

# A Cognitive Account of Metaphor Translation in Two Chinese Versions of *The Wind in the Willows*<sup>1</sup>

**Yi Sun & Ya Guo**

Xi'an International Studies University, China

## *Abstract*

Cognitive Metaphor Theory (CMT), originally formulated by Lakoff and Johnson in 1980, rejects the traditional view of metaphor being a rhetorical phenomenon, and redefines it as a cognitive instrument by which humans perceive, categorize, and conceptualize the world. The cognitive method of metaphor studies offers an innovative research perspective on metaphor translation, which is more a process of reproducing in the target language the mapping relations of the original metaphor than a simple transplantation of the concept on the linguistic level. Metaphor is one of the most common figures of speech in children's literature, but its translation is not as effortless as it might be, for translators have to take into account not only factors such as linguistic, cultural, and social differences, but also children's limited linguistic level and cognitive abilities, which altogether pose a formidable challenge to translators. This paper attempts to construct a cognitive metaphor translation model by exploring the cognitive process that translators go through when dealing with metaphor from the perspective of CMT. The cognitive metaphor translation process is specified as including three steps: metaphor comprehension, metaphor adjustment, and metaphor reconstruction. By analyzing metaphor examples extracted from two Chinese versions of *The Wind in the Willows*, a masterpiece of Kenneth Grahame in children's literature of Britain, this article summarizes metaphor translation techniques in children's literature.

**Keywords:** *Cognitive Metaphor Theory, metaphor translation, children's literature, The Wind in the Willows*

## 1. Introduction

On April 4, 2016, Cao Wenxuan (曹文轩), a Chinese children's fiction writer, won the

Hans Christian Anderson Prize, the highest international recognition issued to an author of children's literature. The news of his success has been greatly welcomed by the Chinese people, and as a result, children's literature has come to the centre of academic interests. Such a top acknowledgement ought to be largely owing to the efforts by translators, whose contribution is mostly manifested in their creative metaphor renditions and cannot be underestimated.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Studies on metaphor

The word "metaphor" comes from the Greek word *metaphora*, which means "to transfer" or "to carry over" (Al-Zoubi, Al-ali, & Al-Hasnawi, 2006, p. 230). In other words, metaphor is the carrying of one thing across to another, which indicates that metaphor involves two objects, and one thing is known in terms of another. The study of metaphor dates back to the time of Aristotle, during which metaphor was regarded as a figure of speech and a rhetorical tool on the linguistic level; it was no more than a dispensable decoration, a derivation of normal language phenomena. In 1980, Lakoff, coauthoring with Johnson, first situated metaphor studies within cognition, pushing the research of metaphor onto a brand-new stage. They claim that "metaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words. On the contrary, human thought processes are largely metaphorical" (1980, p. 6). According to this view, metaphor is actually a process in which one conceptual domain is transferred onto another, and one concept is understood in terms of another.

Conceptual metaphors typically employ two concepts as domains, a more abstract concept as target and a more concrete or physical one as source. The target domain usually contains an elusive and intangible concept, sometimes a freshly conceived one, which cannot be understood or grasped directly. The tendency is then to resort to concrete or physical concepts (the source domain) that people are familiar with to give a full understanding. The source domain and the target domain are interactive with each other in a way that some (but not all) properties, attributes, and relations in the source can be mapped onto the target domain; there is always a case where some attributes or structures of the source domain may be highlighted while others hidden.

CMT has been continuously improved since the publication of *Metaphors We Live By*, signifying a shift toward the cognitive approach to metaphor, away from the traditional rhetorical view. Its publication has doubtlessly brought a cognitive revolution to multidisciplinary fields.

### 2.2 Studies on metaphor translation

Metaphor has been studied for a long time, but research on metaphor translation is still immature, leading to its being a source of discussion and convention during the past few decades.

First, opinions diverge drastically on the issue of metaphor translatability. There are, in general, two diametrically opposed views on this issue. Nida (2004) explicitly contends the view of untranslatability: “Metaphor, however, must often be translated as non-metaphors” (p. 220), while Kloepfer (1967), followed by Reiss (2004), propounds the view that “metaphor is no problem for translation” (Dagut, 1976, p. 25). However, Dagut (1976) remarks that these two views are “too extreme”, and instead he asserts that there is no simplistic general rule for metaphor translation, but “the translatability of any given SL metaphor depends on the particular cultural experiences and semantic associations exploited by it, and the extent to which these can, or cannot, be reproduced non-anomalously in the TL” (p. 28). Following Dagut, Newmark (1980) and Van den Broeck (1981) state that metaphor is translatable but factors like style and culture should be taken into account. Snell-Hornby (1995) holds the same view that “the extent to which a text is translatable varies with the degree to which it is embedded in its own specific culture” (p. 41).

Second, the discussion of metaphor translation shifts to translation modes. Peter Newmark is one of the earliest scholars studying the translation methods of metaphor. Newmark (2001) drafts a prescriptive guideline for translation practice and translators’ training. He classifies five types of metaphor, namely dead metaphor, cliché metaphor, stock metaphor, recent metaphor, and original metaphor; under the branch of stock metaphor, there are seven main procedures for metaphor translation (pp. 95-97). Contrary to Newmark, Van den Broeck puts forward three metaphor translation methods: 1) translation *sensu stricto* (retain the vehicle of the source text [ST] in the target text [TT]); 2) substitution (substitute the vehicle in the ST with a different one in the TT); 3) paraphrase (render the ST metaphor with a non-metaphorical expression in the TL) (1981, p. 77). He insists that descriptive studies of how metaphor is translated are more important than the actual methods used. Toury (2001) offers six methods in metaphor translation, namely “translate metaphor A into metaphor A”, “translate metaphor A into metaphor B”, “translate metaphor A into a non-metaphor”, “translate metaphor A into zero metaphor”, “translate non-metaphor into metaphor”, and “translate zero metaphor into metaphor”.

