

**A Cognitive Approach to Metaphor Translation:**  
A Study on the Translations of Haruki Murakami's Jerusalem Prize  
Acceptance Speech

**TOSHIOKA Saeka**  
(Osaka University)

*This paper studies two translations of Haruki Murakami's Jerusalem Prize acceptance speech in 2009. Murakami originally wrote the draft of the speech in Japanese, and later had it translated into English by Jay Rubin. The transcript of his actual speech was translated into Japanese by Hiroshi Hosokawa. The two translators differ in terms of their intentions while translating Murakami's speech. Drawing on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, this study analyzes how the two translators dealt with the linguistic metaphors used in the speech. It argues that the two translators' intentions while translating seem to have affected their translations of the linguistic metaphors, and accordingly, the conceptual metaphors coined by Murakami. It also shows that Hosokawa's translation, in particular, influences the audience's view on the core content of Murakami's speech by explicitly explaining one idea conveyed by a conceptual metaphor regarding Murakami's criticism of Israel's attack on the Gaza Strip.*

### **1. Introduction**

The translation of metaphorical expressions has been discussed in literature on translation (Nida, 1964; Snell-Hornby, 1988; Hatim and Mason, 1997). Newmark (1988) maintains that some metaphorical expressions used in an expressive or authoritative statement, in particular, should be neatly translated because they convey the core of the speaker's message (122). Taking the translation of metaphorical expressions used in such texts as a case study, the present paper analyzes two translations of Haruki Murakami's Jerusalem Prize acceptance speech, which was given in English at the Jerusalem International Book Fair on February 15, 2009.

---

TOSHIOKA Saeka, "A Cognitive Approach to Metaphor Translation: A Study on the Translations of Haruki Murakami's Jerusalem Prize Acceptance Speech," *Interpreting and Translation Studies*, No.12, 2012. pages 229-247. © by the Japan Association for Interpreting and Translation Studies.

Murakami originally wrote the draft of the speech in Japanese, had it translated into English by Jay Rubin, and then read the English translation at the book fair (Murakami, 2009c). Rubin translated several of Murakami's works including *Norwegian Wood* and *The Elephant Vanishes* (UNESCO, 2011). Rubin was also a guest speaker at an international symposium on Murakami, "A Wild Haruki Chase: How the World is Reading and Translating Murakami," held in Japan in March 2006 (Shibata et al., 2006: 69–98). Murakami's acceptance speech was then recorded and transcribed by Kenji Hasegawa, a reporter for the Jerusalem branch of *Kyodo News* (*47News*, 2009). The transcript was then translated into Japanese by Hiroshi Hosokawa, who was also a reporter for *Kyodo News* (*ibid.*). The transcript of Murakami's actual speech, Hosokawa's Japanese translation of the transcript and commentary on the speech were published on *47News*, a news site that publishes news reported by *Kyodo News* and those from 52 other news agencies across Japan.

To examine the ideas conveyed by metaphorical expressions, the present study draws on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory for analyzing how the two translators—Rubin and Hosokawa—dealt with the metaphorical expressions used in Murakami's speech. Accordingly, it argues that the two translators' intentions while translating seems to have affected their approach to the metaphorical expressions, and that Hosokawa's translation, in particular, has influenced the audience's interpretation of the ideas conveyed by the expressions.

This study considers intention as a factor that decides whether and how translators present themselves to the audience. Intention can be formed through a translator's personal thought on the original text. Accordingly, what Hermans (2007) calls attitudes of a translator, for instance, whether s/he adopts a disapproving, critical, neutral, or supportive attitude to the original text, can influence his/her intention while translating. Intention can also reflect the social expectation of the translator's role in a certain communicative situation. In this regard, what Vermeer (2004) calls "skopos," which is a certain purpose of the translation in a communicative situation in which the translation is carried out (228), can influence the translator's intention while translating. Thus, considering the translator's intention will allow us to comprehensively examine both the social role expected of a translator in a certain communicative situation and his/her personal thoughts on the original text.

The psychology of translation processes is yet to be thoroughly explored (Pym, 2010: 166). Thus, this case study on the translation of metaphorical expressions used in Murakami's speech aims to contribute to the literature. It also attempts to provide some insights into the study of interpreting, because in some

cases, as will be argued later, the intention of translators of speeches and that of interpreters can be discussed on the same ground.

Section 2 of the present paper will explain the tenets of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory. In section 3, how Rubin and Hosokawa dealt with the metaphorical expressions used in Murakami's speech will be analyzed. Section 4 will argue that the two translators' intentions while translating affect their selective translation of metaphorical expressions.

## **2. Cognitive Approach to Metaphor Translation**

The translation of metaphorical expressions has been discussed in literature on translation because they require careful consideration from the translators. The difficulty in translating metaphors may emanate from cultural differences; for instance, Nida (1964), a translator of the Bible, states that the particular extensions of meaning associated with a metaphor ordinarily have no direct equivalents in the receptor language (220). The esthetic quality of metaphors may also cause difficulty when translating literary texts in particular. Snell-Hornby (1988) discusses the importance of preserving the esthetic appeal of a metaphor and the sense of the word when translating literary texts (62).

