Disease and disaster

On the translation of illness and natural force metaphors in a journalistic political essay
Abstract
This essay deals with the translation of certain metaphors in a journalistic political essay. It focuses on metaphor as a conceptual and rhetorical device, and on the translation of metaphors that make use of the source domains NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS. The aim of the essay is to investigate to what extent the two source domains are transferred to the target text in translation, and to show how the fact that metaphors are both conceptual and rhetorical is reason for why they should be transferred when possible. The study is quantitative in that it looks at frequency of source domain transfer into the target text and at the frequency of a few metaphor translation methods, and it is qualitative in that it explains how the metaphors are both conceptual and rhetorical choices on behalf of the author, and in that it explains and analyses the processes leading to certain metaphor translation strategies. The study finds that four different methods are used when translating the metaphors in questions and that it is by far most common to directly translate them. The second most common strategy allows for the source domain to be transferred to the target text but for the actual lexemes or phrases belonging to it to be exchanged for other lexemes or phrases within the same source domain.
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1 Introduction

Builders. Copiers. Cannibals. These are metaphors for translators suggested by Chesterman and Wagner (2002: 13–17). Depending on how one looks at translators and the work they do they can fit the description of either. But when it comes to metaphors, translators will be far more occupied with those they need to translate than those that serve to define them as professionals. Because saying that metaphors are everywhere is not an overstatement. They are manifest by words – their visible form – but exist on a deeper level in societies and cultures as well as in individuals, all of which are relevant from a translator’s point of view. Some metaphors are obvious and impossible to miss, whereas some are invisible, having merged into the lexicon and only noticeable at closer scrutiny. An obvious metaphor can be seen in “The election of Donald Trump as president of the United States is the biggest political earthquake of our times”. Here the metaphor is hard to miss, given that we know that an actual earthquake is a force of nature that can cause destruction for many and we automatically transfer this earthquake knowledge to the topic at hand: the election of Donald Trump. An invisible metaphor, on the other hand, is not as linguistically obvious, as can be seen in the phrase “savage violence has erupted”. A closer look at this metaphor reveals that the violence in question is painted as another force of nature – a volcano that has erupted, causing chaos and destruction.

The prevalence of metaphor in written communication, as is the focus of this essay, depends on the text type and thus varies. Metaphors can occur one by one and make use of different imagery – or source domains – most every time but they can also form a larger coherent structure in which more extensive use is made of a certain source domain throughout a whole text, known as megametaphor.

Metaphors can be conceptual, in that they help us structure and understand our world, and rhetorical, in that they catch attention and convince through the image they convey, which can be all from shocking to beautiful to funny depending on what concepts are combined and what words are used in doing so. Since metaphors are everywhere, both in mind and language, they are also an important part of a translator’s work. And since metaphors serve double purposes they demand special attention since losing or replacing them can have conceptual and rhetorical consequences on top of the obvious semantic ones. This essay takes a closer look at what happens with prevalent metaphors, so-called megametaphors, in the translation of a journalistic political essay.
1.1 Aim and research questions

The twofold aim of this essay is to investigate if megametaphors that in the English source text are structured on certain source domains – namely NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS – are kept in the Swedish target text and to present reason for why a translator should aim at keeping them. The aim will be met by showing how metaphor is a both conceptual and rhetorical device, and as such part of an author’s intentions that a translator may wish to transfer into the target text (see section 1.3 on method), and by studying how individual metaphorical lexemes are translated into Swedish and subsequently investigating why they are translated the way they are. The specific questions that this study will try to answer are:

- To what extent are the source domains NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS transferred into the target text, thus keeping the megametaphors in question intact?
- What metaphor translation strategies are used when translating the metaphors in question and why are these strategies used?
- Can the metaphors in the study be understood as both conceptual and rhetorical choices on behalf of the author and thus important to aim at keeping for the translator who wishes to transfer source text author intentions to the target text?

1.2 Material

The source text (henceforth ST) is the essay "Welcome to the age of anger", written by Pankaj Mishra and published in the Guardian (8 December 2016) as a so-called long read. Long reads are articles that present investigative journalism and analysis, and can for example be reportages, commentaries or, as in this case, essays.

The ST depicts anger, fear, envy and resentment as driving forces in society, and the over-estimation of rational thinking as being a contributing factor to their power. Using Reiss’ categorisation of text functions (1987/1989: 108–9) the article is ‘informative’ in that it holds facts on societal issues as well as takes an historical look at the role of anger and resentment on the one hand and rational thinking on the other. It is, however, not with the main aim of presenting information about politics and history as such that Mishra has written this piece. Rather he wants to inform his reader about the danger he believes that anger and resentment pose, and implicitly argue that we need to take action before it is too late. The text is thus biased and, to use Reiss’ terminology, implicitly ‘operative’ (ibid.). Mishra is clearly dissatisfied with where society is heading.
For this reason, the language used in the text is rather poignant and expressive and to some extent the article also falls into Reiss’ text category ‘expressive’ (ibid.). In the ST, metaphors and other figurative language play an important role in engaging the reader by creating images, awakening emotions, triggering thoughts and, ultimately, provoking action. The examples of such language are many and the title and caption, in example (1):

(1) “Welcome to the age of anger. The seismic events of 2016 have revealed a world in chaos – and one that old ideals of liberal rationalism can no longer explain.”

serve as good as any with their alliteration (age of anger) and metaphor (seismic events). The rhetorical aspects are an important part of the article and have been a main focus of the translation. This is also what the present essay focuses on, since its aim is to analyse the translation of two megametaphors in the article, namely those making use of NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS (illness is here used as a collective term for both disease and injury, i.e. medical conditions that can, need or should be cured) as ways to describe and explain the world and what is happening in it. In Mishra’s article politics and society are thus given physical shape – politics is a landscape and society a body – and both suffer, according to the author.

The audience of the ST are the readers of the Guardian, one of the major and most highly renowned newspapers in the UK. According to the article "Guardian reader profile" (2010) its readership is to a large extent educated, employed and belonging to the higher social grades. Swedish equivalent newspapers are Svenska Dagbladet and Dagens Nyheter and when translating the text I will have these papers and their readers in mind for the target text (TT). In Svenska Dagbladet there is a section called "Under strecket" where essays and analyses are published and in the Sunday supplement these texts are often longer and a translation of the present text would fit here.

1.3 Method

As the primary material for the present essay consists of a translation done by the essay author, the global translation method used is of interest. The translation method is in line with Nord’s recommendations to transfer the author’s intentions with the ST to the target audience (1997: 125). In this case, this includes using figurative language in the shape of metaphors as a means to meet the operative aim of the text. Since the two languages are
both linguistically and culturally related, direct translation, as described by Vinay and Darbelnet (2004, in Munday 2016: 88–89) has been used when possible and oblique translation (ibid.) when literal translation renders grammatically, syntactically or pragmatically unacceptable TT equivalences.

