When translators go barking up the wrong tree

*A study of metaphor translation strategies in a dog breed book*
Abstract
The translation of metaphors can cause problems for a translator since what is typical for a metaphor is that the intended meaning does not match its literal meaning, which can lead to misunderstandings. Apart from this, language differences and cultural differences can also cause problems. This essay deals with the translation of metaphors in a dog breed book from English to Swedish. The aim of the essay is to investigate which translation strategies that are used when translating metaphors and whether lexicalized and non-lexicalized source language metaphors require different translation strategies.

The source language metaphors were found by using the Metaphor Identification Procedure which in this study means determining the lexical units in the source text, deciding the meaning of each unit and then comparing with dictionaries to see whether the lexical unit has a more basic or contemporary meaning and if the meaning in this particular context can be understood based on the more basic or contemporary meaning. If so, the lexical unit was determined to be metaphorically used in this context. The source language metaphors were then classified according to whether they are lexicalized or non-lexicalized, based on Dickins (2005) classification.

The study finds that the most common way of translating a source language metaphor is by paraphrasing it into a non-metaphorical expression followed by using the same or a similar target language metaphor. No clear indications of lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors requiring different translation strategies were found.
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1 Introduction

Metaphors are part of the so called figurative language and what makes them special is that the intended meaning of a word or a phrase does not match its literal meaning (Dickins 2005:2) as in the following example: ‘time flies’ where the intended meaning is that ‘the time passes surprisingly quickly’ (Cambridge dictionary), a meaning which is in contrast with the literal meaning of the word ‘flies’. This means that a metaphor can have different meanings in different contexts. Furthermore, metaphors can be anything from everyday words or phrases or technical language which we do not really think of as metaphors, like ‘the foot of the mountain’ or ‘the eye of a needle’, to the creative metaphors found in poetry (Stålhammar 1997:46ff).

This difference between a metaphor’s intended and literal meaning is probably why an old writer’s rule says that you should avoid metaphors if you know that the text will be translated (Melin 2012:126). It is easier said than done, but the truth is that you never know if the translator will realise that a less established metaphor actually is a metaphor, or if he or she will understand it as literal language. Or, if the translator does understand that it is a metaphor, there might not be a good equivalent in the target language (henceforth TL) (Melin 2012:126). But language differences are not the only thing that can cause problems for a translator; context and cultural differences are also important factors. A by now well-known example of this is in connection with the oil disaster in the Mexican Gulf in 2010 when the Swedish-born BP chairman Carl Henrik Svanberg at a press conference outside the White House stated that “We care about the small people” when referring to the oil spill victims (Gerhart 2010). To care about the small people as opposed to the people with a lot of money and power makes sense in Swedish (att bry sig om den lilla människan/småfolket), but to the Americans small people meant either short people or that some people are less worth than others (Melin 2012:126). This was a simple mistranslation and not at all what Svanberg meant, but nonetheless, many people were offended by his statement and Svanberg had to apologize for his mistake (Gerhart 2010).

Mistakes like that of Svanberg, show that as a translator not only do you need a good command of the source language (henceforth SL) to understand the meaning of metaphorically used words and sentences, but an awareness of possible strategies for transferring that meaning into the TL is also helpful. That awareness is possible to acquire by reading translation theory. Studying different translation strategies at work may therefore increase the translator’s competence for handling this kind of translation.
problem. In Dickins’ (2005:65) words: “the competent analysis of textual material sharpens language awareness and contributes towards better translation.” The purpose of the present paper is therefore to study which translation strategies that are used in the translation of metaphors from English to Swedish and whether there is a difference in strategy between lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors.

1.1 Aim and Scope
As stated above, the aim of the present paper is to study the translation strategies used when translating metaphorical language in a dog breed book from English to Swedish. The following two research questions will be the focus points for the analysis:

- Which translation strategies are used when translating metaphorical language from English to Swedish?
- Do lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors require different translation strategies?

1.2 Material
The source text (henceforth ST) in the present paper is the book *Japanese Spitz: a comprehensive owner's guide* written by the British Japanese Spitz breeder Michael P. Rule and published by Kennel Club Books in 2009, as part of their series of books on rare dog breeds. The book comprises ten chapters dealing with everything from the history and characteristics of the Japanese Spitz, to how to take care of your dog from puppyhood to old age, but also training and the behaviour of the dog. In this paper, the first seven pages of the fourth chapter *Your puppy* and the entire sixth chapter *Training your Japanese Spitz* have been used. The reason for choosing these two chapters was due to their different content and the fact that they were less formal than for example the chapters about the history of the breed and the breed standard, and thus more likely to contain metaphors. It should be noted though, that while Michael P. Rule is stated as the author of the book, chapter six was written by dog-trainer Charlotte Schwartz.

Based on Ingo’s (2007:127–128) description of different basic text functions, the function of the present ST is informative in that it conveys knowledge and information about the Japanese spitz and aspects connected with owning such a dog. It is also imperative due to the fact that it tells you how to act to train a Japanese Spitz. The book
is written in a rather informal American English; the writer speaks directly to the reader through the use of the pronoun you, e.g. ‘You are his leader: his provider of food, water, shelter and security’ (Rule 2009:77) and in some places expressions and exclamation marks are used in a way that gives the text a more informal feeling, as in ‘Easy does it!’ (Rule 2009:38) and ‘In other words, your Japanese Spitz does wonders for your ego because he constantly reminds you that you are not only his leader, you are his hero!’ (Rule 2009:76). The language also contains plenty of terminology related to dogs, such as leash, pack, puppies and breeder.

The audience of the ST is owners or prospective owners of a Japanese Spitz and others with an interest in the breed and they could come from all different levels of society and education. The target text (henceforth TT) readers are assumed to have the same interest in dogs and therefore, no additions have been made to explain the terminology since the readers of the TT are expected to be familiar with the general terminology used in connection with dogs.

1.3 Method

1.3.1 Translation

After reading through the chosen text for a general feel of the language and content, a translation was made in which translation difficulties were noted. Parallel texts on other dog breeds and dog training as well as brochures from the Swedish Kennel Club and dictionaries (see the list of references) were used to get the terminology right and to determine the level of formality and the style that are generally used in similar texts written in Swedish.

