiment can produce concepts that are based on human movement, e.g. LIFE IS A PATH, realized in language in expressions such as it's been a long way.

The concepts introduced as the more universal ones are understood more directly than others. They can be called 'emergent concepts' as they are based on direct experience that is based on direct interaction with the physical world. They "allow us to conceptualize our emotions in more sharply defined terms" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 58). They are potentially transferable from one culture to another, although they emerge out of
experience that is itself bound to cultural circumstances. This will be discussed in the next section, when we discuss the issue of untranslatability.

We have seen how most of our cognitive processes, the way we view, think, perceive or act are based on metaphorical concepts which highly influence our language and enrich: “Our conceptual system thus plays an important role in defining our everyday realities” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:3). But the metaphorical processes vary to a certain extent from culture to culture, from society to society. Metaphorical mappings are likely to vary in universality, that is, some may represent potential 'metaphorical universals', and others might be highly culture and language specific. Just as the numerous numbers of universal metaphors there exist a large number of non-universal metaphors too. In discussing the mapping of metaphors we have to seriously look into which source-target mappings are common in all or at least many languages of the world and are therefore potentially transferable, and, on the contrary, which mappings are less transferable due to the physical, social or cultural experience they are based on: "For example, in some cultures the future is in front of us, whereas in others it is in back" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 14). But here we must not forget that even the more universal concepts are formed in a culture-specific environment. They are also influenced by cultural factors, even though not as much as others. Lakoff and Johnson therefore claim that "all experience is cultural through and through [...] we experience our 'world' in such a way that our culture is already present in the very experience itself" (1980: 57). They continue by stating that our concepts are based on cultural presuppositions which have a tendency to be either more physical, i.e. universal, or more cultural.

In order to underline this, we go back to the orientational concept UPDOWN. We have already discussed and shown that the metaphorical concept HAPPY IS UP is rather universal. However, if we take the system RATIONAL-EMOTIONAL, it is not as obvious which attribute is assigned to which orientation. Whether RATIONAL IS UP or EMOTIONAL IS UP, now depends on the cultural and personal presuppositions of the particular person and the cultural environment. In the Western industrial society, the tendency is definitely towards the concept RATIONAL IS UP because they believe that rational way of thinking and handling our emotions is the key to success. This leads us to
the fact that material value is very important in Western industrial societies. A high value is attached to resources as they lead to material enrichment. But in a different cultural setting emotion may get preference to rationality. Metaphorical concepts are influenced by certain values of a society, while in other parts of the world this may be seen differently.

If we also take into account geographic circumstances, all metaphor types may vary locally. How we experience our world is strongly influenced by outer physical and social characteristics of the region we live in. Topography, climatic zones, different kinds of vegetation and animal life affect our mental concepts as much as the structure of our society. We must take into consideration a person’s urban or a rural background. While concepts based on buildings and transport systems are likely to be more readily available to an urban person, a rural person will tend to incorporate concepts of landscape and animal species. Urban people, for instance, would rather take the concept of a machine to express strength, while others might prefer a strong and huge animal like a bull for this. In reality, however, traditional metaphorical expressions which once emerged in the countryside have survived even in the speech of people living in a city. One may say that a shift of the more universal concepts towards cultural variability is always noticeable depending on how the concepts are expressed in cultural terms.

Many of our metaphors vary because our experiences as human beings also vary. And, on the other hand, our metaphors vary because the cognitive processes we put to use for the creation of abstract thought may also vary. We know that languages are not monolithic but come in varieties reflecting the divergences in human experience. Actually metaphors vary not only cross-culturally but also within cultures. This variation can occur along a number of dimensions including the social, regional, ethnic, style, sub-cultural, diachronic, and individual dimensions. This approach to metaphor variation can be understood as the cognitive dimension of social-cultural diversity. Social dimensions include the differentiation of society into men and women, young and old, middle-class and working class, and so forth.
One example of this is the man–woman dimension. This dimension seems to be operative in several distinct cases: the way men talk about women, the way women talk about men, the way men and women talk about women, the way men and women talk about the world in general (i.e., not only about the other). In English-speaking countries (but also in others), men use expressions like kitten, bird, chick, cookie, dish, sweetie pie etc to refer to women. These metaphorical expressions assume certain conceptual metaphors: WOMEN ARE SMALL, WOMEN ARE BIRDS (bird, chick, hen-party), and WOMEN ARE SWEET FOOD (cookie, dish, sweetie pie). However, when women talk about men they do not appear to use these metaphors of men, or use them in a more limited way. Men are not characterized as birds or chicks, but they can be thought of as LARGE FURRY ANIMALS instead, such as bulls, lions or bears.

To explain regional dimensions we can think about South and East Indian traditions which give birth to many metaphors. It is possible to have conceptual metaphors related to ‘tali’ which is tied in the neck of the bride during Hindu marriage in southern part of India. Similarly the Bengalees from the East can easily relate to ‘sankha’ (white bangle made of choral), ‘pala’ (red bangle) and ‘sindoor’ (vermillion) which are signs of a married woman. And there is possibility of conceptual metaphors related to these terms.

