

## THARAKA COMMUNICATION STYLE AS A TRANSLATION PROBLEM

<sup>1\*</sup>Onesmus Mugambi Kamwara, <sup>2</sup>Prof. Helga Schroeder & <sup>3</sup>Dr. Peter Kamande

<sup>123</sup>Departments of Languages, Linguistics and Translation, Africa International University

\*Corresponding e-mail: [onesmus\\_kamwara@btlkenya.org](mailto:onesmus_kamwara@btlkenya.org)

Publication Date: October 2022

### ABSTRACT

**Background:** Translation is a kind of communication. A translation is done because there is need to communicate to the target audience the contents of the text that is being translated. A good translation should be accurate, clear, natural and acceptable to the audience. A natural translation should take into consideration the style of communication of the target culture. The aim of my study was to investigate the communication style of Kîitharaka and determine how much this style is a translation problem. The research objective was to investigate whether Tharaka people use metaphors in discourse in general and especially in argumentation.

**Methodology:** The research was carried out among the speakers of Kîitharaka from four locations namely: Mutino, Ntugi and Gatunga locations in Tharaka Nithi County, and Tharaka Location of Kitui County. The four locations were chosen to represent the four dialects of Kîitharaka.

**Results of the Study:** The findings are that Kîitharaka uses metaphors extensively and more so in argumentation. So any texts that employ metaphors will be following the natural style of communication of Kîitharaka. Therefore, such texts will be natural Kîitharaka texts. And by extrapolation, Kîitharaka being an African language spoken within an African Culture it can be supposed that any African texts (including translations) that employ metaphors will be natural texts. The converse is therefore true that any texts that avoid the use metaphors especially in argumentation will be unnatural Kîitharaka texts. And by extrapolation, Kîitharaka being an African language spoken within an African Culture, it can be supposed that any African texts (including translations) that avoid the using metaphors in an effort to make the message clear will be producing unnatural texts.

**Keywords:** *Tharaka Communication Style, Metaphor, Translation Problem*

## INTRODUCTION

In this section, the researcher will discuss the background to the language under the study and the background to the topic of the study. The name of the language of study is Kĩtharaka and it is spoken by the people of Tharaka. The Kĩtharaka Ethnologue code is thk. Other alternative names of the language are Saraka, Shoraka and Tharaka (Simons & Fanning 2018). Kĩtharaka has four dialects namely Gatue, Ntugĩ, Thagicũ, and Ígoki (Simons & Fenning, 2018). The speakers of the different dialects are able to communicate clearly, so the dialects are highly mutually intelligible. The main differences between the four are slight differences in the tone of some words or a certain dialect preferring to use certain synonyms of words known to all the other dialects pairing up with other synonyms. For example, the speakers of Ígoki and Ntugĩ prefer to call green grams, *ndengũ* while their Gatue counterparts prefer to call the same cereals *nkĩna*. There have also been influences from the neighboring languages. The Thagicũ dialect has some influence from the neighboring Kamba language. The Gatue dialect whose speakers neighbor the Meru language speakers have borrowed words from the Meru speakers, while Ígoki who border Mbeere, Chuka, Mũthambi, and Mwimbi have picked some words from these neighboring languages over the years. For example, Thagicũ has borrowed the word for water from the Kamba language. So like the Kamba language speakers, Thagicũ dialect speakers call water *kĩguũ*, while the other Tharaka dialects call water *rũũyĩ*. Another example is that Gatue dialect speakers call teacher *mwarimũ*, like the Meru language speakers, while the other three Tharaka dialects use the word *mwarimo* to refer to a teacher. Ntugĩ and part of Ígoki speakers who live far from the boundaries with other language groups have the least influence from other languages. My study will be based on data from all the four dialects of Kĩtharaka.

Kĩtharaka is considered by some scholars as a dialect of Kimeru the language spoken by Meru people (Icheria, 2015). Others, however, maintain that Kĩtharaka is a different language from Kimeru, the language spoken by the Meru people (Mberia 1993:93). Guthrie (1948) classifies Bantu Languages into Zones A to S. Tharaka, which he calls Saraka, is in Zone E and Group 50 and its number in his classification is E54 (Guthrie 1948:43). The other languages he classified in Group 50 include Kikuyu, Embu, and Meru. Ethnologue (2018) Simons and Fenning (2018) classifies Tharaka language as follows, from the wider language group to the smallest language family: Niger-Congo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu, Central E and Kikuyu-Kamba (E.54).

In this study the term “direct communication” means the use of literal direct propositions as opposed to use of figures of speech like metaphors and similes in expressing an idea. On the other hand, “indirect communication” will mean where one communicates an idea using figures of speech like metaphors or similes or using proverbs or parables. The study focuses on the communication style of Tharaka people in argumentation. The question here is if Tharaka people prefer the use of the indirect style of communication through the use of figures of speech like metaphors in argumentation as opposed to the direct proposition or if they use a mixture of both the direct and the indirect style of communication when they advance an argument. In other words, I have been looking at whether people use indirect communication whenever they want to support an argument, for example in the hortatory discourse. I am looking at this subject from a translation point of view with the goal of investigating how this preference poses a translation problem while translating the Old Testament into Tharaka.

Henderson (2017) claims that the Hebrew style of communicating is indirect. She argues that the Hebrew people communicate through stories, parables, and proverbs and that their communication is full of imagery and allusion rather than a direct proposition. Other scholars share this view that the ancient Jews had an indirect style of communication.

Rygg says, "...many Middle Eastern cultures, tend to use an elaborate style which is characterized by the use of rich, expressive language with an abundance of metaphors, similes, flowery expressions, elaborate rhythms, long arrays of adjectives, proverbs and cultural idioms, repetitions, and verbal exaggerations. The purpose is to negotiate relational equality and social harmony..." (Rygg, 2012:20).

In the above quotation, Rygg confirms that the Hebrew style of communication is indirect. The indirect style of communication is found all over the Old Testament of the Bible. There are metaphors, similes, parables, proverbs and allusions used in communicating the message of the Bible. Consider the example of a metaphor from the book of prophet Jeremiah. In the passage below, Jeremiah uses the metaphor of a marriage relationship to describe the relationship between God and Israel. Jeremiah employs this metaphor of a love relationship, which is a common human experience, to communicate the concept of the relationship between the divine and the human:

- (1)       1 The word of the Lord came to me, saying:  
          2 Go and proclaim in the hearing of Jerusalem,  
          Thus says the Lord:  
          I remember the devotion of your youth,  
          your love as a bride,  
          how you followed me in the wilderness,  
          in a land not sown." (Jeremiah 2:1-2 NRSV, 1989)

Jeremiah goes on to develop the marriage metaphor further in which God is portrayed as the husband who has been betrayed by his wife and expresses all the passionate anger and frustration that comes as a result of betrayal. This metaphor reflects the gravity and offense of Israel's unfaithfulness to God. So instead of Jeremiah making a direct proposition about how serious it was that Israel had been unfaithful to God, he chose an indirect style of communication by the use of a metaphor.

Another kind of indirect communication is through the use of proverbs. Below is an example of a proverb from the book of Proverbs.

- (2)       Whoever is kind to the poor lends to the Lord,  
          and will be repaid in full." (Proverbs 19:17 NRSV)

This proverb teaches that helping the poor is good. It advances that although those who are kind to the poor may not be repaid by the poor people themselves, God will repay those benefactors for their benevolence. The writer does not state directly saying: 'Give to the poor' or 'It is good to give to the poor.' He rather uses indirect communication to state the benefits of being kind to the

poor. He invites the audience to judge for themselves whether or not; they can be kind to the poor and be assured that God will repay them in full.