The above discussion of metaphor translation is all based on the traditional viewpoint of metaphor as only a figure of speech—a replaceable linguistic expression.

### 2.3 Studies on metaphor translation in children’s literature

Metaphor is the most effective instrument used by poets and literary writers to construct a unique virtual world. As Kövecses claims, “The ‘real’ source of metaphor is in literature and the arts” (2010, p. 49).

Metaphor is one of the most indispensable and popular types of speech in children’s literature. Metaphor in children’s literature functions both rhetorically and cognitively. As a rhetorical tool, metaphor in children’s literature reinforces the linguistic effect of expressions and enriches the language with liveliness and vitality. In the early development stage of children, their cognitive experiences are drawn directly from their interaction with the physical environment, and they are prone to utilize the subjects they

are familiar with to express their thoughts and feelings. Therefore, metaphor in children's literature plays a significant role in assisting them in perceiving the world around.

Unlike in general literature, metaphor translation in children's literature has its own characteristics which require special attention. In the translation field of children's literature, studies concerning metaphor translations are rather rare. In previous research, scholars of different periods have paid considerable attention to exploring approaches to children's literature translation. Most of them mainly focus on the aspect of language by proposing readability, vividness, and interestingness as translation criteria. When it comes to translating metaphor in children's literature, most scholars tackle this matter from the angle of translation studies, and advocate approaches like free translation, literal translation, domestication or foreignization, and so on. Rarely do they contemplate this matter on the aspect of cognition, which reveals how the translator operates in the process of metaphor translation and which mechanism operates under it.

### **3. Cognitive Metaphor Translation Theory**

Metaphor, as a typical feature of communication, poses a challenge to translation, both for the practising translator and for its treatment in the discipline of translation studies (Schäffner, 2004, p. 1253). Greatly influenced by the traditional view of metaphor, translation studies have mainly focused on discussing the translatability and translation procedures of metaphor from the perspective of traditional linguistics. Only at the end of the 1990s did a cognitive approach to metaphor translation emerge, which considered metaphor as a tool used to understand one domain of experience in terms of another, and which sheds new light on prior studies.

#### **3.1 A cognitive model of metaphor translation**

According to cognitive linguistics, metaphor is a means of understanding one domain of experience in terms of another. The source domain is mapped on the target domain, so translation, as Lakoff (1987) states, requires "a mapping from one language to another language" (Maalej, 2008, p. 61).

Mandelblit (1995) proposed a "Cognitive Translation Hypothesis" in which two metaphor translation scenarios were presented: one of similar mapping conditions (SMC) and one of different mapping conditions (DMC). More specifically, it was proposed that a translator tends to resort to SMC if no conceptual shifts take place between SL and TL, but resorts to DMC when there are conceptual shifts in between. More explicitly, if the two cultures or conceptual systems "conceptualize experience in similar ways, the more the first strategy, 'similar mapping conditions', applies—and the easier the task of translation will be. Otherwise, the second strategy will be adopted and the task will be more difficult" (Al-Zoubi, Al-Ali, & Al-Hasnawi, 2006, p. 230).

There is no doubt that Mandelblit's hypothesis indeed opens up a new path for metaphor translation from the angle of cognition, and that it pushes the research to a

brand-new stage. However, it cannot be denied that Mandelblit's proposal is "a bit too general to account for the metaphorical expressions and conceptual metaphors languages or cultures can offer" (Maalej, 2008, p. 66).

In 2008, Maalej, after combining Mandelblit's "Cognitive Translation Hypothesis" and Hiraga's "comparative cultures" (1991), while monitoring the model through Lakoff and Johnson's cognitive metaphor framework, formulated a cognitive model of metaphor translation. She claims that translating metaphor is best done through "a correlation of conceptual metaphor and metaphorical expressions in both languages" (Maalej, 2008, p. 61). The model of metaphor translation that Maalej puts forward consists of three cognitive steps: (i) unpacking the SL/SC linguistic metaphors into their conceptual counterparts, (ii) deciding the mapping conditions between two cognitive systems by comparing cultural backgrounds of the two languages, and then adjusting the conceptual metaphor accordingly, and (iii) re-packing the metaphor into the TL/TC according to the experiential practices of the TL/TC (*ibid.*, p. 65). Despite this, a more practically observant and explicitly manageable translation proposal needs to be tentatively hypothesized and summoned up. Therefore, it is hypothesized that both cognitive and linguistic levels be taken into account, a specific metaphor translation process be calculated, and an applicable translation technique be concretized under SMC or DMC.

### **3.2 Metaphor translation process**

The translation process for metaphor can be divided into three steps: metaphor comprehension, metaphor adjustment, and metaphor reconstruction.

#### *3.2.1 Metaphor comprehension*

Translation involves at least three major parties: the sender, the translator, and the addressee. The translator works as a middleman playing a significant communicative role between the sender and the addressee of a text, and s/he mainly performs two cognitive activities: processing the original text as an addressee and reorganizing the information into TL as a sender. Nevertheless, the foremost step a translator should take in metaphor translation is metaphor comprehension.

The activity of metaphor comprehension for common readers usually happens automatically and unconsciously, and it is an online temporal process that doesn't consume much time. For a translator, however, metaphor comprehension is not simply restricted to the understanding of the words or literal meaning of the metaphorical expressions on the linguistic level; it should also be expanded to the conceptual level, which means that the translator has to unpack the conceptual metaphors from their superficial metaphorical expressions. As Mandelblit suggests (1997), the translation process first requires "a conscious operation of de-integration (or unpacking) of the source sentence into its conceptual and linguistic input structures" (Maalej, 2008, p. 66).

To know a conceptual metaphor is to know this set of mappings (Kövecses, 2010, p. 33). Mapping, the working mechanism of metaphor, is an effective tool that translators

utilize in metaphor translation. When the translator separates the conceptual metaphor from the metaphorical expression, s/he needs to clearly set the mapping relations between the source domain and the target domain, and to figure out what attributes or features from the source domain are mapped onto the target. Since metaphor is “related to different cultural domains ... the translator has to do the conceptual mapping on the behalf of the target reader” (Al-Hasnawi, 2007, p. 9).