Personal history also plays a role in shaping metaphorical conceptualization. This is imperceptibly true of ordinary people but it is much more clearly true of poets and other creative writers. We can suggest that the unique metaphor-based symbolic system that an author uses may be partially determined by his or her personal life histories. For example, metaphors of American poet and novelist, Sylvia Plath’s poems come in part from the fact that her father was German and that he was an entomologist specializing in bees. Or, we can take popular American writer, Hemingway’s symbolic system. Hemingway did bullfighting in Spain, was a big game hunter in Africa, and was a deep sea fisherman in Florida. All of these activities became symbolic in his novels and short stories.

Undoubtedly human cognition is largely dependent on metaphors. Without them the possibilities to communicate in our world would be cognitively limited. We use metaphorical expressions to extend the repertoire of possibilities to express ourselves. Thus by using metaphorical expressions we not only fill in lexical gaps but also largely
extend our cognitive capacities. By doing so, complexity is reduced and the context is made more abstract. Moreover, metaphorical expressions contribute to the construction of the reality surrounding us. We build bridges not only between languages but also between the differences of two cultures. Each language is a way of seeing and reflecting the delicate nuances of cultural perceptions (Samovar & Porter, 2004:160), and it is translator who not only reconstructs the equivalences of words across linguistic boundaries but also reflects and transplants the emotional vibrations of another culture.

C. Schaffner rightly says, “By studying actual translations and their effects, Translation Studies can thus also contribute to the study of cultural aspects of conceptual metaphors. That is, the analysis of texts for metaphors and metaphorical reasoning processes in different languages may reveal possible cultural differences in the conceptual structures” (2004: 1264).

4.9 Issue of Untranslatability

Although translation as a human activity is as old as the Babel myth, Translation Studies as a discipline is relatively new and still evolving. The possibility of translation has always been a controversial issue. While talking about language, George Steiner in After Babel talks about two opposed views: the Universalists’ point of view and the relativists’ point of view. The Universalists are of the opinion that the underlying structure of languages is universal and hence translation is possible because the differences amongst languages are superficial. For long it was thought that there are two things which give birth to language, firstly, the structures of the Universe and secondly, the universal structures of human mind. And hence the possibility of communicating among different languages is strong as all of them always speak of the same Universe and they have the same human experience. But relativists simply deny the possibility of translation. They believe that the only thing when we do translating is to look for approximate analogies and equivalents. (Steiner 1977:73-4)
Within the last hundred years, the way the relationship between human experience of the Universe and different languages is conceived, has undergone slow transformation. In 1697, Leibniz said that “language is not the vehicle of thought but its determining medium.” He suggested that “thought is language internalized, and we think and feel as our particular language impels and allow us to do.” (Leibniz as cited in Steiner 1977:74)

In 1760, Hamann stressed the existence of “creative, irrational, and manifold proceedings through which language-unique to the species but so varied among nations shapes reality and is, in turn, acted upon by local human experience.” (Hamann as cited in Steiner 1977:78).

Humboldt spoke of the language as a “third universe” midway between the phenomenal reality of the “empirical world” and the internalized structures of consciousness. (Humboldt as cited in Steiner 1977:81). Language structures experience and at the same time this structuring is subject to the continuous flux of the collective behavior of the users.

In this century Internal linguistics made us aware of the fact that every language dissects different aspects of the same reality, that it is our language which biases our view of the Universe, that we only perceive in this Universe what our language shows of it. This position seems to be relevant to the questionability of translation as a satisfactory practice.

Here is one of the most famous quotations in which Whorf (1940) laid out his view on the relationship between language and thought: “…the background linguistic system (in other words, the grammar) of each language is not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas but rather is itself the shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individual’s mental activity, for his analysis of impressions, for his synthesis of his mental stock in trade. Formulation is not an independent process, strictly rational in the old sense, but is part of a particular grammar, and differs, from slightly to greatly, between different grammars. We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds – and this mans largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely
because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way. An agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is confined in the patterns of our language” (as cited in Hudson, 1996: 96).

The principle of ‘linguistic relativity’ stated by Whorf implies, that no man can describe nature with total impartiality; on the contrary he is subject to certain ways of interpretation. As far as the human conscience is concerned, there is no universal and objective physical reality. We perceive and describe nature according to the orientations imposed by our native language. The same physical evidence does not lead all observers to the same image of the Universe, unless they have a similar linguistic background. The name of Edward Sapir has been largely associated to his disciple Benjamin Whorf, especially in the so called “Sapir-Whorf hypothesis”. However, both of them had different points of view about the relationship between language, thought and culture.

