UDC 81′255.4:821.111 (73)

T. P. Andrienko, PhD (Philology), Associate Professor
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

COGNITIVE PATTERNS IN TRANSLATION OF TROPES

The cognitive patterns of rendering tropes in translation of belles-lettres from English into Ukrainian and Russian are studied with the account of shared cognitive mappings and shifts in the cognitive structures involved. The tendency to retain the same mappings even if it entails compensation of the missing cognitive structures reveals the significance of the strategy of maintaining the original system of images.

Key words: *cognitive mapping, translation of tropes, metaphor, metonymy, irony, literary-artistic translation*

Statement of the problem. Tropes are studied in stylistic semasiology as the devices with the intrinsic interplay of primary (logical) and figurative meanings, with the aim of creating expressiveness or specific imagery of the text. This category, described also as the "figures of quality" includes metaphor, metonymy and irony. The problem of translating these tropes lies in the necessity to render their contextual (i.e. figurative) meaning, while maintaining the same pragmatic effect and, if possible, the imagery of the original. The practice of translation exposes the risks of inevitable losses: "… most texts, particularly those rich in metaphor and polysemy (which cannot be adequately compensated), will be rather clearer, simpler and "poorer" in translation, and will serve as one (of several possible) interpretations of the original" [Newmark 1988, 178]; "…irony often remains intended but not understood, or unintended but imagined" [ibid].

The importance of tropes for delivering the message of the piece of verbal art on the one hand, and the complexity of their translation accounts for the **relevance** of this research which **aims** at analyzing the cognitive processes underlying the choice of translator's decisions in translating tropes.

Materials and methods. The tropes were selected from the classical works of the English literature and their available translations into Ukrainian and Russian languages; the selected

samples were analyzed with the application of methodology combining the methods of cognitive analysis and conceptual mapping with the comparative translation analysis.

Discussion of results. We view the cognitive foundations of polysemy in metaphor as described in the theory of conceptual integration (blending) [Fauconnier, Turner 2003]. Conceptual blending is characterized as a basic mental operation that leads to the creation of a new meaning playing a fundamental role in the construction of meaning in everyday life, in the arts and sciences, and especially in the social and behavioral sciences. The authors describe the procedure of conceptual integration (blending) in the following way: "the essence of the operation is to construct a partial match between two input mental spaces, to project selectively from those inputs into a novel 'blended' mental space, which then dynamically develops emergent structure" [Fauconnier, Turner 2003, 57–58].

Construction of meaning is associated with cognitive mapping which, in broad sense, is viewed as the mental representation by human mind of the extralinguistic world [Жаботинская 2012]. S. Zhabotinskaya correlates cognitive mapping with the process of semiosis and describes it as a three-stage onomasiological process developing in the following ways: (1) from the extralinguistic information to the content of the verbal sign stored in the human mind; (2) from the content of the verbal sign to its inner form; (3) from the inner form of the verbal sign to its surface form [Жаботинская 2012, 180]. We assume that the formation of tropes is to be traces at the third stage (the transition from the inner form of the verbal sign to its surface form) where an integrative space is formed, linking two concepts which may have only one similar feature, sometimes minor or imaginary, to form metaphor. The cognitive mechanisms of the other tropes may be assumed to develop according to the same principle, with the different nature of the integrative space: in metonymy the integrative space is formed based on the connection (adjacency) of the input spaces; in irony, the cognitive mechanism lies in involvement in the integrative space of the actual and ideal situations which are in the relations of contrast, resulting in the comical effect.

Whereas human mind performs the mapping of the world, and language performs the mapping of the mind, the surface form of the language units may be viewed as mapping their inner form, while each national language may have its specific features at each stage of mapping [Жаботинская 2012, 182]. Metaphors, and hence, conceptual blends, are culture-specific [Lakoff, Johnson 2003], which raises a problem of translation: the translator may be faced with the situation where the mapping underlying a source-language (SL) trope does not exist in the target language (TL).