While some studies have been documented on ancient Israel in terms of style of communication, nothing has been documented on Tharaka style of communication. I, therefore, would like to investigate the communicative style of Tharaka people. Identifying the Tharaka style of communication is important in order to produce a good translation. A good translation should be accurate, clear and natural (Barnwell, 2007). By identifying the style of communication of Tharaka one will be able to produce a natural translation. When the translation is not natural, it is not idiomatic and often the meaning of the original message is obscured or changed. Readers are discouraged because reading such a translation is difficult and they do not enjoy (Blight, 1999).

### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The Old Testament of the Bible was written against the background of the Hebrew Culture. The Hebrew Community of the Old Testament used the indirect style of communication, employing proverbs, parables and figures of speech rather than direct communication (Henderson, 2017:1). Translators who do not know the Hebrew language have to use the language of wider communication as an intermediary language. Tharaka translators relied mainly on English translations and translation helps like Translator's handbooks, Bible Dictionaries and Bible commentaries all of which were written in English. This has been in practice so that "translation into receptor languages was to be done using intermediary translations—for example, English in Anglophone Africa and French in Francophone Africa." (Mbua 2018:3) From my experience as Bible translator with the Tharaka translation project and as a translation consultant trainee with Bible Translation and Literacy, I have noticed that some meaning based English translations at times re-express in literal direct proposition what was initially expressed as a metaphor in the Hebrew language. This re-expression changes the communication from the indirect to the direct style. For translators who have to rely on English translations, there is a risk of the translators carrying over the communicative style of the source language, which in such a case would be English, into the translation of the receptor language. The resultant translations are 'translations of translations' and they carry over the underlying cultural and linguistic western worldview into the translation of the receptor language, (Mbua 2018). My study is geared towards investigating the style of communication of the Tharaka people in discourse and to determine whether the communication style is indirect or direct and thus to find out how much it is a problem in translation practice when the translation is done from an English source. My findings will inform the Tharaka translation team so as to produce a translation that follows Tharaka style of communication. A translation that follows the communication style of a language is a natural translation. If a translation is not natural often the meaning of the original message is obscured or changed. Readers are discouraged because reading such a translation is difficult and it is not enjoyable to read (Blight, 1999).

### **RESEARCH OBJECTIVE**

To investigate whether Tharaka people use metaphors in argumentation in hortatory discourse or if they use literal expressions.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Literature Review on Tharaka

In this sub-section I am discussing publications that have been published about the language and I will be showing how relevant these publications are to my current study.

*Ngono cia Kîraci kîa Mbere-* (Stories for Class One) by Bible Translation and Literacy. 2003. This is a book that contains stories from Tharaka. There are different types of narratives in this book. There are fables, etiological myths, ogre narratives, trickster narratives and human tales. All the stories have a moral lesson. This is the first story book in the series of Tharaka stories. I will use the parables, metaphors and proverbs used in these stories.

*Ngono cia Kîraci kîa Bîrî-* (Stories for Class Two) by Bible Translation and Literacy. 2003. This is a book that contains narratives from Tharaka. There are different types of narratives in this book. There are fables, etiological myths, ogre narratives, trickster narratives and human tales. All the stories have a moral lesson. This is the second story book in the series of Tharaka stories. I will use the parables, metaphors and proverbs used in these stories.

*Tûthoomeeni Kîtharaka Kiraci Kîa Mbere* (Let us Learn Tharaka Language: Class One- by Bible Translation and Literacy. 2003. This is a Tharaka Language Book used to teach Class one pupils how to read and write the Tharaka language. It is the first book in the series of 'Let Us Learn the Tharaka Language'. I will use the proverbs and metaphors that are used in this book for my research.

*Tûthoomeeni Kîtharaka Kîraci kîa Bîrî* (Let us Learn Tharaka Language: Class Two- by Bible Translation and Literacy. 2003). This is a Tharaka Language Book used to teach Class Two pupils how to read and write Tharaka language. It is the Second book in the series of 'Let Us Learn Tharaka Language'. I will use the narratives and metaphors that are used in this book for my research.

*Tûthoomeeni Kîtharaka Kîraci kîa Bithatû* (Let us Learn Tharaka Language: Class Three- by Bible Translation and Literacy. 2003). This is a Tharaka Language Book used to teach Class Three pupils how to read and write Tharaka language. It is the third book in the series of 'Let Us Learn Tharaka Language'. In this book we also find narratives, chants, proverbs and riddles. I will use the proverbs and metaphors that are used in this book for my research.

Njagi (2003) explores how attitude is expressed in Kîtharaka. In this document Njagi discusses Tharaka particles that show the attitude of the speaker towards the subject of his/her utterance. Some of the attitudes that are communicated through these particles include; sympathy, displeasure and doubts. Reading Njagi's work opened my eyes to indirect communication in Tharaka.

Mberia (1993) examines the Tharaka orthography. He identifies thirteen consonant sounds and three semi-vowels. His work was a very critical contribution to the development of Kîtharaka because he published his work about the same time when Bible Translation and Literacy was beginning the work of bible translation in Tharaka. He also argues that Tharaka people are an independent tribe and not a sub-tribe of Meru and therefore concludes that Kîtharaka is an independent language and not a dialect of Meru. In my research I will use the orthography that Mberia developed to give examples in Kîtharaka.

### **Literature review on Translation**

In this section, I am going to discuss Gutt (1992), who discusses translation from the point of view of the Relevance Theory and Blight (1999).

Gutt (1992) has explored the Relevance Theory model of communication as an approach which might allow translators to handle translation problems more easily. According to Relevance Theory, the communicator has some thoughts that she wants the audience to recognize. She tries to achieve this by showing some kind of behavior—that is, by producing some kind of stimulus. This kind of communication is ostensive-inferential communication. It is this kind of communication that Sperber and Wilson (1995) concentrate on. In the application to translation, Gutt argues that Relevance Theory provides a much sharper tool for meaning analysis, or exegesis and can help us with a more adequate understanding of translation problems. Hence, it can also help us to arrive at better solutions. On the issue of processing a message for a culture that is different from the culture of the original audience, he says that miscommunication in secondary communication situations follows from the fact that the interdependence of stimulus, context, and interpretation is inferential. Generally speaking, the validity of an inferential argument depends on its premises; if different premises are supplied, the original conclusion may no longer follow. Likewise, if the new context is so different that no adequate contextual effects are achieved, the audience will be at a loss to know what the communicator was trying to get across. His application of Relevance Theory to translation helped me to understand how to interpret non-literal expressions.

Beckman and Callow (1984) say that leaving the implicit information of the original implicit in the Receptor Language version can mislead the readers of the Receptor Language. They further argue that since languages differ in their patterns of explicitness and implicitness, it is to be expected not only that some of the implicit information of the original would become explicit, but also that the reverse process would take place — some of the explicit information would become implicit. Here Beckman and Callow are confirming that there is a need to investigate the communicative style of language before you come up with a natural translation.

Blight (1999) discussing the translation of metaphors says if the translation is not generally understood the translator should try filling in parts of the comparison to see how much must be made explicit before it is understood correctly. He, however, notes that as much as possible the metaphors need to be retained. He argues, that the lesser that has to be filled in, the better, since the impact of metaphors will be lost if everything has to be made explicit.

### **Literature review on Relevance Theory**

Sperber and Wilson (1995) argue that in addition to the linguistic input which can be enriched to get some of the intended meaning of the speaker, there is the inferential process that the hearer undertakes. This is controlled by the universal cognitive tendency to maximize relevance. This reality is captured in the Cognitive Principle of Relevance which states: Human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance. Also whenever a speaker makes an ostensive stimulus, verbal or non-verbal, to the hearer, the hearer assumes that the speaker has something relevant he would like to communicate to the hearer. This is expressed in the Communicative Principle of relevance which states; every ostensive stimulus conveys a presumption of its own optimal relevance. This is what makes it possible to predict and manipulate the mental states of others. Clark (2013) discusses explicatures and implicatures where it says that implicated

conclusions are inferred from the explicature of the utterance and the contextual assumptions that are mutual manifest to speaker and hearer and the implicated premises are based on the presumption for relevance. Relevance Theory is the framework that is guiding my research and I find the work of Sperber & Wilson and that of Clark very useful in my study.