Lakoff and Turner state that “any discussion of the uniqueness or idiosyncrasy of a metaphor must ... take place on two levels: the conceptual level and the linguistic level” (1989, p. 50), so metaphor translation should also be tackled on both the linguistic and conceptual levels. Metaphor comprehension, as the first step of metaphor translation, is a process which shifts from the level of the linguistic to the conceptual, as it makes conceptual metaphors visible from metaphorical expressions. Metaphor comprehension gives the source language and culture top priority by exerting a thorough examination of the source language’s conceptual system. As stated, metaphor is ubiquitous in language, and it arises from recurring life experience and stable cognitive cultural models, so in the source language there are always conventionalized ways of conceptualizing a certain concept; for translators, it is important to acquire the way of conceptualizing the target domain within the source language’s cognitive system.

### *3.2.2 Metaphor adjustment*

Metaphor adjustment is a process based primarily on a cultural comparison between two conceptual systems, and it takes place on the conceptual level. Cultural variations stand as the major obstacle in the process of metaphor translation, which are caused by differences in the broader cultural context as well as in the natural and physical environments. The cultural basis of metaphor has been discussed by plenty of scholars. Lakoff and Turner (1989, p. 214) rightly argue that “to study metaphor is to be confronted with hidden aspects of one’s mind and one’s culture.” Some basic experiences may be shared by most cultures, but some can only be acquired by people living in the culture where the language is spoken (Lakoff, 1987, p. 312). Shared experience should be translationally transportable, more readily and easily than culture-specific experience (Maalej, 2008, p. 61). Snell-Hornby (1988) also maintains that “the essential problem posed by metaphor in translation is that different cultures, hence different languages, conceptualize and create symbols in varying ways, and therefore the sense of the metaphor is frequently culture-specific” (ibid., p. 61).

Therefore, metaphor translation is not merely a matter of word alignment, but also a cross-cultural communicative activity which requires knowledge of both linguistic systems and cultures. A comparison between the source and target cultures stands at its heart.

Once the translator has unpacked the conceptual metaphor from the linguistic expression and figured out the mapping structures of the metaphor, s/he then needs to put the conceptual metaphor into the target cultural context to identify, based on the comparison between the two cognitive conceptualizing systems, whether there are conceptual shifts between the two

conceptual systems. If there are no conceptual shifts, it means that the mapping relations in the original conceptual metaphor can be fully transplanted into the target one, and if there are shifts, then the mapping relations have to be adjusted according to the cognitive features of the target culture. More specifically, as Al-Hasnawi elucidates that “the translator is called upon to play the role of a proxy agent doing the act of conceptual mapping on behalf of the TL reader. If he can touch upon a similar TL cognitive domain, then his task will be fulfilled quite successfully and easily. If not, he has to look for the cognitive domain that fits in the TL as the SL one does” (2007, p. 10).

### 3.2.3 *Metaphor reconstruction*

After comparing metaphor within cultural backgrounds, the translator reaches the final step, which is the process of metaphor reconstruction. The translator’s task “consists in repacking into the TL what has been unpacked in the SL” (Maalej, 2008, p. 67). This step is mainly manipulated on the linguistic level of the TL.

In the previous two steps, the mapping relations between the source and target domains of the original metaphor have been unpacked and adjusted to form an equivalent mapping structure which fits into the target cognitive environment. The translator’s next task is to organize metaphorical expressions in the TL based on the adjusted conceptual metaphor. Although the original conceptual metaphor has been modulated according to the target culture, the process of linguistic realization is not as easy a task as we expect, for the process involves many factors, such as the writing criteria of the TL, as well as target readers’ cognitive abilities and acceptance.

When it comes to children’s literature, translators have to pay great attention to the linguistic and cognitive features of the genre, as well as children’s cognitive abilities, to make the translated text both simple and plain and interesting and amusing for its target readers.

This step is the most essential of the three as it is where the translated text is generated. Therefore, the problem arises as to how to assess the metaphor translation product, or what translation criteria the translators should observe to assess whether their final work can be qualified as a successful translation. Nida postulates the concept of “dynamic equivalence”, in which “translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalence of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style” (2004, p. 166). The concept of dynamic equivalence is postulated within the sphere of linguistics, and some scholars in cognitive translation studies adopt and accommodate it within the cognitive field by putting forward the concept of the “cognitive equivalence” of translation, which means that the target reader obtains the same, or similar, cognitive reaction as their counterpart, the source reader, does. Our translation of metaphor should “aim at ‘cognitive equivalence’, where metaphor is deemed as a cognitive construct representing instances of how people conceptualize their experience, attitudes and practices, and how they record them verbally” (Al-Hasnawi, 2007, p. 12). Lakoff notes that “‘accurate translation’ requires close correspondences across conceptual systems”

(1987, p. 312), which implies that the cognitive experience target readers obtain from the translated text should be in concordance with that of source readers.

The translator has a few options when choosing a metaphor translation method: if the translator can “touch upon a similar TL cognitive domain, then his task will be fulfilled successfully and easily, and the result of this action is often an equivalent TL metaphor, or—in the worst case—a TL simile; otherwise, he has to look for the cognitive domain that fits in the TL as the SL one does by rendering metaphor into a paraphrase, a footnote, an explanation or—as a last resort—it can be omitted” (Al-Hassnawi, 2007, p. 5). To be more precise, if the same conceptual metaphor is utilized in both languages, and at the same time there are identical or similar concepts in the target language, the translator may produce an equivalent metaphor by retaining the original concepts, replacing the concept with a standard concept, or retaining the original concept but translating the metaphor into a simile; otherwise, s/he can maintain the original concept, replace the SL concept with a different TL concept, use a non-metaphorical expression to substitute the original metaphor, or omit the metaphor.