Viewing metaphor in a very broad sense – as almost any figurative expression – P. Newmark suggests a number of methods of its translation, including: translation via the same image (for trite metaphor), translation via a different image (for cliché), rendering of sense (for standard metaphor), adaptation of the image (for original metaphor), rendering the sense and the image (for metonymy), weakening of metaphor through substitution by simile or omission of a redundant metaphor [Newmark 1988, 184].

Cognitive studies of the translation of metaphors [Al-Hasnawi 2007; Kulwindr 2012] are based primarily on the Cognitive Translation Hypothesis by N. Mandelblit, according to which there are two main scenarios for translating metaphors:

(1) under similar mapping condition, SMC and

(2) under different mapping condition, DMC [Mandelblit 1995].

Having compared a number of works devoted to the translation of metaphor, M. Rodriguez-Marquez identifies the following patterns of translation of metaphors:

1. Same conceptual metaphors and similar linguistic metaphors.
2. Same conceptual metaphors but different linguistic metaphors.
3. Different conceptual metaphors but similar linguistic metaphors.
4. Different conceptual metaphors and different linguistic metaphors [Rodriguez-Marquez 2008, 31].

While the other tropes have not been studied so closely in translation aspect, it may be assumed that the cognitive mechanisms of their formation imply the possibility of various patterns of their translation, differing in cognitive and verbal mechanisms employed in the TL. Bearing in mind that, according to R. Langacker, "the semantic value of an expression does not reside in either the base or

the profile individually, but rather in the *relationship* between the two" [Langacker 1986, 6, italics added – T.A.], let us analyze some examples of tropes and their translations, with the view to unveiling the cognitive patterns or shifts in their translation.

In a rather complex interplay of the ways of metaphorization in the source and target languages, the most important in our view is the proximity or difference between the two cultures that may share common history, common precedent texts, contacts between the languages and other factors contributing to the internationalization of metaphors (e.g., Christian nations have a significant number of common metaphors and metaphorical phraseology from the Bible), as well as the formation of common ways of cognition by image in understanding the reality.

Thus, the translation between English and Ukrainian may rely on the existing metaphors – cross-lingual equivalents that have similar cognitive mapping and surface form (as a result of borrowing into both the languages from the same source or similar mapping). This metaphor is most easily translated as, recreating its surface form (literal meaning), the translator also renders the metaphorical image:

Lolita, ***light of my life****, fire of my loins. My* ***sin****, my* ***soul*** *(V. Nabokov. Lolita)*

Лоліта, ***світоч мого життя****, шал моїх чересел.* ***Гріх*** *мій,* ***душа*** *моя. (В. Набоков Лоліта. Перекл. П. Таращук)*

However, even in the case of common metaphorical mapping, the translator may have to make certain shifts in the integrative space to maintain the personification which otherwise would be impossible:

And we sit here, by its margin, while the ***moon*** *who loves it [the river] too, stoops down to kiss it* ***with a sister's kiss****, and throws her silver arms around its clingingly; and we watch it as it flows, ever singing, ever whispering, out to meet* ***its king, the sea*** *– till our voices die away in silence… (Jerome K. Jerome Three Men in a Boat)*

І ми сидимо при березі, а ***місяць****, котрий любить річку теж, схиляється, щоб поцілувати її* ***братнім поцілунком****, і міцно пригортає її своїми срібними руками. А ми дивимось, як вона тече, завжди співоча, завжди шепітна, назустріч своєму* ***володарю-океанові****, доки наші голоси не гинуть у далекій тиші… (Джером К. Джером Троє у човні. Перекл. О. Негребецький)*

The mapping "MOON AND RIVER – SIBLINGS" undergoes a gender shift – instead of SISTER, the moon is pictured as a BROTHER, which is conditioned by the surface form of the Ukrainian word; similarly, "sea" which is neuter is substituted by "ocean" which is masculine, to be personified as a KING. Although the translator maintains the domains the two 'inputs' belong to, in the first case the relation between them, and in the second case, the scope of the fragment of extralinguistic world represented by the metaphor, is changed.