According to Sapir, there is no relationship of causality between language and culture that is between a selected inventory of experience (culture) and the particular manner in which the society expresses all experience (language). Culture and language are two non-comparable and unrelated processes unless it can be shown that culture has an innate form, a series of formal patterns quite apart from subject-matter that may serve as a term of comparison with language. However, the points of contact between Sapir’s and Whorf’s hypotheses are very important. Sapir stated: “No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The world, in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached.” (Sapir as cited in Bassnett, 2002:21)

We must agree that absolute sameness between two languages can not exist. Eugene Nida, in Language Structure and Translation (1975), insists on the existence of three presuppositions which must underlie all semantic analysis:

1. No word (or semantic unit) ever has exactly the same meaning in two different utterances.
2. There are no complete synonyms within a language.
3. There are no exact correspondences between related words in different languages. After these statements, Nida rejects any possibility of perfect communication and affirms that all communication is one of degree.

Nida indicates that the cultural fact symbolized by a word provides the *denotative* meaning, whereas the emotional response experienced by the speakers in the culture is the basis of the *connotative* meaning.

The search for linguistic universals is still one of the main objectives of contemporary linguistics, and the general opinion is that inter-linguistic communication is possible, with a higher or lower degree of equivalence.

Eugene Nida, in *Language Structure and Translation* (1975:27), classifies the problems of translation as:

- Loss of information
- Adding of information
- Skewing of information

Catford, in *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965:93) states that “in total translation, translation equivalence depends on the interchangeability of the SL, and TL text in the same situation.”

He distinguishes between 2 types of untranslatability: linguistic and cultural. Linguistic untranslatability takes place when the TL has no formally corresponding feature. This type of untranslatability happens typically in cases where an ambiguity peculiar to the SL text is a functionally relevant feature, for example SL puns. Cultural untranslatability, on the other hand, is not due to difference between two languages, but crops up when a situational feature, functionally relevant for the SL text, is completely absent from the culture of the TL. For example one can not find an English equivalent for the Bengali word *nandimookh*. And it happens because this is a very typical Bengali ceremony performed in the morning of the marriage when the eldest male members of both the bride and the groom perform certain rituals to please the souls of the long gone forefathers. As English culture does not have this type of ritual, untranslatability is obvious to occur while translating the word *nandimookh*. 
Catford admits that in many cases, what provokes untranslatability is the impossibility of finding an equivalent collocation in the TL. (Catford 1965:93-103).

Peter Newmark in his *Approaches to Translation* states that any operation of translation entails a loss of meaning that he classifies in four groups (Newmark 1981:7-8):

1. If the text describes a situation which has elements peculiar to the natural environment, institution and culture of its language area, there is an inevitable loss of meaning, since the transference to or rather the substitution or replacement by the translator’s language can only be approximate.

2. Two languages, both in their basic character (langue) and their social varieties (parole) in context have different lexical, grammatical and sound systems, and segment many physical objects and all intellectual concepts differently.

3. The individual uses of language of the text writer and the translator do not coincide. Everybody has lexical if not grammatical idiosyncrasies, and attaches ‘private’ meanings to a few words.

4. The translator and the text writer have different theories of meaning and different values. The translator may look for symbolism where realism was intended, for different emphasis.

The translator may intend to produce as nearly as possible the same effect on his readers as the source text created in the minds of its readers. But there are uncountable instances where this effect can not be attained.

This happens:

i. Because of the peculiarity of the language, to the existence of puns etc.

ii. a non-literary text relating to an aspect of the culture familiar to the first reader but to the target language reader is unlikely to produce equivalent effect.

iii. There is the artistic work with a strong flavor which may also be rooted in a particular historical period. If the culture is as important as the message, the translator reproduces the form and content of the original as literary as possible, without regard for equivalent effect. (Newmark 1981)
According to Newmark all these elements that imply ambiguity, polisemy and puns are translated in a different way, depending on the type of text. If it is a literary text, these elements have to be produced as perfectly as it is possible, trying to keep the principle of equivalence. If it is a non-literary text, they may be explained in the TL. Perhaps the most evident problems in translation are the handling of idioms, puns and metaphors. As Bassnett (2002:30) points out, “idioms, like puns, are culture bound.” She further states, “In the process of interlingual translation one idiom can be substituted for another. That substitution is made not on the basis of a corresponding or similar image contained in the phrase, but on the function of the idiom.” (2002:31).

The translation of metaphor is one specific problem in the process of translation. Metaphor points out to a particular vision of the world, specific in each culture. Dagut stresses the uniqueness of metaphor and denies the possibility of finding an equivalent in TL:

Since a metaphor in the SL is, by definition, a new piece of performance, a semantic novelty, it can clearly have no existing ‘equivalence’ in the TL; what is unique can have no counterpart. Here the translator’s bilingual competence is of help to him only in the negative sense of telling him that any equivalence in this cannot be ‘found’ but will have to be created. The crucial question that arises is thus whether a metaphor can, strictly speaking, be translated as such, or whether it can only be ‘reproduced’ in some way (Dagut 1976:21-3).

Perfection is like a mirage for a translator. In each work translators will have to fix a degree of fidelity and tolerance. Equivalence, more or less approximate, and adequacy of the translated text to its original is the only thing one may hope for.
4.10 Metaphor Translation: Existing Approaches

In his popular book *A Textbook of Translation* Newmark writes, “whenever you meet a sentence that is grammatical but does not appear to make sense, you have to test its apparently nonsensical element for a possible metaphorical meaning” (Newmark 1988: 106).