The use of metaphorical expressions is also known to reflect the intention of the writer. Hatim and Mason (1997) explains that metaphorical expressions are a "dynamic use of language" (30). In other words, they are a marked use of language that mirrors a particular intention of the writer, and therefore, may need special attention from the translators (*ibid.*: 30–31). Similarly, Hatim and Mason (1990) asserts that the occurrences of metaphors have "a cumulative effect, which suggests a particular perception of reality, and this is what the translator seeks to capture" (4).

One such intention of writers would be to express their ideas to the audiences by using metaphorical expressions. This is the case when a writer employs original metaphors that are "created or quoted by the writer" (Newmark, 1988: 122). Newmark (1988) maintains that original metaphors used in an expressive or authoritative statement should "contain the core of an important writer's message, his personality, his comment on life," and although they may have more or less cultural elements, such metaphors have to be neatly translated (*ibid.*). This seems to apply to some of the metaphorical expressions used in Murakami's speech.

To take the ideas that are conveyed by metaphorical expressions into consideration, this study draws on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which views the metaphorical function as an innate nature of human cognition (Lakoff and

Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff and Turner, 1989). Regardless of the text types within which metaphorical expressions appear, the metaphorical use of languages is considered to reflect how people perceive the world around them. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) states, the system of human cognition is fundamentally metaphorical, and this enables us to use metaphorical linguistic expressions (6-7). For instance, as Lakoff and Turner (1989) shows, we cannot articulate our views on abstract daily concepts including life, death, and time without using metaphorical expressions in English because our reasoning on such concepts is metaphorical (50-51).

The metaphorical function underlying the metaphorical use of language is called conceptual metaphor, which is described as mappings between two conceptual domains: source domain and target domain (Lakoff, 1987: 276). The conceptual metaphor “A IS B” refers to the conceptual mapping between the source domain B and the target domain A (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 59). For instance, groups of metaphorical linguistic expressions employed for talking about abstract daily concepts realize underlying conceptual metaphors such as LIFE IS A JOURNEY, DEATH IS SLEEP, or TIME IS A CHANGER (ibid.: 52). The forms of metaphorical linguistic expressions that realize such conceptual metaphors can vary (Steen, 1999; Cameron, 1999). For instance, an underlying conceptual metaphor may be realized not only in the form of a simile but also in the form of extended metaphors.

Conventional metaphorical expressions realize conceptual metaphors, on which our daily reasoning of abstract concepts is based, whereas unconventional metaphorical expressions coined by a speaker may introduce new conceptual metaphors to the audience. That is, through the use of unconventional metaphorical expressions, speakers/writers can introduce new ways of perceiving the reality or a particular topic to the audience (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 145). A listener’s interpreting process of different linguistic metaphors may also vary depending on whether the expression is conventional or novel. The interpretation of the highly conventionalized metaphorical expressions may not require the activation of two conceptual domains, whereas the interpretation of unconventional metaphorical expressions would require it (Steen, 1994: 8).

In the following section, this paper analyzes how Rubin and Hosokawa translated the metaphorical expressions used in Murakami’s speech. Murakami seems to have employed linguistic metaphors in his speech for three reasons: to introduce his idea to the audience, to emphasize his point, and to concisely convey his thoughts. Using the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, this paper will particularly show that Murakami employed novel metaphorical expressions in his speech to introduce his ideas to the audience. The remainder of the study employs

“metaphor” to refer to conceptual metaphors and “linguistic metaphor” to linguistic expressions that are based on such conceptual metaphors.

### 3. Translation of Linguistic Metaphors Used in Murakami’s Speech

#### 3.1. Rubin’s Translation of Linguistic Metaphors

Murakami uses a novel linguistic metaphor when he expresses his stance as a writer:

1. “もしここに硬い大きな壁があり、そこにぶつかって割れる卵があったとしたら、私は常に卵の側に立ちます。そう、どれほど壁が正しく、卵が間違っていたとしても、それでもなお私は卵の側に立ちます。([author’s translation] If there is a high solid wall and an egg that breaks against it, I will always stand on the side of the egg. Yes, no matter how right the wall is and how wrong the egg is, I will still stand on the side of the egg.)” (Murakami, 2009d: 161)

Murakami explains that the linguistic metaphor used in the citation above has two meanings. One is that “[author’s translation] bombers, tanks, rockets, white phosphorus shells, and machine guns are the high solid wall. The egg is the unarmed civilian who is crushed, burned, and shot by them” (ibid.: 161). Another connotation is that the egg is an individual and the wall is “the System.”