Metonymy used as a means of characterization may be represented via the same mapping (PART OF FACE – FACIAL EXPRESSION), but the use of additional explication (in this example – keeping information indicating that the mood of the character) facilitates the reader's decoding of the image:

*"It is devilish fine wine," said the **Eyebrows**, and they looked more good-humoured…(Thackeray. Vanity Fair, p. 125)*

*– Еге ж, нічогеньке вино, – погодились **насуплені брови** і явно полагіднішали. (Теккерей. Ярмарок суєти. Перекл. О. Сенюк, с. 119)*

Irony seems easy to render in translation due to the similarity of the system of values underlying the evaluative meanings of the words used or cognitive scenarios employed, as in the following example of self-irony:

"Why, you skulking little devil, you," they would say, "get up and do something for your living, can't you?" – not knowing, of course, that I was ill.

*And they didn't give me pills; they gave me clumps on the side of the head. **And, strange as it may appear, those clumps on the head often cured me – for the time being.** (Jerome K. Jerome Three Men in a Boat)*

– Ану, ледаче чортеня, – казали мені, – вставай і йди заробляй на хліб!

*Ніхто ж, звісно, не знав, що я був хворий. Тому мені не давали таблеток, давали лише запотиличники. **І, як це не дивно, ті запотиличники часто мене зцілювали, на якийсь час.** (Джером К. Джером Троє у човні. Перекл. О. Негребецький)*

The same cognitive model may 'work' in translation even if irony is based on another trope, for example, metaphor, provided the

mapping is similar in the two languages, as in the following example where the translation was done centuries later than the original:

VOLPONE. Yes, to be learned, Mosca.
MOSCA. O no, rich
Implies it. ***Hood an ass with reverend purple,***
So you can hide his two ambitious ears*,*
And he shall pass for a cathedral doctor*. (Jonson, Volpone, 11)*

ВОЛЬПОНЕ
Да, славно быть ученым.
МОСКА
Нет, богатым, –
И все приложится. ***Одень в порфиру***
Осла, спрячь два честолюбивых уха –
И чтим осел, как кафедральный доктор*.*
(Бен Джонсон. Вольпоне Перевод П. Мелковой)

Yet, sometimes the cognitive mapping underlying irony undergoes some changes necessary to maintain the ironic effect:

At "Corway Stakes" – the first bend above Walton Bridge – was fought a battle between Caesar and Cassivelaunus. Cassivelaunus had prepared the river for Caesar, by planting it full of stakes (and had, no doubt, put up a notice-board). But Caesar crossed in spite of this. You couldn't choke Caesar off that river. ***He is the sort of man we want round the backwaters now.*** *(Jerome K. Jerome Three Men in a Boat)*

Біля "Корвейських Паль" – першого вигину річки після Волтонського мосту – відбулася битва між Цезарем та Кассівелауном. Кассівелаун підготував річку, щоб Цезар не міг її форсувати – понабивав у дно паль (і, поза сумнівом, почепив таблицю із забороною). Однак, Цезар перетнув Темзу все одно. ***Такий, як він, нам би і тепер знадобився – гамувати прибережних землевласників.*** *(Джером К. Джером Троє у човні. Перекл. О. Негребецький)*

In the above example the ironic effect is primarily created by the contrast of the two input spaces belonging to different domains – heroic history and trivial facts of contemporary life. To highlight this contrast, the translator adds details specifying even further the trivial situation of arguments between the travelers and the owners of the lands where they camp. The mental projection of such rows onto the

battle between Caesar and Cassivelaunus exaggerates the contrast and the ironic effect.