#### **4. Metaphor Translation in *TWITW***

*The Wind in the Willows* (*TWITW* for short), which enjoys a high reputation as a classic of English children’s literature, has been welcomed and pursued by Chinese children since the beginning of the 21st century. *TWITW* has been translated into Chinese by a number of translators. This paper chooses two representatives: one translated by Yang Jingyuan, and the other by Ren Rongrong. The reasons for selecting these two versions are as follows: firstly, they are the two most popular versions on the market; secondly, the linguistic features manifested in each diverge significantly; thirdly, the translation strategies the two versions incorporate are contrasting; and, last but not least, because the translation aims the translators hold are disparate, the two versions present different styles. These two versions chosen are also the newest publications in the current book market. Admittedly, however, this paper does not intend to present a comparison between them in terms of language quality, but instead attempts to delve into the metaphor translation process of the two translators from the cognitive perspective.

Metaphor is pervasive in daily language, and particularly abundant in works of literature. *TWITW*, as a classic masterpiece of children’s literature, contains a large range of interesting and lively metaphorical expressions worth studying. This section manages to extract some representative metaphors from *TWITW*, and takes Yang’s and Ren’s corresponding versions to demonstrate the metaphor translation process. This part mainly unfolds with metaphor translation techniques under each category of similar and different mapping conditions. If the two languages conceptualize experience “in a similar fashion, the SMC applies. However, if literal translation sounds odd, shocking, or unintelligible to target readers, DMC applies” (Maalej, 2008, p. 69).

#### 4.1 Translation techniques under SMC

SMC signifies that there are no conceptual shifts occurring between the source language and the target language, and more plainly, the mapping relations in the source metaphor are retained or wholly transplanted into the target text without changes or deletions. Therefore, translation techniques under SMC cover methods of producing an equivalent metaphor by retaining the original concept, keeping the original concept but translating it into a simile, and replacing the original concept with a standard one in the target culture.

##### 4.1.1 Retaining the original concept

In translation, the first task is to be loyal to the author, and faithfully convey the information, so literal translation undoubtedly is the first option as long as it will not engender any misunderstanding or cognitive difficulties. The translator's faithfulness is to find "equivalence in the experience of the participants", and that "translators must convey the same kind of experience with the same kind of material, and to expand, reduce, or modify textual components only as far as necessary to minimize a divergence of experience" (Maalej, 2008, p. 77).

(1) ST: He somehow could only feel how jolly it was to be the only **idle dog** among all these busy citizens. (Grahame, p. 2)

TT1: 只 觉 得, 在 一 大 群 忙 忙 碌 碌 的 公 民 当 中, 做 一 只 唯 一 的 懒 狗,  
only feel in a crowd of busy De citizen among be one-CL only De idle dog  
是 多 么 惬 意。 (Yang, p. 3)  
is how jolly

TT2: 却 只 觉 得 在 所 有 这 些 忙 人 当 中 做 一 个 唯 一 的 懒 汉 太 快 活 了。  
but only feel in all these busy man among be one-CL only De sluggard too jolly  
(Ren, p. 5)

For a translator, s/he first needs to unpack the conceptual metaphor from this image metaphor *idle dog*. Here, "he" refers to the Mole, who escapes from his spring-cleaning work in order to be jolly and relax. The Mole is personified as someone who is obliged to whitewash his little house. The conceptual metaphor is HUMAN IS A DOG in which the source domain is dog and the target domain is human. The image of the dog is mapped onto human beings. The dog is a rich image in both Western and Chinese cultures, which includes various features, such as being smart and loyal, wild and fierce, etc. Compared with the positive image of the dog in English culture, its negative aspects are emphasized much more in Chinese culture. Here, in the original text, the author chooses to explicitly manifest the ground of this metaphor. That is to say, the author employs the aspect of idleness of the concept of the dog to refer to a man, so the conceptual metaphor can be further specified into HUMAN IS AN IDLE DOG.

In Yang's version, she reserves the original image of the dog, and directly translates it into the equivalent item "懒狗" (idle dog) which faithfully preserves the mapping

structure in the source language. Whereas Ren transforms the dog image into an idler image, a person who is lazy and does not work. Compared with the image of an idler, children are more familiar with the image of dogs as animals, since pets often play an irreplaceable role in their early mental development, and usually bring children great pleasure and happiness. “Idler”, on the other hand, presents a picture of a grown-up who has a large sized body and wears an indifferent expression, which cannot fully capture the lively, vivacious, and ingenuous personality of the Mole. Therefore, although both of the versions are acceptable, when concerning children’s cognitive abilities, Yang’s version is more likely to be favored by children.

#### 4.1.2 Rendering metaphor into a simile

When the two languages share the same conceptual metaphor, the most adoptable translation technique is to directly transplant the original concept into the TL. However, in some cases, this may bring about readers’ confusion or an incompleteness of the metaphorical meaning, so translators can take the technique of rendering the metaphor into a simile as an alternative. According to Newmark (1980), translation of metaphor by simile “has the advantage of combining communication and semantic translation in addressing itself both to the layman and the expert if there is a risk that the simple transfer of the metaphor will not be understood by most readers” (p. 88).

(2) ST: Purple loosestrife arrived early, **shaking luxuriant tangled locks along the edge of the mirror** whence its own face **laughed** back at it. (Grahame, p. 30)

TT1: 紫色 的 珍珠菜 最先 登场, 抖开 它那 乱 丝 般 丰美 的  
purple De loosestrife the first arrive shake its that tangled silk like luxuriant De  
秀 发, 垂挂 在 镜 面 般 的 河 水 边 沿, 镜 中 的 脸, 又 冲  
beautiful hair hang along mirror like De river edge in the mirror De face again  
它 自 己 微 笑。(Yang, p. 27)  
itself smile

TT2: 大 片 的 黄 莲 花 开 的 最 早, 在 镜 子 似 的 河 边 摇 晃 着  
a cloud of De yellow lotus bloom De most early on mirror like river bank shake-PROG  
它 们 密 密 的 一 簇 簇 美 丽 花 朵, 而 在 水 里, 它 们 自 己 的 脸 又 回 过  
their thick De clusters of beautiful flowers but in river their own face again come  
来 对 它 们 笑。(Ren, p. 42)  
back at them smile

There are two kinds of metaphor in this expression, a personification and an image metaphor. The flower, purple loosestrife, is personified as a beauty who shakes her hair and laughs heartily. Yang maintains the personification and faithfully follows the original linguistic structure, whereas Ren just reserves the scene of laughter and abandons most expressions of the personification. Compared with Ren’s version, Yang’s version fully captures and delivers the aesthetic feelings which personification brings to the original

text, and ushers in greater reading pleasure to children.