With regard to translation method, Ingo (2007:338–339) states that for the target language reader, a translation is just a text among all the other texts and sometimes it is not even obvious that it is in fact a translation. Nevertheless, it is the translator’s responsibility to produce a target text which is adapted to the specific rules of the target language and which is as clear and informative as the ST, but also adapted to the context where it is to be used (ibid.). The translator also needs to decide on how free or exact the translation needs to be, but also how free or exact it can be with regard to the language pairs involved (ibid.:339). Ingo (2007:218) also states that when translating informative texts, it is generally more important to transfer the meaning of the ST than
the form of its language. With the above statements in mind, the focus has been on transferring the content and meaning of the source text into the target text and adapting it to the target audience. This is what Newmark (1998:47) terms a *communicative translation*. However, I have also, as far as possible, tried to transfer the form of the ST language which in many cases was possible due to the closeness between the source language (English) and the target language (Swedish).

1.3.2 Study

The ST was subjected to the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP), (see section 2.3), which was designed by the Pragglejaz Group (2007). Using the MIP means going through the ST and determining the different lexical units. All headwords that can be found in a dictionary have been considered a lexical unit in this study. Then one has to decide what the meaning of each lexical unit is in that particular context. The third step is to decide whether each lexical unit has a more basic or contemporary meaning (present day meanings since the TT audience is considered to be contemporary) than that used in the ST and for this, various monolingual dictionaries of American English (listed under Dictionaries and corpora in the list of references) were used. If a lexical unit was found to have a more basic or contemporary meaning according to a dictionary, and if it was possible to understand the contextual meaning based on the more contemporary or basic meaning, it was determined to be a metaphor. The metaphors were then classified according to Dickins’ (2005:9) classification into lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors (see section 2.4). If a metaphor was found in a dictionary with the same metaphorical sense as the one used in the ST, then the metaphor was classified as lexicalized. Similarly, if it could not be found in any dictionary and if the reader needs to meet the metaphor in its context to understand it, it was classified as non-lexicalized.

To help determine whether the translation of a SL metaphor is a metaphor in the TL or not, *Svensk ordbok* (available online) and *Svenskt språkbruk: ordbok över konstruktion och fraser* (2015) have been of help, as well as the Swedish corpora *Språkbanken* (available online).

Furthermore, it was decided that instances of figurative language that were found in idiom dictionaries, i.e. idioms, were to be left out of the analysis due to the fact that according to Gibbs et al. (1997:142) most of the scholars researching figurative language do not consider idioms to be particularly metaphorical, but more as examples
of so called dead metaphors (i.e. they are such a common part of our language that that we do not even recognize them as being metaphorical).

The method for analysis is both quantitative and qualitative. For the quantitative part, the individual metaphors were collected and categorized according to lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors and translation strategy used. The qualitative analysis serves to explain the translation strategies used when translating the SL metaphor into the TL.

2 Theoretical Background

Within Translation Studies, the two main concerns regarding metaphors have been whether they can be translated at all, and strategies for transferring them from one language to another (Samaniego Fernández 2013:162). According to Dagut (1976:33) “the translatability of metaphor fluctuates according to the complex of cultural and linguistic factors involved in each particular case” and this can really put a translator to the test. Newmark (1998:104) goes as far as stating that “Whilst the central problem of translation is the overall choice of a translation method for a text, the most important particular problem is the translation of metaphor”. Dickins (2005:4) argues that metaphors are important because they are “a pervasive feature of language.” However, it is not the fact that metaphors are a common part of the language that makes them important in translation. Though, the fact that it may not always be easy for a translator to find a simple TT correspondence to the ST metaphor, suggests that metaphors are an important issue in translation (ibid.:5). However, it is the metaphors’ stylistic and referential implications that make them important in translation according to Dickins (2005:13).

This section will continue with a discussion of problems when translating metaphors before moving on to a definition of metaphorical language, the different parts of metaphor, their classification and strategies that can be used when translating them.

2.1 Problems when translating metaphors

Most often, writers compose their texts without considering a future translation into different languages and hence, metaphors are chosen so that they will be understood by
the readers of the text, i.e. the readers should preferably be equipped with associations
which are close to those of the writer (Dobrzyńska 1995:596). Kövecses (2014:31) adds
to this by stating that people also tend to draw on their field of expertise when they use
metaphors which means that they adjust the metaphors to the contextual factors.
However, according to Dobrzyńska (1995:598), when these texts are later translated
into different languages they will not only be transferred into new languages but also
into new cultures and to readers with different associations and experiences or they
might even be from different epochs, which means that the world the writer and the
reader have in common might only be hypothetical. This is also pointed out by Ingo
(2007:120), who states that when translating a metaphor into the target language, the
translator needs to decide whether the thing being compared to will be understood by
the target readers given their cultural background. The chosen expression in the target
text must also give the same associations to the target readers as the metaphor in the
source text (ibid.).

To be able to translate a metaphor, the first step is to actually recognize it as a
metaphor. Stålhammar (1997:36–38) writes that to be able to interpret a metaphorical
expression, one needs to have an understanding of the basic meaning of the
metaphorically used expression, but also knowledge about the world. She brings up the
example man is a wolf where one first of all needs to understand what a wolf is, and
secondly, in which way a wolf is viewed in the present culture and which of its
culturally defined traits that the statement draws on. Is it for example its cruelty or its
fur that is referred to, or the fact that it is a predator or a pack animal (ibid.)? Therefore,
it is of fundamental importance to understand how a metaphorically used expression is
understood in the source language if one should be able to transfer that meaning into the
target language (ibid.:48). Stålhammar (1997:49) further states, that if a translation is
done too quickly, the result could be a loan of foreign terms, or translation loans of so
called ‘false friends’. False friends are words in two languages that look or sound the
same, e.g. the English and Swedish words actual/aktuell, eventual/eventuell (Ingo

Once a metaphor has been identified and understood, the next step is finding a
suitable equivalent expression in the target language (Wang 2013:2327). Since
metaphors contain abstract meanings, finding an equivalent abstract meaning may pose
a challenge for translators (Kövecses 2014:25). Furthermore, there are contextual
factors that influence the metaphorical meanings heavily (ibid.). Culture is not only
things like schools, cities and organizations (Wang 2013:2330) but also material things like food and clothes, gestures and habits, environment and ecology, cultural heritage and values of the society and all this can cause translations problems as well (Fernández Guerra 2012:4–5). However, a cultural awareness of the translator will help bridge that problem (ibid.).