During the translation process the search for fitting TT equivalences was aided by dictionaries and corpora. The dictionaries used were both monolingual and bilingual, to offer both definitions and translation alternatives. The corpora used for Swedish were the newspaper and journal corpora in Språkbanken, accessed by help of the search engine Korp, and the corpora used for English was the News on the Web corpus (NOW), holding journalistic writing and thus also targeting relevant parallel texts.

The method for analysis used in the present study is quantitative as well as qualitative. For the quantitative part the individual metaphorical lexemes or phrases – so-called micrometaphors – belonging to the megametaphor source domains NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS were collected and categorized according to their respective source domains, as described by Kövecses (2005, 2010). Subsequently, the individual metaphorical lexemes/phrases were studied to ascertain what metaphor translation strategy – categorisation inspired by Newmark (1981) and van den Broeck (1981) – had been used in the respective cases. The qualitative analysis is twofold. It serves to explain and exemplify metaphors as both conceptual and rhetorical devices that ought to be kept in translation, and draws on, first and foremost, Lakoff and Jonsson (1980), Kövecses (2005, 2010) and Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008). It also reasons about and motivates the strategies adopted when translating the metaphors, as presented in the quantitative section. The qualitative analysis also uses the corpora and dictionaries earlier mentioned, along with parallel texts, to draw conclusions about the degree of lexicalization of the metaphors used, analyse the selected TT equivalents and find possible alternatives. To lessen the amount of comparative data from parallel texts, the corpora samples were limited to 50 hits for each search string.
2 Theoretical background

The theoretical background presents a framework for the present study by defining concepts, presenting strategies and justifying theoretical choices. In section 2.1 metaphor and its functions are defined. Section 2.2 presents methods for metaphor categorization. This is followed by an explanation of the concept megametaphor in section 2.3. Lastly, in section 2.4, metaphor translation strategies are presented.

2.1 Defining metaphor

In this section, the concept of metaphor – i.e. what metaphor is – and its functions are explained. The concept and functions are intertwined, as can be seen in example (2):

(2) My wife is my sun. (my example)

It can easily be understood that the wife is not an actual sun but the image helps explain what the spouse means to the sender, because everybody knows that the sun is warm, light and a prerequisite for life. If the spouse instead, as in example (3), is referred to as

(3) my ball and chain (my example)

that is understood too, but here the wife has turned into a restraint in the shape of a device used to prevent prisoners from escaping. Both examples use metaphor to describe the spouse in question but build on different concepts to do so – the sun and the ball and chain. Depending on which metaphor one chooses, the wife will be understood as two different people, underlining that the function – how we are led to understand a concept (here the wife) – of metaphor is the result of what concepts are chosen as comparison.

However, no matter what concept is chosen – here either the sun or the ball and chain – the workings are the same: one concept is understood in terms of another. As a matter of fact, this is evident already in the term ‘metaphor’, since the Greek word metaphor refers to something that is carried or moved from one place to another, as pointed out by Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008: 211). Consequently, the concept of metaphor itself is a metaphor, since the carrying and moving a metaphor does is that of semantic meaning and not of physical objects. A modern-day definition of metaphor is “figure of speech that implies comparison between two unlike entities” (Encyclopedia Britannica)
or, as Knowles and Moon (2006:3) phrase it, “the use of language to refer to something other than it was originally applied to, or what it ‘literally’ means, in order to suggest some resemblance or make a connection between the two things”. The last two definitions highlight two aspects:

1. that metaphor utilizes language in order to make comparisons and
2. that metaphor is a figure of speech, i.e. a literary device, which can be used to different effects.

Long before today’s scholars (some of these presented below) started to investigate the conceptual power of metaphor Aristotle discussed the rhetorical power of metaphor in his Rhetoric and stated that “it is not enough knowing what you want to say, you also have to say it in the right way” (in Cassirer, 1997: 41). Ever since then the metaphor has been listed among the most important rhetorical – or literary or poetic – devices. Elmelund Kjeldsen labels the metaphor one of the four major tropes (2008: 210) and states that it is the one that is the most known and most frequently used (ibid.: 211). He goes on to reinstate what he claims is commonly acknowledged, namely that metaphor, and other tropes, serve as attention catchers and keepers, offer aesthetic satisfaction through linguistic delight and amusement, and are ways to make a phrase memorable (ibid.: 222–223). He also underlines, however, that metaphors and other tropes are not mere decorations, but rather serve an underlying purpose of persuading a reader or listener into thinking or acting in a certain way (ibid.: 223). A metaphor can thus be an important and efficient linguistic tool for the writer or speaker who wishes to affect his/her audience, and in the present ST the author makes ample use of metaphor with this purpose.

However, this rhetorical power would not exist – neither in the present ST nor anywhere else – if the concepts that the metaphors build on were not cognitive, meaning that they are built on an understanding of the world and can also, in their own turn, help us understand the world. Lakoff and Johnson are much cited in present-day metaphor research and they partly echo the above definitions of metaphor when they state that “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (1980: 5). But their focus lies, as can be seen, more on the actual understanding and experiencing – i.e. cognition – than on the purpose of metaphor as a linguistic device, as expressed by the rhetoricians referred to above. In Lakoff and Johnson, metaphors are to be understood as consisting of a known, often physical or at least easily characterised
‘source domain’ lending (some of its) characteristics to an unknown and often abstract ‘target domain’ which it thereby helps describe (ibid.). One of their many examples is the LOVE IS A PATIENT metaphor which can be seen in expressions such as example (4):

(4) “This is a sick relationship” (ibid.: 49).

(Source and target domains are presented in more detail in section 2.2 on categorization of metaphor). Lakoff and Johnson claim that metaphor is neither only nor in the first place a rhetorical device, but rather a way to conceptualize and define the world or a certain topic, and also that the use of certain metaphorical concepts can decide how we perceive the world or the topic at hand (ibid.: 3–6). On this follows that cultures using different metaphors when talking about the same phenomena will come to understand the phenomena in question in different ways. Lakoff and Johnson use the concept ‘argument’ as an example and show how differently that concept will be understood in two cultures where one equals it to war and one to dance, as in examples (5) and (6):

(5) “I demolished his argument” (ibid.: 4)

(6) “It was a one-step-forward-one-step-back discussion” (my example)

Metaphors are thus cognitive and reflect culture as well as society. This means that according to Lakoff and Johnson, as here verbalized by van der Weele and van der Boomen (2008: 2), metaphors do not exist “to color or embellish, as they are typically said to do when they are seen as poetic devices: nor do they mislead or lie […] Instead they govern, shape and frame.”