The image metaphor here is RIVER SURFACE IS A MIRROR in which the image of mirror is mapped onto the image of a river surface, as both of them possess a reflective surface. This image metaphor stems from our physical interaction with the world around us, and is deeply grounded both in the English and Chinese cognitive systems. However, when translators directly transfer the mapping structure of the original metaphor into the TL by translating “the edge of the mirror” into “<sup>zài jìng zǐ de biānyuán</sup>” (the edge of the mirror), this may cause confusion to target readers, and they may assume that there is no metaphor at all, and “<sup>jìng zǐ</sup>” (the mirror) in the target text is the real object we utilize on a daily basis. In order to avoid misinterpretation, translators can transfer the metaphor into a simile in which the source domain and the target domain are all revealed. In the above two versions, Yang and Ren both choose to transform the metaphor into a simile “<sup>jìng miàn bān de hé shuǐ biān yán</sup>” (the edge of the mirror) and “<sup>jìng zǐ sì de hé biān</sup>” (the edge of the mirror), which achieve the same cognitive effects as the original metaphor as well as avoid wrong interpretation on the side of readers.

#### 4.1.3 Replacing the concept with a standard TL concept

Most translators and language learners may have the translation experience that when they encounter a particular metaphor, an equivalent expression in the TL emerges simultaneously. However, when traced back to their origins, the two metaphors substantially diverge in their ways of conceptualization. This is because, in the course of time, and influenced by language transformation and cultural communication, a previously random mapping relation may have been fixed, which signifies, for a particular metaphor, that it has a standardized and conventionalized counterpart in the TL. The translator may “replace the image in the SL with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture” (Newmark, 1980, p. 96). Therefore, we will also incorporate this metaphor translation condition into SMC.

(3) ST: “Do you suppose,” asked the second one, “that you are the only living thing that **craves with a hungry longing** to hear the cuckoo’s note again?” (Grahame, p. 121)

TT1: <sup>dì èr zhī yàn zǐ shuō</sup> “<sup>nǐ yǐ wéi zhǐ yǒu nǐ cái kě wàng zài yí cì tīng dào dù juàn de</sup>  
the second swallow ask you suppose only you long for again hear cuckoo POSS  
<sup>tí shēng ma</sup>啼声吗？” (Yang, p. 102)  
cry

TT2: “<sup>nǐ yǐ wéi</sup>,” <sup>dì èr zhī yàn zǐ wèn dào</sup> “<sup>zhǐ yǒu nǐ yí zhī shēng wù kě wàng zhe</sup>  
you suppose the second swallow ask only you one-CL creature long for-PROG  
<sup>chóng xīn tīng dào dù juàn de gē shēng ma</sup>重新听到杜鹃的歌声吗？” (Ren, p. 158)  
again hear cuckoo POSS singing

The conceptual metaphor in English is DESIRE IS HUNGER, in which the experience of hunger is mapped onto the desire for something. However, in Chinese, for the original

concept of hunger, its standard equivalence in Chinese is the concept of thirst. We habitually draw from the experience of thirst to describe our yearning; DESIRE IS THIRST is the conventionalized conceptual metaphor underlying the Chinese cognitive system. Translators can directly replace hunger with thirst as the mapping condition within desire and hunger is the same as within desire and thirst. Therefore, in both Yang's and Ren's versions, "a hungry longing" is translated into "渴望" (<sup>kě wàng</sup> desire). It needs clarifying here that the transformation of hunger to thirst has long been internalized in the Chinese linguistic systems, and for translators, the translation of "a hungry longing" into "渴望" (<sup>kě wàng</sup> desire) is a subconscious activity that doesn't require additional effort.

## 4.2 Translation techniques under DMC

DMC betokens that there are conceptual shifts between the source language and the target language, or more specifically, the mapping relations in the source metaphor are partially or wholly abandoned or deleted by translators in the target text. Therefore, translation techniques under DMC include maintaining the original concept despite cultural differences, substituting the original concept with a concept unique to the target culture, rendering the source metaphor into a non-metaphorical expression, and adding a metaphor to a non-metaphorical expression.

### 4.2.1 Maintaining the original concept

Images marked with cultural backgrounds in metaphor need extra processing effort on the part of translators. Those specific culture-loaded images are in lack of corresponding images in Chinese culture. Normally, translators have only two options, either rendering the image literally, or saving it. The second option brings the target cultural images into the source language, which may add an exotic flavor to the target text and stimulate cultural communication. To preserve the freshness and originality of metaphor and the cultural flavor of the unique novel, transplanting images and using similar figures of speech are usually the first choice for translators (Cheng & Li, 1997, p. 235). Therefore, some cultural images in the SL can be maintained as long as they do not provoke any cultural conflicts.

(4) ST: THE RETURN OF ULYSSES (Grahame, Title of Chapter 12, p. 172)

TT1: 荣归故里 (Yang, p. 143)  
return with glory home

TT2: 尤利西斯的归来 (Ren, p. 220)  
Ulysses De return

Ulysses is a legendary Greek king and the hero of Homer's epic poem *Odyssey*, who is noted for his courage and ingenuity. In the title as used by Grahame, the name of Ulysses refers to Toad, who overcomes his difficulties and finally returns to and reclaims his home, Toad's Hall, under the help of his three beloved friends. Ulysses metaphorically stands for a heroic image, and there is a conceptual metaphor TOAD IS A HERO, in which the

characteristics of Ulysses are mapped onto Toad's figure.