The biggest challenge for the translator is the difference of the cognitive bases in the source and target languages, which requires the translator either to use the existing TL mappings or to create a new mapping, or probably even the input domain. In the following example irony is based on the allusion to the literary work known to the English audience, but not commonly available to the Ukrainian readers (at least not published in translation):

*Once, when Mr. Crawley asked what the young people were reading, the governess replied "**Smollett**." "Oh, **Smollett**," said Mr. Crawley, quite satisfied. "His history is more dull, but by no means so dangerous as that of Mr. **Hume**. It is history you are reading?" "Yes," said Miss Rose; without, however, adding that it was **the history of Mr. Humphrey Clinker.** (Thackeray. Vanity Fair, p. 90)*

*Одного разу, коли містер Кроулі поцікавився, що читає молодь, гувернантка відповіла: "**Смоллета**". – "Ага, **Смоллета**, – сказав містер Кроулі, цілком задоволений, його історія хоч і нуднувата, але не така небезпечна, як історія містера **Юма**. Ти ж бо читаєш історію?" – "Так", відповіла міс Роз, проте не пояснила, що це **історія Гамфрі Клінкера**. (Теккерей. Ярмарок суєти. Перекл. О. Сенюк, с. 89)*

To maintain the author's trope, the translator supplies the necessary information in an interpretative note, including the names and dates of life of the authors, and the names of the books referred to. However, she doesn't name the genre – the picaresque novel, – which would be enough to recreate the irony of the original.

Summarizing the observations, we may state that the cognitive foundation for faithful rendering of the tropes in translation is the existence of shared cognitive structures or similar cognitive mappings. The specific nature of tropes in the source and target languages is revealed at the stage of mapping from the inner to the surface form of the language unit. In the texts of verbal art the tropes under study – metaphor, metonymy and irony – are used to create the imagery of the text or the author's ideostyle, which makes them essential for rendering in translation.

In most of the cases in our observation the translators followed the same strategy, trying to maintain the cognitive mapping of the original as closely as possible. If the two contacting language cultures have respective shared cognitive structures, the preference is given to recreation of the same cognitive mapping through the same inner form (the same image). The differences in grammar categories resulted in the necessity of shifts when in personifications inanimate beings were represented as humans. This case demonstrates the transformation of the model of conceptual blending in translation: the translator may choose to substitute one of the inputs, in order to maintain the main feature of the integrative ('blended') space – the relation between the two input spaces. Yet such substitution may result in certain shifts in the nuances of such relation (scope, emotiveness etc).

The translators may also tend to explicate the relation between the two input spaces by adding the words which name or represent the common feature of the two blended concepts. Such addition is the explication of the link between the inner and the surface form, and may be necessary if the SL mapping is not so deeply entrenched in the TL culture; otherwise, it will result in 'overinterpretation', when the translator deprives the TL reader of the chance to make the necessary cognitive operation, reduces the informational value of the text (its entropy) and makes the text "clearer, simpler and poorer" [Newmark 1988, 178].

The most challenging translation problem exists in the absence in the TL of a respective input space or mapping necessary to reproduce the author's metaphor. The translators of the literary artistic texts in this case try to create the necessary cognitive structures (by providing additional information) in order to maintain the author's cognitive mapping. Shifts in cognitive mappings in such cases are mostly observed in translations, done by the authors of the original works [See: Андрієнко].

Conclusions. The translation of metaphor, metonymy and irony in the literary artistic texts employs the commonalities in the cognitive mapping of the SL and TL which allow establishing the same relation between the inner form and the surface form of the sign. The shifts in the cognitive patterns include different degree of

specification, scope or minor details, but do not go beyond the same mapping. The absence of the same mappings or input spaces necessary to recreate the same image is compensated for by commentaries supplying additional information. The translators' choices are determined by the strategy of maintaining the author's ideostyle and the system of images of the original.

The **prospect** for further research is studying the translation of metaphors in the texts of other styles (specifically, journalistic or scientific) with the view to revealing differences in the cognitive patterns involved in their translation.

REFERENCES

1. *Андрієнко Т. П.* Стратегії очуження й одомашнення в перекладі художнього дискурсу з англійської мови на українську : монографія / Т. П. Андрієнко. – К.: КиМУ, 2011. – 264 с.