Another theorist who draws on Lakoff and Johnson’s theories is Kövecses. He states that metaphor is a thing of thought rather than language (2005: 2) and describes metaphor as a complex phenomenon that is not only linguistic but also conceptual, socio-cultural and physical. (ibid.: 9). He also finds that metaphors that are based on human experience are potentially universal (ibid.: 35), implying that though metaphors show cultural and social variation they can have a common core metaphorical concept based on universal experience. This claim is of interest in the present study since the two megametaphors studied are built on such universal experiences, namely those of natural force and illness. Also, naturally, since the ST metaphors have been subject to translation,
universal experience can be expected to be manifest in the TT in the shape of direct transfer of source domain from the ST.

Metaphor as a translator’s problem is something that interests Newmark. He claims that metaphors serve a double purpose and labels them cognitive and aesthetic (1988: 104). A good metaphor, states Newmark, meets both purposes (ibid.). This is a standing-point that this essay takes, since it is in line with how the present ST uses metaphorical concepts both in order to make the reader understand and experience the world as the author sees it, as suggested by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and in order to be convincing and aesthetically pleasing, as suggested by Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008).

In summary, theory suggests that metaphors can be defined both as conceptual devices used to explain and understand the world, and rhetorical and aesthetic linguistic devices used to persuade or please the reader. This means that though a metaphor may first be used with the purpose of making a concept understandable or clearer, it may also, in practice, serve to modify or embellish our language – for aesthetic and/or operative reasons. No matter the actual reason it is used at a certain point in a text, the metaphor carries both conceptual and rhetorical power, as suggested by Newmark (1988). Metaphorical conceptualization can thus be said to be rhetorical in itself, since an author’s choice of concepts to compare tells readers how they should categorize and understand the topic at hand. In the present ST the author has, for example, chosen to compare certain societal and political events to natural forces and the state of the world and its people to various illnesses or injuries, when other comparisons with other concepts were also theoretically possible. The author’s standing point can thus be – and is so in the present ST – visible in the choice of metaphors, making the metaphors part of an operative aim and serving to persuade the reader. A translator must take these different aspects and double purposes of metaphor into account and thus has more than one reason to treat metaphors with respect and show a willingness to transfer them into the TT. This is why, in this translation-oriented essay, focus cannot lie solely on either aspect of metaphor but has to include both, especially since the aim of the translated article is operative and the language used to meet this aim expressive.
2.2 Categorizing metaphors

Categorization of metaphors can be done either in terms of how common or novel the metaphor is, or in terms of what concept is used as a reference or comparison object in the metaphor. In section 2.2.1 metaphor categories that are based on commonness and/or novelty are presented. These categorizations differ mainly in respect to how fine-grained they are. Section 2.2.2 presents the parts a metaphor consists of and how metaphors can be categorized on the basis of these parts.

2.2.1 Degree of commonness or novelty

Newmark (1988: 106–113) presents six types of metaphor focusing on the common and/or novel aspects, namely ‘dead’, ‘cliché’, ‘stock’, ‘adapted’, ‘recent’ and ‘original’, here accompanied by Newmark’s own examples. A dead metaphor is one that is so common that we hardly recognize it as a metaphor. It is exemplified by words such as foot and mouth, which originally refer to body parts but are also metaphorically used in expressions such as “the foot of the mountain” and “the mouth of the river” (my examples). A cliché metaphor is one that is “used as a substitute for clear thought” (ibid.: 107). In Newmark’s opinion, it is overused and often used in order to obfuscate facts by the help of emotive images as in “a jewel in the crown” (ibid.: 107). The stock (or standard) metaphor is an established, though not overused, metaphor, exemplified by “wooden face”. It may also have emotive purposes but is, according to Newmark, efficient and concise in an informal context (ibid.: 108). Stock metaphors also exist in adapted versions, meaning that they have been adapted to fit a certain situation, as in “pouring Goldwater on the missiles” (ibid.: 111). Newmark’s fifth metaphor, the recent metaphor, is a metaphorical neologism – recently and anonymously coined and rapidly spreading, like (at the time Newmark wrote his book) the word pissed as a metaphor for drunk (ibid.: 112). The last type of metaphor in Newmark’s categorization is the original metaphor, which is invented by the writer and can, according to Newmark, be “universal, cultural or obscurely subjective” (ibid.). Newmark uses an example from a Guardian editorial in which “a ton of enforced silence was dumped on Mr. Eaton” (ibid.).

Dickins (2005: 9) defines only two metaphor categories, the ‘lexicalized’ and the ‘non-lexicalized’. A lexicalized metaphor can be recognized as a metaphor that has a rather fixed meaning. Dickins example is rat, which, besides its dictionary definition ‘rodent’, is acknowledged to metaphorically mean ‘a person who deserts his friends or associates’. The non-lexicalized metaphor is not fixed but rather varies depending on the context. The example Dickins gives is the word tree in “a man is a tree”, which can be
interpreted differently depending on the context which can, as Dickins points out, suggest that part of a man is not visible – like a tree having a root system, or that his life is like that of a tree in that it can bear fruit and lose its leaves. In Dickins’ categorization lexicalized metaphors include Newmark’s dead, stock and recent metaphors and non-lexicalized include his adapted and original metaphors. Also, Newmark’s metaphor types are hard to distinguish. This is why – in a small-scale study like the present – Dickins’ categorization will be used.

2.2.2 The parts of metaphor

As mentioned in 2.2, metaphors can also be divided into subcategories depending on what parts make up the actual metaphor. These parts go by different terms with different theorists, but show how metaphor is made up of one concept that is understood in the terms of another based on a comparison between the two.

Kövecses (2005: 5–6) uses the terms ‘source domain’, ‘target domain’ and ‘experiential basis’ for the parts that a metaphor is built of. A source domain is the concept of comparison and is often more physical or concrete than the target domain which is the concept being compared to it and which is often more abstract. The experiential basis is “some embodied experience” that let the two concepts be correlated. In a later article (2010: 4) Kövecses draws on Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and underlines how this conceptualization exists on a level above the actual linguistic realization of it, an example being LOVE IS A JOURNEY. This conceptual metaphor does not have to be used as such, as in “Love is a journey”, but it is the umbrella concept for many different metaphors drawing on the same image, such as “My husband and I have been walking this road together for twenty years now” and “Marriage is a bumpy ride” (my examples). This is the case in the present ST where the megametaphors POLITICAL/SOCIETAL CHANGES/EVENTS ARE NATURAL FORCES and THE STATE OF THE WORLD/THE PEOPLE IS AN ILLNESS exist on a level above their various linguistic realisations in the shape of separate lexemes or phrases. Kövecses also shows how sources and targets are not combined in a fixed way, but that a certain source domain can be used with several different target domains and vice versa (2005: 6), which further strengthens the importance of the source domain chosen – as it may be one of several theoretically possible ones.