The linguistic metaphor introduces a conceptual metaphor which is comprised of the source domain—AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL—and the target domain—AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM.” The two meanings of the linguistic metaphor explained by Murakami seem to have been derived from this conceptual metaphor, because the military equipment such as bombers and tanks are metonyms of “the System,” and therefore, the civilians killed by them should be understood as the metonym of the target domain: AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM.” Thus, the conceptual metaphor AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL would lead the audience to regard the lifeless solid “System” as a threat against living, fragile human beings. As a result, this conceptual metaphor might function to persuade the audience to support Murakami’s statement in the speech that “[author’s translation] we must not allow the System to exploit us. We must not allow the System to be independent. The System did not make us. We made the System” (ibid.: 163).

Moreover, there seems to be another idea conveyed by the conceptual metaphor—AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL. It appears to express that Murakami is critical of Israel’s attack on the Gaza Strip, which was launched in December 2008. Murakami, in his speech,

described the bombardment as follows: “more than a thousand people had lost their lives in the blockaded city of Gaza, many of them unarmed citizens—children and old people.” (Murakami, 2009b) Although he did not explicitly criticize the attack itself, the conceptual metaphor could have allowed the audience to interpret Murakami’s speech as being critical of Israel’s attack. For instance, an article on Murakami’s speech published on *Jpost.com*, which is the online edition of *Jerusalem post*, seems to confirm this. In the article titled “Murakami, in Trademark Obscurity, Explains Why He Accepted Jerusalem Award,” the author comments on Murakami’s speech: “Israel is not the egg. Confused? This might be the only explanation we will ever hear from the Japanese bestselling author Haruki Murakami—and in true Murakami style, even it will be somewhat vague” (Loney, 2009). This description suggests that the actual attack can be understood as a metonymy of the target domain—AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM”—as shown in the article published on *Jpost.com*.

Rubin translated the novel linguistic metaphor that introduces AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL such that it reproduces the conceptual metaphor, as follows:

2. “Between a high solid wall and an egg that breaks against it, I will always stand on the side of the egg. Yes, no matter how right the wall may be and how wrong the egg, I will stand with the egg.” (Murakami, 2009a: 167)

In addition, Murakami introduced two conceptual metaphors that express his view on the task of novelists: NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS. First, in the following citation, the novelists’ commitment to the truth is described:

3. “小説家はうまい嘘をつくことによって、本当のように見える虚構を創り出すことによって、真実を別の場所に引っ張り出し、その姿に別の光をあてることができるからです。真実をそのままのかたちで捉え、正確に描写することは多くの場合ほとんど不可能です。だからこそ我々は、真実をおびき出して虚構の場所に移動させ、虚構のかたちに置き換えることによって、真実の尻尾をつかまえようとするのです。([author’s translation] By telling skillful lies, by creating fiction that looks like reality, novelists can bring the truth to another place, and shine another light on it. In many cases, it is almost impossible to see the truth as it is and describe the truth accurately. This is why we try to catch the tail of the truth by luring the truth to a fictional place and replacing it with a fictional form.)” (Murakami, 2009d: 159)

There seems to be a conceptual metaphor invoked by these linguistic metaphors that consist of the source domain, HUNTERS, and the target domain, NOVELISTS, although they are not explicitly lexicalized. As the speech unfolds, the networks of linguistic metaphors, which are underlined in the citation above, develop the correspondences between the two domains of the conceptual metaphor. Therefore, as they read the draft of the speech, the audience would learn to perceive the target domain, NOVELISTS, in terms of the source domain, HUNTERS. The conceptual metaphor allows the audience to view novelists writing fictions and clarifying some aspects of truth as being similar to hunters chasing after their games, and in some cases, risking their lives.

Another set of linguistic metaphors are employed when Murakami expresses his view on novels' role in protecting the value of individuals:

4. “私が小説を書く理由は、煎じ詰めればただひとつです。個人の魂の尊厳を浮かび上げさせ、そこに光を当てるためです。我々の魂がシステムに絡め取られ、貶められることのないように、常にそこに光を当て、警鐘を鳴らす、それこそが物語の役目です。 ([author's translation] The reason why I write novels boils down to one reason. To bring the dignity of the individual's soul to the surface and shine a light on it. To keep shining a light on it and sound an alarm, to save our souls from being tangled and despised by “the System.” This is the very role of novels.)” (Murakami, 2009d: 161; 163)

The linguistic metaphors, which are underlined in the citation above, invoke a conceptual metaphor that consists of the source domain, GUARDS, and the target domain, NOVELISTS. Again, the network of the linguistic metaphors in the citation would develop the correspondences between the two domains of the conceptual metaphor as the speech unfolds. By means of this conceptual metaphor, the audience would be introduced to Murakami's view on novelists as in the position of saving the dignity of individuals from the threat of “the System.”

Thus, the two conceptual metaphors that have the target domains of NOVELISTS would provide the audience with a new perception of novelists. In other words, novelists are engaged in the critical job of fighting for the truth and humanity, rather than just creating fictions for their own pleasure.