Ulysses, one of the most recurrent characters in Western culture, is a specific culture-loaded image to which there is no corresponding character in Chinese culture, so translators have only two options, either maintaining the image by adding an explanation, or transferring it literally. Yang deletes the image of Ulysses, and chooses to reveal the deep metaphorical meaning “荣归故里” (THE RETURN OF ULYSSES), which literally denotes “to return home with honor.” Yang's choice is mainly based on her consideration of children, the target readers. It is difficult for Chinese children to figure out the metaphorical meaning of the title, as most of them are not familiar with Western culture, and lack the appropriate cultural cognitive environment. Ren, however, takes the other option by loyally upholding the image. He translates the title into “尤利西斯的归来” (THE RETURN OF ULYSSES) with an explicit footnote that Ulysses is a great hero in Homer's epic, ancient Greek *Odyssey*. Although Ren's version may pose reading difficulties to young readers, it can expand children's knowledge of Western culture, enriching Chinese culture, and enhancing the mutual-cultural exchange. This foreignized translation strategy is an attempt at introducing the cognitive model of the SL into the TL.

#### 4.2.2 Substituting a concept with a different one in the TL

A preferable strategy for rendering metaphor of different mapping conditions and different lexical implementation is “to replace it with its semantically equivalent TL metaphor” (Iranmanesh, 2010, p. 10). To transplant the original concept directly into the target language might put the metaphor at risk of losing the meaning. With no ready-made corresponding mapping model in the conceptual system of the target language, translators may choose the option of replacing the concept in the original conceptual metaphor with another practicable exclusively from the target culture. Translators are attempting to reconstruct the mapping model in the target through which similar cognitive effects may be conjured up in the target reader's mind.

(5) ST: “what are you looking at?” said the Rat presently, when **the edge of their hunger was somewhat dulled**. (Grahame, p. 8)

TT1: “你 在 看 什 么 ？” 河 鼠 问 。 这 时 ， 他 俩 的 辘 辘 饥 肠 已 多 少  
 you PROG look what water rat ask this time they two De hunger had somewhat  
 缓 解 。 (Yang, p. 8)  
 dull

TT2: “你 在 看 什 么 ？” 河 鼠 问 他 。 如 今 饥 饿 已 经 刹 住 一 点 。 (Ren, p. 12)  
 you PROG look what water rat ask him now hunger has stop a little

Based on our daily experience, we can directly obtain the image of a knife from the metaphorical expression *the edge of their hunger was somewhat dulled*, as the edge of a knife is dulled if used for a long time. The conceptual metaphor underlying the phrase is HUNGER IS A SHARP KNIFE. Being hungry is like being cut by a sharp knife, and when hunger

fades away, the knife blade is dulled similarly.

In Chinese, there are no equivalent concepts in the target conceptual system, so translators choose to abandon the original concept and search for a closely related one in the target which can mostly capture the metaphorical meaning. In Chinese culture, hunger is often conceptualized as a kind of pain which can be eased. Therefore, Yang translates the metaphorical expression into “<sup>lù lù jī cháng yì duō shǎo huǎn jiě</sup>辘辘饥肠已多少缓解” (the edge of their hunger was somewhat dulled), in which HUNGER IS A KIND OF PAIN. Ren also chooses to replace the original image with a new one, but he skips over the conventional way of conceptualizing hunger, and comes up with a novel metaphor HUNGER IS A RUNAWAY VEHICLE by rendering the metaphorical expression into “<sup>jī è yì jǐng shā zhù yì diǎn</sup>饥饿已经刹住一点” (the edge of their hunger was somewhat dulled). He creatively employs the scene of a runaway vehicle as the source domain to structure hunger. Part of the attributes of a runaway car are mapped onto hunger. Hunger is like a high-speed vehicle out of control, and when hunger is relieved, it is like the speed of the runaway vehicle brought under control.

The two translators both decide to abandon the image of the knife in the original text, but they adopt two completely different images to re-conceptualize hunger, a conventional pain image and a novel vehicle image. Both of these conceptual metaphors have achieved the metaphorical effects that the original text intends to convey, but as to the degree of familiarity toward the two concepts, the image of pain in Yang’s version is more child-oriented and vivid.

#### 4.2.3 Using non-metaphorical expressions

Some concepts in original metaphors are culture-specific and not shared by the target conceptual system, in which case it is difficult to find a similar concept in the target culture that can restore the original mapping relations. As Schäffner claims that “the image in the ST cannot always be retained in the TT because the image that is attached to the metaphor is unknown in the TL, or the associations triggered by the SL metaphor get lost in the TL” (2010, p. 1256). In order to avoid misunderstanding and confusion resulted from cultural variations, and “to properly communicate the true meaning of these metaphoric expressions, translators play the role of an active mediator by using non-metaphorical descriptive expressions” (Lee, 2006, p. 368). Therefore, translators often choose to adopt the method of translating the metaphor into a non-metaphorical expression as an alternative.