Kövecses (2010:18–27) also lists common source and target domains. Among the common source domains, we find overall concrete concepts, such as the human body,
animals, machines and tools, health and illness, and forces – the last two being the source domains that are made extensive use of in the present ST. Among the common target domains, we find overall abstract concepts, such as emotion, morality, politics, events and actions, and time.

The categorization in this essay is done primarily according to the source domains of the two megametaphors used in the ST. This is because these source domains are prevalent enough to be understood as conscious conceptual choices by the author in order to meet the operative aim of his text, thus making these conceptual choices rhetorical. Also, Kövecses (2010) presents the actual source domains – NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS – that are prevalent in the present material. Secondarily, the categorization of metaphor into lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors according to Dickins (2005) is utilized when deciding what alternative translation to use. Next section explains and terms the extensive use of these two source domains in the present ST.

2.3 Megametaphor

A ‘megametaphor’ – also called sustained or extended metaphor (Rezanova and Shilyaev, 2015: 31) – is defined by Kövecses (2010: 57) as a metaphor that runs through an entire text and that surfaces in the shape of ‘micrometaphors’, i.e. actual individual lexicalizations of the metaphor in the shape of lexemes or phrases. In other words, a megametaphor consists of a source domain being used recurrently in a text (or, indeed, other type of communication), thus fortifying by repetition the conceptualization that the sender makes use of. Kövecses discusses megametaphor in relation to fiction (2010: 57) and refers to an example by Donald Freeman who shows how Shakespeare’s Macbeth makes use of the megametaphor source domains PATH (MOTION) and CONTAINER when characterizing Macbeth’s career (ibid.: 58). In a more recent article Rezanova and Shilyaev define megametaphor as a “network of metaphorical lexemes” (2015: 31) and present a study of megametaphor in four Jack London novels in which they find that there is one overarching megametaphor – DOG IS A MAN – that gives structure to the micrometaphors that are visible on the linguistic surface of the text, and in which dogs are described as having feelings and social relationships (ibid.: 36–38). The authors claim that megametaphor functions as both a cognitive and linguistic mechanism that grants coherence and cohesion in a text (ibid.: 31), echoing back to the definition of metaphor in section 2.1, in which it was understood as a conceptual as well as rhetorical and aesthetic device, but also adding that megametaphor can function as linkage in a text.
This goes well along with the present ST in which the author makes prevalent use of two source domains, the recurrence of which offers a sort of spine to the text at the same time as they serve to conceptualize the world they describe for the reader.

2.4 Translating metaphors

As mentioned in section 2.1, metaphor is a pervading feature of language and it is, or at least can be, of both conceptual and rhetorical importance. This means that it is important also for the translator who will have to choose a strategy – either consciously or unconsciously – for translating metaphors. According to Newmark (1988: 104–106) translating metaphors is even “the most important particular problem” of translation, though he also claims that it assists in deceiving the audience (since metaphors are mainly used for that purpose) by using incidental resemblances (ibid.).

No matter his somewhat negative attitude to metaphors, Newmark presents seven different strategies that can be used by translators when translating metaphors, and by theorists – as is the case in the present study – when categorizing metaphor translation (1981: 87–91). Newmark’s seven strategies are here accompanied by my own English – Swedish examples (Newmark’s own examples are in French and German).

1. Using the same metaphor as in the SL – i.e. a literal translation in which both target domain and source domain are kept in the TL, like when “the foot of the mountain” is translated by “bergets fot”.

2. Replacing it with a standard TL metaphor that is culturally, contextually or stylistically more fitting, exemplified by “stare danger in the face” being translated by “skratta åt faran”.

3. Replacing it with a simile. This strategy means that the translator spells the comparison out – claiming that one thing is like another and not that it is another. This strategy reduces the shock of the metaphor, according to Newmark, and can be seen in the translation of “My kids are monkeys” with “Mina barn beter sig som apor”.

4. Using a simile and add sense – i.e. explain the simile in plain, non-figurative language, as exemplified by “My kids are monkeys” being translated with “Mina barn beter sig som apor och går inte att ha i möblerade rum”.
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5. Replacing the metaphor by sense – i.e. neutralize it and use plain and non-
    figurative language in a literal paraphrase. An example of this strategy is when
    the metaphor “My kids are monkeys” becomes “Mina barn är vilda” in translation.
6. Deleting the metaphor and not exchanging it for anything, meaning that there will
    be a semantic loss in the TT.
7. Using the same metaphor and add sense in order to enforce the metaphor with
    plain, non-figurative language. Can be seen in the translation of “My kids are
    monkeys” into “Mina barn är apor som inte går att ha i möblerade rum”.

Newmark’s list of metaphor translation strategies is rather extensive, as is his list of
metaphor types. van den Broeck (1981: 77) presents only three different strategies:

1. ‘Sensu stricto’ – direct translation by using the same source domain (vehicle) to
    conceptualize the same target domain (tenor) in TL as in SL. Van den Broeck
    points out that using the same source domain (vehicle) can result in either an
    idiomatic or “daring” and innovative metaphor in the TL, depending on if the
    metaphor is lexicalised or not.
2. Substitution of SL metaphor by a TL one that is using a different source domain
    (vehicle) but corresponds in meaning with the SL metaphor and can be said to be
    a “translational equivalent”.
3. Paraphrase. This is when the SL metaphor is translated by a non-metaphorical
    word or expression, resulting in plain language – what Newmark calls sense.

As can be seen, the above authors agree on three strategies. One by which the metaphor
is directly translated, one by which it is translated by a metaphor that is a pragmatic TL
alternative and one by which the SL metaphor is translated by a TL non-metaphor.
Newmark (1981), however, also takes into consideration that there is a weaker form of
metaphor – the simile – that can be used to underline the fact that a word is used
figuratively, i.e. when one says that something is like something else and not that it is
something else, as is the case with metaphor. Furthermore, Newmark allows for the
combinations of metaphor or simile and sense, strategies that seem useful for a translator
who wishes to transfer the intended meaning of a metaphor as well as respect the author’s
choice of imagery, be it for conceptual, aesthetic or rhetorical reasons.
The present material is not very extensive and only four metaphor translation strategies are represented in the material. Three are those agreed upon by Newmark (1981) and van den Broeck (1981) but the fourth is one that was added due to the focus of the study on megametaphor source domains. Concerning this aspect, the categorizations presented above proved not to be fine-grained enough when it comes to differentiating between different types of direct translations. In the present material, a differentiation is done between direct translation that uses the same metaphor source domain by directly translating the lexemes or phrases that represent it, and semi-direct translation (my term) that makes use of the same source domain but uses different lexemes or phrases that also sort under the same domain. The translation strategies that proved relevant for this analysis are:

**Same metaphor**: both source domain and the lexicalization of it – i.e. the actual word(s) chosen – are the same in TL as in SL. Example: see Newmark’s first strategy.