### **Literature review on the communication style of the Hebrew people**

Henderson (2017) argues that it is time for Bible Translation partners to rethink their approach to Old Testament translation. She argues that many non-western communities where the translation of the Bible is taking place can identify more readily with Hebrew people than they can identify with the people from the West. Their modes of thinking maybe analogical, rather than logical. Their style of communicating may be indirect, through stories, parables, and proverbs, full of imagery, allusion, veiled or hidden talk rather than direct propositions. She also identifies other areas of similarity between the non-western communities and the Hebrew people. These similarities are shared cultural values in terms of their value for the community, kinship, and hospitality as opposed to western individualism, their awareness of the spiritual world and the sacred as opposed to the western secularism. Henderson's work is very central to my research because she inspired me to take on the subject I am investigating.

Rygg (2012) explored the communicative styles of different people. He argued that the communication style of a people depends on their culture. He supported his argument with the work of Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey. 'Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) argue that people in moderate uncertainty-avoidance, high-context cultures, i.e. many Middle Eastern cultures, tend to use an elaborate style which is characterized by the use of rich, expressive language with an abundance of metaphors, similes, flowery expressions, elaborate rhythms, long arrays of adjectives, proverbs and cultural idioms, repetitions, and verbal exaggerations. The purpose is "to negotiate relational equality and social harmony" (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey 1988:106).' Rygg's work is important to me because he categorized the Middle Eastern culture as those that prefer an indirect style of communication.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The Qualitative design was used in this research in form of a descriptive survey. The research aimed at describing the state of affairs as it exists. The research was done among the speakers of Kĩtharaka in four locations namely: Mutino, Ntugi and Gatunga locations in Tharaka Nithi County, and Tharaka Location of Kitui County. The four locations were chosen to represent the four dialects of Kĩtharaka. I chose the locations to represent speakers of the four dialects of Kĩtharaka. The research used purposeful sampling. The researcher chose respondents from the different Kĩtharaka dialects in the different locations. The researcher asked twenty-four respondents questions regarding the preferred communication style in various situations. The researcher himself is conversant with the four dialects. Six people per dialect is a good number to represent each dialect because language is a common factor to all. Even the dialectal differences are not very big. Another reason for keeping the number small was that dialectal differences were not expected to have any significant influence in the use of metaphors, proverbs and parables.

For metaphors, the researcher used: *Ngono cia Kiraci kĩa Mbere* by BTL (2003), *Ngono cia Kiraci kĩa Bĩrĩ* by BTL (2003), *Tũthoomeeni Kĩtharaka Kĩraci kĩa Bithatũ* by BTL (2003). On the whole the researcher collected 20 metaphors. The researcher also interviewed respondents, using an interview guide to determine the role of metaphors in communication. The following are the steps

taken in data analysis; the researcher isolated metaphors. Metaphors were interpreted using the Relevance theory framework: that is, by considering each of the metaphors as linguistic device that give rise to implicatures. The analysis of encyclopedic entries was used on each of the devices. The encyclopedic entries in combination with the Tharaka cultural context and background information yields the interpretation of the figurative speech. The interpretation that yielded more cognitive effects with lesser processing efforts for each implicature was adopted. Then the responses from the interviewees were analyzed to determine the role of metaphors in Tharaka communication in order to determine the communication style of Tharaka.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Definition of metaphors

Norquist (2019) defines metaphor as a trope or figure of speech in which an implied comparison is made between two unlike things that actually have something in common. A metaphor expresses the unfamiliar (the tenor) in terms of the familiar (the vehicle). When Neil Young sings, 'Love is a rose,' the word 'rose' is the vehicle for the term "love," the tenor."

Bullinger (1999) defines a metaphor as a transference or carrying over or across. He says that metaphor can be called 'representation' or 'transference.' Arguing that while simile gently states that one thing is like or resembles another, the metaphor boldly and warmly declares that one thing is another. While the simile says, "All flesh is as grass (1 Peter 1:24). the metaphor carries over the figure at once and says, "All flesh is grass" (Isaiah 60:6) (Bullinger,1999:735).

Webster Dictionary defines metaphor as a "figure of speech in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them (as in *drowning in money*). (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/metaphor>)

Metaphors and similes are quite similar because both the simile and the metaphor and the simile compare two entities. Barnwell, appreciating this similarity between the two figures of speech, says the following about a metaphor: Metaphor is also a comparison. The only difference between a simile and a metaphor is that in a simile it is explicitly stated that it is a comparison, usually by a word such as "like", "as", while in a metaphor the comparison is just implied. (1986:86)

Although the term metaphor or metaphoric has been used to refer to a number of figures of speech, Bullinger states that the term metaphor is confined to a distinct affirmation that one thing is another owing to some association or connection in the use or effects of anything expressed or understood. (1999:735)

My working definition of a metaphor is a figure of speech in where one thing is being likened to another without explicitly stating the point or points of likeness. I adapt Barnwell's definition of a figure of speech as a phrase or clause whose meaning cannot be derived directly from the sum of the literal meanings of each of its words (Barnwell, 1986)

It is therefore a form of comparison in which a topic is said to be the illustration without explicitly stating the point or points of comparison. It is unlike a simile that uses comparative words such as, "like" or "as" are used between the topic and the illustration. In this definition there



are three aspects to consider in each metaphor. There is the topic, the illustration and the point or points of comparison. For example

(1) John is charcoal.

John is the topic under discussion. Charcoal is the illustration. The point of comparison is not stated here but it is the black color of the charcoal is now being ascribed to the skin complexion of John. To arrive at the intended point of comparison the addressee looks at the most credible interpretation as explained in the Relevance Theory.

### Types of metaphors

Norquist (2019) identifies 14 types of metaphors. Namely; absolute metaphors, complex metaphors, conceptual metaphors, conventional metaphors, creative metaphors, dead metaphors, extended metaphors, mixed metaphors, primary metaphors, root metaphors, submerged metaphors, therapeutic metaphors, visual metaphors and organizational metaphors. In my current study I will only deal with three types of metaphors, namely; conventional, creative and extended metaphors.

1. **Conventional:** A familiar comparison that doesn't call attention to itself as a figure of speech.
2. **Creative:** An original comparison that calls attention to itself as a figure of speech.
3. **Extended:** A comparison between two unlike things that continues throughout a series of sentences in a paragraph or lines in a poem.

A metaphor will be considered conventional after it has been in use in for a long time and the speakers in the community get used to the comparison. This will mean that whenever the metaphor is mentioned, the audience will quickly identify the comparison. I can demonstrate this by use of an example.

(2) Mûkami i simba.

Mûkami is a lion.

In example 1 above a human being is said to be a lion. Because such a comparison has been in use for a long time, the audience will very quickly identify the point of similarity between Mûkami and lion. I will discuss the process of identifying the intended similarity as provided for by the Relevance Theory in the next sub-section. Very little attention will be given to the illustration, lion.

On the other hand, one may come up with an unfamiliar metaphor, which is the creative kind of metaphor that will require the audience to think through it. This means that the metaphor will call attention to itself as people. The following example may demonstrate this concept;

(3) Kurû n'îmûtuîkîîre korona

The dog has become to him coronavirus.

The Coronavirus became commonly known in many parts of the world in 2020. Many Tharaka people got to hear of the virus in the same year. If one comes up with a Tharaka metaphor in example 2, the audience will notice that the construction is new. It is an example of a creative metaphor. Yet the audience will still process the metaphor to get the intended point of similarity.