His book can be considered a practical guide to one’s strategies of negotiating the translation problems. He says that while the “central problem of translation is the overall choice of a translation method for a text, the most important particular problem is the translation of metaphor” (Newmark 1988: 104). Once the strategy of translation is decided all the hundreds of smaller decisions become necessary to the creation of the new text. Whether stock or original, for Newmark, metaphor “always involves illusion … [it is] a kind of deception, often used to conceal an intention” (ibid). As we use language we have a natural tendency to imply messages rather than making blunt statements, the reasons of which may be wit, politeness, status etc. He goes on to say: “metaphor incidentally demonstrates a resemblance, a common semantic area between two or more or less similar things — the image and the object” (Newmark 1988: 104). But a question may arise here. Because if the resemblance is just ‘incidental’ can a sensible and effective equivalent be produced?

Newmark gives many examples of polysemy from single words to extended phrases and suggests possible translations. He even acknowledges that a whole text can be based on a metaphor. But he still presents metaphor in six degrees of conventionality; “dead, cliché, stock, adapted, recent and original” (Newmark 1988: 105). Though these are the surface forms in which we encounter metaphor, the importance of them cannot be overlooked. Each source text is a cultural product with a specific context and functions and the translator always has to deal with specifics.
Newmark defines the act of translating as transferring the meaning of a text, from one language to another, taking care mainly of the functional relevant meaning.

He works with three propositions:

- "the more important the language of a text, the more closely it should be translated";
- "the less important the language of a text... the less closely it needs to be translated";
- "The better written a text, the more closely it should be translated, whatever its degree of importance..."

He is of the opinion that the translator has to establish priorities in selecting which varieties of meaning to transfer in the first place. For that he has to use his creativity, particularly when he is forced to distort the target language introducing new elements of another culture.

Newmark criticizes the present-day controversies stuck to the conflict between free and literal translation.

For him if the theory of translation insists on discussing the topic of equivalence it would be text to text equivalence and not simply word to word. He distinguishes types of texts and types of words in the texts.

He classifies texts in three categories:

- scientific-technological
- institutional-cultural
- literary texts

But he stresses that technical or institutional translation can be as challenging as rewarding as literary translation.
Because every word has its own identity, its resonance, its value, and words are affected by their contexts, he distinguishes different types of words:

- functional words
- technical words
- common words
- institutional words
- lexical words
- concept words

He considers two types of translation: semantic and communicative, although he states that the majority of texts require communicative rather than semantic translation. Communicative translation is strictly functional and usually the work of a team. Semantic translation is linguistic and encyclopedic and is generally the work of one translator.

Among the translation problems Newmark (1981) discusses he gives special attention to the metaphor. He proposes seven procedures for its translation:

1. Reproducing the same image in the TL, e.g., golden hair—*goldenenes Haar*.
2. Replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture, e.g., other fish to fry—*d’autres chats à fouetter*.
3. Translating metaphor by simile, retaining the image, e.g., *Ces zones cryptuaire ou s’ e’labore la beaute’.*—the crypt-like areas where beauty is manufactured. According to Newmark, this procedure can modify the shock of the metaphor.
4. Translating metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense (or occasionally a metaphor plus sense), e.g., *tout un vocabulaire molie’resque*—a whole repertoire of medical quackery such as Molie’rë might have used. Newmark suggests the use of this compromise solution in order to avoid comprehension problems; however, it results in a loss of the intended effect.
5. Converting metaphor to sense, e.g., *sein Brot verdienen*—to earn one’s living. This procedure is recommended when the TL image is too broad in sense or not appropriate to the register. However, emotive aspects may get lost.
6. Deletion, if the metaphor is redundant.
7. Using the same metaphor combined with sense, in order to enforce the image.

For Newmark then translation is a craft. The translator acquires a technique in which the process to be followed takes into account the acts of comprehension, interpretation, formulation and recreation.

4.11 A Potential Application of Conceptual Metaphor in Translation

Lakoff and Johnson’s idea of conceptual metaphor can potentially be very useful to the translator. Newmark looked at metaphor as ‘incidental’ but the cognitive linguistic approach considers metaphor to be a function of perception and thought which can be expressed linguistically. This is not incidental but fundamental.

An awareness of conceptual metaphor empowers us to explore terminology. The origin of a culturally bound word is often metaphorical in nature.