Furthermore, the style of a text depends on the author’s choice of words and is a reflection of his or her emotions and personality (Wang 2013:2329) and translators of non-fictional texts, as is the focus in the present paper, always have to decide how important it is to keep the rhetorical style of the source text in the target text (Knowles & Moon 2006:92).

If the target language has the same metaphor as the source language, i.e. if the TL metaphor uses the same image and sense, then there is no problem (Knowles & Moon 2006:89–90). However, it is possible that both languages have the same metaphor (image), but that it has a different connotation in the target language or is used in a different way (ibid.:90). An example of this could be the word cat which has the denotation ‘a small animal with fur, four legs, a tail, and claws’ (Cambridge dictionary) but whose connotation in English could be ‘spiteful’ or ‘malicious’ while in German the connotation is ‘grace’ and ‘agility’ (Snell-Hornby 1988:56). It is also possible that the frequency or the formality of the metaphors is different in the two languages. These aspects may force the translator to choose a different strategy than literal when translating the metaphor (ibid.).

In the next section, a definition of metaphor will be made before the different parts of metaphors and their classification is discussed.

### 2.2 Defining metaphors

According to Samaniego Fernández (2013:162), most translation theorists seem to avoid defining metaphors and some study metaphor translation problems without ever defining what they actually mean by metaphor. However, there is a need of defining what is meant by metaphor in this paper in order to be able to find, classify and study the metaphor translation strategies.

Metaphors are perhaps most commonly thought of in connection with poetry, fiction or other kinds of creative writing, but they are just as present in our everyday
language, e.g. in technical descriptions, every day gossip, sports commentary, newspapers, magazines and different media (Melin 2012:16, Glucksberg 2001:v).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980:3) have come to the conclusion that metaphors are a part of how we understand the world around us, i.e. we think and act in metaphors though we are perhaps not aware of it. One example discussed by them (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:4–5), is the metaphor ‘argument is war’ as in ‘I won the argument’ where winning an argument is not just talked about using terms of war but is also seen as actually winning the argument. Hence, the language used to talk about arguments is not rhetorical or imaginative but literal, since this is the way arguments are conceived (ibid.).

Lakoff and Johnson’s theory, which is known as the “cognitive linguistic view of metaphor” (Kövecses 2010:x), states that metaphors, as opposed to the traditional view, are concepts rather than words and they are used in everyday language to help us understand different concepts, which means that they are not only produced by skilled poets and speakers. The main purpose of metaphor is therefore not rhetorical or artistic and often they are not even based on similarity. Instead, we use the metaphors to make sense of abstract things such as life by talking and thinking about it in terms of for example a journey, which is more concrete to us (ibid.:4).

In the present paper, the definition of metaphor is based on Dickins (2005:2), who defines metaphor as “a figure of speech in which a word or a phrase is used in a non-basic sense suggesting a likeness or analogy (whether real or not […]) with another more basic sense of the same word or phrase”. This definition was chosen because the classification of metaphors in the present paper will also be based on Dickins’ (2005) categories and this is believed to contribute to consistency in what metaphors are and how to categorize them. Furthermore, Dickins (2005:2) states that this definition is rather traditional. However, determining whether a word or phrase is used metaphorically is not always that easy, as discussed in section 2.1. Therefore, as a tool in helping to determine whether a word or phrase is used in a non-basic sense, i.e. metaphorically, in the ST, the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) will be used. The MIP was developed by a group of researchers as a tool for metaphor scholars in deciding whether a word or phrase is used metaphorically in a particular context (Pragglejaz Group 2007:2). The procedure was developed because there is often disagreement about what a metaphoric word or phrase actually is, and also because, as
mentioned previously, many metaphor scholars do not always specify what they mean by metaphor (ibid.:1).

The MIP works according to the following steps:

1. Read the entire text-discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text-discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
   (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be
      – More concrete: what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell and taste.
      – Related to bodily action.
      – More precise (as opposed to vague)
      – Historically older.
   Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
   (c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current-contemporary meaning in other contexts than in the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in a comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical (Pragglejaz Group 2007:3).

Next, the different parts of a metaphor will be discussed before moving on to the classification of metaphors and possible translation strategies.

2.3 The parts of metaphor

To be able to discuss metaphor, there are three things that need to be identified and examined (Knowles & Moon 2006:9). First of all, it is the metaphor, which can be anything from a single word to a longer stretch of text. Then it is the meaning, i.e. what
the metaphor refers to and finally the *similarity* between the metaphor and the meaning (ibid.). These three aspects are often referred to as the *vehicle*, the *topic* and the *grounds* (ibid.). Knowles and Moon (2006:9) illustrate the terms through the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context</th>
<th>Be prepared for a <em>mountain</em> of paperwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metaphor/vehicle</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning/topic</td>
<td>a large amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connection/grounds</td>
<td>ideas of size, being immovable and difficult to deal with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vehicle then, is the metaphor that is used to understand the topic which is its intended, or literal, meaning and the grounds is what the topic and vehicle have in common, “the relationship between the literal and metaphorical meanings (ibid.:9–10). In the above example, the grounds could also for example have been the coldness of prototypical mountains or their snow-capped or rocky tops (ibid.:10).

The notions topic and vehicle will be used when discussing different translation strategies in section 2.5. In the next section, the categorization of metaphors will be discussed.

### 2.4 Classifying metaphors

There are different ways of categorizing metaphors, but most authors usually divide metaphors into different categories depending on how new or lexicalized they are (Samaniego Fernández 2013:165).

One of the most often cited typologies is that of Newmark (1998) which distinguishes six different types of metaphor, namely ‘dead’, ‘cliché’, ‘stock’, ‘adapted’, ‘recent’ and ‘original’. Dead metaphors are, according to Newmark (1998:106), metaphors which are such a common part of our language that we do not even consider them as metaphors any longer, e.g. ‘the *foot* of the mountain’ or ‘the *mouth* of the river’. However, a dead metaphor can come to life again if it begins being used in a different way e.g. using ‘rub out’ in the sense of killing someone instead of removing something (Newmark 1981:86) or if a chair starts limping on one of its *legs* (Stålhammar 1997:14).

