

SELECTED SHAKESPEARE'S METAPHORS IN TRANSLATION¹

ŁUKASZ STOLARSKI

INTRODUCTION

The main aim of the paper is to analyse separate examples of metaphors in translation. In order to do that the present author isolates 25 metaphorical expressions from Shakespeare's *Sonnets*. First 13 English examples are compared with their counterparts in Barańczak's translation of the cycle. All the rest of the metaphors are analysed in terms of their relation to three Polish versions — by Kasproicz, Słomczyński and (again) Barańczak.

As the theoretical background for the analysis made in the paper the author presents the position taken by the Theory of Translation. Additionally, the author makes an attempt to adopt the Relevance Theory to explain the processes involved in metaphor translation. In short, certain assumptions put forward by the Theory of Translation are employed to operate in the Relevance Theory.

PETER NEWMARK'S OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING THE TRANSLATION OF METAPHORS

The problem of metaphor translation is not particularly well discussed in the Translation Theory. Among those who actually did take up the matter one can list Menachim Dagut (1976), Raymond van den Broeck (1981), Mary Snell-Hornby (1988) and Peter Newmark (1995a; 1995b). Snell-Hornby, for example, following, as she calls it, an "integrated approach", postulates that whether a metaphor is translatable or not cannot be decided by a set of abstract rules, but must depend on the structure and function of the particular metaphor within the context concerned. However, the present author will not discuss the details of the suggestions made by the aforementioned writers, though some may be immensely interesting, except for Peter Newmark's proposals. His position on the subject deserves closer inspection

¹ Reprinted from *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* No 2649, *Anglica Wratislaviensia* XLII. 2004.

because it is both profound and practical. In his two important works on translation (1995a; 1995b) he devotes as much as one chapter in each to the discussed problem. The assumptions presented in both books are similar and are summarised briefly hereunder.

First Newmark (1995a) divides metaphors into five types: *dead*, *cliché*, *stock*, *recent* and *original*. In his later account (1995b) he introduces the sixth category which he calls *adopted*. Besides describing the metaphors he also suggests how they should be rendered in translation.

Dead metaphors are defined as those (1995b: 106) “where one is hardly conscious of the image.” Their former figurative content is their present literal meaning. Therefore in translation they are treated as non-figurative language.

Cliché metaphors are characterised as (1995b: 107): “metaphors that have perhaps temporarily outlived their usefulness, that are used as a substitute for clear thought, often emotively, but without corresponding to the facts of the matter.” Newmark proposes two ways of translating them. The first option might be to reduce a *cliché metaphor* to sense and the second option to replace it with a less tarnished metaphor.

To the next type of metaphor — a *stock metaphor* — Newmark devotes the most significant part of the chapter in both books. In the second work it is defined as (1995b: 108) “an established metaphor which in an informal context is an efficient and concise method of covering a physical and/or mental situation both referentially and pragmatically — a stock metaphor has a certain emotional warmth — and which is not deadened by overuse.” Newmark gives a very detailed account of the ways this type of metaphor can be translated. Depending on many factors, for example the intention of the text, the intention of the translator, the reader, etc., the translator may resort to many different translatory procedures. Newmark enumerates the following such procedures: reproducing the same image, replacing the image in the source language with a standard target language image which does not clash with the target language culture, translation by simile, by simile plus sense, conversion to sense, deletion and, finally, using the same metaphor combined with sense.

The concept of *adapted metaphor* appears vague. Newmark does not provide any definition of the term. The only conclusion one can draw from his work is that this is a type of metaphor somewhere between a *stock metaphor* and a *recent metaphor*. However, any other characteristics are not given. Newmark claims that an *adopted metaphor* can be translated, where possible, by an equivalent *adapted metaphor*.

Recent metaphors, on the other hand, are given a thorough description. Newmark states (1995b: 111): “By recent metaphor, I mean a metaphorical neologism, often ‘anonymously’ coined, which has spread rapidly in the

source language.” He suggests three ways of dealing with the problem if there is no accepted equivalent: describing the object, creating a translation label in inverted commas and transferring a metaphorical neologism peculiar to the source language.

Newmark calls the last type *original metaphors*. He states that in principle, in authoritative and expressive texts they should be translated literally, regardless of whether they are universal, cultural or obscurely subjective. There are, however, cases, where an *original metaphor* appears to be somewhat obscure and not very important, so it can be sometimes replaced with a descriptive metaphor or reduced to sense.

From the above summary one may draw the conclusion that in Newmark's two papers the translation of metaphors should be rendered by using various procedures. What is more, even though in the case of some types of metaphor certain categories are preferable to other, there is no one hundred percent certainty that in a given case the supposedly favoured procedure should be chosen.