Many of the metaphors I will be discussing in this chapter will be the creative or the conventional type. However, in Chapter four, as I discuss the use of indirect communication through the use of parables I will then be discussing extended metaphor because parables are a form of extended metaphors (TeSelle, 630)

### **Interpreting Metaphors in Discourse**

In this section, I discuss how one goes about interpreting metaphors in discourse. In my presentation so far I have been giving the metaphor and their meanings without discussing how one arrives at the appropriate interpretation. Metaphors are figures of speech. A figure of speech as a phrase or clause whose meaning cannot be derived directly from the sum of the literal meanings of each of its words (Barnwell, 1986). For one when the hearer hears the speaker say something the hearer assumes that whatever the speaker is saying is of importance and worthy thinking about. There is no better way of expressing this assumption than the Relevance Theory does in its Communicative Principle which states: Every ostensive stimulus conveys a presumption of its own optimal relevance (Sperber & Wilson 1995). This means that when an utterance reaches the hearer he treats it as worthy of his attention and starts to look for an appropriate interpretation.

It is worth noting that speaker is presumed to aim at optimal relevance not at literal truth. So when the speaker issues any utterance, the hearer starts processing the utterance in search of optimal relevance. The hearer is constrained to search for relevance not only in the linguistic coding alone. He has a repertoire of encyclopedic knowledge he has stored in his mind (Sperber & Wilson 1995: 87) that will be activated by the verbal stimulus by the speaker in the form a metaphor.

Some of the encyclopedic information that speakers may share may include general information gathered from observing nature. Examples of knowledge gained from observing nature is for example knowing that fire can burn, that grass is green, that elephants are big mammals and that the bigger an animal is the bigger their waste matter, that mucus is slippery to the touch among others observations.

Other kinds of shared knowledge are from the folk role. Speakers of the same language will in most cases have shared narratives about people, animals and other things. It is such knowledge that will be activated when one mentions an ogre to Tharaka audience because they have ogre narratives accounting how an ogre would masquerade as a beautiful lady or a handsome young and end up eating almost all the people in the village. The ogre was always depicted as extremely merciless but not very clever. On the other hand, Tharaka fables always portrayed the hare as physically weak but extremely cunning, with the ability to beat even strong animals in contests. Any animal or person who happened to be an opponent of hare in any competition ended up not only defeated but completely out witted and embarrassingly ridiculed!

Knowledge of the cultural practices is also another kind of shared knowledge by speakers of the same language. For example, among the Tharaka, there was a cultural practice around how widows relied on men to uproot coach grass in their farms. Indeed, the Tharaka name for the grass is 'kirema ntigwa' which means, 'that which defeats widows'. It was the case that a widow who had some coach grass in her farm and wanted it weeded out had to prepare traditional liquor and men would spend the whole day uprooting a few strands of coach grass and they would not allow the widow to come near them as they dug. It was also a known fact that any widow who tried to

uproot coach grass on her own would be said to have revolted against men and would be required to pay the fine of a goat and big pot of traditional liquor to appease the men.

Such are some of the types of encyclopedic information that the hearer accesses when they get a linguistic or any other form of an ostensive stimulus. In addition, the optimal interpretive expression of thought should give the hearer information about that thought which is relevant enough to be worth processing, and should require as little processing effort as possible. There are many quite ordinary situations where a literal utterance is not optimally relevant: for example, where the effort needed to process it is not offset by the gain in information conveyed. (Sperber & Wilson, 1995:233)

When a reader or hearer encounters a metaphor there follows an activation of encyclopedic entries. To demonstrate what I mean let us discuss the following example from Tharaka metaphors.

(4) Ngûgî înu nîtuîkire kîrema ntigwa. Ka yaûma woogu?

The work has become coach grass. Has it become that difficult?

In the above example hearer access all the information he has about work which is the topic or the tenor and about coach grass which is the vehicle (Norquist, 2019) or the illustration (Barnwell, 1986). A lot of attention is given to the illustration, ‘coach grass’ because it is the one which is meant to help the reader to understand how work has become. For a Tharaka hearer the following entries of encyclopedic information will be accessed about coach grass:

Coach grass is;

- a) A kind of grass –This is from general observation
- b) Green in color –This is from general observation
- c) Is usually difficult to up root. This is from general observation
- d) It grows up again even after it has been uprooted- from general observation.
- e) Only men were allowed to weed it out- This is from cultural knowledge
- f) Widows had to make beer for men to weed it if for her. - This is from cultural knowledge
- g) When men went to weed it they spend the whole day weeding a very small portion just to show how difficult it was for them to weed it. In this sense there was trickery involved. Men used the opportunity of coach grass to eat widows’ property. – This is from cultural knowledge.

All the above entries refer to coach grass in general and are stored in the mind of speaker and hearer. These are shared information. And when one hears the mention of coach grass all these entries are available for the hearer.

But based on the Cognitive Principle of relevance, only a few of those entries will be chosen to refer to work which is an activity and not an item. Work is now the context which is provided for the interpretation of the utterance. Work is an activity, “so all the encyclopedic entries are screened through that lens.” (Schroeder, 2018). Therefore, Tharaka hearer will interpret the utterance: “the work has become coach grass” as.

- a) It is difficult to do

- b) It recurs again once it is done.
- c) Some people will present themselves as if no other can do it except them.
- d) That there may be trickery involved by people who want to take advantage of the situation for their own gain.

The other entries that cannot apply to an activity like, the work has become a type of grass or it has now become green in color are rejected as not relevant. The audience is left with possible implied meanings from the remaining encyclopedic entries. And given the sentence that follows, the question if the work has become that difficult, the audience knows that the speaker is doubting whether the situation is being faithfully depicted. So the conclusion that audience will be that ‘there may be trickery involved by people who want to take advantage of the situation for their own gain.’

I would like to discuss yet another example from Tharaka metaphors;

(5) Gatugi kiraciini i kembe.

Gatugi in class is a razor blade.

The encyclopedic entries of a razor blade include;

- a) It is small.
- b) It is made up of metallic element.
- c) It is very sharp
- d) Can cause an injury
- e) It is usually bought
- f) It sold wrapped up in a paper cover
- g) It is easily broken
- h) It rusts
- i) It used to shave

All the above entries are recoverable from general experience of the item. This is unlike the coach grass that some of the entries were from cultural knowledge.

From all these entries the audience will select only what they deem applicable to a human and a student for in this case. This is because we are given the screen through which we are interpreting the implicature as Gatugi in class. Gatugi in Tharaka is the name of a lady. And because the context here is in class, Gatugi is in a learning environment. So, the audience will reject all the other entries about razor blade as in being;

- a) Small.
- b) Made up of metallic element.
- c) Able cause an injury
- d) usually bought
- e) sold wrapped up in a paper cover

- f) easily broken
- g) Prone to rust
- h) Used to shave.

It will accept only one of the entry. That of being very sharp. And since the audience knows they are dealing with a human subject they will pick the meaning of sharpness that applies to such a subject.

My last example on this section is a metaphor whose relevant interpretation will require the access to encyclopedic information that comes from folk role.

(6) Mutugi i kayûgû bai.

Mutugi is a hare.

Hares are;

- a) Small mammals – This is from general knowledge of the animal.
- b) Have very tender meat- - This is from general knowledge of the animal.
- c) Have very fine hair – from general knowledge of the animal.
- d) Feed on vegetables only- from general knowledge of the animal.
- e) They are tricky- This is from Tharaka fables
- f) Difficult to catch- This is from general knowledge of the animal.
- g) They are fast- This is from general knowledge of the animal.
- h) They are malicious – This is from Tharaka fables

All the above entries refer to hares in general and are stored in the mind of Tharaka speakers and hearers. These are shared information. And when one hears the mention of hare all these entries are available for the hearer.

But based on the Cognitive Principle of relevance, only a few of those entries will be chosen to refer to Mutugi who is known to be a human being. Mutugi is now the context which is provided for the interpretation of the utterance. Mutugi is a human being, “so all the encyclopedic entries are screened through that lens.” (Schroeder, 2018). Therefore, the Tharaka hearer will interpret that Mutugi is:

- e) Tricky
- f) Difficult to catch
- g) Fast
- h) Malicious

The other entries that cannot apply to a human being like, Mutugi is a small mammal; he has fine fur eats vegetables only are rejected as not relevant. The audience is left possible implied meanings from the remaining encyclopedic entries.