Rubin translated the linguistic metaphors that realize the two conceptual metaphors, NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS, as follows:

5. “[N]amely, that by telling skilful lies—which is to say, by making up fictions that appear to be true—the novelist can bring a truth out to a new location and

shine a new light on it. In most cases, it is virtually impossible to grasp a truth in its original form and depict it accurately. This is why we try to grab its tail by luring the truth from its hiding place, transferring it to a fictional location and replacing it with a fictional form.” (Murakami, 2009a: 165)

6. “I have only one reason to write novels, and that is to bring the dignity of the individual soul to the surface and shine a light upon it. The purpose of a story is to sound an alarm, to keep a light trained on The System in order to prevent it from tangling our souls in its web and demeaning them.” (ibid.: 167; 169)

Rubin’s translations above show that he rendered these novel linguistic metaphors such that they reproduce the two conceptual metaphors in his translation.

On the other hand, there are linguistic metaphors that are employed to emphasize Murakami’s point, rather than introduce his ideas to the audience. The interpretation of such metaphors might not require the activation of the two conceptual domains because these linguistic metaphors are relatively conventional.

Murakami seems to have employed a linguistic metaphor “どれほどの逆風が吹いたとしても ([author’s translation] no matter how strong the head wind blows)” for the purpose of emphasizing his point:

7. “なぜなら小説家というものは、どれほどの逆風が吹いたとしても、自分の目で実際に見た物事や、自分の手で実際に触った物事しか心からは信用できない種族だからです。 ([author’s translation] Because novelists are the tribe who cannot believe anything other than what they actually see with their eyes or what they touch with their hands, no matter how strong the head wind blows.)” (Murakami, 2009d: 161)

This metaphor emphasizes novelists’ stubbornness in believing only what they see and feel.

Similarly, the linguistic metaphor “煎じ詰めれば ([author’s translation] boil down to)” in the citation below also seems to emphasize his point:

8. “私が小説を書く理由は、煎じ詰めればただひとつです。 ([author’s translation] The reason why I write novels boils down to one reason.)” (ibid.)

The above linguistic metaphor draws the audience’s attention to the statement that follows, in which Murakami explains his ultimate reason for writing novels.

Rubin omitted the two linguistic metaphors: “どれほどの逆風が吹いたとしても ([author’s translation] no matter how strong the head wind blows)” and “煎じ詰めれば([author’s translation] boils down to)” in his translations, as shown below:

9. “Novelists are a special breed. They cannot genuinely trust anything they have not seen with their own eyes or touched with their own hands.” (Murakami, 2009a: 167)
10. “I have only one reason to write novels.” (ibid.)

The omission of these expressions seems to have made the translation relatively straightforward.

In addition, there is the case in which Murakami uses a conventional linguistic metaphor in quotes. As shown in the following citation, he uses the conventional expression “へそ曲がり ([author’s translation] devil’s advocate)” in quotes to describe the nature of novelists:

11. “小説家の多くがそうであるように、私は一種の「へそ曲がり」であるのかもしれませんが。 ([author’s translation] Like many novelists, I am probably a kind of ‘devil’s advocate’).” (Murakami, 2009d: 161)

The interpretation of this linguistic metaphor would not require the activation of the two conceptual domains because it is a conventional expression. However, Murakami used it to add a meaning that is specific to this context. The expression is originally used for negatively describing someone who does the opposite of what s/he is told. Being quoted in the speech, however, the negative connotation of the expression seems to be lost. It seems that Murakami used this conventional linguistic metaphor in quotes to concisely express his view that he positively evaluates such a nature of novelists, although it may not be considered by many people as a virtue.

Rubin translated the linguistic metaphor “へそ曲がり ([author’s translation] devil’s advocate)” in an explanatory manner as follows:

12. “Perhaps, like many other novelists, I tend to do the exact opposite of what I am told.” (Murakami, 2009a: 167)

This explanatory translation seems to have made the translation clearer in meaning, although the connotation that Murakami conveyed while quoting the conventional expression seems to have been lost.

In summary, Murakami employed linguistic metaphors in his speech to introduce his idea to the audience, emphasize his point, and concisely convey his thoughts. Rubin omitted or altered the linguistic metaphors except for those that introduce new conceptual metaphors to the audience. There are three conceptual metaphors introduced by Murakami to express his ideas to the audience: AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL, NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS, and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS. Rubin preserved the novel linguistic metaphors, and consequently, reproduced the three conceptual metaphors realized by them. On the other hand, Rubin omitted or altered conventional linguistic metaphors that Murakami employed to emphasize his point and concisely convey his thoughts.

### 3.2. Hosokawa’s Translation of Linguistic Metaphors

There are three sets of novel linguistic metaphors that Hosokawa is yet to deal with and that realize three conceptual metaphors: AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL, NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS, and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS.