The above observations by Newmark may be treated as the summary of the assumptions concerning metaphors from the point of view of the Theory of Translation.

THE RELEVANCE THEORY

The Relevance Theory does not deal directly with the issues discussed in the Theory of Translation. However, from the theoretical assumptions that are presented by the former one can deduct conclusions which fall within the scope of competence of the latter. Still, before proceeding any further it seems necessary to revise some basic concepts of the Relevance Theory.

This approach of tackling the problem of metaphor (as well as other phenomena encountered in human languages) is based on the assumption that whenever we communicate something to other people we aim at “optimal relevance,” which means that addressees always assume that whatever was said to them (or that which they read) was expressed in the most effective way. They act as if their role is to recover from the utterance the most relevant meaning. On the basis of what was said they will build “contextual assumptions” in the expectation that they will interact with their existing assumptions to yield a “contextual effect”. The model also assumes that understanding of utterances goes through three stages — said, explicating and implicative. Explicature is an elaborated logical form and implicature is a new logical form, derived from explicature in a two-step process. The derivation of implicature proper may require first an “implicated premise,”

before the consequent implicature, or “implicated conclusion” can be inferred.

Sperber and Wilson’s Relevance Theory is the first cognitive account of pragmatic understanding. It maintains that:

every utterance is an interpretive expression of a thought of the speaker’s. [...] A mental representation, like any representation with a propositional form, can be used descriptively or interpretively. When it is used descriptively, it can be a description of a state of affairs in the actual world, or it can be a description of a desirable state of affairs. When it is used interpretively, it can be an interpretation of some attributed thought or utterance, or it can be an interpretation of some thought which it is or would be desirable to entertain in a certain way: as knowledge, for instance. [...] metaphor involves an interpretive relation between the propositional form of an utterance and the thought it represents; irony involves an interpretive relation between the speaker’s thought and a desirable state of affairs; interrogatives and exclamatives involve an interpretive relation between the speaker’s thought and desirable thoughts. (Sperber, Wilson 1996: 231)

Sperber and Wilson also distinguish between *strong* and *weak* communication. In the case of the former, the speaker (or a writer) intends the hearer to recover a specific set of propositions. He will constrain the interpretation of the utterance so that the hearer takes very little responsibility in the choice of contextual assumptions and contextual effects. But the speaker may also produce an utterance with no expectation whatsoever about the way in which it will be understood and the hearer is expected then to take considerable responsibility in the selection of contextual assumptions and effects. In between these two extremes there is, of course, an entire range of intermediate cases.

Later in their book Sperber and Wilson define the term *poetic effects*. This concerns utterances which achieve most of their relevance through a wide array of weak implicatures. There are no entirely new assumptions added but instead there is an increase in the manifestness of a great many weakly manifest assumptions. Common *impressions* are created, as opposed to common *knowledge*. The term does not suggest that such effects can be achieved only by poets, because everyone produces metaphors or ironical utterances in everyday life. Such utterances do not have to be called poetry, but they exhibit the characteristics of indeterminacy and vagueness just the same.

A metaphor is then perceived in the Relevance Theory in terms of its array of weak implicatures. The wider the range of possible conclusions, the weaker the implicatures, and the more the hearer must share the responsibility for deriving them.

Sperber and Wilson divide metaphors into *highly standardised* and *highly creative*. Standardised metaphors involve examples which give access to an encyclopaedic schema with one or two dominant and highly accessible as-

sumptions. They yield certain intended implications. However, the relative indirectness must be justified by some additional information which is more difficult to pinpoint, and even these metaphors cannot be paraphrased without loss. Nevertheless, *standardised metaphors* are much easier to process than *creative metaphors*. The latter, on the other hand, result in a wide array of weak implicatures. Neither of them seems a dominant one. Sperber and Wilson summarise this issue by stating (236):

In general, the wider the range of potential implicatures and the greater the hearer's responsibility for constructing them, the more poetic the effect, the more creative the metaphor. A good creative metaphor is precisely one in which a variety of contextual effects can be retained and understood as weakly implicated by the speaker. In the richest and most successful cases, the hearer or reader can go beyond just exploring the immediate context and the entries for concepts involved in it, accessing a wide area of knowledge, adding metaphors of his own as interpretations of possible developments he is not ready to go into, and getting more and more very weak implicatures, with suggestions for still further processing.