(6) ST: How **black was his despair** when he felt himself sinking again! (Grahame, p. 11)

TT1: <sup>yí huǐr ér</sup> 一会儿, <sup>tā yòu chén le xià qù</sup> 他又沉了下去, <sup>shēn shēn dì xiàn rù jué wàng</sup> 深深地陷入绝望。(Yang, p. 10)  
a moment later, he again sank-ASP down deeply sink into despair

TT2: <sup>kě tā jiào de zì jǐ yòu chén xià qù le</sup> 可他觉得自己又沉下去了, <sup>tā jiǎn zhī shì jué wàng la</sup> 他简直是绝望啦!  
but he feel himself again sink down-ASP he simply is despair

The metaphor in the sentence involves the image of the color black. In English, a lot

of emotions are conceptualized by virtue of color words. For instance, black is the color of night, which is surrounded by endless darkness and quietness, and the sensations it brings to people are heaviness and suffocation. Therefore, black metaphorically represents hopelessness and a depressive state of mind. In this case, the image of black is mapped onto the image of despair, which endows despair with the heavy feelings that black brings out. In Chinese, colors are not applied to express emotions, and the expression of “<sup>hēi sè de jué wàng</sup>” (black despair) is unintelligible; rather, shallowness and deepness of emotions are employed to manifest intensity, like “<sup>shēn shēn de jué wàng</sup>” (deep despair). Through the comparison of cognitive models within English and Chinese cultural backgrounds, the translator may ascertain that this metaphor translation falls under the DMC, for which a certain degree of adjustment is necessary.

In Yang’s version, she substitutes the image of black with the Chinese conventional way of conceptualizing despair, with the shallowness and deepness of emotions. Meanwhile, the translator adds a new metaphor into the translation. Despair is also conceptualized as a container which has an inside space. When people feel down, they are like in a room full of despair. Therefore, “black despair” is rendered into “<sup>shēn shēn dì xiàn rù jué wàng</sup>” (deep despair). However, Ren selects a completely different translation technique, by which he translates the metaphor into a non-metaphorical expression. He transforms the metaphorical meaning the word black delivers to an adverbial of degree “<sup>jiǎn zhí</sup>” (simply) to emphasize the intensity of despair. Although the mapping relations in the original metaphor have been modulated according to the target cultural cognitive models, both versions achieve the same cognitive effects as the original one.

#### 4.2.4 Adding a metaphor

Toury argues that “from the perspective of the TT, two additional cases can be identified: the use of a metaphor in the TT for a non-metaphorical expression in the ST (non-metaphor into metaphor), and the addition of a metaphor in the TT without any linguistic motivation in the ST (zero into metaphor)”; this view deals with metaphor not as a translation problem, but as a translation solution (Schäffner, 2010, p. 1256). As translators may convert a metaphor into a non-metaphorical expression, there are also cases where they may insert a new metaphor into a previous, non-metaphorical expression in the translated text. Nida (2004) considers the translation of a non-metaphor by a metaphor as relevant to reaching more effectiveness in communication. This technique supplements the source language with rich target cultural connotations, which makes the translated language more interesting and vivifying.

(7) ST: “It’s going to be a tedious business,” said the Badger, sighing. “I’ve never seen Toad so **determined.**” (Grahame, p. 81)

TT1: “<sup>shì qíng jiāng hěn nán bàn</sup>,” <sup>huō</sup> <sup>tàn le kǒu qì</sup> <sup>shuō</sup>. “<sup>wǒ cóng méi jiàn guò chán chú zhè yàng</sup>  
matter will be very difficult to solve badger sigh-ASP say I never see toad so  
<sup>sǐ xīn yǎn ér</sup>” (Yang, p. 68)

stubborn

TT2: “这件<sup>zhè jiàn</sup> 讨厌<sup>tǎo yàn</sup> 事情<sup>shì qing</sup> 有日子<sup>yǒu rì zi</sup> 可拖<sup>kě tuō</sup> 了,” huón<sup>huón</sup> 叹着气<sup>tàn zhe qì</sup> 说<sup>shuō</sup>, “我<sup>wǒ</sup> 还没<sup>hái méi</sup> 见过<sup>jiàn guò</sup>  
 this-CL annoying thing is going to drag on badger sigh PROG say I never see  
 癞蛤蟆<sup>lài gā má</sup> 这样<sup>zhè yàng</sup> 吃<sup>chī</sup> 了秤砣<sup>le chēng tuó</sup> 铁<sup>tiě</sup> 了心<sup>le xīn</sup>。” (Ren, p. 105)  
 toad so determined

The context behind this sentence is that Toad is obsessed with cars, and in order to pursue his new habit, he is willing to discard all his fortune, including his house—Toad’s Hall. To prevent Toad from sinking too deep into this obsession and making more irrational mistakes, his friends, Water Rat, Mole, and Badger, try to lock him and get his life back on track, but Toad refuses to listen to them, revealing a strong and tough attitude. At this moment, the Badger says that “I’ve never seen Toad so determined.” There are no conceptual metaphors in this sentence, and plainly, it is a literal narration of Toad’s unyielding manner. Nevertheless, it is transparent that new concepts are added in the above two versions. Yang translates “determined” into “死心眼儿<sup>sǐ xīn yǎn ér</sup>” (stubborn), which is a typical Chinese expression to refer to someone stubborn and inflexible. “死<sup>sǐ</sup>” (death) literally means death, while “心眼儿<sup>xīn yǎn ér</sup>” (heart and eyes) represents heart and eyes. “死心眼儿<sup>sǐ xīn yǎn ér</sup>” (stubborn) literally means someone who has a dead heart and eyes. The heart is used to sense and the eyes to see, so if one’s heart and eyes are dead, it signifies her/his death in general. Thus, the metaphorical metaphor underlying “死心眼儿<sup>sǐ xīn yǎn ér</sup>” (determined) is STUBBORNESS IS DEATH, in which the symptoms of death are borrowed to describe human beings’ stubbornness. If someone has a “dead” heart and eyes, it means that s/he has become insensitive to the changes occurring around them, and still strongly insists on what s/he strongly believes.

This strategy also applies to Ren’s version as he translates “determined” into “吃了秤砣<sup>chī le chēng tuó</sup> 铁<sup>tiě</sup> 了心<sup>le xīn</sup>” (determined) which derives from the Chinese allegorical saying “王八吃秤砣<sup>wáng bā chī chēng tuó</sup>——铁<sup>tiě</sup> 了心<sup>le xīn</sup>” (determined). In traditional Chinese cuisine, when people cook turtles, they usually put a heavy stone inside the turtles’ bodies after removing the entrails, to prevent them floating up during the process of stewing. As the stone inside the turtle’s body takes the position of the heart, ancient Chinese people gradually resorted to this daily experience to advert to someone who also has a “stone” heart. Stones are cold and hard, and if one has a “stone” heart, it means that s/he has a cold and hard heart that is impossible to be warmed up, and that the person is unable to change into another state of mind. The conceptual metaphor lying in this allegorical saying is STUBBORNESS HAS THE HARDNESS OF A STONE in which some attributes of a stone are mapped onto the state of being stubborn. If a person has a “stone” heart, it means s/he has made decisions to do something which cannot be influenced or changed by others.