Hosokawa rendered the linguistic metaphors that realize AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL such that the conceptual metaphor would be preserved in the translation:

13. The transcript of the speech: “[I]t goes something like this: Between a high solid wall and an egg that breaks against it, I will always stand on the side of the egg. Yes, no matter how right the wall may be and how wrong the egg, I will stand with the egg.” (Murakami, 2009b)

Hosokawa’s translation: “「高く、固い壁があり、それにぶつかって壊れる卵があるとしたら、私は常に卵側に立つ」ということです。そうなんです。その壁がいくら正しく、卵が正しくないとしても、私は卵サイドに立ちます。([author’s translation] That is, if there is a high solid wall and an egg that breaks against it, I will always stand on the side of the egg. Yes, no matter how right the wall is and how not right the egg is, I will stand on the side of the egg.)” (Murakami, 2009e)

On the other hand, he altered the linguistic metaphors that realize the other two conceptual metaphors: NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS.

First, he rendered “the novelist can bring a truth out to a new place” as “小説家は真実を暴き ([author’s translation] the novelist can expose a truth),” and omitted “try to grab its tail”:

14. The transcript of the speech: “[T]he novelist can bring a truth out to a new place and shine a new light on it. In most cases, it is virtually impossible to grasp a truth in its original form and depict it accurately. This is why we try to grab its tail by luring the truth from its hiding place, transferring it to a fictional location, and replacing it with a fictional form.” (Murakami, 2009b)

Hosokawa’s translation: “上手な嘘をつく、いってみれば、作り話を現実にするこゝによって、小説家は真実を暴き、新たな光でそれを照らすことができます。多くの場合、真実の本来の姿を把握し、正確に表現することは事実上不可能です。だからこそ、私たちは真実を隠れた場所からおびき出し、架空の場所へと運び、小説の形に置き換えるのです。([author’s translation] By telling skillful lies, which is to say by making fictions real, novelists can expose a truth and shine a new light on it. In most cases, it is in fact impossible to grasp the original form of truth and depict it accurately. That is why we lure the truth from its hiding place, transfer it to a fictional place, and replace it with the novel form).” (Murakami, 2009e)

The omission of “we try to grab its tail” could weaken the function of the linguistic metaphors of invoking the source domain, HUNTERS, in comparison with the original that should enable the audience to imagine novelists writing stories as hunters chasing after their games. In addition, the alteration of “bring a truth out to a new place” to “真実を暴き ([author’s translation] expose a truth)” reflects Hosokawa’s interpretation of the original text. Such omission and alteration suggest that Hosokawa chose to explain what Murakami intended to convey, instead of explicitly translating the original linguistic metaphors into Japanese.

Second, Hosokawa rendered “to keep a light trained on the System” as “注意を向けさせること ([author’s translation] draw attention to the System).”

15. The transcript of the speech: “The purpose of a story is to sound an alarm, to keep a light trained on the System in order to prevent it from tangling our souls in its web and demeaning them.” (Murakami, 2009b)

Hosokawa’s translation: “小説を書く目的は、「システム」の網の目に私たちの魂がかからめ捕られ、傷つけられることを防ぐために、「システム」に対する警戒警報を鳴らし、注意を向けさせることです。([author’s translation] The purpose of writing a story is to sound a preliminary warning and draw attention to the System in order to prevent our souls from being tangled in the mesh of the System and being hurt).” (Murakami, 2009e)

The alteration of “to keep the trained light on the System” to “注意をむけさせること ([author’s translation] draw attention to the System)” would have weakened the

function of linguistic metaphors to trigger the source domain, GUARDS, in comparison to the original, which should enable the audience to imagine a novelist as someone who protects valuables by using lighting equipments.

In summary, Hosokawa rendered the linguistic metaphor that realize AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL such that the conceptual metaphor would be reproduced in his translation. On the other hand, some of the linguistic metaphors that realize the two conceptual metaphors, NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS, are not preserved in Hosokawa’s translation.

#### **4. The Translators’ Intentions and Selective Translations of Linguistic Metaphors**

The analysis above shows that Rubin and Hosokawa either selected linguistic metaphors that were to be preserved so that they would reproduce a conceptual metaphor, or altered or omitted linguistic metaphors. This section will discuss how the translators’ intentions while translating seem to affect their selective translation of linguistic metaphors. The study regards intention as a factor that decides whether and how translators present themselves to the audiences.