From Tharaka fables the most cited character of the hare is being tricky, malicious or cunning. Interestingly, even the two characteristics that can apply to both human beings and the hare; that of being fast and difficult to catch are understood metaphorically.

#### 4.4 Hebrew use of Indirect Communication

Since my study is geared towards producing a natural translation of the Bible, I am also interested in the style of communication of the Israelites among whom the Bible was written. The Israelites used the indirect style of communication by “the use of rich, expressive language with an abundance of metaphors, similes, flowery expressions, elaborate rhythms, long arrays of adjectives, proverbs and cultural idioms, repetitions, and verbal exaggerations...” (Rygg, 2012: 20).

In this section will be looking at the use of the indirect style of communication among the Israelites during the Bible times through the use of metaphors. I will draw my metaphors from the Bible. I will discuss five metaphors from the Bible. One will be based on human relationships, one on nature and three from different professions. Four of these are from the Old Testament and one from the New Testament. For each metaphor I will be giving the alternative way expressing the same message expressed by the use of the metaphor to prove that the use of the metaphor was a deliberate choice by the speaker, since the same message he gave using a metaphor could have been said in literal terms. Example 6 is on human relationships.

- (7) Do you thus repay the Lord,  
you foolish and senseless people?  
Is not he your father, who created you,  
who made you and established you?  
(Deut. 32:6) ESV

The writer here used the metaphor of a father. In the simple figure of father there are many encyclopedic entries. Such entries include

- i) one who is stronger than the people addressed
- j) one with authority over the addressees
- k) the provider to the addressees
- l) the protector of the addressees
- m) one with whom the addressees should be deeply attached.

In this case the writer could have decided to replace the metaphor of ‘father’ with ‘one who is stronger than you, has authority over you, provides for you, protects and with whom you should be deeply attached’ The writer, however, chose to use the metaphor to communicate his message. This was a deliberate choice because he knew that his audience appreciated the indirect style of communication. King & Stager says the following about the father figure, “...the biblical family has six main features; it is endogamous, patrilineal, patriarchal, patrilocal, joint and polygamous...*Patrilineage* regulates descent and inheritance, meaning that descent is reckoned in the father’s line not the mothers. *Patriarchy* signifies that the father (*paterfamilias*) is the head of the family addressed as *ba’al*, ‘lord’ and has authority over the household, protecting and

providing for his wives and children...” (2001:38) This show that the father figure was a significant one among the Israelites.

Example 7 is based on nature. Rocks are common in many Israelite areas and so it is a familiar illustration that is employed in example 7.

(8) He is the Rock, his works are perfect,  
and all his ways are just.  
(Deut.32:4) NIV 2011.

In this verse, as in a number of other verses of the Bible, God is referred to as a rock. The encyclopedic entries of the audience include;

- a) symbol strength,
- b) symbol of stability
- c) symbol of invincibility.

The author could have therefore said, “He is strong, he gives stability and cannot be destroyed.” Yet he chose to use the figure of ‘rock’ deliver his message.

Example 8 is drawn of farming. Grapes were among the main crops grown by the Israelites.

(9) And now I will tell you  
what I will do to **my vineyard**.  
I will remove **its hedge**,  
and it shall be devoured;  
I will break down its wall,  
and it shall be trampled down.  
(Is.5:5) ESV

In this verse God refers to the people of Israel as his “vineyard.” Vineyard has the following encyclopedic entries in the mind of the intended audience

- a) That which will produce for its planter,
- b) Bring some profit to the planter
- c) Dependent on its dresser
- d) Bring joy to its owner when he is to make wine from the grapes.

These encyclopedic entries help the audience to understand the expectations of God who is the vinedresser on the Israelites. Once the expectations are not met, the consequence is captured in the next metaphorical action; removing the hedge around the vineyard.

Hedge also has its encyclopedic entries. They include

- a) Protection from outside by marauding animals

- b) Boundary mark of one's possessions
- c) It is a mark that something is important to the owner.

Absence of the hedge will mean that God is warning the people that he would withdraw his protection around his people to allow their destruction he will be showing that they are no longer his and that he will be treating them as insignificant.

The next example, example 9, is drawn from another profession of animal husbandry. King and Stager notes; "The most frequent domesticated animals found in the Bronze and Iron Age archeology sites are sheep and goats... The sō'n (collective for small cattle, namely sheep and goats), the most important domestic animals in Palestine and an index in their owner's economic status are well suited for the dry, hot climate of the Near East..." (2001:113) This means that the keeping of sheep is a familiar and a key activity in Israel.

(10) The Lord is my **shepherd**;

I shall not want.

(Psalm 23:1) ESV

In this Psalm the author calls the Lord his 'shepherd'. Some of the encyclopedic entries that will be activated at the mention of shepherd as a figure of speech will include

- a) leads his flock- shows the way
- b) provides what is to be eaten
- c) protects from the enemies' attacks
- d) tends to the sick or hurt animals
- e) restrains his animals not to stray, among other meanings

However, the author chose to use a metaphor, 'shepherd' to communicate to his audience.

My last example from Hebrew culture, example number 10, is from the fishing profession.

(11) And Jesus said to them,

"Follow me, and I will make you become fishers of men..."

(Mark 1:17, ESV)

The figure of a fisherman here has the following encyclopedic entries;

- a) Professional – one needed to train to be a good fisherman.
- b) Peaceful approach to the prey – noise is likely to chase away the prey
- c) Patience waiting for fish to come into your traps
- d) Faith- throwing nets where you cannot see your targets but you throw all the same
- e) At times it could be dangerous in the stormy lake Galilee.



From the above five examples from the Hebrew culture, we can see that the speakers had the option of using the direct style of communication where they would have used literal language to communicate but they opted to use metaphors to communicate the message they had.

#### 4.5 Use of Indirect Style of Communication in Tharaka Discourse

In my study I have been investigating the style of communication in Tharaka. In this section I am particularly discussing the use of metaphors in communication. In my research, I discovered that indeed Tharaka people use metaphors very extensively. I found this out from my reading of Tharaka literature and from my interview with people during which time I collected a number of metaphors. Below I will share a few of the metaphors I found in literature and through interviews as a way of demonstrating that indeed use of metaphors in Tharaka is prevalent. For each example I will also provide a literal translation, provide range of encyclopedic entries that each metaphor activates in the minds of the audience, provide the alternative literal expression that the speaker may have used to express the same idea he expressed using metaphors.

- (12) Karîmi n' atuîkire kîbuu kia njîra.  
Karîmi has become a path fruit tree.

(This metaphor was picked from the Narrative: *Rûgono rwa Karîmi na Njerû*. Unpublished Tharaka Narrative- see Appendix I)

This metaphor was used to describe a woman who had become immoral. The information could be passed even in the presence of small children without risking sounding obscene. When this metaphor is mentioned there are a number of encyclopedic entries that are activated. These include the following:

- a) The fruit tree referred to here is a kind of a shrub
- b) Produces some good tasting fruits in clusters.
- c) Fruits are eaten by children, adults and even some animals like monkeys and baboons.
- d) Being on the wayside is that all people can see it and so they will pick fruits from there.
- e) Being a shrub all and sundry can reach even its top branches.
- f) Baboons especially love these fruits they assemble where it is
- g) Because it is on the wayside the baboons are always on the lookout as they eat the fruits and so when they notice a passerby the baboons hurriedly pluck the clusters of the fruits and at times break small branches that hold the clusters.
- h) Children passing by will stop and pluck the fruits and at times break the branches
- i) So such fruit tree is usually messed up with by people and animals!

This accessibility by all is now carried over to loose women. Where it means that all people have undue access to her.