Cliché metaphors are, according to Newmark (1998:107), metaphors which are no longer very useful, and he considers them “a murky area between dead and stock
metaphor” (Newmark, 1981:87). Examples of clichés given by Newmark (ibid.) are ‘explore all avenues’ and ‘leave no stone unturned’.

A stock (or standard) metaphor is “an established metaphor which in an informal context is an efficient and concise method of covering a physical and/or mental situation both referentially and pragmatically” and an example is ‘She wears the trousers and he plays second fiddle’ (Newmark 1998:108).

Stock metaphors have not been killed by overuse like the dead metaphors though some of them are clichés (Newmark 1981:87). Adapted metaphors are stock metaphors that have somehow been adapted or personalised (Bojovic 2014:74) and Newmark (1998:111) illustrates with the following example “the ball is a little in their court” where a little has been added to the stock metaphor ‘the ball is in their court’.

Recent metaphors in turn, are new metaphors that have often spread very quickly in the source language. They can for example be new words for already established ones e.g. pissed for drunk or skint for without money (Newmark 1998:111).

Original metaphors are in Newmark’s (1998:112) typology the metaphors that are created by the writer or speaker and he is of the opinion that these should be translated literally because they: (a) contain an important part of the writer’s message and reflect his or her personality and (b) this kind of metaphor will enrich the target language as well.

Dickins (2005:9ff) on the other hand, divides metaphors into two different categories: lexicalized and non-lexicalized. Lexicalized metaphors are those that are “recognizably metaphorical, but whose meaning in a particular language is relatively clearly fixed” (Dickins 2005:9). These metaphors are by Dickins (ibid.) illustrated through the example rat which, apart from its literal meaning of a type of ‘rodent’, also can have the metaphorical meaning “a person who deserts his friends or associates.” Newmark’s dead, stock and recent metaphors are included in Dickins’ lexicalized metaphors (Dickins 2005:25). However, Dickins (2005:18–19) has chosen to omit Newmark’s cliché metaphors since he considers Newmark’s examples marginally or not at all metaphorical but more like “stock metaphors which one happens to particularly dislike."

The non-lexicalized metaphors, according to Dickins (2005:9), are those which do not have a meaning that is clearly fixed. Instead the meaning of these metaphors may vary from context to context which means that it is up to the reader or listener to figure

---

1 Newmark (1998) does not explain what an adapted metaphor is.
out the meaning. Dickins (2005:9) illustrates this kind of metaphor with the example *tree* as in ‘A man is a tree’. To understand this metaphor, it needs to be put in its context since different interpretations are possible in that one can compare man to a tree in regard to its trunk, branches and leaves, but also in regard to its flowers or fruits or that it loses its leaves in the autumn (ibid.). Newmark’s adapted and original metaphors are included in Dickins’ (2005:25) non-lexicalized metaphors.

For the purpose of the small-scale study in the present paper, Dickins’ (2005) categorization into lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors will be used since the focus is on the translation strategies used rather than the type of metaphors in the source and target texts, and because it offers a clearer way of classifying metaphors than what Newmark’s typology does.

The next section will deal with prescriptive and descriptive translation strategies and strategies that can be used when translating SL metaphors into the TL.

### 2.5 Translation strategies

The translation of metaphor has always been of interest within translation studies (Samaniego Fernández 2013:159). However, even though a cognitive point of view has begun to be incorporated in the study of metaphor translation, the approach is still to a large extent normative, i.e. certain criteria which state in which way a certain translation should be done in a particular culture, have been imposed on the translators (ibid.). The source text has been seen as the model which should be copied in the target text and faithfulness to the source text is then seen as the purpose of all translations. Thus, the focus tends to be on what is lost in the translation or mistakes that have been made, while offering closed lists of translation strategies (ibid.). One of the most commonly used prescriptive lists of translation strategies is that of Newmark (Samaniego Fernández 2013:166). Newmark’s list contains the following recommended ways of translating metaphors and the strategies are also put in order of preference (Newmark 1981:88):

1) reproduce the same metaphor in the TL as in the SL
2) replace the SL metaphor with a standard TL metaphor
3) replace the SL metaphor with a TL simile
4) replace the SL metaphor with a TL simile plus sense
5) replace the SL metaphor with the sense in the TL
6) delete the SL metaphor in the TT
7) translate the SL metaphor into the TL and add the sense.

As opposed to prescriptive models, descriptive models focus on what translation is like in reality and studying metaphor translation from a descriptive point of view would instead give information about the trends of translational behaviour (Samaniego Fernández 2013:160). The translation in the present paper will be based on Toury’s (2012) and van den Broeck’s (1981) descriptive models of translation strategies, which will be presented below, and the metaphors in both the source text and the target text will be considered.

From Toury’s (2012:108–109) descriptive point of view, the following translation strategies may, “in principle […] be relevant to any study of metaphor-and-translation.” Since Toury has not illustrated his strategies with any examples, I have inserted my own to illustrate the different strategies:

(1) metaphor into ‘same’ metaphor, as in ‘ray of hope’ translated as ‘en strimma av hopp’
(2) metaphor into ‘different’ metaphor, for example ‘they gave him the cold shoulder’ translated as ‘de gav honom kalla handen’
(3) metaphor into non-metaphor, as in ‘dropped testicles’ translated as ‘testiklarna är på plats i pungen’
(4) metaphor into 0 (i.e. complete omission, leaving no trace in the target text)
(5) non-metaphor into metaphor, for example ‘she disciplined the boy angrily’ translated as ‘hon skällde på pojken’
(6) 0 into metaphor (i.e., addition, pure and simple, with no linguistic motivation in the source text) (Toury 2012:108–109)

The main difference between Toury’s and Newmark’s strategies is that Toury’s are possible ways of translating SL metaphors into the TL, while Newmark’s are recommended ways put in a preferred order as well. Since Newmark’s focus is on the source text, he does not take into consideration the possibility of non-metaphorical SL being translated into a metaphor in the TL (Samaniego Fernandez 2013:166).
Since Toury does not give any examples to illustrate what is meant by ‘the ‘same’ and ‘different’ metaphor, the translation strategies suggested by van den Broeck (1981:77) will also be discussed. According to van den Broeck (ibid.), there are three theoretically different possibilities of metaphor translation:

(1) ‘sensu stricto’, which means that both the topic and vehicle of the SL metaphor are translated into the TL (which is what Toury calls ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’)