Intention may be formed through a translator’s personal thoughts on the text they are translating. In this regard, what Hermans (2007) calls attitudes of a translator, for instance, whether s/he adopts a disapproving, critical, neutral, or supportive attitude to the original text, can influence his/her intentions while translating. As Hermans (2007) argues, such attitudes may be expressed in the notes or annotations (55). Translators’ attitudes can also be found from their interventions in the texts. As Munday (2009) explains, shifts in the translation such as additions, omissions, and alterations would indicate the translator’s intervention (17). One of the reasons that motivate these shifts is the translators’ preferred translation strategies (ibid.). For instance, the translators and interpreters strengthen or undermine particular aspects of the narratives elaborated in the texts by a translation strategy called “selective appropriation of textual material” (Baker 2006: 114). Baker (2006) explains that translators may strategically suppress or accentuate a particular aspect of the source texts while translating them, and through this, they contribute to the elaboration of a particular narrative encoded in the original texts (ibid.). Thus, the translators’ attitudes expressed in the notes or annotations or suggested in textual features of the translation may indicate their intentions while translating.

In addition, intention can reflect the social expectation of the translator’s role in a certain communicative situation. In this sense, what Vermeer (2004) calls

“skopos,” which is a certain purpose of the translation regarding a communicative situation in which the translation is carried out (228), can affect the translator’s intention while translating. When translating public speeches, there are two possible roles for translators. Firstly, translators generally render a draft of the speech into the language of the target audience before the speaker delivers it. Secondly, once the speaker has delivered the speech, translators render them into different languages that can be published on news sites, newspapers, or in some cases, in a book, therefore tapping into a wide range of global audiences. The two roles of translators described above are relevant to the analysis of the two translators, Rubin and Hosokawa, who were engaged in the translation of Murakami’s speech. These general social expectations of their roles could have influenced their intentions while translating.

#### 4.1 Rubin’s Intention while Translating

Rubin’s presence was not revealed to the audience at the book fair. When Murakami gave the speech, there was neither reference to the translator (Rubin) nor to the fact that the original draft of the speech was in Japanese. That is, the audience did not know that Murakami had written the draft of the speech in Japanese and what they were listening to was Rubin’s English translation of it. In fact, the presence of the translator (Rubin) was not revealed until an interview with Murakami was published in the April 2009 issue of *Bungeishunju* (文芸春秋), in which Murakami revealed that he had originally written the draft in Japanese. Murakami’s original Japanese draft of the speech and Rubin’s English translation were also published with the interview.

In this regard, it seems that a description about interpreters in Riccardi (2002), that “[i]nterpreters have a clear role to perform, but the less their presence is felt, the better they are at carrying out their task” (86), seems to apply Rubin. In the same fashion as how the interpreter’s presence needs to be less felt by the audience, Rubin’s presence has to be less felt by the audience who listened to Murakami’s speech at the book fair.

Moreover, Riccardi (2002) argues that interpretation targets a limited audience involved in the ongoing communicative situation, while translation can be perceived by anybody who comes across the texts (84). This also seems to apply to Rubin. Having been asked by Murakami himself, Rubin seems to have translated the text keeping the audience at the Jerusalem book fair in mind. That is, like an interpretation, Rubin’s translation targeted the limited audience at the book fair. For instance, the textual features of Rubin’s translation suggest that the translation was produced such that it functions as a speech delivered in Jerusalem. In the

speech, Murakami illustrated that his acceptance of the prize raised concerns regarding Israel's attack on the Gaza Strip, which was launched in December 2008: “私はイスラエルに来て、このエルサレム賞を受けることについて、「受賞を断ったほうが良い」という忠告を少なからざる人々から受け取りました。 ([author's translation] I was about to come to Israel to accept the Jerusalem Prize, when I was advised by not a few people that I should decline the acceptance of the prize)” (Murakami, 2009d: 159). Rubín changed “Israel” to “here” and added “in Japan” as follows: “In Japan, a fair number of people advised me not to come here to accept the Jerusalem Prize” (Murakami, 2009a: 165).

The tendency observed in Rubín's translation of linguistic metaphors also reflects Rubín's intention, which was similar to that of interpreters. As analyzed previously, Rubín preserved the novel linguistic metaphors, and consequently, reproduced the three conceptual metaphors they realized: AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL, NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS, and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS, while he omitted or altered conventional linguistic metaphors that Murakami employed to emphasize his point and concisely convey his thoughts. Such tendency in translations of the linguistic metaphors suggest that Rubín made the translation as straightforward and clear in meaning as possible to prevent the audience's misunderstanding of what Murakami actually meant. Again, this strategy seems to share features of interpretation. Riccardi (2002) argues that the interpreters' main objective is to facilitate the effective communication among the users of different languages (87). Therefore, they may change the style and registers, add explanations, or omit a portion of a text, if they believe these interventions are necessary; this seems to explain Rubín's translation of linguistic metaphors.

Thus, how the translation is presented to the audience and the textual features of the translation suggest that Rubín's intention while translating the draft seem to be much closer to those of interpreters, as described in Riccardi (2002). It can be assumed that in rendering the speech, Rubín needed to be cautious of not imposing his presence in the translation because the audience will consider the translation as the words of the speaker. His translations of linguistic metaphors also reflect his intention of being closer to interpreters, in terms of how he attempted to facilitate the effective communication between the speaker and the audience through his intervention in the translation.