2. *Жаботинская С. А.* Когнитивное картирование как лингвосемиотический фактор / С. А. Жаботинская // Функциональная лингвистика : сб. науч. работ / Крымский республиканский ин-т последипломного пед. образования / под науч. ред. А. Н. Рудякова. – Симферополь, 2012. – № 3. – С. 179–182.

3. *Al-Hasnawi Ali R.* A Cognitive Approach to Translating Metaphors [Електронний ресурс] / Ali R. Al-Hasnawi // Translation J. – July 2007. – Vol. 11. – No. 3. – Режим доступу до журналу: URL: http://translationjournal.net/journal/41culture.htm

4. *Fauconnier G.* Conceptual blending, form and meaning [Електронний ресурс] / G. Fauconnier and M. Turner // Recherches en communication. – N°19 (2003). – Режим доступу до журналу: http://tecfa.unige.ch/tecfa/maltt/cofor-1/textes/Fauconnier-Turner03.pdf

5. *Kulwindr K. G. S.* A cognitive approach and translation strategies used in the subtitling of metaphors in three American movies [Електронний ресурс] / A. Iranmanesh, Dr. Kulwindr Kaur a/p Gurdial Singh // Found in Translation: A Common Voice in a Multicultural World : International Conference, University Of Malaya, 23-25 July 2010. – Режим доступу до джерела: http://english.um.edu.my/anuvaada/abstracts/KULWINDR.pdf

6. *Lakoff G.* Metaphors we live by / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. – London: University of Chicago Press, 2003. – 276 p.

7. *Langacker R. W.* An Introduction to Cognitive Grammar / R. W. Langacker // Cognitive Science. – 1986. – 10. – P. 1–40.

8. *Mandelblit N.* The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for Translation Theory / N. Mandelblit // Translation and Meaning. P. 3. – Maastricht: Universitaire Press, 1995.

9. *Newmark P.* Approaches to Translation / P. Newmark. – London; N. Y.: Prentice Hall, 1988.

10. *Rodriguez-Marquez M. de M.* Patterns of Translation of Metaphor in Annual Reports in American English and Mexican Spanish : Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy / M. de M. Rodriguez-Marquez. – University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, UK, 2008. – 146 p.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 20.12.14

Т. П. Андриенко, доц., канд. филол. наук
Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко

Когнитивные модели перевода тропов

Когнитивные модели передачи тропов в переводе художественной литературы с английского языка на украинский и русский изучаются с учетом общих когнитивных картирований и смещений в задействованных когнитивных структурах. Тенденция к сохранению тех же картирований, даже если это влечет за собой компенсацию недостающих когнитивных структур, свидетельствует о значимости стратегии сохранения системы образов оригинала.

Ключевые слова: *когнитивное картирование, перевод тропов, метафора, метонимия, ирония, художественный перевод.*

Т. П. Андрієнко, доц., канд. філол. наук
Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка

Когнітивні моделі перекладу тропів

Когнітивні моделі відтворення тропів в перекладі художньої літератури з англійської мови на українську та російську вивчаються з урахуванням загальних когнітивних картувань і зсувів у залучених когнітивних структурах. Тенденція до збереження тих же картувань, навіть за необхідності компенсації відсутніх когнітивних структур, свідчить про значущість стратегії збереження системи образів оригіналу.

Ключові слова: *когнітивне картування, переклад тропів, метафора, метонімія, іронія, художній переклад.*

UDC 811.133.1'25

Cherniyenko Galyna, maître de conférence
Université Nationale de Kiev (Ukraine)

A PROPOS DE L'EXACTITUDE TRADUCTRICE DES UNITES LEXICALES A QUELQUES SENS

Dans l'article ci-joint il s'agit de la nécessité de l'analyse littéraire et traductologique du texte, de son herméneutique, avant sa traduction dont le but est de déterminer le genre et le style du dit texte, le choix du lexique thématique, la