(2) substitution, which means that the SL vehicle is replaced by a TL vehicle which has more or less the same topic (which is what Toury calls ‘metaphor into different metaphor’)

(3) paraphrase, which means that a SL metaphor is translated into a non-metaphorical expression in the TL

Based on the above discussion, the metaphor translation strategies will in the present paper be studied from the point of view of the following framework:

(1) metaphor translated into the same metaphor, i.e. the SL vehicle and topic are transferred into the TL which means that both the metaphor and its literal meaning is the same in both SL and TL

(2) metaphor into different metaphor, i.e. the SL vehicle has been replaced by a TL vehicle that has more or less the same topic. In other words, the SL metaphor has been translated by a different TL metaphor which has a very similar literal meaning

(3) metaphor into non-metaphor, which means that the SL metaphor is translated into a non-metaphorical expression in the TL (paraphrased)

(4) metaphor into 0, which means that there is no trace of the SL metaphor in the TL
3 Analysis

In this section, each of the different translation strategies used in the present translation will be discussed and examples of both lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors will be given where applicable.

3.1 Metaphor into the same metaphor

When a SL metaphor is translated using the same TL metaphor, it means that both vehicle and topic are kept in the translation.

3.1.1 Lexicalized metaphor

The first example to be discussed, is that of the expression *latch onto*.

(1) He *latches onto* you and wants to stay close. Valpen *hakar på* dig och vill vara nära.

The basic sense of the verb *latch* is, according to *Cambridge dictionary*, ‘to close something, or to close something using a latch’. The contextual sense of the metaphor *latch onto* is that the puppy will be close to you all the time. The basic sense and the contextual sense are in contrast with each other, but considering the noun form of the word latch, i.e. ‘a device you use to close a door or a gate’ (*Cambridge dictionary*), it is possible to understand the metaphor in this example, i.e. the puppy will stay very close to you at all times, giving you a feeling of it being more or less attached to you.
Therefore, *latches onto* is considered to be metaphorically used in this context according to the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007).

Since the phrase *latch onto* can be found in for example *Cambridge dictionary* with the sense ‘to stay close to someone or spend a lot of time with someone, usually when they do not want you near’, it means that it has a fixed meaning and is thus in accordance with Dickins’ (2005:9) classification sorted as a lexicalized metaphor.

The source text metaphor has been transferred into the target language using the phrase ‘*haka på*’. The most basic sense of the verb *haka* is, according to *Svensk ordbok*, ‘fästa med något som är vinkelbög mot rörelseriktningen’ (attach with something which is perpendicular to the direction of movement). The sense of the metaphor ‘*haka på*’ is in this context that the puppy will follow you very closely, and it is possible to understand the metaphor based on the basic sense of the verb *haka* in the TL in the same way as in the SL. The metaphor *haka på* can be found in *Svenskt språkbruk* (2015:454) with the sense ‘ansluta sig till, följa med’ (join, come along) and it is therefore categorized as a lexicalized metaphor in the TL as well.

Moving on to the translation strategy used, we can then see that this is an example of a SL metaphor which has been transferred using the same metaphor with the same meaning in the TT, i.e. the ST vehicle *latch onto* and the topic *staying very close to someone* are both intact in the TT. Another possible translation would have been to use the paraphrasing (‘metaphor into non-metaphor’) ‘*följer efter*’ (follows) which would have meant that the vehicle would have changed while the topic was kept. In line with trying to keep the form of the ST in the TT, it was decided to use the TL metaphor *haka på* in the translation instead of the paraphrasing *följer efter*. As discussed in section 2.5, this is also the method preferred by Newmark (1981).

### 3.1.2 Non-lexicalized metaphor

In the second (2) example, there is a non-lexicalized metaphor which has been transferred using the same metaphor in the target language.

(2) **They will be indescribably irresistible balls of white fur.**

De kommer att vara helt obeskrivligt oemotståndliga vita pälsbollar, men sakta i backarna.

The basic sense of the word *ball* is ‘a round object that you throw, hit, or kick in a game or sport’ (*Longman dictionary of American English* 2008:70). In the present context, the
expression *balls of white fur* refers to the puppies. The contextual sense contrasts with the basic sense, but it is possible to understand the contextual sense based on the basic sense since puppies do resemble balls at times, especially if they are of a breed with a lot of coat. Since it is possible to understand the contextual sense based on the basic sense, the word *ball* is metaphorically used in this context according to the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007).

The expression *balls of white fur* cannot be found in its metaphorical sense in a dictionary, hence the reader needs to see the metaphor in its context to understand the meaning of it and therefore it is according to Dickins’ (2005:9) categorization classified as a non-lexicalized metaphor.

If translated completely literally, the metaphor in Swedish would be *bollar av vit päls*. However, a search on *Språkbanken* (5 March 2018) showed 495 hits for *pälsbollar* (fur balls) and 0 hits for *bollar av päls* (balls of fur) and it was therefore decided that *pälsbollar* was to be used in the translation. The search result for *pälsbollar* showed that the noun is used both in a literal sense and in a metaphorical sense referring to both dogs and cats. However, the word *pälsboll* cannot be found in *Svensk ordbok* which means that the reader needs to see the word in its context to understand in which sense it is being used and it is therefore a non-lexicalized metaphor in the TL as well.

The translation strategy used in this example is ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’ since both the ST vehicle *balls of fur* and the topic *puppies* are kept in the TT.

### 3.2 Metaphor into a different metaphor

When a SL metaphor is translated using a different metaphor in the TL, it means that the topic is kept in the translation while the vehicle is changed.

#### 3.2.1 Lexicalized metaphor

In example (3), there is a SL metaphor which has been transferred as a different metaphor in the TL:

(3) If one of the puppies *melts* your heart, pick him up for a closer examination.  
(p.39) Om du *faller för* en av valparna, lyft upp den och undersök den närmre.
The basic sense of the verb *melt* is “to change something from solid to liquid by heating” (*Longman dictionary of American English* 2008:631). The contextual sense of *melt your heart* is to ‘start to have feelings for one of the puppies’. The contextual sense and the basic sense of the word *melt* are in contrast with each other, but it is possible to understand the contextual sense based on us humans tending to think of our feelings as a matter of the heart. In line with Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) conceptual metaphors, we use the heart, which is concrete, to understand feelings, which are abstract. Hence, we use the idiom *heart of stone* to talk about an unkind or cruel person (*Cambridge dictionary*) and in the same way we can understand the heart as melting when our feelings for someone change in a positive way. Since the contextual sense can be understood based on the basic sense, the word *melt* is determined to be metaphorically used in this context according to the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007).