#### 4.2 Hosokawa's Intention while Translating

Hosokawa's translation and the transcription of Murakami's actual speech were published together. Therefore, the audience would have been fully aware that the

translation is not exactly the words of the speaker, because as Hermans (1996) argues, a translation “never coincides with its source, it is not identical or equivalent in any formal or straightforward sense” (24). The fact that the original English transcript of the speech was published together with the translation even suggests that Hosokawa’s translation can be recognized by the audience as being subordinate to the original text. That is, it can never replace the original. In this regard, Hosokawa’s translation contrasts Rubin’s translation, which was accepted as Murakami’s own words by the audience at the book fair.

The textual features of Hosokawa’s translation show that he applied a general translation strategy particularly used by news translators, as described in Bielsa and Bassnett (2009). Hosokawa omitted repetitive words while translating the transcript into Japanese. For instance, he rendered “[p]lease do allow me to deliver a message, one very personal message” as “非常に個人的なメッセージをお話しすることをお許してください ([author’s translation] please allow me to deliver a personal message),” omitting “a message.” This seems to be a translation strategy called “summarizing information,” by means of which the lengthy parts of the original texts that are no longer fully relevant to the target readers are reduced (Bielsa and Bassnett, 2009: 64). Although repetition can be effective when it is used in the actual speech, it may feel redundant when it is written in news texts. This would be the reason why repetition is reduced in Hosokawa’s translation.

His translation of linguistic metaphors also suggests that he summarized the ideas they conveyed. As described previously, Hosokawa rendered the linguistic metaphors that realize AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL such that the conceptual metaphor would be reproduced in his translation, while he altered some of the linguistic metaphors that realize the two conceptual metaphors NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS. The translations of the linguistic metaphors concerning the latter two conceptual metaphors suggest that Hosokawa summarized what Murakami seems to have meant, instead of accurately reproducing how he said it.

There is another feature of news translation discussed in Bielsa and Bassnett (2009) that also applies, to a certain extent, to Hosokawa’s translation. They maintain that news translators may “change the prevalent news angle or point of view from which events are narrated,” so that the translation can function more effectively as news for a different public (93). Hosokawa expressed his approval of Murakami’s speech in the commentary, and by doing so, led the audience’s attention toward the environment in which the speech was delivered. He expressed that the speech was “[author’s translation] relatively critical of Israel, which has ‘overwhelming military power’” (Hosokawa, 2009), and that Murakami’s decision

to give such a speech in Jerusalem should be considered as brave. Hosokawa also illustrates his view on the city of Jerusalem in his commentary: “[author’s translation] Jerusalem is entangled with religion and politics. It often experiences terrorist attacks as well as conflicts between the Jews and Palestinians” and “there is a great deal of tension in the city” (ibid.). According to the emails received from the editorial department of *47News* in reply to the author’s inquiry, Hosokawa lived in Jerusalem as a reporter for the Jerusalem branch of *Kyodo News*. Hence his description of the city could have been based on his own experience, which may also have strengthened the persuasiveness of his view that Murakami’s decision to deliver the speech was brave.

In short, Hosokawa’s intention while translating seems to be shared with news translators, who are expected to provide information of an event in a concise and clear way rather than accurately reproduce styles of the source text (Bielsa and Bassnett, 2009: 65). His selective translation of linguistic metaphors seems to show the same tendency. In addition, Hosokawa expressed his approval of the speech in his commentary, and thus explicitly showed the audience that Murakami’s speech is critical of Israel’s attack. In other words, Hosokawa, in his commentary, explicitly explained that the idea conveyed by the conceptual metaphor, AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY “THE SYSTEM” IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL is that Murakami is critical of Israel’s attack on the Gaza Strip. It might have been possible for the audience to interpret the conceptual metaphor in this way, even if no such explicit explanation had been given in the commentary. However, the fact that Hosokawa explicitly explained this in his commentary can leave a rather strong impression on the audience that this critical message toward Israel is the main point of Murakami’s speech.

## 5. Conclusion

This study conducted a case study of the translation of metaphorical expressions used in Murakami’s speech. Applying the Conceptual Metaphor Theory to the analysis of metaphor translation enabled us to analyze not only how the translators have dealt with the surface form of linguistic metaphors, but also how they have dealt with ideas conveyed by conceptual metaphors in Murakami’s speech. The study suggested that the translation of linguistic metaphors used in the speech can be influenced by the translators’ intentions while translating. The present study considers intention as a factor that decides whether and how translators present themselves to the audiences. Focusing on translators’ intentions allowed us to comprehensively consider the social role expected of the translator in a certain communicative situation and his/her personal thoughts on the text.