THE RELEVANCE THEORY AND TRANSLATION OF METAPHOR

The summary of the procedures proposed by Newmark presents a very neat prescriptive way of dealing with metaphor in translation. One, however, should bear in mind that different approaches to translation offer various solutions to given translatory problems. Nevertheless, the so-called *equivalent effect principle*, called also the *principle of dynamic equivalence* (E.A. Nida) or the *principle of similar or equivalent response or effect* (P. Cauer), remains unquestionably superordinate in all translation theories and is claimed to be the basic guide-line in translation. The principle holds that the translator should produce the same effect on his own readers as the source language author produced on the original readers.

In the Relevance Theory terminology this means that the translator should supply the reader with such contextual assumptions that will yield contextual effects and thus contextual conclusions similar to the ones created in the minds of the readers of the original. This does not mean, however, that the contextual assumptions brought to bear by the translator are to be identical with the ones supplied by the author of the original. The reason for such a conclusion can be deduced from the observations presented hereunder.

All people, even of the same language zone, experience life differently. This results in differences in the quality and quantity of propositions which are stored as factual descriptions of the world. This observation can explain the phenomenon of different interpretations of the same text by different individuals, especially if the text is full of *poetic effects*. The differences in

the information stored as concepts, or, in other words, addresses, in the case of people speaking one language, are usually much smaller than in the case of people representing different language zones. The translator, then, in order to create in the minds of his readers contextual effects comparable to those supplied by the author of the original to his (however dissimilar they may be, taking into account the different interpretations of the same text mentioned above) will be forced in many cases to supply the contextual assumptions, which are different from the contextual assumptions in the original.

This kind of reasoning may suggest that for a translator in many cases the best way to convey the contextual assumptions that would yield the required contextual effects would be to choose the translation which is less than literal. The translator, then, may be forced to use various procedures of translating, other than simply literal translation.

Another observation which would help to support the claim expressed above can be inferred from the notion of *interpretive resemblance*. Blackmore (161) writes:

This notion is based on the claim that any object can be used to represent any other object which it resembles. [...] more generally, an utterance can be used to represent any representation which it resembles in content, whether this be a public representation like an utterance, or private representation like a thought. In fact, they [Sperber and Wilson] claim that every utterance is an interpretive representation of a thought — namely, the thought that the speaker wishes to communicate. This is not to say, however, that the hearer is entitled to expect that the utterance provides a literal interpretation of the speaker's thought. It may be sufficient for the speaker to provide a less-than-literal interpretation of his thought. Indeed, a less-than-literal representation may be more appropriate on some occasions than a completely literal one.

In other words, the optimally relevant utterance may be at times the one which very closely resembles the speaker's thought; at others, it may be one which involves a looser resemblance. In order to achieve optimal relevance the speaker will resort to different means, that is, will provide the hearer with either more literal or less literal representations of his/her thoughts. In the case of figurative language, and metaphor in particular, a less than literal interpretation is chosen.

Needless to say, paraphrases, summaries and indeed translations are also instances in which an utterance can be used to represent another utterance. The translator, then, aiming at optimal relevance, will also resort to various means, that is, will provide the target language reader with either a more literal or less literal representation of the ideas expressed in the original text. As a consequence, he will use various procedures of translating, and these will not necessarily represent literal translation.

For the above mentioned reasons, from the theoretical background presented by the Theory of Relevance one may conclude that there is no one preferred procedure of translation. Furthermore, the translator aiming at optimal relevance will use different techniques. He will have to take into consideration the differences in the quality and quantity of the propositions which are stored as factual descriptions of the world between the source language and target language readers. The translator will also bear in mind that in order to make the target language reader recover the expected contextual effects at the least processing cost s/he will sometimes use a less than literal representation.

Thus the present author does not claim that there is one most relevant method of translating metaphors. Both the Translation Theory and the Relevance Theory reject such an idea. Nevertheless, what the present author will do in the subsequent part of the paper is to enumerate examples of metaphorical expressions and the procedures used by different translators in order to translate them. The aim of such an examination is to substantiate the conclusions drawn in this chapter.

THE CHOICE OF THE MATERIAL FOR THE ANALYSIS

The metaphors chosen as the examples hereunder come from Shakespeare's *Sonnets*. They are of various kinds and vary from *highly creative* to *highly standardised*, even though one could expect them to be mainly *original*, to use Newmark's terminology, since they were extracted from poetic texts. Such a state of affairs may be explained by the fact that many examples of Shakespeare's metaphors, which nowadays seem standardised, were regarded as creative in their author's time. Nonetheless, after a long period of time their novelty wore off and to the present reader they may seem not creative at all. In addition, even in present poetry one is bound to find various kinds of metaphorical expressions, not only "purely" *original* ones. Such reasoning results from the notion of gradation of metaphor — one can imagine a scale on which the ends constitute prototypical literal uses of a language and prototypical strong metaphors. Most of the cases, nevertheless, fall somewhere in between the two extremes. Therefore, it is very difficult to propose any dependable division of metaphors, because one can always find examples of metaphorical expressions which are on the border of a given two types. What is more, in probing deeper the problem of classification one must inevitably face the dilemma of delineating, to the extent that one can, between literal and figurative uses of language. In other words, such investigation leads to the question as to how to differentiate

a metaphorical expression from a literal one. This issue, however, is beyond the scope of this paper.

