

۱۳۸۸۷۹.

METAPHORICAL DISCOURSE AND IDEOLOGY IN TRANSLATION

Nilloofar Imani, MA.

IAU, Tehran South Branch

Farzaneh Haratyan, Ph.D.

IAU, Garmsar Branch

سرشناسه	: ایمانی، نیلوفر، ۱۳۷۱ -
عنوان و نام پدیدآور	Imani, Niloofar
مشخصات نشر	/ Metaphorical discourse and ideology in translation:
مشخصات ظاهری	Niloofar Imani, Farzaneh Haratyan.
شابک	: تهران: شاپرک سرخ، ۱۳۹۵ = ۲۰۱۶ م.
وضعیت فهرست نویسی	: ۱۳۳ ص.
یادداشت	: 978-600-8435-73-0
آوانویسی عنوان	: فیبا
موضوع	: انگلیسی.
موضوع	: متافوریکا...
شناسه افزوده	: ترجمه
شناسه افزوده	: Translating and interpreting:
رده بندی کنگره	: هراتیان، فرزانه، ۱۳۵۶ -
رده بندی دیویی	: Farzaneh Haratian:
شماره کتابشمار ملی	: ۳۰۶/الف/۳ ۱۳۹۵
	: ۰۲/۴۱۸
	: ۴۴۶۰۴۸۶

Titel: METAPHORICAL DISCOURSE AND IDEOLOGY IN TRANSLATION

Authors : Niloofar Imani - Farzaneh Haratyan

Published : First Print 2016

Publication: Shaparak-Sorkh

Printing & Binding : Shaparak

Circulation : 1000

Price: 120000 Rial

ISBN : 978-600-8435-73-0



Shaparak- sorkh publications

1 unit.24 No. Shahid janati Alley.Azadi St. Enqelab Sq.Tehran.Iran

+9821-66933746

+98912-2144600

www.shaparac.com

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
Newmark's Theory.....	11
Translation of Metaphors.....	13
The Similarity View	15
The Interaction View	15
The Pragmatic View.....	16
The Cognitive View	16
Metaphor and Simile.....	19
Analyzing Metaphor and Simile	20
Types of Metaphor and Simile and their Translations.....	23
Dead Metaphors	28
Cliché Metaphor.....	29
Standard Metaphors	30
Recent Metaphors	31
Adapted Metaphors.....	31
Original Metaphors	32
Other Forms of Figures of Speech	33
Metonymy	35
Synecdoche.....	36
Euphemism	37
Hyperbole.....	39
Personification	39
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): Origins and Goals.....	40
Textual Level Analysis	46

Words with Different Ideological Implications	47
Words with Ideologically Significant Implications	47
Passivization/ Activization	47
Nominalized Forms/ Verbalization	48
Positive/ Negative.....	48
Tense.....	48
Thematization (Theme/ Rhyme Displacement)	49
Inference (Reasoning Rather than Direct or Explicit Statement)	49
Shift of Modality.....	49
Cornerstones of CDA: Discourse, Ideology, Power	50
Ideology	55
Power	59
Michel Foucault's View of Discourse, Power and Ideology	62
Norman Fairclough.....	66
Ruth Wodak.....	73
Teun A. Van Dijk	76
Approaches in CDA	81
Historical-discourse Approach	82
Cognitive-discourse Approach.....	83
Social-discourse Approach.....	86
CDA and Translation Studies	89
Ideology in Translation	94
Political Discourse Translation	99
Recent Researches on CDA	104
References	109

Introduction

Translation is a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, as Lefevere (1992:31) states, whatever their intention, "reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way". "Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society" (Lefevere, 1992, p. 31).

According to Lefevere (1992, p. 31), "rewritings can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices, and the history of translation is also the history of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another". But rewriting can also represent "innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by translation helps us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live" (Lefevere, 1992, p. 31).