The metaphorical sense, i.e. ‘to suddenly feel love or sympathy’, used in this context can be found in *Longman dictionary of American English* (2008:631) and therefore it is in accordance with Dickins’ (2005:9) categories classified as a lexicalized metaphor.

The SL metaphor *melts your heart* has been transferred into the TL metaphor *falla för* (fall for). The basic sense of the TL verb *falla* is ‘to move downwards to a lower level due to the power of gravity’ (*Svensk ordbok*). The lexicalized sense of the metaphorically used *falla för* is ‘to like someone or something or to fall in love’ (*Svenskt språkbruk* 2015:273).

In this example we thus have a SL metaphor which has been transferred into a different TL metaphor, i.e. the topic in the SL metaphor (feelings of love) is kept in the TL metaphor, but the vehicle has changed from an image of your heart melting to an image of you falling for something.

Another possible solution would have been to transfer the SL metaphor into the TL metaphor *smälta* (melt) as in ‘om en av valpara får dig att smälta’ (if one of the puppies makes you melt) or ‘får ditt hjärta att smälta’ (makes your heart melt) as it would have been closer to the SL vehicle since the basic sense of the TT verb *smälta* is, according to *Svensk ordbok*, ‘to change from a solid to a liquid form’, i.e. the same as in the SL. The metaphorical sense when somebody melts is that ‘you go all soft on the inside’. However, a comparison of the expressions ‘du faller för’, ‘får dig att smälta’ and ‘får ditt hjärta att smälta’ on *Språkbanken* (3 April 2018) showed that ‘du faller för’ (917 hits) is more common than ‘får dig att smälta’ (27 hits) and ‘får ditt hjärta att
smälta’ (21 hits). All of these three expressions are in Språkbanken found in the more informal contexts of blogs, discussion forums and twitter, which suggests that it is a rather informal kind of language. However, since the expression ‘du faller för’ rendered the highest number of hits, it was decided that this was the expression to be used in the translation.

3.2.2 Non-lexicalized metaphor

In example (4), we have both a SL metaphor transferred into the same TL metaphor in the word *round* and a SL metaphor transferred into a different TL metaphor in the expression *bundles of white fur*. The focus of the discussion in this section will be on the latter.

(4) They should all be about the same size – nice, *round*, plump bundles of white *fur*. De bör allihop vara av ungefär samma storlek – fina, *runda* och vita *pälsbollar*.

The basic sense of *a bundle* is ‘a group of things such as papers, clothes, or sticks that are fastened or tied together’ (*Longman dictionary of American English* 2008:126). The contextual meaning of *bundles of white fur* is the puppies which look like bundles consisting of white fur. The basic sense ‘a group of things fastened together’ and the contextual sense of a litter of puppies are contrasting with each other, but it is possible to understand the metaphor based on the contextual sense and the expression *bundles of white fur* is therefore determined to be metaphorically used in this context in accordance with the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007).

The expression *bundle of white fur* cannot be found in any dictionary and the reader needs the context to fully understand the metaphor. Therefore, it is in accordance with Dickins’ (2005:9) classification assigned to the category non-lexicalized metaphors.

The SL metaphor has been transferred into the previously discussed SL metaphor *pälsbollar*. For a discussion on that metaphor, see section 3.1.1.2. Another solution that was considered, was to translate the SL metaphor into the TL metaphor *vita pälsknyten*. However, a search on Språkbanken (3 April 2018) showed that while *pälsknyte* (bundles of fur) rendered 1 hit, *pälsbollar* (fur balls) rendered 1143 hits which suggests that
pälsbollar is more common, even though some of those hits were literal uses of the word referring to for example balls of fur attached to different types of clothing. It was therefore decided to translate the ST metaphor bundles of white fur with the slightly different non-lexicalized TL metaphor vita pälsbollar, which means that the SL topic puppies is kept while the vehicle is slightly changed from a bundle to a ball.

This translation strategy is, as discussed in section 2.5, the second option on Newmark’s (1981) prescriptive list of preferred translation strategies and it holds the same position on Toury’s (2012:108–109) and van den Broeck’s (1981:77) descriptive lists.

3.3 Metaphor into a non-metaphor

When a ST metaphor is translated into a non-metaphor it means that it is paraphrased in the TL by using a non-metaphorical word or expression.

3.3.1 Lexicalized metaphor

In example (5), the ST metaphor fancy footwork has been paraphrased into kreativitet (creativity) in the TL.

Regardless of which country you live in, the search for a Japanese Spitz will require some research and fancy footwork.

(5) Oavsett vilket land du bor i kommer sökandet efter en japansk spets att kräva en del efterforskning och kreativitet.

The basic sense of the noun footwork is ‘skillful use of your feet when dancing or playing a sport’ according to Longman dictionary of American English (2008:398). In the present context, the phrase fancy footwork could indicate that one will have to do a lot of walking to find a puppy. However, it was interpreted to mean that one will have to be creative in ways of finding a puppy. The contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it since it, according to Kövecses (2010:7), is possible to understand an abstract effort in relation to a physical effort which is more concrete. It was therefore decided that, in line with the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007), the expression fancy footwork is metaphorically used in this context.
Furthermore, *fancy footwork* is categorized as a lexicalized metaphor, in accordance with Dickins’ (2005:9) definition, since it is found in *Merriam Webster’s Learners Dictionary* with the meaning ‘active and skillful movement or activity to achieve a goal’.

The translation strategy used in this example is ‘metaphor into non-metaphor’ since the ST metaphor has been transferred into the non-metaphorically used TL noun *kreativitet*. This strategy was used since the same or similar metaphor was not found in the TL. A literal translation of *footwork* into *fotarbete* would not work since the meaning of *fotarbete* according to *Svensk ordbok* is ‘(utförande av) små fotförflytningar för att i varje ögonblick inta bästa möjliga position’ ((the performance) of minor movements of the foot to place oneself in the best possible position in every moment). According to *Svensk ordbok* there is a more figurative meaning of *fotarbete* and that is ’rutinarbete eller otacksamt grovarbete i motsats till mer glamoröst arbete’ (routine work or ungrateful heavy work as opposed to more glamourous work). However, this meaning was not considered quite right in the present context and therefore the noun *kreativitet* (creativity) was chosen instead since it is believed to better represent the meaning of the ST metaphor and give the target text readers the same associations as the source text readers. This is in line with Ingo’s (2007:120) statement that when translating a metaphor, the translator needs to consider whether the TL readers will understand the expression and if it will give them the same associations as the SL readers (see section 2.1).