Each of the examples of metaphors was assigned a number. After the number of a given metaphor there is also written the number of the sonnet from which the example was taken. Finally, after the comma, the reader is presented with the number (or numbers) of the verse (verses).

Examples of metaphors translated by Barańczak, Kasprowicz and Słomczyński are additionally marked with the letters B, K and S respectively. The symbols are inserted between the number of the example and the number of the sonnet.

The examples are in some cases supported by the information concerning the context provided in brackets. Nevertheless, even though the metaphors are presented as clearly as possible, in most cases the reader is advised to refer to the context of the entire sonnet. The full meaning of a given metaphorical expression is usually the result of its interaction with other elements provided in the text.

If a metaphor stretches across more than one verse, then the first word of a new verse is, as in the original, written with a capital letter.

Even though there are innumerable translations of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* into Polish, the author has decided to choose examples from only three: those by Maciej Słomczyński, Jan Kasprowicz and Stanisław Barańczak. The choice of these particular translators lays in the fact that they are all (or, in the case of Kasprowicz, were) eminent poets themselves. Consequently their translations may be certainly regarded to be of very high quality.

BARAŃCZAK'S TRANSLATION

At first it seems enough to examine examples of metaphors in one translation without comparing them to the way they were treated in other translations. This will reveal whether metaphorical expressions are in fact translated by implementation of diverse methods, even in the case of one translator.

The original version	Barańczak's translation
(1) 12,13 Time's scythe	(1) B 12,13 kosą Czasu
(2) 153,10 The boy for trial needs would touch my breast (with his brand)	(2) B 153,9-11 Chłopiec [...] (pochodnią) dotknął na próbę Mej piersi
(3) 148,12 The sun itself sees not till heaven clears	(3) B 148,12 I słońce nie nie widzi poprzez chmur przesłonę

(4) 133,9 prison my heart in thy steel bosom's ward	(4) B 133,9 Uwięź zatem me serce w swym stalowym łonie
(5) 11,13-14 She carved thee for her seal, and merit thereby, Thou shouldst print more, not let the copy die	(5) B 11,13-14 Tyś jednym z nich, z tych, których rzeźbi dłoń Natury Jak pieczęć, by powielać piękności kontury
(6) 132,5-6 the mourning sun of heaven Belter becomes the grey cheeks of the Cast	(6) B 132,5-6 ranne słońce, codziennym swym torem Wznosząc się, wsącza złoty blask w szare obłoki
(7) 132,7 full star that ushers in the even	(7) B 132,7-8 gwiazda, co wieczorem Rozbłyska, w glorii kąpie nieb zachodnie mroki
(8) 130,4 black wires grow on her head	(8) B 130,4 Włos jej to włos — nie w złocie wyrzeźbione fale
(9) 138,1 my love swears that she is made of truth	(9) B 138,1 luba moja klnie się, że nie wie co zdrady
(10) 4,7 Profitless usurer	(10) B 4,7 -----
(11) 154,12 I, my mistress' thrall	(11) B 154,12 -----
(12) 133,1 I let my heart be his guard	(12) B 133,11-12 sam go przed srogością twoją niech osłonię Sercem, bezpiecznym niby wydzielona cela
(13) 3,11 windows of thine age	(13) B 3,11 twój syn, jak okno przebite w lat murze

The examples (1)B and (2)B present the same translatory technique. Barańczak, in order to create in the mind of his readers the contextual effects yielding implicated conclusions comparable to those created in the minds of English readers, reproduces the same image as in the original. In these two cases, the Polish reader's contextual resources, or cognitive environment, are exactly the same as in the case of the English reader.

In (3)B and (4)B the situation is still similar. The type of translation applied is reproduction of the same image. Nevertheless, in (3)B one can notice a slight overtranslation. Namely, "chmur przesłone" is an additional implicated premise, which yields contextual effects not present in the original. Still, the difference in meaning is not considerable and the example must be treated as an instance of literal translation.

On the other hand, in (4)B it is the undertranslation which may be noticed. It lacks the implicated concept of "ward". The effort needed for the recovery of the full sense of the translation is smaller than that which is expected from the reader of the original. Nonetheless, the recovered contextual effects and final conclusions are not exactly the same and lack some of the information conveyed by the English version of the metaphor.