**Same source domain, different lexeme**: the source domain is the same in TL as in SL but a different word or phrase has been used that is not a direct translation of the SL word or phrase, though still belonging to the same source domain. Example: “He is without direction in life” translated by “Han har inget mål i livet”. Both SL and TL here use the source domain JOURNEY but refer to it in different ways.

**Other TL metaphor**: a TL metaphor that has basically the same meaning as the SL metaphor but that uses a different source domain. Example: see Newmark’s second strategy.

**Sense**: the SL metaphor is translated by a TL non-metaphor. Example: see Newmark’s fifth strategy.
3 Analysis

In his text, as accounted for in section 1.2 on material, Mishra (2016) makes use of two megametaphors when he describes the state of the world, what happens in it and its people. These megametaphors are structured on the two source domains NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS, in the following described and explained as deliberate conceptual choices. This is because these two source domains consist of phenomena out of human control that we have reason to be frightened of and Mishra (2016) clearly uses them to convince his reader that there is reason to be frightened of current events, the state of the world and (some of) the people inhabiting it. These two megametaphors and their micrometaphors, i.e. their surface manifestations in the shape of separate lexemes or phrases, are consequently what the following analysis investigates.

Section 3.1 gives a quantitative overview of the metaphorical lexemes/phrases and the translation strategies used. Then follows, in section 3.2, a qualitative discussion of the metaphors as both conceptual and rhetorical devices, and on the translator’s options and choices based on semantic meaning of lexemes, corpora searches, parallel texts and theoretical standpoints.

3.1 Quantitative overview

This quantitative overview presents what strategies have been used when translating the individual micrometaphors – separate lexemes or phrases – that are part of the NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS megametaphors in the material. The metaphors are categorized according to their respective source domains.

3.1.1 Translation of metaphors using NATURAL FORCE as source domain

The ST holds 20 metaphor lexemes/phrases that are part of the NATURAL FORCE megametaphor. Table 1, overleaf, shows which translation strategies were used and to what extent they were used.
In Table 1 it shows that 17 (15 + 2), i.e. 85 percent, of the micrometaphors with NATURAL FORCE as source domain use the same source domain in the TT. There are 15 instances when the same lexicalization has been used in TT as in ST – meaning that a direct translation of the word or phrase has been used – and two when the source domain is the same but a different word or phrase has been used. In one case, another TL metaphor has been used and in two cases the ST metaphor has been translated by a non-metaphorical expression, i.e. sense. In section 3.2 the metaphor translation strategies will be exemplified and discussed.

### 3.1.2 Translation of metaphors using ILLNESS as source domain

In the ST there is a total of 23 individual metaphor lexemes or phrases that are part of the ILLNESS megametaphor. The two megametaphors were thus almost equally common in the ST. Table 2 shows what translation strategies were used when translating the ILLNESS metaphors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation strategy</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same metaphor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same source domain, different lexeme</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other TL metaphor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows that the ILLNESS megametaphor has been kept intact throughout the TT. In 16 cases (70 percent) the metaphor was directly translated using the same lexicalization and in seven cases (30 percent) it was translated by a different word or phrase sorting under the same source domain. In section 3.2 the metaphor translation strategies will be exemplified and discussed.

According to the results of this small-scale quantitative study it is thus possible not only to respect the ST author’s choice of using figurative language (95 percent of the cases) in order to meet an operative aim, but also to keep a certain megametaphor – and with it the author’s conceptual and rhetorical choices – intact to a large extent (93 percent of the cases) when translating from English to Swedish. In the following section the individual metaphors are presented as conceptual and rhetorical choices and the translator’s options, choices and reasoning presented.

3.2 Qualitative analysis

In this qualitative section of the analysis, examples of SL metaphors and their TL correspondences are discussed. In section 3.2.1 examples that are part of the NATURAL FORCE megametaphor are analysed and 3.2.2 analyses examples that are part of the ILLNESS megametaphor. The examples from each source domain are selected so as to show how the four different metaphor translation strategies are used – which is why the examples are unevenly distributed between the source domains since only the NATURAL FORCE metaphors were translated by use of all strategies – and are followed by a discussion of the metaphors as both conceptual and rhetorical choices on behalf of the author, and of the choices leading to the strategy in question.

3.2.1 NATURAL FORCE as source domain

The following section holds examples of micrometaphors that are part of the ST NATURAL FORCE megametaphor and are selected so as to exemplify all the metaphor translation strategies utilized.

3.2.1.1 Same metaphor

In example (7) the two NATURAL FORCE micrometaphors in the ST are directly translated by corresponding lexemes in the TL – i.e. by the exact same metaphor – thus contributing to keeping the megametaphor intact.
The election of Donald Trump as president of the United States is the biggest political *earthquake* of our times, and its *reverberations* are inescapably global.

In the present example, the ST uses a metaphor that compares an election result to an earthquake, a phenomenon that draws on the source domain *NATURAL FORCE*. The metaphor suggests that the election result is something violent and outside of human control, something that we cannot escape and that we will have to suffer the consequences (here *reverberations*) of. This choice of metaphor is interpreted as both conceptual and rhetorical, in line with the assumptions made by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Kövecses (2005) and Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008) presented in section 2.1. It is conceptual in that it uses the *NATURAL FORCE* source domain in order to explain to the reader what the election is like and what it means, and it is rhetorical since the choice of source domain is that of the author who could have chosen to conceptualize differently by, for example, using the source domain *BIRTH* or *AWAKENING* (the election could be “the birth of a new era” or “a new dawn”, for instance). The author has thus chosen a source domain connotating violence and human helplessness rather than one connotating something that is in essence positive.