Etymology or the study of word origin is perhaps one place where metaphor exists almost entirely. The metaphors contained in an etymological word, phrase or term, can be ultimately the best means of understanding how our ancestors thought about the world, and how ultimately the ideas have changed into having what we now have. It happens quite often that the etymological metaphor of a word, even if we are not immediately familiar with the specific etymology, seems logical and totally understandable to us perhaps after a brief explanation of how it came to mean that. Eugene Nida, working for the American Bible Society, had the practical experience of the problems of getting both what he termed formal and dynamic equivalence in a greater variety of source and target languages than any other translator can even think of. In Towards a Science of Translating (1964) he identifies the gaps between culturally defined metaphors, even when they are playing a literal role. He explained it with an example of Adam’s apple. In a region where nobody has ever heard about Adam or never seen an apple, this metaphorical phrase may create confusion. There may be different lexical realization for this phrase in another language but the literal translation of this English phrase is
problematic. In Uduk, for example, this anatomical feature becomes ‘the thing that wants beer’ (Nida 1964:219). But if the translator uses the analytical process which Lakoff and Johnson employed in the endnotes of their updated version of *Metaphors We Live By* (2003), the conceptual metaphor will help him to understand the dual metaphorical structures behind Nida’s two terms. The explanation will go in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English : <em>Adam’s apple</em></th>
<th>Uduk: <em>the thing that wants beer</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual Metonym:</strong></td>
<td>1st Conceptual Metonym:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Judeo-Christian tradition Adam was the first man. Here Adam stands for all men.</td>
<td>The thyroid cartilage is in the throat, i.e. in the area of the body where thirst is felt; where beer and its effects are first experienced, although it is the whole man who wants the beer. (The part stands for the whole)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual Metaphor:</strong></td>
<td>2nd Conceptual Metonym:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stretched skin over the forward protrusion of the thyroid cartilage evokes the shape of an apple. In English, descriptions of the body abound in such linkings: roof of the mouth, bridge of the nose, arch of the foot, etc. (One object is described in terms of another.)</td>
<td>Although women also have a thyroid cartilage in the same part of the body, it is not a prominent feature of their physique. In Uduk culture of Southern Sudan women are associated with growing grain and brewing beer, while men are more associated with drinking it. So, a male feature can be described in terms of a male activity. (One aspect can stand for another.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This makes one thing crystal clear that in spite of the different linguistic terms the metaphorical thought process worked in the same way irrespective of the different cultures. The understanding of conceptual metaphor enables the translator to scrutinize the structure and components of these lexical items. While translating the translator is not misled to think of an actual apple belonging to Adam or of a physiological feature in a man’s throat craving for ‘beer’. 
*Prominentia laryngea* is the descriptive medical term for the English phrase *Adam’s apple*. But we hardly see anyone using the medical term. In fact there is no need of explaining the term if it is being used in the English community. In the same way a native Uduk speaker will not misunderstand something familiar and conventional in his language. But one can not deny the fact that conceptual metaphor will be of great assistance for a translator to make his job easy rendering his work an easy understandability to the target readers. Newmark (1991) encourages us by saying that a language such as English would gain by the literal translation of many foreign key-words, idioms and possibly even proverbs (Newmark 1991:35). Time and again there have been several discussions to minimize the translation loss. And there seems to be no end to the issue of the possibility or impossibility of translating metaphors. In this connection Nida comments: “Some persons object to any shift from a metaphor to another, a metaphor to a simile, or a metaphor to a nonmetaphor, because they regard such an alteration as involving some loss of information. However, the same persons usually do not object to the translation of a nonmetaphor by a metaphor, for such a change appears to increase the effectiveness of the communication” (Nida 1964: 220). But we should not adopt any extreme position as it shuts all possibilities of communication. Modern understanding of conceptual metaphor helps the translator not to look at the source text with a skeptical eye and indulge in the mechanical task of finding equivalent but to look at the ‘metaphorical web’ as useful for enriching language.

The reason why metaphors are especially hard to translate is that often, they are a product of the culture that belongs to the language. The author of the original metaphor probably had an audience in mind that has approximately the same cultural background as him. When the text is translated, however, a different culture has to be taken into account. The same metaphor might not have the wanted effect there. The metaphorical vehicle may not have the same connotations as it does in the source culture. This is the reason why metaphor often present in her article “Metaphor and Translation: some implications of a cognitive approach” (2004:1253), Schäffner mentions similar reason for the translation problems that metaphors cause: “It has been argued that metaphors can
become a translation problem, since transferring them from one language and culture to another one may be hampered by linguistic and cultural differences”. The translator has to make an estimation about the knowledge or ideas which the source culture and the target culture share (in other words, he has to establish a common ground, if there is any), to translate the metaphor properly. It is due to this that “[translatability] is no longer a question of the individual metaphorical expression, as identified in the ST, but it becomes linked to the level of conceptual systems in source and target culture” (Schäffner 1258).

A successful translation must capture the sense of the original rather than merely the words and could only be regarded as a successful piece of communication if it makes sense to the receptor. In semiotic terms that would mean that signs, connotations, denotations and references in the source text would have to be translated or recreated in such a way in the target text that the response of the target language receptors would be equivalent to that of the source language receptors.

If a translation can meet the following basic requirements of (1) making sense; (2) conveying the spirit and manner of the original; (3) having a natural and easy form of expression; and (4) producing a similar response, it stands to reason that some conflict between form and content will result (Nida 1964: 164). Most often content will have priority over style.