(5)B presents an example of another translatory technique. Barańczak uses reproduction of the same image again, but this time he does it by ap-

plying simile. Therefore, the Polish reader is suggested to choose only some of the implicated assumptions created in his mind. The person who reads the English version of the metaphorical expression is not constrained in such a way. He/She is much more unrestricted to choose which of the implicated premises are the most important. The Polish reader, however, is almost cautioned that the image is only partially applicable and must be more careful to choose the proper contextual assumptions.

In (6)B Barańczak chooses an intermediate procedure between reproducing the same image and replacing the image in the source language with a target language image. In other words, reproduction of the image in target language is partial. The frame, or schema, of “morning sun” appears in both the English and the Polish version. However, the second part of the metaphor is considerably altered, if not changed altogether. First of all, the expression “codziennym swym torem wznosząc się” is obvious overtranslation. It supplies the Polish reader with additional contextual assumptions not recoverable from the original version. For example, the word “torem” (by track) suggests the idea of sun moving along certain path. This could encourage the reader to enter assumptions connected with such a frame, for instance the fact that it is usually a vehicle that can move along a path. Therefore, the sun in Barańczak’s translation may be interpreted as a vehicle. Moreover, in the original version these are the clouds that have an effect on the sun. In the translation, nonetheless, the sun affects the clouds. The relationship between the two is reversed.

(7)B presents an even more drastic shift of the image. This time the reader of the translation is provided with almost entirely different implicated premises than the reader of the English original. This does not mean that the translator by means of a different image expresses a different idea. As postulated in the paper, it may be the case that the “less than literal” interpretation of the original version is the most relevant one and consequently may be in fact better than the literal one. Indeed, the main idea included in the original is the same as in the translation. The concept of the planet Venus appearing in the sky at evening is present in both versions. The overall meaning of the metaphor is not changed but expressed in a different way. This new way may be treated as more appropriate for the target language reader, yielding more contextual effects than would be in the case of literal translation.

(8)B is similar to (7)B, but the implicated assumptions supplied to the reader of the Polish version are even more dissimilar from these delivered to the reader of the English original. Nonetheless, the argumentation used before still holds. Even though the image is different, the idea of hair that is unattractive, in whatever way expressed, is present in both versions.

In (9)B Barańczak applies conversion to sense. Here the implicated conclusions conveyed by the original are expressed explicitly. This translatory procedure reduces the cost in processing for the reader, yet at the same time the array of weakly implicated assumptions is also considerably smaller.

Both (10)B and (11)B present an instance of deletion. They are, however, markedly different. Even though in the case of (10)B the idea of “profitless usurer” cannot be pinpointed in any categorical way, the present author claims that it still exists in the sonnet. It is most strongly manifested in lines 7-9. It is nevertheless communicated via an impression rather than a clear idea. (11)B, on the other hand, is a “pure” case of deletion. The address of “thrall” cannot be detected in any part of the Polish translation.

The examples (12)B and (13)B present situations wherein the translator mixes different techniques. (12)B involves applying translation of metaphor by simile and additionally replacing the image in the source language with a target language image. Here Barańczak not only changes the image of the original expression by supplying the Polish reader with different associations, but also converts the idea expressed to a simile, thus stressing only some of the aspects of the expression. To put it another way, the premises implicated in the translation differ from those in the original. Moreover, by conversion to simile the translator directs the attention of his reader towards specific conclusions, probably those which would be the most strongly implicated, if the image was a “normal” metaphor. The fact that the images of the Polish translation and the English original are dissimilar (to a certain extent at least) does not suggest, nevertheless, that the conclusions derived by their respective readers will be substantially different. As postulated in this paper and already discussed in the case of (7)B, the translator, in order to create in the minds of their readers contextual effects comparable to those supplied by the author of the original, will be forced in many cases to supply the contextual assumptions which are different from those derived from the original. In the example discussed the principle holds perfectly well. The Polish reader will certainly interpret Barańczak's translation in such a way as to arrive at similar conclusions as the reader of the original after analysing Shakespeare's version. In (13)B the situation is also complex. First of all, the translator applies conversion to sense. The expression “twój syn” is the literal meaning of the original English expression. Additionally, Barańczak makes use of translation by simile. Moreover, the simile contains a quite strong overtranslation. The phrase “przebite w lat murze” (pierced in the years' —meaning age's —wall) is absent from the original altogether. The effort needed for recovery of the full sense of the translation is greater than that which is expected from the reader of the original. However, it is certainly offset by additional contextual assumptions yielding new contextual effects and eventually implicated conclusions.