Rubin's intention was similar to that of interpreters. His intention seems to be formed through the social expectation of his role as a translator of a speech draft. Rubin translated the novel linguistic metaphors such that the three conceptual metaphors were preserved in the translation, while omitted or altered relatively conventional linguistic metaphors used for emphasizing Murakami's point or concisely conveying his thoughts. This seems to be also the result of his intention, which is similar to interpreters, to avoid unnecessary ambiguity as much as possible so that Murakami's message would be conveyed to the audience without being misunderstood.

On the other hand, Hosokawa's intention was formed through the social expectation of his role, which is similar to news translators in general, and his personal thoughts on Murakami's speech. In his translation, he altered and omitted some of the linguistic metaphors that realize the two conceptual metaphors, namely NOVELISTS ARE HUNTERS and NOVELISTS ARE GUARDS, while he preserved the linguistic metaphors that reproduce AN INDIVIDUAL SUPPRESSED BY "THE SYSTEM" IS AN EGG BREAKING AGAINST A WALL. Hosokawa summarized the ideas conveyed by the former two conceptual metaphors, instead of reproducing how Murakami said them. This seems to reflect his intention that is similar to news translators in general. It seems that Hosokawa also influenced the audience's view on the core message of Murakami's speech by explicitly explaining the idea conveyed by the conceptual metaphor, that is, Murakami's criticism of Israel's attack on the Gaza Strip.

### **Acknowledgements**

The author would like to thank Ms. Mika Funakoshi at the editorial department of *47News* for the valuable information.

.....

### **About the Author**

歳岡冴香 (TOSHIOKA Saeka) 大阪大学大学院言語文化研究科修士課程修了。University College London MA in Translation Theory and Practice 修了。大阪大学大学院言語文化研究科博士後期課程在学中。関西大学非常勤講師。

.....

### **Primary Sources**

#### **English Sources**

- Murakami, H. (2009a). Of Walls and Eggs. (J. Rubin, Trans.)文芸春秋(4), pp. 165-169. Tokyo.
- Murakami, H. (2009b). “Jerusalem Prize” Remarks. *47News*. [Online] <http://www.47news.jp/47topics/e/93880.php?page=all> (March 6, 2011).
- Loney, S. L. (2009). Murakami, in Trademark Obscurity, Explains Why He Accepted Jerusalem Award. *J.post.com* [Online]<http://www.jpost.com/ArtsAndCulture/Books/Article.aspx?id=132970> (August 25, 2011).

### Japanese sources

- 47News*. (2009). Introductory Note. *47News*. [Online] <http://www.47news.jp/47topics/e/93880.php?page=all> (March 6, 2011).
- Murakami, H. (2009c). 僕はなぜエルサレムに行ったのか (Why I Went to Jerusalem). 文芸春秋, (4), pp.156-168. Tokyo.
- Murakami, H. (2009d). 壁と卵 (An Wall and an Egg). 文芸春秋, (4), pp.159-163. Tokyo.
- Murakami, H. (2009e). 村上春樹エルサレム賞スピーチ全文日本語訳 (An Unabridged Japanese Translation of Haruki Murakami’s Jerusalem Prize Acceptance Speech). (H. Hosokawa, Trans.) *47News*. [Online] <http://www.47news.jp/47topics/e/93925.php> (March 6, 2011).

### Secondary sources

#### English sources

- Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and Conflict*. Oxson: Routledge.
- Bielsa, E. and Bassnett, S. (2009). *Translation in Global News*. Oxson: Routledge.
- Cameron, L. (1999). Operationalising “Metaphor” for Applied Linguistic Research. In G. Low & L. Cameron (Eds.), *Researching and Applying Metaphor* (pp.3-28). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. Oxson: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (1996). The Translator’s Voice in Translated Narrative. *Target*, 8 (1): 23–48.
- Hermans, T. (2007). *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Munday, J. (2009). *Style and Ideology in Translation: Latin American Writing in English*. Oxson: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1998). *A Textbook on Translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill Archive.
- Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. Oxson: Routledge.
- Riccardi, A. (2002). Translation and Interpretation. In A. Riccardi (Ed.), *Translation Studies Perspective on an Emerging Discipline* (pp. 75-91). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steen, G. (1994). *Understanding Metaphor in Literature: An Empirical Approach*. London: Longman.
- Steen, G. (1999). Metaphor and Discourse Towards a Linguistic Checklist for Metaphor Analysis. In G. Low & L. Cameron (Eds.), *Researching and Applying Metaphor* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- UNESCO. (2011). *Index Translationum*. [Online] [http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=7810&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=7810&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) (September 2, 2011).
- Vermeer, Hans J. (2004). Skopos and Commission in Translation Theory. A. Chesterman (Trans.), In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Translation Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 227-238). New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1989).

### **Japanese Source**

- Shibata, M., Numano, M., Fujii, S., & Yomoda, I. (Eds.), (2006). *A Wild Haruki Chase* 世界は村上春樹をどう読むか (A Wild Haruki Chase: Reading Murakami Around the World). Tokyo: Bungeishunju.