The whole process of thinking is based on the perception of similarity and difference and metaphor is a fundamental tool of exploring that similarity or difference. Metaphors depend on the assumption that the reader or hearer shares a great deal of knowledge about the vehicle with the writer or speaker. Use and meaning of metaphors are generally culturally or group determined. Most metaphors that we use are based on easily recognizable grounds and thus do not disturb the flow of speech. But poetry tends to make extensive use of obscure metaphors and unraveling these metaphors poses a challenge for the readers and also makes poetry reading interesting. Proverbs are short sayings of folk wisdom -of well known maxims, facts or truths – expressed succinctly and in a way that makes them easy to remember. Sometimes when translating certain
word of cultural flavor, there is no equivalent word in target language but only to explain. One has to translate the implied meaning according to contexts.

As conceptual metaphor is a matter of thought it can pass over interlinguistic barriers. The translator has to look into the nature of the idiom, the potency of a given image and what relation it might have to an extended metaphor in the larger discourse of the text or to say precisely, to the larger culture. And it is possible when the translator considers a metaphor more than a stylistic category. As a result his or her translation will not be restricted to find a matching TL expression. He or she can feel more flexible and consider translation by explanation or paraphrasing or translation and explanation both at a time if the intentions of the author of the source text are accessible.

4.12 Metaphors in *Udo Megh*: A Discussion

It is worth mentioning at this point that the title of the concerned text is itself a metaphor. The title *Udo Megh* translated as *The Stray Cloud* embodies Shewli who appeared suddenly and unexpectedly like that piece of cloud which overshadowed the peaceful blue sky of Deya and Soumya and disturbed the apparent happiness of their conjugal life (Bhattacharya, 2007. Personal communication).

Since metaphors are related to different cultural domains, this implies that the translator has to do the job of conceptual mapping on behalf of the TL reader; he has to look for a similar TL cognitive equivalence in the target culture. The more the SL and TL cultures in question conceptualize experience in a similar way, the easier the task of translation will be. But since human real-world experiences are not always similar, and metaphors record these experiences, the task of the translator becomes more difficult when translating these metaphors across languages related to different cultures. The difficulty of metaphor rendition lies not in the assumption that languages cannot provide equivalent expressions for their metaphors, but in the fact that they lack corresponding metaphors related to the same conceptual domain or area. Hence translators, whose task
is to produce a TL text that bears a close resemblance to the SL text, should be aware of cognitive and cultural issues when translating from the SL to TL or vice-versa. It is not enough for translators to be bilingual, but they should have sound knowledge of the target culture.

In the case of our selected text our focus will be on conceptual metaphor as it provides a good approach to discuss various metaphorical expressions based on human concepts and experiences. In the cross-linguistic comparison we will compare two languages, Bengali (SL) and English (TL) to show cross cultural similarities as well as variations. The two languages belong to different language groups and have their distinct cultural ideas and assumptions. The method that we have adopted in translation of metaphorical expressions in the text *Udo Megh* will be very beneficial in understanding metaphors in the light of cognitive approach. It will also illustrate the relevance of Conceptual Metaphor Theory for Translation Studies.

In search for cognitive equivalence to replace the SL image with a TL image that does not clash with the target culture, we have differentiated between two cognitive mapping conditions to the translation of metaphors. And they are:

1. Metaphors available in TL with
   a) Similar lexicalization patterns
   b) Different lexicalization patterns.
2. Metaphors, not available in TL
   a) Possible to generate in translation because of shared experiences
   b) Not possible to generate in TL because of culture specific expressions.

These categories will be exemplified below:
1. Metaphors Available in Target Language

a) Metaphors which have similar lexicalization patterns in the Target Language

This category represents metaphors expressing a small number of ideas shared by the two languages and hence expressed, roughly speaking, by similar expressions. Anthropologists call these shared ideas 'cultural universals.' Comprising many diverse sub-cultures, a universal culture can be thought of as an assemblage of common core attitudes and values reflected by practices common to most of the sub-cultures. Similarities in mapping conditions across diverse cultures could be labeled as 'pancultural metaphorical expression,' which derives from 'panhuman sharing of basic experience.'

The following examples from *Udo Megh* will help us to clarify our point.

(i) *Amar rakto tagbag kore futche*

   English: My blood is boiling.
   
   Sense: Anger

In the above example both the English and Bengali metaphorical expressions are used to convey the concept ANGER. It is to be noted that both Bengali and English use metaphorical expressions for the concept which have similar lexicalization pattern. We can say that in case of this SL metaphor, there is an equivalent expression available in TL which is identical in both form and meaning.

(ii) *setu baandhaar chesta koraa*

   Bridge build try do

   English: try to build a bridge
   
   Sense: to minimize gap (physical or mental) between people.

A bridge is usually built to reduce the gap between two locations of space. Similarly the efforts taken up to minimize the difference of opinion between individuals can be compared to a bridge. We can see that the TL has the same lexical pattern as is seen in the SL.
iii) *Naak golaano*

Nose   poke

English: poke one’s nose.