Using this translation strategy means that the SL vehicle *footwork* was lost in the translation process, but the topic *creativity* has been kept.

### 3.3.2 Non-lexicalized metaphor

Next, the translation of the non-lexicalized metaphor *dropped* in example (6) will be discussed.

(6) If you are purchasing your Japanese Spitz puppy for future show purposes, you might want to wait until the pup is 10 to 12 weeks of age and so that you are sure about erect ears, *dropped* testicles, etc.  

Om du köper din valp för utställning längre fram kanske du vill vänta tills den är 10 till 12 veckor gammal så att du kan vara säker på att öronen är upprättstående, att testiklarna *är på plats i pungen* och så vidare.
The most basic sense of the adjective *dropped* in the expression *dropped testicles* is ‘designed to extend or begin lower than normal’ as in for example ‘a dress with a dropped waist’ according to *Merriam Webster*. A search on COCA (18 May 2018) indicated that the adjective *dropped* is not very commonly used in this sense since none of the first 500 hits contained the word used in this sense. It is therefore believed that *dropped* in this expression is related to the verb form *drop* with the sense ‘to stop holding or carrying something, so that it falls’ or ‘to fall’ (*Longman dictionary of American English* 2008:309). The contextual sense of the expression is that a dog’s testicles have moved into place in the scrotum. The basic sense and the contextual sense are in contrast. However, it is possible to understand the contextual sense of *dropped testicles* if one considers the verb form *drop* as in *falling*. Not that the testicles actually fall into place, but they do move from a higher position in the abdomen to a lower position in the scrotum and thus, according to the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007), the word *dropped* is metaphorically used in this context.

Since no instances of *dropped* with the sense of ‘moving into place’ have been found in any dictionary, it is categorized as a non-lexicalized metaphor in accordance with Dickins’ (2005:9) definition.

The translation strategy used in this example is ‘metaphor into non-metaphor’, i.e. replacing the SL metaphor with a TL paraphrase, i.e. *dropped testicles* have been transferred as *testiklarna är på plats i pungen* (the testicles are in place in the scrotum). It was considered using the TL verb ‘fall’ as in *testiklarna har fallit på plats i pungen* (the testicles have fallen into position in the scrotum), but a Google search suggested that while it is possible to use the verb ‘fall’, it is more common in Swedish to say that ‘the testicles are in place in the scrotum’ than that ‘they have fallen into place in the scrotum’ and consequently the translation *testiklarna är på plats i pungen* was chosen. This way of translating the ST metaphor means that the vehicle *dropped* is lost while the topic *testicles in place in the scrotum* is kept. This way of translating by replacing the SL metaphor with the sense is on the fifth place in Newmark’s (1981) list of preferred translation strategies. Newmark’s opinion is that one should rather translate the metaphor using a simile or a simile plus the sense (places three and four on his list) than paraphrasing it, but a simile could not be thought of in this particular case. Toury (2012) and van den Broeck (1981) do not state any preferred order of their translation strategies, however, they both have paraphrasing as the third option on their lists which perhaps suggests that they consider it a more likely strategy than Newmark.
3.4 Metaphor into 0
When a ST metaphor is translated into 0 it means that there is no trace of the metaphor in the TT.

3.4.1 Lexicalized metaphor
In example (7) below, the SL metaphor *accident* has not been transferred at all into the TT.

(7) Once indoors, put the puppy in his crate (for control, not for punishment) until you have had time to clean up his accident.  
Väl inomhus igen, sätt valpen i hagen (för kontroll, inte bestraffning) medan du städar upp efter den.

The most basic sense of the word *accident* is, according to *Longman dictionary of American English* (2008:7), ‘a situation in which someone is hurt or something is damaged without anyone intending it to happen’. The contextual sense is that the puppy has urinated or defecated on the floor. The contextual and the basic sense contrast, but it is possible to understand the contextual sense since a puppy relieving itself indoors is generally seen as something done unintendedly and is thus looked upon as an accident. Thus, the word *accident* is according to the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007) used metaphorically in this context.

Furthermore, it is classified as a lexicalized metaphor in line with Dickins’ (2005:9) definition since it according to *Merriam Webster* is informally used in American English when talking about a baby or pet who involuntarily urinates or defecates which means that it has a fixed meaning.

In the TT there is no trace of the ST metaphor. It would be possible to transfer the SL metaphor by using the same metaphor in the TL, i.e. *olycka* (accident) which, according to *Svensk ordbok*, can be used to describe ‘an unpleasant event’ meaning that in this context the TT readers would understand it in the same way as the ST readers. However, it was decided to be left out since it is believed that the TT reader will understand what is being referred to without adding the word *olycka* in the translation. Since it would have been possible to translate the SL metaphor into the same TL
metaphor, this way of translating is also down to the personal taste of the translator. Translating in this way means that the vehicle *accident* was lost in this example, but the topic (*puppy urinating inside*) is still there, though not as explicit in the TT as in the ST.

### 3.4.2 Non-lexicalized metaphor

In example (8) there is another example of where there is no trace of the SL metaphor in the TT.

(8) As a *sidebar*, you will not use food forever in getting the dog to obey your commands.  

When consulting *Merriam Webster*, it was determined that the most basic sense of the word *sidebar* is ‘a short news story or graphic accompanying and presenting sidelights of a major story’. In the present context, the word is used in the sense of giving some extra information or a note on something. The basic sense and the contextual sense are to some extent the same, which according to the Pragglejaz Group (2007) would indicate that the word is not metaphorically used in this context. However, a sidebar in a magazine or on a website is more concrete than the abstract sense in which the word is used in the present context. Since it is possible to understand the contextual meaning based on the basic meaning, it was decided that the word *sidebar* is metaphorically used in this context in the ST. The metaphorical use of the word *sidebar* has not been found in any dictionary and is therefore, according to Dickins’ (2005:9) classified as a non-lexicalized metaphor.