In translating metaphor, many scholars, like Nida (1964), Catford (1965), Mason (1982), and Hornby (1988) believe that culture is a main factor in translating metaphor because it is quite relevant to the nature of metaphor. On the other hand, Dagut (1976: 32) in his article entitled "Can Metaphor Be Translated?" states that:

There is no simplistic general rule for translation of metaphor, but that the translatability of any given source language metaphor depends on (1) the particular cultural experiences and semantic exploited by it, and (2) the extent to which these can, or cannot, be reproduced non-

anomalously in target language, depending on the degree of overlap in each particular case.

Furthermore (1987:82) states:

“What determines the translatability of a source language metaphor is not its boldness or originality but rather the content to which the cultural experiences and lexical matrices on which it draws are shared by speakers of the particular target language.”

Regarding cognitive metaphors, linguists like Lakoff and Johnson (1980, P.3) believe that they exist in “everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action,” and they also mentioned that “the conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical”. Moreover, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, P.7) state that metaphorical discourses are derived from metaphorical concepts. ‘Time is money’ is a metaphorical concept and ‘you are wasting my time,’ ‘I don’t have the time to give you’ or ‘I have invested a lot of time in her’ are metaphorical discourses.

Also Steen (1994, P.4-5) suggests that:

Cognitive turn has had three significant consequences. First of all, metaphor has had its notorious stigma of abnormality or deviance removed. The second consequence of this new situation is less fortunate. For with metaphor’s conquering of the social sciences, it has lost its comfortably clear character as an apparently well-defined problem within rhetoric and poetics. The third consequence of the revaluation of metaphor is the framing of a question which is the result of the other two consequences.

The notion that all literary languages are metonymic/metaphorical is not a new subject, and it had been advocated by many creative writers and literary translators. Literary critic Richards is quick to point out the connection: Richards for example, devotes two of six chapters of *The Philosophy of Language* (1936) to the subject. Not limiting his findings to literary language, Richards views metaphor as a fundamental property of human thought, connecting the metaphor to "transference". Metaphors, according to Richards, thus create meanings, or provide the means for thinking, thereby shaping our very lives.

In literary investigation, the view of metaphor is fundamental rather than an embellishment on language. The New Critics, echoed the view of the formalists; indeed for them the transaction between words and things could lead to a fusion yielding not just a decoration added to an object, but an entirely new and organically unified object.

While the contributions of post-structuralist thinkers to translation practice have been fairly negligible, some recent thinking on metaphor seems useful. Drawing on work by linguists like Jakobson, many post-structuralist thinkers tend to view metaphor as something always present even in the most common words. Indeed, post-structuralist scholars tend to argue that culture's view of "reality" is dependent on the metaphorical process. Language ceases to be viewed as something reflecting reality and instead becomes understood as the medium by which an individual's conception of reality is formed.

The double constitution of metaphor is perhaps best elaborated by Derrida, who in *White Mythology* (1972), translated in 1982; argues that "while metaphors are invariably encounter with an older canonical

system of associations, they also displace those associations, during which process the possibility for a semantic wandering is opened". Many of the terms Derrida uses for talking about metaphor are the very same he uses about translation. For Derrida, both translations and metaphor open up a space between non-meaning preceding language and meaning/truth embedded in language. For Derrida, every word functions as a metaphor, or better said, every word functions as a metaphor of a metaphor, thereby involving the reader/translator in the unlimited semiotic chain.

According to Encyclopedia of Literary Translation, perhaps the "postcolonial" approach to translating metaphor comes from a group of modernist literary translators from Brazil. Haroldo and Augusto de Campos (1990), who have articulated, a translation strategy that questions the transparent, self-effacing role of the translator who tends to reduce metaphor to simpler and easy to understand terms, and instead advocate emphasizing differences and diverging from the norm. Translation is viewed less as a medium to carry a unified and fixed meaning across cultures and instead as a medium that does not necessarily correspond with religion, music, or semantic fields of the original. Indeed, translation becomes another kind of original writing, just as inventive, inspired and spontaneous. The goal, according to the de Campos brothers, is to translate not literally, but metaphorically, with the aim of producing analogous effects by different means. The goal is less a version, more reversion; less a reconstitution of the signs in another language, more a reconstitution of the movement of the signs in language, even at the risk of adding phonetic, syntactic, or semantic connotations.