Sense: to interfere in someone else’s matter.

As nose is the most protruding body part on the frontal side of our bodies, it would be coming on our way if we make physical contact with another individual or object. Here the physical contact with nose is used to refer to the act of interference. This expression is available both in Bengali and English.

iv) *Nijer paaye daaraano*.

Own feet   stand

English: Stand on one’s own feet.

Sense: Self dependent.

A person standing on his own feet does not depend on anyone or any device for walking. Nobody has any doubt regarding this. This knowledge is easily connected with the idea of someone’s self-sufficiency and self dependence. Both Bengali and English use this metaphorical expression to convey the sense of one’s self dependence.

b) Metaphors having similar mapping conditions but lexically realized differently

In this category come many such sayings which embody a general truth. These are expressions which can be metaphorically linked to ideas, people, their life style, religion etc. These can be rational truths, with or without any empirical basis. Here we have cited some examples from *Udo Megh*. These will show us how the English translations and their Bengali counterpart metaphors are related to the same conceptual domain. But there is difference in lexical choice.
i)  *Khaajnar cheye baajna beshi*

Revenue than musical instrument much

English: Empty vessels sound much

ii)  *Chore chore mastuto bhai.*

Thief thief cousin brothers.

Birds of a feather flock together.

iii)  *Thod bori khaada khaada bari thod*

Inside stem of a banana tree | little ball of pasted pulses | upright | upright | little ball of pasted pulses | inside stem of a banana tree.

English: Putting old wine into new bottle.

---

2. Metaphors not available in Target Language

a) Metaphors which are possible to generate in translation because of shared experiences.

While translating *Udo Megh*, it was observed that it was possible to undertake a literal rendition of certain metaphors based on universal or overlapping human experience.

Certain universal experiences share underlying conceptual structure despite the absence of relevant linguistic expressions in every culture. In *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson mentions experiential gestalts which are based on the nature of our bodies, our interactions with our physical environment and our interactions with other people within
our culture. These experiential gestalts serve as the grounding of conceptual metaphors (1980: 117). Based on such shared conceptual mapping it is possible to generate new metaphors in the target language. Translation thus becomes a process to enrich the target language.

Chokh e dhulo deoyaa

Eye inside dust give

English: To throw dust in someone’s eyes.

If dust is thrown in someone’s eyes it obstructs vision. One can not keep track of things. Thus the sense of deception or cheating someone becomes evident by the expression *throwing dust in someone’s eyes*. Anybody all over the world has the same physical experience and can easily connect to this.

Paayer nich theke maati shore jayoa

Feet beneath ground slip

English: Slipping away of ground under one’s feet.

Ground is the base to stand. If that is not there one will be unstable to stand and fall down. Instability is always compared to a troublesome situation. Thus the literal translation of the Bengali expression will not be problematic for the target readers to relate to.

Maathaay aakash bhenge poraa.

Head sky break fall.

English: the sky falling in one’s head.

Such expression springs up from our conception of the hugeness of the sky. If it literally falls on one’s head it will bring about calamity. Such expression gives the sense of facing
in an unexpected disaster. Such expression easily conveys its inner meaning to the target readers because of the universal experience.

*Mukhe chaayaa ghonaay.*

Face shadow overclouded

English: The face clouded.

Cloud is related to darkness and darkness to unhappiness. Everyone is familiar with the concept HAPPINESS IS LIGHT. Hence clouding of face can easily be understood by the target readers as the unhappy state of mind.

*Raag jol hoye gelo*

Anger water become

English: Anger turning to water.

Everyone is familiar with the concept ANGER IS HEAT, Water is associated with cooling. Thus the literal rendition *anger turning to water* conveys the sense of cooling of one’s anger.

*.Chokhe andhokaar dekhaa*

Eye darkness see

English: Everything dark in front of one’s eyes.

We know that darkness impedes clear vision. Everyone has the experience that mental trauma or anxiety brings us to a state where we are almost blind to see anything. Thus the metaphorical expression *everything dark in front of one’s eyes* easily can convey the meaning of source metaphor.
Pake pore jaoyaa

Mud fall go

English: To fall in filth.

Fall is universally associated with misfortune. Mud is associated with dirt. Thus falling in filth can be understood by the target readers as the misfortune of a person.

Pathor buk

Stone heart

English: Stone heart.

All of us know that stone is heavy, a big burden to lift. Here the concept SADNESS IS BURDEN is behind such expression. Unhappiness of mind is always associated with a heavy burden. And it is an universal experience.

b) Metaphors which are not possible to generate in TL because of culture specific expressions.

We have already discussed how language functions as the best mirror of human society and culture. It is from the language that we can discover the culture specific terms which are very integral to a particular culture. According to Dagut (1972:32), 'the translatability of any given SL metaphor depends on (1) the particular cultural experience and semantic associations exploited by it, and (2) the extent to which these can, or not, be reproduced non-anomalously in TL, depending on the degree of overlap in each particular case.' Such metaphors are called root metaphors underlying people's views or attachments and shaping their understanding of a situation.
Here we have cited few examples from *Udo Megh* which show that the literal English translations for these expressions do not work as equivalents. The attempts to maintain these metaphors in English translation have communicatively failed. To solve this problem, we have provided glossary after the English translation of the text and thus clarified the meanings. However, few such terms were retained in our English translation so that the target readers enjoy the flavor of the original.