In the ST in (7), the *NATURAL FORCE* megametaphor is manifest in two micrometaphors: *earthquake* and *reverberation*. Two blog posts on political metaphor – Rundell (2011) and Gallagher (2014) – suggest that the earthquake metaphor is lexicalized, as the term is used by Dickins (2005). This suggests that it has a fixed meaning and is commonly used. Rundell (2011) points out how the word *earthquake* is often used figuratively and Gallagher (2014) states that "Metaphorically, *earthquakes* and *tremors* can describe important events that happen in an organisation that change the normal course of activities." Searches on NOW Corpus (28 March 2017) make for a more tentative claim for lexicalization of the first of the two words, however. Both *earthquake* and *reverberation* are indeed used metaphorically, but out of the first 50 hits on *earthquake* only one shows the word used in a metaphorical sense: “Barring a political earthquake, Mr Sarkozy will enter a run off against Mr Hollande (…)” (Willsher & Sparks, 2012). When instead adding the adjective *political* to the search string there is a
total of 319 hits, suggesting that it is used in this sense and that the collocation is of essence if the metaphor is to be labelled lexicalized. Reverberation, on the other hand, proves to be a very common metaphor, with 20 out of 50 hits using the word in a non-literal sense, as in “Amazon abruptly cancelled ‘Good Girls Revolt’, in what felt like a small-scale reverberation of the election.” (Blake, 2016).

When translating the present metaphors, it is first noted that in Swedish ‘jordbävning’ and ‘skalv’ are the words that correspond to the literal semantic meanings of the SL lexemes. Searches on Korp (28 March 2017) also render only one hit out of 50 of a non-literal meaning of the word jordbävning but adding politisk to the search string renders a total of 80 hits, showing that the expression is indeed used, as in “Segern för SNP (skotska nationalistpartiet) är en politisk jordbävning” (SvD, 2008). This is taken as proof of lexicalization and consequently admission to use this word metaphorically. The noun skalv (it is also past tense of a verb and searches had to be restricted to nouns) is seemingly very rare used metaphorically in Swedish. Among the first 50 hits on Korp there is no example of the word being used metaphorically. A search on the related word efterskalv (‘aftershock’) renders a few hits with metaphorical use, however. This word was selected due a willingness to keep the ST imagery through the example.

### 3.2.1.2 Same source domain, different lexeme

Example (8) shows how the ST metaphorical lexeme belonging to the megametaphor source domain NATURAL FORCE has been translated by a different lexeme from the same source domain in the TL. This means that the megametaphor is kept intact but has been lexicalized differently.

(8) The widespread experience of the maelstrom of modernity has only heightened the lure of ressentiment. Att allt fler sveps med av den moderna tidvågen tycks bara öka ressentimentets lockelse.

Also in this example it can be argued that the choice of metaphor source domain is both conceptual and rhetorical (according to the theories of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Kövecses (2005) and Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008)). The metaphorically used lexeme maelstrom literally means ‘whirlpool’, i.e. a force of nature in the element of water. Such a force is hard to resist – it is strong and sudden and may pull even the strongest swimmer under the surface. In the ST, this is thus how modernity is conceptualized, i.e. how it is
understood and presented. This conceptualization is also rhetorical since the author has made a choice as to what source domain to use. The NATURAL FORCE source domain is chosen because it paints a frightening picture and in this particular example tells us that modernity sweeps us with it – and may pull us beneath the surface – whether we want to or not. The author could have compared modernity to something else – an embrace for example, letting modernity be understood as a caring mother instead of a violent force of nature.

According to *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* the first definition of the word *maelstrom* is its metaphorical meaning of ‘a situation full of uncontrollable events or strong emotions that make people feel weak or frightened’. This means that the metaphorical meaning is more common than the semantic one. This is confirmed by a search on the word on NOW Corpus (May 2, 2017) which shows only examples of metaphorical use in the first 50 hits. This suggests lexicalization in its most definite shape, and maelstrom can be labelled what Newmark refers to as a dead metaphor, meaning that it is hardly recognized as one any longer.

The TT uses the word *tidvåg* as an equivalent instead of *malström*, which is the direct semantic translation of *maelstrom*. *Tidvåg* means ‘tidal wave’, which is indeed also a force of nature in the element of water but which has less violent and frightening connotations. A *tidal wave* is indeed also impossible to withstand, but it is not incalculable and sudden as a *maelstrom*. A search for *malström* on Korp (2 May 2017) shows that the metaphorical use of the word seems to have taken over also in Swedish, since only one out of 50 hits (there is a total of 124) use the word in its literal sense. This is not mirrored by *Svensk ordbok* which defines the word with its literal meaning: ‘kraftig virvelström i trånga sund o.d.’. It can be concluded, however, that corpus search suggests that the word could have been directly translated but instead a different word of the same source domain has been used. Korp (2 May 2017) suggests, however, that the word *tidvåg* is much less commonly used in Swedish (only a total of eight hits), literally as well as semantically, than *malström*. In other words, even though the TT keeps the megametaphor intact through the present example by using a word of the same source domain, it would have been possible – and also preferable when the aim of the translator was to honour the conceptual as well as rhetorical choices of the ST author – to stay even closer to the ST by direct translation. Instead the translator’s choice here weakens the metaphorical conceptualization – and hence also the rhetorical impact – since the word *tidvåg* does not have the same connotations of violence and suddenness as *maelstrom*. 
3.2.1.3 Other TL metaphor

In example (9) a metaphor in the ST has been translated by a TL metaphor using a different source domain. This is also the only example of this strategy being used when translating metaphors in the material.

(9) It was this gangrenous ressentiment, festering for so long in places such as the Daily Mail and Fox News, that erupted volcanically with Trump’s victory.

Det var denna ressentimentets cancersvulst som så länge vuxit hos bland andra The Daily Mail och Fox News och som efter Trumps seger visat sig vara elakartad.

This example is a combination of two metaphors in which something that is first conceptualized as a disease (it is gangrenous) turns into a violent natural force (it erupted volcanically). Though the focus here will be on the translation of the NATURAL FORCE part of the metaphor, this translation will be affected by the metaphor that comes before it. The natural force in this example is thus an erupting volcano, serving to conceptualize the aftermaths of Trump’s victory in the 2016 election. It explains how Trump’s victory brought matters to the surface that were for a long time before simmering underneath it. The volcano was there before Trump won, so to speak, but it was not until the actual victory that it had its outbreak, releasing its deadly streams of lava. The metaphor is thus clearly conceptual, as this is described by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and Kövecses (2005), since it uses the meaning and connotations of one concept to explain another. This choice of conceptualization on behalf of the ST author is also interpreted as rhetorical, as Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008) suggests is a major function of metaphor. This is because the ST author’s choice of source domain tells us that his opinion of the election result is that it is something negative with negative aftermaths, and this he wants his readers to agree with. His choice of source domain means that he has deselected source domains with more positive and less violent connotations. Thus, it seems evident that his choice of NATURAL FORCE as source domain is a rhetorical choice.