The option that the speaker left and chose the metaphor is below:

- b) Karimi n' atuîkire mûka ûmûmaramaru  
Karimi has become an immoral woman.

The elderly opted to use such a metaphor for two reasons; to avoid being understood by unintended persons like children or a non- fluent speaker of the language who happened to be around and to paint the picture of the situation vividly to deliver the message more forcefully. The picture of a fruit tree that is easily accessed and mishandled by adults, children and baboons is very vivid. It engages the audience more actively than the literal expression would engage it.

Example number 12 is based on a common myth regarding certain kind of snake. This kind of a snake is said to black. This will make difficult to see if it is in a dark background like in a fireplace where there is charcoal. It is barely more than a foot long. Because of its relative shortness it can escape notice and even when someone sees it not as frightening as twelve feet python would be. It is not very fast in moving away from people and so it can appear deceptively friendly. It is said to have two heads. The snake bites a person and injects poison into its prey fangs that are in its mouth which of course in the head of a snake. Therefore, the head is the deadliest part of the snake body that a person fears coming into contact with. Now with this mythical snake that has two heads, it can be very dangerous because if you see one of its heads away from you, you may relax thinking that you are safe while in reality the second head could be just next to your leg and about to bite you. So, with that snake you cannot trust what you see with your eyes. You should be very careful

(13) Kanyua, îra i njoka ya mîromo îîrî.

Kanyua, that is a snake of two mouths.

(This metaphor was picked from the Narrative: *Rûgono rwa Karîmi na Njerû*. Unpublished Tharaka Narrative- see Appendix I.)

The context of this metaphor is when you are cautioning people against someone who is not trustworthy. The same message could have been expressed by saying:

Kanyua ti muntû wa gwîtîgîka.

Kanyua is not trustworthy.

The next examples 13 and 14 are comments on the character of two different people. Examples 13 compare a person with a flame of fire. This is to show how unapproachable she is.

(14) Kaumba i rûrîmbî rwa mwanki.

Kaumba is a flame of fire.

The alternative literal expression could have been

Kaumba I mûrûru mûno.

Kaumba is very fierce.

Example 14 compares a person to a lion.

(15) Kiania akûgwata mbia cia akûrû îîndî i cimba.

Kiania after getting the money for the aged is now a lion.

(Collection of Metaphors from Tharaka- from my research with 24 Tharaka respondents)

The alternative literal rendering would have been;

Kiania akûgwata mbia cia akûrû n'ararûrire muno.

Kiania has become fierce after getting money for the aged.

It is worth noting that the examples number 13 and 14 describe the same quality in a person but using different metaphors. Flame of fire and a lion are used to communicate the same concept of being unapproachably fierce. The two metaphors above the have the same literal meaning. Example 15 is based on types of woods.

(16) Ageririe kûringa mwekûrû wake eethîra i kîanda kîa mîkame.

He tried to beat his wife but he found that she is a store of mahogany.

(This metaphor was picked from the Narrative: *Rûgono rwa Karîmi na Njerû*. Unpublished Tharaka Narrative. - see Appendix I)

The store is the house where Tharaka people kept their valuables. These valuables were mainly harvested grains, honey from the bee hives and farm tools and weapons. These belongings were the most important possessions that a family could have. The grains and honey meant their subsistence, farm tools were to help them produce more food for the future and weapons were for defense against attacks by the enemies and some of them like bows and arrows and spears were used to kill animals for food. That means if you could break into somebody's store and carry away what was there, you will have effectively beaten him because he will have no food at present, he will have no ability to produce more food and worse still he will be defenseless. This means that people took time to build strong granaries that could not be broken into easily.

The mahogany tree is one of the hardest woods in Tharaka and these woods can last for many years. Most Tharaka houses were temporary and lasted up to 5 years or so. A mahogany wood is resistant to destruction by soil, water and termites. Even breaking the wood with bare hands is difficult. So breaking into a store built with mahogany wood in a very difficult task- that which is almost impossible using your bare hands.

The encyclopedic entries associated with the mahogany and the store would be activated. The audience would arrive that the conclusion that the efforts by the man to beat his wife were thwarted miserably. Therefore, the literal rendering of the metaphor message could have been;

Ageriirie gûtura mwekûrû wake eethîra atimûûmba.

He tried to beat his wife but he found out that she was too strong for him.

Example 16 is based on the human body.

(17) I kû ûkuuga gûtithiîka? Aaga riitho na nthongo!

Where are you saying cannot be reached? Here sight and blindness.

There is a belief by Tharaka people that misfortunes can strike anytime. A proverb goes, "Ûtakuîte ûtibîttîtie nthongo." That is "If you have not yet died you have not escaped the misfortune of losing your eye." The metaphor in example 16 is based on that philosophy: that the moving from a person with sight to one who is blind is something very easy. Therefore, one can be having two sound eyes at this moment and after a short time one eye is lost. This high probability of losing sight is expressed as spatial distance. And so very short distances are said to be as short as the distance between sight and blindness. Thus, the information in metaphor would have otherwise been re-expressed as follows:

I kû ûkuuga gûtithîka? Aaga akubî ûûgû!

Where you are saying is too far? It is actually very close.

Example 17 is based on animals.

(18) Kûrûa na Mugambi i gûciindana na njogu kûmia.

Fighting Mugambi is competing with the elephant to defecate.

The metaphor is used when you are either warning a person against doing what is very clearly impossible or when report on a futile endeavor that obviously failed. The metaphor has since become an idiom in that the fixed construction ‘gûciindana na njogu kûmia’ that is ‘competing with an elephant to defecate’ is popularly used as idiomatic expression to express futility just like ‘kûthambia ngûkû magûrû’ that is ‘to wash the legs of a chicken’ is used. (Kanampiu & Van der Wal, 2019). The literal rendering of the message expressed in the above metaphor would be;

Kûrûa na Mugambi n’ûntû bûkari ta bûtaûmbika?

It is nearly impossible to fight Mugambi.

The last example in this section is based Tharaka folklore.

(19) Mutegi n’îrimarimo

Mutegi is an ogre.

Tharaka narratives told of creatures that had superhuman strength. These were called ogres. An ogre could out run the fastest man, can swallow a whole village, could mimic the speech of any person and could also transform themselves into different things and forms. An ogre who is interested in trapping a girl would transform itself into a handsome young man and that which is interested in attracting young men will masquerade as a very beautiful girl. According to the narratives human flesh was delicacy for them. Of all the qualities that were ascribed to ogres the most salient one was being merciless. Even if a person helped an ogre from death and did many good things to them when the ogre got the opportunity it would not spare them. No amount of beseeching would move an ogre to listen and spare its victim. Only wit could save a victim from the hands of an ogre. So the literal rendering of the message would be;

Mutegi atirî kiao.

Mutegi is very merciless.

The choice to use the metaphors instead of literal rendering was deliberate and the respondents to my semi-structured interview schedule gave me the reasons for using metaphors. Their responses are discussed in the next section 4.6.

#### 4.6 Results from the Interview Schedule

I administered a semi-structured interview schedule to 24 Tharaka speakers from four dialects of Tharaka. These for dialects of Kîitharaka are: Thagicû, Ígoki, Ntugî and Gatue. (BTL, 2019, vii). I have discussed these dialects in a greater depth in my background to the language of study in Chapter of this document.

From each of the four dialects I got six respondents. Four of my respondents had worked in Tharaka Bible translation work. In the course of their work they interacted with speakers from the four dialects. They had opportunity to travel to all the areas of Tharaka occupied by speakers of

the various dialects and to review texts written in the various dialects. The four are therefore very well very well versed with all the four dialects. As I interviewed and analyzed data from my research, I have the advantage of being a mother tongue speaker of the language and also having worked with Tharaka Bible Translation and with Mother Tongue Based Literacy Project in Tharaka schools I had exposure to all the four dialects of Kĩĩtharaka Language.