*Dhoyaa tulsi paataa*

Cleaned *tulsi* leaf

Sense: Honest person

*Tulsi* is the sacred plant dearer to the Lord Vishnu. *Tulsi* symbolizes purity. It is considered as the holy plant to the Hindus. *Tulsi* is believed to promote longevity and life long happiness and worshipped in every Hindu house. As this is very much culture specific the target readers would not have related to the original Bengali expression if it was translated literally. Hence the implied sense of an honest person is provided in our translation.

*Mukh haandi*

Face vessel for cooking

Sense: Dull or gloomy face.

*Haandi* means a deep, narrow-mouthed vessel for cooking food. This word is very specific to Indian culture. If we translate this term literally into English it will make no sense to the TL readers as they are not acquainted to the cultural item *haandi*. There is no single lexical item which corresponds to the word *haandi*. So the sense was conveyed as gloomy face or to pull a long face.
Chaadnata

*Chaadnata* is a canopied place, bounded by banana plants and is decorated with *alpana* or colorful designs. This is the place where rituals of Bengali marriages take place. There is no English equivalent for this culture specific term. We have retained this Bengali word in our English translation and clarified the meaning in the glossary.

*Judhisthirer kanya*

Judhisthir’s daughter

Sense: A virtuous and true person

Yudhisthira was the first Pandava, born to Kunti, who was famous for his virtue and truthfulness. In any adverse situation he never left truth.

The translation of the particular word in the novel *Udo Megh* can not be literally translated as it will not make sense to the TL readers who do not know Indian epics. Hence the sense was translated as a true person.

*Jodobharot*

Lifeless Bharat

Sense: dull or inactive person

Bharat the eldest son of King Rishabdev, was a devout theist and a great ruler of Treta Yuga. Having duly installed his sons as new rulers he resolutely departed from his opulent palace and started to lead a life of a mendicant. He was always engaged in constant remembrance of the supreme lord. He completely lost any desire for mundane sense pleasures and remained steady in his devotion. But unfortunately he become so absorbed in raising a bay deer that he gradually forgot his holy duties and even forgot to meditate on and worship the Supreme Lord. Even at the time of his death his mind was absorbed in the body of the deer. After death he was
reborn as a deer but remembered his previous life. Later he was born to a devout saint belonging to the family line of Angira.

Due to his exalted consciousness, Bharat, could remember his previous lives. He was afraid of making the same mistake and so he remained aloof from family attachments and material activities. He didn’t want to fall into the false bodily identification again, so he behaved like a fool and dullard. Hence he was called Jado Bharat.

If we translate this term *jado bharat* into English it will not make any sense to the target readers as they might not be familiar with our culture and history. So while translating the inner sense of this term was conveyed and the word ‘inactive’ was used in the place of the original word *Jado Bharat*.

### 4.13 Conclusion

Since metaphors are related to different cultural domains, this implies that the translator has to do the job of conceptual mapping on behalf of the TL reader; he has to look for a similar TL cognitive equivalence in the target culture. The more the SL and TL cultures in question conceptualize experience in a similar way, the easier the task of translation will be. But since human real-world experiences are not always similar, and metaphors record these experiences, the task of the translator becomes more difficult when translating these metaphors across languages related to different cultures. The difficulty of metaphor rendition lies not in the assumption that languages cannot provide equivalent expressions for their metaphors, but in the fact that they lack counterpart metaphors related to the same conceptual domain or area. Therefore, in search for cognitive equivalence to replace the SL image with a TL image that does not clash with the target culture, we have differentiated between three cognitive mapping conditions to the translation of metaphors: (1) metaphors of similar mapping conditions, (2) metaphors having similar mapping conditions but lexically implemented differently, and (3) metaphors of different mapping conditions. The difference between these three can be represented as a continuum, with the set of metaphors of similar mapping conditions at
one end, and those of different mapping conditions at the other end of the continuum, and those of similar mapping conditions but lexically realized differently as an intermediate set in between the polar opposites. Examples of the first category generate as human experiences throughout the globe are more or less similar; the second set is related to the same conceptual domain in the SL and the TL, but the ethical system in the TL or the SL has led to major differences in lexical choice; whereas the third set includes the culture-bound SL metaphors that are mapped into a domain different from that of the TL.

It can be concluded that translators, whose task is to produce a TL text that bears a close resemblance to the SL text, should be aware of cognitive and cultural issues when translating from Bengali into English or vice-versa. Therefore, it is not enough for translators to be bilingual, but they should be bicultural as well. Because translators suffer twice when approaching some metaphors which are culture-bound and due to their figurative meaning intralingually; it is recommended that translators should be trained in coping with metaphor translation not only in foreign-language programs, but also in their native language.