The search string erupt volcanically has only one hit on NOW Corpus (20 April 2017) and the fact that it is also an example of metaphorical use is not enough to draw any conclusions as to its lexicalization. Searches on other combinations of the words volcano/volcanic/volcanically and erupt/eruption/erupting do not suggest that it is an
overly common metaphorical concept but that it can be used. *Volcanic eruption* is not used as a metaphor among the first 50 hits, though it occurs once as a simile in “Like a volcanic eruption, he forces his pain down his readers’ minds (…)” (Sam-Duru, 2017). *Volcano eruption* gives two simile hits and *erupting volcano* is used as a metaphor twice and as a simile four times out of 50. In Swedish volcano eruptions can also be used metaphorically. Searches on Korp (20 April 2017) give that three out of 50 hits on the word *vulkanutbrott* are examples of metaphorical use, as in “Det var ett kreativt vulkanutbrott som kraftfullt skakade om musikindustrin i sina grundvalar” (Jensen, 2013). The reason why the same source domain is not used in the TT in this particular example is thus not that it is not possible, but rather the mix of metaphors. In the translation, the adjective *gangrenous* has become the noun *cancersvulst* and also the subject of the sentence. A direct metaphor translation would result in a TT where a tumour erupts volcanically – conjuring up a different, rather odd, image altogether. In the TT, the choice fell on developing the cancer metaphor (part of the ILLNESS megametaphor) by stating that the tumour proved to be *elakartad* (malign).

In conclusion, the metaphor translation method used in this example was to use a different TL metaphor. The NATURAL FORCE source domain is thus lost but also exchanged for the source domain of the other megametaphor in the text, namely ILLNESS. This can be said to be in line with the conceptual and rhetorical choices of the ST author.

3.2.1.4 Sense

The last example using NATURAL FORCE as source domain discussed here is example (10) overleaf. This example is one out of two in the material in which the ST metaphor has been translated by a non-metaphorical equivalent, i.e. sense, in the TT, thus resulting in loss of the megametaphor source domain NATURAL FORCE as well as of figurative language as a whole.
Certainly, the current *conflagration* has brought to the surface what Friedrich Nietzsche called "ressentiment" (…)

Det står klart att dagens *kaos* lockat fram det som Friedrich Nietzsche kallade "ressentiment" (…)  

Again, the ST author’s choice of metaphor can be interpreted as both conceptual and rhetorical. It is conceptual, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and Kövecses (2005) argue, in that it describes current events like an unstoppable fire – a *conflagration* – and uses the meaning and connotations of that lexeme as a means to categorize and explain the phenomena in question. The image conjured up by the word *conflagration* is that the current events described are all-consuming and uncontrollable and have consequences that are hard to foresee, control and stop. This choice of concept also excludes other possible ones, however, and current events are for example not described as an unstoppable merry-go-round or train or movement, which are also possible comparisons but with more positive connotations. In other words, the conceptual choice is also rhetorical. The metaphor is chosen and used to convince the reader of an opinion, as described by Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008), since it wishes to paint what is happening as something dangerous and close to out of human control.

The English lexeme *conflagration* directly translates to Swedish ‘storbrand’, a word that can also be used metaphorically as in “Takten måste minska, annars hotar både överhettning och storbrand, men i Borgs tabeller ser det ljus ut flera år framåt…” (Jonsson, 2011). A search on Korp (18 April 2017) suggests that it is not very commonly used metaphorically, however, with one out of 50 hits not referring to an actual physical fire. In English, metaphorical use of the word is instead more common than non-metaphorical use. In NOW Corpus (18 April 2017) the 50 first hits on *conflagration* hold 15 instances of non-metaphorical use of the word, i.e. referring to real fire. Thus 35 out of 50 instances show metaphorical usage, as exemplified by “…the potential of sparking off political conflagration in Nigeria.” (Okoye, 2017). This suggests that the metaphor is lexicalized in English but not in Swedish, and a direct translation may render an unidiomatic TL equivalent that the target audience will not necessarily understand in the right way. The translator’s choice was here to exchange the metaphor for sense, using the word *kaos* (‘chaos’) that can be said to sum up what *conflagration* brings.
3.2.2 **ILLNESS as source domain**

The following examples are part of the ST megametaphor that uses ILLNESS as source domain. In 3.1.2 the quantitative analysis showed that the micrometaphors – the individual metaphorical lexemes or phrases – belonging to this megametaphor were either directly translated by a corresponding lexeme (70 percent) or translated by a different lexeme belonging to the same source domain (30 percent). The second strategy was thus far more common in translation of the ILLNESS metaphors than in translation of the NATURAL FORCE metaphors (with ten percent of the lexemes/phrases). Below two examples are analysed, one representing each metaphor translation strategy.

**3.2.2.1 Same metaphor**

In example (11) the ST metaphor has been directly translated by a lexical equivalent in the TL. This means that through this example the megametaphor is kept intact.

(11) This intellectual effort – which was first undertaken more than a century ago by the thinkers cited here – would necessarily take us beyond liberalism and its faith in the *curative power* of economic growth.

En sådan intellektuell kraftsamling – som inleddes för över ett århundrade sedan av tänkarna citerade ovan – skulle nödvändigtvis ta oss bortom liberalismen och dess tro på den ekonomiska tillväxterns läkande kraft.

In example (5) economic growth is conceptualized as something that – according to liberals – has *curative power*, thus connotating some illness that both can and needs to be cured. The medicine suggested is economic growth. If you believe that something has the ability to cure you are certain to estimate it highly, which is what the ST author claims that liberals do when it comes to economic growth. This means that the conceptualization in this example is done not in order to argue for something but rather in order to argue against it. Liberals are too focused on economic growth, according to the ST author, who thinks it is necessary we go beyond this “faith” and its belief that economic growth is a kind of saviour. This is also the reason why this metaphor is not only conceptual, as defined by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and Kövecses (2005), but also rhetorical, as presented by Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008): it underlines what is looked upon as, and is supposed to be understood as, a liberal misconception.
The TL expression *curative power* is ‘läkande kraft’ in Swedish. And as has already been stated this expression is directly translated. In NOW Corpus (3 May 2017) the search string *curative power* renders only 25 hits, but these suggest that the expression is more often used metaphorically, i.e. not in relation to a specific medical condition or medicine (15 cases) and as exemplified by “The curative power of democracy has had its impact” (Khare, 2017), than in a literal sense (10 cases), as exemplified by “The opioids that are prescribed so often do not have any curative power” (*The Chattanoogan*, 2016). In Swedish, the directly translated equivalent expression is even more commonly used in a broader metaphorical sense. As a matter of fact, there were no examples among the 50 examined where the expression was used when discussing a certain medical condition or medicine. Seemingly the metaphor is lexicalized in both languages, as described by Dickins, and direct translation of the metaphor thus not only possible but also pragmatically correct.

### 3.2.2.2 Same source domain, different lexeme

The last example, example (12), illustrates an instance of the source domain being transferred – and consequently the megametaphor being kept intact – to the TT by means of a different phrase in the TL than in the SL.