COMPARISON OF THREE DIFFERENT TRANSLATIONS

This part of the paper will examine how separate examples of metaphorical expressions were dealt with by different translators. As previously mentioned, the translations being compared are those by Barańczak, Kasprowicz and Słomczyński.

The original version	Barańczak's translation	Kasprowicz's translation	Słomczyński's translation
(14) 3,9 Thou art thy mother's glass	(14) B 3,9 Matce jesteś zwierciadłem	(14) K 3,9 Zwierciadłemś matki swojej	(14) S 3,9 Zwierciadłem matki jesteś
(15) 146,2 these rebel powers that thee array	(15) B 146,2 osaczon ciasno przez pułk zbuntowany	(15) K 146,2 kuszonej przez szal rozhlukany	(15) S 146,2 (duszy) targanej przez buntu żywioły
(16) 154,12 I, my mistress' thrall	(16) B 154,12 -----	(16) K 154,12 -----	(16) S 154,12
(17) 134,10 Thou usurer	(17) B 134,9 niby lichwiarz	(17) K 134,9-10 sposobem lichwiarzy Czar swój wyzyskać umiesz	(17) S 134,9 Lichwiarko
(18) 3,7 who is he so fond will be the tomb	(18) B 3,8 życia, które wicznie wszak nie będzie trwało	(18) K 3,8 grób w nim miała, bezpotomnie zmarła(własna miłość)	(18) S 3,7-8 bezpotomnie skona, Do grobu niosąc
(19) 1,14 To eat the world's due	(19) B 1,14 Uroda, którą pożre zachłanna mogiła	(19) K 1,13-14 ty wraz z mogiłą Wchłoniecie razem jego (świata) własność miłą	(19) S 1,14 Nim grób je pożre
(20) 4,8 so great sum of sums	(20) B 4,8 -----	(20) K 4,8 skarbów nawał	(20) S 4,8 skarb
(21) 3,10 the lovely April of her prime	(21) B 3,10 dawne swe maje i kwietnie	(21) K 3,10 swą wiosnę	(21) S 3,9-10 swej młodości Kwiecień
(22) 128.4 wiry concord	(22) B 128,3 harmonią strun	(22) K 128,3-4 (palcami poruszająca) druty strun w przemiętki ton	(22) S 128,4 strun dźwięk
(23) 141,12 Thy proud heart's slave and vassal wretch	(23) B 141,11-12 jak znikoma Resztką człowiecka, wasal po stracie cesarza	(23) K 141,12 Służę, jak lennik i pachoł twej dumie	(23) S 141,12 szczątek ludzki i pachoła
(24) 15,8 brave state	(24) B 15,8 -----	(24) K 15,8 swych wyżyn	(24) S 15,8 to, co wzrosło
(25) 15,7 youthful sap	(25) B 15,7 Młodym wigorem	(25) K 15,7 młodość życia sokami wesoła	(25) S 15,7 młody sok

Example (14) and its three translations — (14)B, (14)K and (14)S — present the situation where all the three translators applied the same translatory technique. Namely, they reproduced the image used in the original. Here it was enough to supply the readers of the translation with identical contextual implications yielding identical contextual effects and eventual conclusions as in the English version.

In (15)B, (15)K and (15)S the applied techniques are again alike. Here, however, all the three translators chose replacing the image from the source language with a target language image. In order to describe (15)B, (15)K and (15)S in more detail we need to consider some additional circumstances. The original version of the sonnet in line 2 lacks a beginning — some of the editions of the collection repeat the last two words of the first verse, but others treat it as an editorial mistake and leave this line blank. As a result, the full context of the discussed metaphor is unknown. The three translators solve this problem by supplying their readers with additional implicated premises yielding contextual assumptions not necessarily present in the original. For example, Barańczak fills the missing part with the word “wódz” (commander), thus supplying his reader with contextual resources allowing him to interpret the image in terms of war. The English metaphor does not, however, suggest such an interpretation. In short, the cognitive environment constructed by the Polish reader is different from that which is constructed by the English reader. The translations by Kasprowicz and Słomczyński also allow their readers to access different contextual assumptions than the original version. In (15)K “kuszanej przez szal rozhukany” (tempted by the raging frenzy) the translator has built up a different image than that used in the original. Similarly, in (15)S “targanej przez buntu żywioły” (buffeted by the element’s rebellion) the interpretive representation of the Polish version differs significantly from the one present in the original. Still, the theory followed in this paper justifies the manner in which (15) was rendered in the three translations.

(16)B, (16)K and (16)S are additional examples wherein the translators adopt the same technique. All of them use deletion. The image of “mistress’ thrall” is therefore absent from all three translations.