Yang and Ren both practice the strategy of interposing a metaphor into English expressions, by which the meaning of the original sentence is wrapped with the clothes of Chinese culture, and is also specified and exemplified by conventionalized metaphors within the Chinese cognitive system. This technique endows the original meaning with abundant

cultural connotations, which may bring thrilling reading pleasure to the target readers.

## 5. Conclusion

The article elevates previous analyses of metaphor translation from the linguistic and cultural level to the cognitive level, and delves into the influence that the cognitive process exerts on translator's selection of translation techniques, which is of great theoretical and practical value to the comprehension of children's literature and translators' decisions.

First of all, a cognitive metaphor translation process is presented through a descriptive analysis of metaphor translation from the perspective of CMT. The cognitive metaphor translation process, different from the traditional one, should be conducted both on linguistic and cognitive levels, and translators should be fully aware of different ways of conceptualization between cultures. Therefore, the cognitive metaphor translation process is broken into three steps: metaphor comprehension, metaphor adjustment, and metaphor reconstruction. Second, translation techniques concerning translation of metaphors in children's literature are enumerated under the two metaphor mapping conditions—SMC and DMC. Under SMC, translators may maintain the metaphor and replace it with an equivalent expression in the TL, or, in some cases, transfer it into a simile. However, under DMC, translators may usually replace the original concepts with new ones in the TL, but there are also cases where translators may choose to represent the cognitive differences directly on the surface level of the target language by keeping the concept of the contradictory mapping condition. In other cases, the original concept may be rendered into a non-metaphorical expression, or simply deleted from the TL. Last but not least, a comparative case study of metaphor translation in two Chinese versions of *TWITW* from the angle of cognition is conducted. In Yang's version, metaphors or images are basically retained, and the strategy of foreignization is exercised by the translator so as to maintain most of the SL metaphor. While Ren, for the purpose of making the language straightforward for his young readers, mainly chooses to convert SL metaphors or images into accessible TL ones. It is our hope that this study will generate some instructions and inspiration to future studies on metaphor translation of children's literature.

## Note

- 1 This research is sponsored by Funds for Distinguished Young Scholars in Shannxi Provincial Universities.

## References

- Al-Hasnawi, A. R. (2007). A cognitive approach to translating metaphors. *Translation Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/41metaphor.htm>
- Al-Zoubi, M. Q., Al-Ali, M. N., & Al-Hasnawi, A. R. (2006). Cogno-cultural issues in translating metaphors. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 14(3), 230-239.
- Cheng, M., & Li, B.-B. (1997). Cultural transplantation and transformation: Metaphor translation

- of *A Dream of Red Mansions. Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, (2), 227-235.
- Dagut, M. B. (1976). Can “metaphor” be translated? *Babel*, (1), 21-33.
- Grahame, K. (2012). *The wind in the willows* (R.-R. Ren, Trans.). Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
- Grahame, K. (2013). *The wind in the willows* (J.-Y. Yang, Trans.). Hefei: Anhui People’s Publishing House.
- Grahame, K. (2015). *The wind in the willows*. Tianjin: Tianjin People’s Publishing House.
- Hiraga, M. K. (1991). Metaphor and comparative cultures. *Cross-cultural Communication: East and West*, (3), 149-166.
- Iranmanesh, A. (2010). *A cognitive approach and the translation strategies used in the subtitling of metaphors in three American movies*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, H.-S. (2006). Socio-cultural characteristics found in Russian-Korean translation of metaphorical expressions. *Meta*, (2), 368-377.
- Maalej, Z. A. (2008). Translating metaphor between unrelated cultures: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective. *Sayyab Translation Journal*, (1), 60-82.
- Mandelblit, N. (1995). The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory. In M. Thelen & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (Eds.), *Translation and meaning, Part 3* (pp. 483-495). Maastricht: Universitaire Press.
- Newmark, P. (1980). The translation of metaphor. *Babel*, (2), 93-100.
- Newmark, P. (2001). *Approaches to translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education.
- Nida, E. A. (2004). *Toward a science of translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Reiss, K. (2004). *Translation criticism: The potentials & limitations*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign language Education Press.
- Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, (36), 1253-1269.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1995). *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign language Education Press.
- Toury, G. (2001). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign language Education Press.
- Van den Broeck, R. (1981). The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation. *Poetics Today: Translation Theory and Intercultural Relations*, (4), 73-87.

**(Copy editing: Curtis Harrison)**

### **About the authors**

Yi Sun (sytony9728@163.com), PhD, is a doctoral supervisor and full professor of English at Xi'an International Studies University (2013 – present), and conducts his collaborative studies as a Fulbright Researcher (2016 – 2017) at New York State University at Albany. His major research interest is the interface study of metaphors in pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, comparative linguistics, multimodal discourse analysis, and translation. He has published three monographs, more than forty Chinese articles indexed by CSSCI, and English articles such as A Study of Metaphor Translation in the Commentary of Shaanxi History Museum From the Perspective of CMT (2016) in *SKASE—Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, and A Visualized Bibliometric Analysis of Interpreting Studies in Mainland China: Progress and Prospects (2017) in *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies*. He holds the position of deputy Editor-in-Chief of *Foreign Language Education* and the *Journal of Xi'an International Studies University*.

Ya Guo (285948829@qq.com) is a postgraduate student in the School of English Studies at Xi'an International Studies University, specializing in translation studies.