(12) **In search of a balm for these wounds,** many intellectuals have embraced nostalgic fantasies of vanished unity.

I jakt på ett botemedel mot sjukdomen så har många intellektuella hemfallit åt nostalgiska fantasier om ett fölorat samförstånd.

In this example, the ST metaphorical phrase *a balm for these wounds* refers to the solution of a problem, the problem being division in society. This choice of metaphor thus conceptualizes the problem as an injury, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and Kövecses (2005). The image painted is that the division is a wound inflicted on society, which is pictured as a human being, that needs to be healed or at least soothed. This choice of concept is most surely also rhetorical, as described by Elmelund Kjeldsen (2008), since it serves to persuade the reader that society is wounded by the mentioned division and that this wound needs to be seen to and healed, here referred to as a *ba?m*. Had the author not wished to paint societal division as something problematic but rather something
positive and desirable he would have conceptualized differently, and perhaps spoken about “icing on” or “a cherry on top of” the cake that is the status of society.

When looking at the metaphor as a translating issue, the individual lexemes are first investigated. Of the 50 first hits on balm on NOW Corpus (24 March 2017) 17 were used in a metaphorical sense, exemplified by “If you support me in pouring a balm on the wounds of the people who have been exploited so long (…)” (Shahbaz Sharif, 2017). This is one out of two examples in this sample that pair balm with wound. Among the 50 first hits on the noun wound on NOW Corpus (24 March 2017) five are metaphorical uses of it as in for example “To rub a little salt in the wound for Boston, the Leafs scored…” (Blackburn, 2017). This small corpus search thus suggests that this metaphor is lexicalized – as described by Dickins – in English. The Swedish word for balm, ‘balsam’, can also be used metaphorically, as is underlined by a search for the word on Korp (24 March 2017) which renders 18 metaphorical uses of the word out of 50, one example being “…den är vilsam och som balsam för öronen” (GP, 1994). Wound is ‘sår’ in Swedish and this word can also be used metaphorically; 20 out of 50 instances on Korp (24 March 2017). One example is: “Priset blev plåster på såren för Gonzales” (DN, 1987), which also shows a common match for the word, namely plåster (plaster), thus stating that the wounds were covered up. The phrase plåster på såren is a rather common Swedish metaphor, with 6273 hits on Korp and it is here a possible translation alternative. The searches prove that keeping the source domain in the Swedish translation is a realistic strategy – the wound can be directly translated and the balm exchanged for a plaster. Plåster på såren is not a very strong expression in Swedish, however. It is seldom used together with any references to a larger group of people or a more general trauma, such as societal division, corpus search suggests. A plaster is also not something you go in search of, as is suggested in the ST. The ST wound is seemingly not to be looked upon as something that can be easily patched up or soothed after a visit to the local pharmacy, which is why a plaster makes for a weak translation alternative. The alternative opted for is instead botemedel för sjukdomen (‘cure for the disease’), exchanging the wound for a disease and the balm for a cure. This alternative keeps the ILLNESS source domain but finds a pragmatically more correct way of doing so by means of a different lexicalization of it.
4 Summary and conclusion

This essay has analysed the translation of metaphors in a piece of expressive journalistic writing with an operative aim. The examined metaphors use NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS as source domains and are part of larger structures termed megametaphor. These megametaphors – and the lexemes and phrases belonging to them – are interpreted as conceptual and rhetorical choices on behalf of the author, and as such something that should be transferred to the TT. The aim of the essay was twofold: to investigate to what extent the megametaphors were kept intact through the process of translation and to show how the individual metaphors can be interpreted as both conceptual and rhetorical. The aim was met by answering three research questions.

In answer to the first research question, the study finds that the source domains NATURAL FORCE and ILLNESS are commonly used for metaphorical conceptualization in both English and Swedish, and that the two megametaphor source domains are largely kept (in 93 percent of the cases) in the translation.

The study also shows, in answer to the second research question, that even though direct translation – from one SL lexeme or phrase to a TL one with the same semantic meaning – is the most common metaphor translation strategy used (in 72 percent of the cases), it is also rather common for the source domain to be kept in translation but through a different lexical realization in the TL. This strategy was used in 21 percent of the cases and can be interpreted as some proof that it is not necessary to directly translate in order to respect author intentions, as these are expressed by conceptual and rhetorical choices manifest in the metaphors selected. The translation also held examples of two additional translation strategies, but these were used only seldom. These were the strategy of translating a metaphor to a different TL metaphor (only used once in the material) and the strategy of translating a metaphor to sense (used twice in the material). The fact that there were alternative strategies to the ones that lead to the transfer of source domain from ST to TT, but that these were seldom used, underlines how transferring author intentions in the shape of metaphors can be an active choice for a translator who will have different strategies to choose between.

In answer to the third research question, the study finds that, and shows how, the metaphors in the analysis can be interpreted as both conceptual and rhetorical choices on behalf of the author. The two source domains that Mishra (2016) uses for the two megametaphors consist of phenomena that we cannot control but will inevitably still be
subject to. These concepts serve well as source domains when conceptualizing other phenomena that, according to a certain author for example, are frightening and uncontrollable. In both languages, however, there are often also alternative ways of conceptualizing that can mirror the opinions and aims of the individual. If one does not believe that a certain phenomenon is — as in this case — frightening, one can find other source domains that help paint a different, perhaps more positive, picture of the phenomena in question. Thus, one can use conceptualization as a rhetorical device, something which this essay has also underlined and taken as reason to transfer metaphor source domains when possible.

It is not possible to draw any general conclusions based on a small-scale study of the translation of a single text. The data consisted of a total of 43 metaphors that used the two source domains and though that can be regarded a high number in a specific text, it is still only one text translated by one translator. A study that can be used for drawing more general conclusion about the frequency of source domain transfer into TTs and about what metaphor translation strategies are used will naturally need to be much larger. It needs to investigate more translations by different translators of texts written by different authors, and also include more source domains. In a larger study, it would also be possible to draw conclusions about source domain universality, something which this essay has only touched upon briefly. In order to find if the two metaphor source domains investigated here are universal — and thus can be used as conceptual and rhetorical devices in many cultures and languages — further and much more extensive research needs to be carried out, both on original texts and on translations.

What this study does show, however, is that metaphors can be an important part of a text, for conceptual and explanatory reasons, as well as operative and rhetorical ones. This implies that the translation of metaphor is an important issue that will have consequences for how the ST author’s intentions are transferred into the TT. A metaphor that is altered or lost in translation can mean that a piece of the world that the ST author presents is altered or lost, at both conceptual and rhetorical cost.
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