The examples from (17) to (20) are cases where two of the translators used the same method and one applied a different one.

(17)S is an example of literal translation — “lichwiarka” means “usurer”. Nevertheless, in the other two Polish versions one can observe an instance of translation of metaphor by simile. Both Barańczak and Kasprowicz constrain the interpretation of their interpretive representations by directing the reader’s attention to only some of the possible intended implicated premises yielding contextual effects. Even though the address of “usurer” is as present in the translation as in the original, the Polish reader seems to be guided to choose only the most strongly implicated conclusions.

In order to translate example (18) Kasprowicz reproduces the same image without under- or overtranslation. Barańczak and Słomczyński, on the other hand, employ conversion to sense. In order to supply their readers with contextual assumptions yielding the contextual effects and eventually implicat-

ed conclusions comparable with those present in the cognitive environment of the reader of the original, they decided to convey the most strongly implicated context-dependent conclusions in a literal way. Therefore (18)B and (18)S lack the very essence of the metaphor in (18), which is perceived, in the Relevance Theory, in terms of a wide range of weak implicatures. However, in accordance with the theory accepted in this paper, they did so in the belief that such an interpretation of the English version would be the most consistent with the Principle of Relevance. That is to say, their interpretive resemblance will have adequate contextual effects for the minimum necessary processing, which would not be the case if they reproduced the image present in the English version. They assumed that the Polish reader would not be able to process such an image in the intended way, or the cost in processing would be too great for the recovery of the intended contextual effects, and therefore such a translation would be less than optimally relevant.

In (19)K one can notice an evident overtranslation. Nevertheless, the image is still the same, which can be observed in neither (19)B nor (19)S. Barańczak and Słomczyński replace the image in the source language with a target language image. Additionally, the meaning of the original is significantly altered. Comparing, for instance, (19) and (19)S, in both cases some type of consumption is involved. In the English version it is the young man, the addressee of the poem, who is accused of gluttony. In contrast, in the translation, it is the man's grave that is accused of the same transgression. Needless to say, the two images will supply their respective readers with different implicated assumptions which will yield different implicated conclusions. One must bear in mind, however, that a translator aiming at optimal relevance on certain occasions will use representation that is less than literal, and sometimes even diverging considerably from the original text. Occasionally it may also result in certain changes in meaning.

Finally, among the examples where two out of three translators use the same translatory technique, it is readily apparent that (20)B represents the case when Barańczak applies deletion, but in Kasprowicz's and Słomczyński's versions it is replacing the image in the source language with a target language image which is implemented. However, (20)K and (20)S differ from (19)B and (19)S — in the former the meaning of the original metaphor is retained. To put it another way, Kasprowicz and Słomczyński supply their reader with contextual assumptions different from those present in the English version, but still the conclusions implicated in the translations are comparable with the original ones.

The examples from (21) to (25) reveal that some metaphorical expressions present in Shakespeare's "Sonnets" were translated differently by the three translators, all by various and dissimilar methods.

To begin with, example (21) does not seem to pose many problems. All three translations represent reproducing the same image in the target language. In the case of (21)B and (21)K, nonetheless, we are dealing with the instances of over- and undertranslation, respectively. In (21)B it is not only “kwiecień” (April) which is mentioned, but also “maj” (May). Conversely, the undertranslation of (21)K is due to the lack of the name of the month—Kasprowicz mentions only “wiosnę” (spring), which is a more general term than “April”. On the whole, the differences of (21)B and (21)K in relation to the English original are minor, but still noticeable.

The way (22) was rendered in the three translations is more complicated than (21). Firstly, Barańczak reproduces the same image. Secondly, Kasprowicz replaces the image in the source language with the target language image, retaining the meaning. Finally, Słomczyński converts the original metaphor to its sense. All three translators used the mentioned techniques in order to comply with the Principle of Relevance. Barańczak decided that the most relevant method of translation for (22) was a very literal interpretation of the original image. Conversely, Kasprowicz and Słomczyński opted to present their readers with less than literal interpretation of the English metaphor, perhaps because they resolved that this would comply best with the Principle of Relevance.

Example (23) is even more intriguing. In (23)S the translator replaces the image in the source language with the target language image. The contextual implications recoverable from it are still comparable to those which could be derived from the original version. The method applied in (23)K is translation of metaphor by simile. Again the implicated premises and the resulting contextual effects and conclusions are comparable with those rendered in the English version. The choice of the weak implicatures is here somehow restricted, or guided, as in the other cases of conversion to simile. (23)B is the most striking among the three Polish versions of (23). Not only does Barańczak apply the translation of metaphor by simile, but also partially changes the image. In his interpretive representation some of the implicated premises are omitted, such as the address “heart’s slave”, but others are added, like the concept of “cesarz” (an emperor).