The following are the responses that I got from the interview. My first question was whether they used metaphors when they are talking to other people. All of them affirmed that they do use metaphors. And when I asked how often they used them they said they used them always.

My second question was on whether according to them people used metaphors when counselling and giving advice to others. The answer to this was also in the affirmative by all of my respondents. And when I asked them what they considered to be the reasons as to why people used metaphors they gave such reasons as;

- a) For emphasis in that metaphors communicate the highest degree. For example, when you say, '*Kĩmia is a lion*', you mean '*Kimia is very fierce.*' Metaphors communicate the intensity that could otherwise be communicated by adverbs of degree like, very, extremely exceedingly.
- b) To get the attention of your audience. The vivid picture painted by the metaphors ensures that your audience is closely following the speaker.
- c) Some said it was only through the use of metaphors that one can be clearly understood.
- d) Some also said metaphors can enable one to communicate messages that could have otherwise been too vulgar or unpleasant to the audience without being offensive.
- e) Still others said that at times one may choose to use metaphors to do selective communication. This is where there are children and idea being discussed is considered to be in appropriate for them and so the speaker may opt to use metaphors to leave the children out of the loop of communication.

My last question was whether there were times that use of metaphors was considered in appropriate. For this question the response was that metaphors are used in day to day communication but there sometimes when people may opt not to use metaphors. Some of these circumstances included

- a) There are times that people may not use a lot of metaphors like,
  - i) If the addressee is a child and the speaker is unsure if the child will understand the metaphor
  - ii) If the addressee is not a mother tongue speaker of Kĩĩtharaka and as in above, the speaker is unsure if the addressee will understand
  - iii) If the speaker is younger than the addressee it will be considered impolite to use some metaphors.

Some of the observations we can draw from the responses I got from administering the interview schedule are that Tharaka people use metaphors in day to day communication. Another one is that people use metaphors purposefully and that there at times when people opt not to use metaphors

#### **4.7 Use of metaphors in argumentation**

##### ***Introduction***

So far I have been discussing the use of metaphors in Tharaka discourse in general. In this section I want to pay special attention to the use of metaphors in argumentation. I collected these

metaphors in the context of two hortatory discourses. *Advice to a prospective bride* and *Advice given to young men by an old man*. I will provide these texts among the appendices at the end of my thesis.

In these two texts the speakers are trying to convince their audiences to accept their reason and to behave in a certain way. In the advice to a prospective bride the speaker would like the prospective bride to adhere to a certain way of behavior and to abandon a certain way of behavior. Therefore, the speaker wants to influence the thinking of her audience. This kind of discourse is argumentative. The speaker tries to convince the listener through deductive reasoning or through inductive reasoning. Deductive reasoning is applied where an exhortation is given and then the reasons for obeying the exhortation are given. Below is an example of deductive reasoning from *Advice to young men by an old man not to be misled by modern advancements*:

- (20) Firstly, respect your parents and those older than you. If you respect them they will love you and respect you in return and they will bless you. And if you need their help as long you respect them they will not deny you their help.

Inductive reason is where you begin by presenting the reasons and then you conclude with the exhortation. Below is an example of inductive reasoning from *Advice to a prospective bride*.

- (21) Being obedient to your husband is not to be foolish and respecting your mother-in-law is not bowing too low. So obey your husband and respect the mother of your husband.

In hortatory discourse there are two types of information namely fore ground information and background information.

### **Metaphors in foreground information**

Foreground information is also known as the main argument. This is the part of the text that advances the argument. It consists in imperatives: exhortations and prohibitions. It tells the addressees what to do and what they should not do. The metaphors here are drawn from the *Advice given to a prospective bride*. This text is about how she is expected to behave in her soon to be assumed role as somebody's wife.

- (22) *Ûtibatîrue ûtuîka kîongo kîûmo kîrî mûkûrû waku*  
You shall never be 'the hard head' to your husband.

The 'kîongo kîûmo' which can be translated as 'the hard head', is a kind of an herb that is very stubborn to herbicides. Even when you uproot it mechanically it remains green for a long time, and it may grow roots on the part of the stem that is in contact with the soil. This makes the herb a very difficult weed to manage in the farms. It is for this reason those people who are stubborn are compared to the herb, 'kîongo kîûmo.' And when Tharaka audience hears the mention of the metaphor all the encyclopedic entries against the herb are activated but the choice of what applies in this constrained by the topic of the metaphor. Since the topic is a human being and it will act as the screen through which all the entries will be all inferences will be evaluated. Those which cannot apply to a human subject will be rejected. The message of the metaphor therefore would have been put directly as:

- Ûtikikaarege kwathîkîra mûkûrû waku.*  
Do not be stubborn to your husband.

The next example is from plants. But this time round it is about crops grow in Tharaka. The crop is peppers

(23)        Ûtigaatuîkîre naciaragu ncini .

Do not become peppers to your mother in law.

The metaphor of a pepper here is used to depict a person who brings discomfort to others in more than one way. The common pepper in Tharaka is very hot. When you put it into your mouth you feel the heat. As a result, a lot of saliva is produced. Tears will also start flowing from your eyes and you will have a running nose. Should the pepper accidentally get into your nose or worse still into your eyes, you will really suffer. So pepper will make you to be very uncomfortable. Such are the encyclopedic entries about peppers and so when a person is said to be pepper to another, it means he has deprived them of peace.

The alternative literal expression would have been;

Ûtikaagîre naciaragu ûkiri.

Do not deprive your mother in law peace.

Example 23 based on a mythical creature.

(24)        Ûtigaatuîke ntîrîka.

Do not be 'I cannot be told'.

'Ntîrîka' is a mythical animal in Tharaka folk role. It is said that long time ago there used to very strong animals called 'ntîrîka'. These animals were also very beautiful and clever. All animals admired and feared them. However, the animals had one strong weakness: they never listened to any advice. They believed that they were cleverer than all animals. That is why they were called by others 'ntîrîka' whose literal translation of this is 'I cannot be told', At one time they decided to look different from the other animals and so they said they wanted to have horns not on top of their heads but on the underside attached to the lower jaws. Other animals tried to advise the ntîrîkas against their proposal to have horns on the lower jaw, but true to their names they did not accept the advice. So they were given horn on their lower jaw. That time there was tall grass and a lot of water so the 'ntîrîka' would just plant their horns on the ground and eat the tall grass comfortably and also when they went to drink water their horns did not disturb them because there was enough water to accommodate the horns and allow their mouths to reach the water. But there came a drought that caused water to dry up in many rivers and there remained only very shallow springs and grass dried up leaving very small short tufts of grass. With the horns on the lower jaws the 'ntîrîka' could not reach the grass or the water. So all 'ntîrîka' eventually died of thirst combined with hunger.

So when one likened to the mythical ntîrîka, they be audience retrieves the encyclopedic entries in about concludes that the said people are those cannot heed any advice. The literal rendering of the metaphor would be:

Ûtikaarege kûthikîria ndoria

Do not fail to heed to advice.

The last metaphor in this section is about a fruit tree.

(25)                    Ūtikoorotuĩka kĩbuu kĩa njĩra.

Do not ever be wayside fruit tree.

I discussed this metaphor in detail in section 2.4 where I described the process of interpreting metaphors in discourse

The explicit way the speaker would have expressed herself could have been as shown below.

Ūtikaaromaramara

You shall never be immoral

All the four examples above are simple imperatives. Interestingly all of them are negative commands. They all take the form ‘Do not be or do not do’ one thing or the other. Among the Tharaka people there are the following ways of giving commands.