The translations of (24) and (25) by Barańczak, Kasprowicz and Słomczyński are at least as engaging as (23), if not more.

The method adopted in (24)K is, as in previous examples, replacement of the image in the source language with the target language image, where the meaning is retained. (24)B is an instance of also already discussed deletion. However, the case of (24)S is unique, not observed in any other example listed in this paper. Here Słomczyński converts the metaphor to its sense and then alters it. Consequently some of the implicated assumptions present

in the original are absent in the translation. “To, co wzrosło” (this which has grown) implies youth and the most typical associations connected with its semantic frame. Conversely, the English expression “brave state” conveys additional contextual assumptions yielding implicated conclusions. The word “brave” especially broadens the scope of associations, by additionally introducing ideas connected with some courageous deeds, which, in truth, could be inferred from the Polish counterpart, but are not in any way highlighted.

Lastly, (25) is an example that has been rendered in the three translations by applying reproduction of the same image in the target language in (25)S, replacement of the image in the source language with a target language image with coincident alternation of meaning in (25)B, and conversion to sense combined with (only) partial reproduction of the same image in (25)K. Among the three versions, the last mentioned — (25)K — warrants closer inspection. In addition to conversion of the metaphor to its sense in the words “młodość życia” (youth of life) the translator repeats the metaphor, which in his version is partially altered. Kasprowicz provides the readers of the translation with the strongest implicated conclusion one can derive from reading the English version. He also repeats the metaphor itself, but some of its implicated assumptions are altered. The interaction of the most strongly manifested implicated premise of the original text plus additional contextual implication added by the translator will surely increase the cost in processing. Nevertheless, it will be offset by additional contextual effects yielding additional contextual implications. By adopting the described solution one may say that Kasprowicz has complied with the Principle of Relevance.

SUMMARY

At the beginning of the paper the author presented a summary of how metaphor is treated in the Translation Theory. In the subsequent part the author revised some basic concepts of the Relevance Theory and discussed the manner in which figurative language is perceived in this framework. Next, the author made an attempt to employ the theoretical assumptions presented by the latter to draw conclusions that fall within the scope of competence of the former. Namely, it has been proposed that the differences of quality and quantity of propositions which are stored as factual descriptions of the world, in the case of those of different language zones, influence the way metaphor is dealt with in translation. Moreover, it has been suggested that the notion of “interpretive representation” used in the Relevance Theory may be successfully applied to explain the processes involved in translat-

ing figurative expressions. Finally, it has been stated that according to both the Translation Theory and the Relevance Theory there is no one preferred procedure of translating metaphor.

The analysed examples support the above claims. They show a very wide range of possible methods used in translating figurative language. Some of them create representations close to the original, and some that are very far from being literal. All of them, however, are justifiable on the basis of the translator's responsibility to conform to the Principle of Relevance. It is, therefore, this principle and not any notion of literalness that guides the process of metaphor translation.

REFERENCES

- Blackmore, D. 1992. *Understanding Utterances. An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Dagut, M. 1976. "Can 'Metaphor' be Translated?" *Babel* XII, 21-33.
- Newmark, P. 1955a. *Approaches to Translation*. Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Phoenix ELT.
- Newmark, P. 1955b. *A Textbook of Translation*. Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Phoenix ELT.
- Snell-Hornby, M. 1988. *Translation Studies. An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sperber, D. Wilson D. 1996. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford-Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Van den Broeck, R. 1981. "The Limits of Translatability Exemplified by Metaphor Translation". *Poetics Today* 4, 73-87.
- Wojtasiewicz, O. 1992. *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Polskiego Towarzystwa Tłumaczy Ekonomicznych, Prawnych i Sądowych.
- Sources
- Rowse, A. L. 1973. *Shakespeare's Sonnets. The Problems Solved*. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Shakespeare, W. 1934. *Sonnets*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd.
- Shakespeare, W. 1993. *Sonety*. Przekład Stanisława Barańczaka. Poznań: Wydawnictwo a5.
- Shakespeare, W. 199-?. *Sonety*. Przekład Mariana Hemara. Warszawa: Burchard Edition.
- Shakespeare, W. 1922. *Sonety*. Przekład Jana Kasprowicza. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy "Biblioteka Polska".
- Shakespeare, W. 1988. *Sonety*. Przekład Macieja Słomczyńskiego. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Shakespeare, W. 1975. *Sonety*. Przekład Jerzy S. Sito, Jerzy Łowiński, Leszek Elektorowicz i inni. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.