### Ways of making commands and requests in Kĩĩtharaka

- a) *Nwa Mwanka*- you must –Strong command – Used to reprimand a person. Works with a senior issuing punishment to a junior
- b) *Bũtikooro bũrũtha* –You should never. -Strong prohibition. It is also used in uttering curses.
- c) *Utibatũrue*- You are not supposed to do – Strong prohibition- This is used as strong instruction
- d) *Ūtikaarũthe*- Do not do- solemn but even prohibition
- e) *Ūrũthe*- Do- simple imperative- other factors like facial expression, tone or pitch can communicate varying levels of urgency
- f) *Nũkũromba ũrũthe* – I request that you do-request
- g) *Nwambeende ũrũtha*- I would like you to- expression of a desire-
- h) *Ingwĩĩgia/ inkũmenya ũkaarũtha*- I believe/ I know that you will do- expresses faith in the fulfillment of the desired
- i) *Nwa ũrũthe*- You may do- weak request/permission

In this scale in (a-d) are strong commands. (e) is rather neutral. From (f- i) the intensity of the urgency of the commands are less felt.

However, accompanying extra linguistic communication can significantly modify the urgency of any of the commands. (Kamwara 2016 Research on Hortatory Discourse among the Tharaka people) (unpublished)

### Metaphors in the background information

I will discuss four types of background information in this section namely: credential information, situational information, motivational information and enabling information. All my examples are drawn from two hortatory texts: *Advice to a prospective bride* and *Advice given to young men by an old man*.

- a) Credential information.

Credential information is meant to give credibility to the speaker in the hortatory discourse. It is meant to assert the speaker as qualified and authoritative enough to address the topic and to advise the addressee(s). In the two hortatory texts we the credential information is represented by a similar clause whose translation is given below;

May I take this opportunity to give you advice because *I have seen much*.



‘I have seen much’ is an idiom that means that the speaker is experienced enough to be able to give advice to the counselees. We do not have metaphors as part of credential information.

b) Situational information.

This is the information that paints the general situation related to the topic that the speaker is addressing. It is any information that helps to describe the current situation. Under this kind of support information are two examples. These are discussed under examples 24 and 25.

Example 24 states that some wives became District Commissioners

(26) Ibaatuĩkire mandiicii.

They have become District Commissioners

This is the idea behind this metaphor. Sometimes during the colonial times, Tharaka people knew District Commissioners (currently known as Deputy County Commissioners) to be the most powerful people. Nobody could contradict what the District Commissioner said. The commissioners were also known to do all manner of things without being questioned. Even if they killed, no one could question them. They were feared, actually dreaded. So, the encyclopedic entries about DCs include the notion of people who were above any authority. The speaker would have opted to explicate his message by saying:

I baaregire watho.

They do not accept any authority.

Example 26 plays the same role of painting the unfavorable situation as it is with some married women. It is this situation that the counselor is addressing. A certain woman had made herself unapproachably fierce. Hence the metaphor in example 27 below:

(27) Eetuĩkithia makara

She made herself embers.

Embers can burn whoever touches them gets burnt. People therefore do not go very close to embers for fear of being burnt. Therefore, the literal rendering would have been:

N’ atuĩkire ûmûrûru mûno na atitheengeerekaga.

She became fierce and unfriendly.

c) Motivational information

There is a lot of this kind of information in the two text. Motivational information is the rationale for behavior change advocated for by the speaker in a hortatory discourse. In many cases it is the benefit of heeding the advice of the speaker. Examples of such information from *Advice to young men by an old man not to be misled by modern advancements* include: “When you obey your parent you make him happy. He knows that he has a good child. And an obedient child receives blessings...”

From the text, *Advice to a prospective bride*, there is a metaphor supplying motivational information.

(28) Ūgaatuĩka kanyîrî gaake.

You will be her lovely bird.

Kanyîrî is a brightly colored bird that is lovely to look at. It has long white tail feathers. When it flies around with the white tail feathers trailing behind, it looks very gracious. Among Tharaka local birds, kanyîrî is considered the most beautiful and loved. Even when children go to hunt birds they cannot think of killing it. Anyone would love to capture it instead so that they may just look at it. So the bird is treated preferentially. The literal rendering of the metaphor above would be:

Ûgaatuîka mwana wake ûra eendeete mûno.

She will consider you as her favorite child.

The kind of information motivational information. The counsellor gives the hearer some of the reasons for heeding to her advice. She motivates her by pointing out the benefit of following the counsel.

#### d) Enabling information-

This is mainly in form of proverbs and sayings that call to the minds of the exhortees the values of the community. This kind of supportive information is found in the various positions. The proverbs are cited as a way of confirming the validity of the argument. Here is an example from the text, *Advice to young men by an old man not to be misled by modern advancements*: It is said, "He who rejects his mother has chosen to die." The adage is quoted to appeal to the values of the community. That it has been accepted throughout the ages that some behavior is un acceptable and behaving in such a manner is self-condemnation.

The examples of metaphors in background information are in different tenses. Unlike the metaphors on the foreground which are all imperatives, the tense of background information varies from simple past, simple present to simple future tense.

### SUMMARY

In this chapter I have been investigating the use of metaphors as an instance of the use of indirect style of communication. A number of observations can be made. One of these observations is that metaphors express the superlative qualities. In each of the metaphors the meaning expressed an intensity marked by extremely, very, the most or other such adverbs of degree. This was pointed out by the respondents to my semi-structured interview schedule. Another observation is that there are different metaphors that carry the same meaning. There are times where two metaphors have similar meaning the two can be used without appearing redundant. Finally, Tharaka people use metaphors in argumentation as has been demonstrated in the analysis of the hortatory texts where we have metaphors in both the main argument and in the support information.

### CONCLUSION

Firstly, any texts that employ metaphors will be following the natural style of communication of Kîtharaka. Therefore, they will be natural Kîtharaka texts. Secondly, any texts that avoid the use metaphors in an effort to make the message clear to Tharaka people will be avoiding using the natural style of communication of Tharaka people. Therefore, such texts will be an unnatural Kîtharaka texts.

## IMPLICATIONS

The contribution of this study is that it has demonstrated that Kĩitharaka uses metaphors in communication. Metaphor is a figure of speech. Employing this figure of speech is natural in Kĩitharaka. Therefore, any translation done in Kĩitharaka should endeavor to use this figure of speech so as to be natural. If we extrapolate the findings on Kĩitharaka to other African languages, we can make a similar conclusion that any text in these languages should endeavor to use this figure of speech so as to be natural. Some translation helps emphasize on using non-literal expression in order to be clear in the target language. This would mean replacing metaphors in the source language with some non-literal expression in the target language. The result of following such advice without caution would be ending up with a text that avoids the use of metaphor as figure of speech which will be an unnatural text. The contribution of this study is a call to Bible translation teams of African languages to be awake to the communication style of their languages.

## REFERENCES

- Barnwell, K. (1984). *Bible Translation: An Introductory Course for Mother-Tongue Translators*. Bible Translation & Literacy (EA). (2018). *Mwimbi-Muthambi Sociolinguistic Survey*. Nairobi. BTL(EA).
- Blight, C. Richard. (1999). *Translation Problems from A to Z*. Dallas. SIL International
- Bullinger, E.W. (1999). *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*. New York. Baker Publishing group.
- Clark, Billy. (2013). *Relevance Theory*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Pres. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139034104>
- Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. (1988). *Culture and Interpersonal Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Guthrie, Malcom. (1948). *The Classification of the Bantu Languages*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Gutt, Ernst-August. (1992). *Relevance Theory*. Dallas. Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Henderson, Anne. (2017). *Through a Hebrew lens or a Western filter*. Dallas. BT Conference.
- Mberia, Kithaka. 1993. *Segmental phonology with special reference to the noun and to the verb*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- Rygg, Kristin. (2012.) *Direct and Indirect Communicative Style*. University of Bergen, Norway.
- Schroder, Helga. (2018). *Semantics and Pragmatics. Lecture Notes*. AIU.
- Simons, Gary F. and Fennig, Charles D. (eds.). 2018. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World. Twenty-first edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre. (1995). *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*. Oxford:
- TeSelle. (1975) *Parable, Metaphor and Theology: Speaking in Parables*. Philadelphia: Fortress. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jaarel/XLII.4.630>