Since there is no trace of this metaphor in the TT, the vehicle and the topic have both been lost in the translation. In Swedish, the *sidebar* is called *faktaruta* but this translation would not have worked as it would not have made any sense to the TT reader, a literal translation would therefore not be an option in this example which is in line with Ingo’s (2007:120) statement that the translation must make sense to the reader.

A translation that would have been possible would be to use is the expression *i förbigående kan nämnas* (by the way) which, according to *Svenskt språkbruk* (2015:364), has the meaning ‘doing something on the side while doing something else’ thus translating the SL metaphor by paraphrasing it in the TL (‘metaphor into non-metaphor’). However, since the expression *as a sidebar* was understood as trying to
convince the dog owner that food was not going to be used for the rest of the dog’s life, the choice of translation fell on the Swedish adverb *naturligtvis* which is more convincing than the expression *i förbigående kan nämnas*.

This way of translating, i.e. leaving the SL metaphor out of the translation is put on place number six in Newmark’s (1981) list of preferred translation strategies, in fourth place on Toury’s (2012:108) descriptive list and not mentioned at all by van den Broeck (1981). This means that Newmark and Toury, but not van den Broeck, consider the omission a possible translation strategy.

### 3.5 Non-metaphor into metaphor

When a non-metaphor in the ST is transferred into a metaphor in the TT it means that there is a non-metaphorical word or expression in the ST that has been transferred as a metaphor in the TT. Since the word or expression in the ST is non-metaphorical it means that it cannot be categorized as a lexicalized or non-lexicalized metaphor based on the SL.

(9) Look at their eyes to see if any of them have runny or red bloodshot eyes; they should be bright and *sparkling*.  
   Titta på deras ögon för att se om någon av dem har rinnande eller blodsprängda ögon; de ska vara klara och *fulla av bus*.

In the above example (9) the word *sparkling* has the basic meaning of ‘shining brightly with points of flashing light’ according to *Longman dictionary of American English* (2008:976) and in this case, it is the eyes that are supposed to be sparkling. This is also the contextual sense in this example. Based on the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007), *sparkling* is therefore not metaphorically used in this context.

In the TT, *sparkling* has been transferred as *fulla av bus* (full of mischief). This is a metaphorically used expression since the eyes cannot literally be full of mischief. A search on the Swedish translation of *sparkling eyes* in *Norstedts engelska ordbok* revealed that *sparkling eyes* can be translated into *tindrande ögon*. This would be a literal translation of the SL expression. The word *tindrande* has the same basic sense as *sparkling*. A search on *Språkbanken* (13 May 2018) suggests that *tindrande ögon* is an expression which is often used in connection with children. Out of the total search result
of 236 hits, about 31 per cent were used in connection with children and only 0.8 per cent in connection with dogs. *Norstedts engelska ordbok* also states that *sparkling* can be translated in a more figurative sense as *spritande* or *sprudlande*. This is believed to be closer to the intended sense in the ST. However, a search on *spritande ögon* on *Språkbanken* (13 May 2018) rendered zero hits and a search on *Google* (13 May 2018) resulted in one hit only, suggesting that this is not an expression used in Swedish. A similar search on *sprudlande ögon* resulted in zero hits on *Språkbanken* (13 May 2018) and 84 hits on *Google* (13 May 2018), which suggests that this is not a very common expression in Swedish either. Anyone who has seen a litter of puppies will recognize that they are generally full of mischief and very active and therefore, the expression *fulla av bus* was considered next. A search on this phrase in *Språkbanken* (13 May 2018) rendered 16 hits which were used in connection with children, ponies and puppies. A *Google* search (13 May 2018) on the same phrase resulted in 2720 hits and out of the first ten hits, five were related to puppies. It was therefore decided, that this translation was to be used in this context, resulting in a non-metaphorical expression being translated as a non-lexicalized TL metaphor. Using this translation strategy means that the topic is kept in the TT.

In the next example (10) there is also a non-metaphorically used SL expression which has been transferred as a metaphor in the TL.

(10) If the puppy chews on the arm of the chair when he is alone, you will probably *discipline* him angrily when you get home.

Om valpen tuggar på ett armstöd när den är själv hemma kommer du troligen att *skälla på den* när du kommer hem.

The most basic sense of the word *discipline* in the ST is ‘to punish someone’ according to *The Longman dictionary of American English* (2008:285) and it is used with this sense in the present context as well. This means that according to the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007), this word is not metaphorically used in this context.

The word *discipline* has been transferred into the metaphor *skälla* in the TL. The most basic sense of the expression ‘*skälla på någon*’ is ‘to bark at someone’, according to *Svensk ordbok*. However, it can also be used metaphorically with the sense ‘to scold somebody’ (*Svenskt språkbruk* 2015:1046). To scold someone is to punish them verbally for something so in this example, the sense of the ST word has been kept in the TT by using a TL metaphor. This way of translating, i.e. that a metaphor can be added
in the TT where there is none in the ST means that while there is no vehicle in the SL, the topic is still kept in the TL. This translation strategy is only considered by Toury (2012:109). As seen in table 1, section 3.1, this is not a very common translation strategy and Toury (ibid.) even suggests that this is more of a translation solution than a translation problem.

3.6 0 into metaphor

Zero into metaphor means that a metaphor has been added in the TL without any linguistic motivation in the SL. However, no instances of this translation strategy were found in the translation in the present study.

3.7 One ST metaphor, different translation strategies

In some instances in the translation for the present paper, the same SL metaphor was translated using different translation strategies. Below, the SL metaphor relieve himself will be discussed.

(11) You can train a puppy to relieve himself wherever you choose, but this must be somewhere suitable. Du kan lära valpen att uträtta sina behov var du vill, men det måste vara på en lämplig plats.

(12) Your puppy needs to relieve himself after play periods, after each meal, after he has been sleeping and at any time he indicates that he is looking for a place to urinate or defecate. Valpen behöver vanligen gå ut när den har lekt, efter varje måltid och efter att den har sovit och närhelst den visar tecken på att den försöker att hitta en lämplig plats att kissa eller bajs på.

(13) The older the puppy, the less often he will need to relieve himself. Ju äldre valpen blir, desto längre klarar den sig mellan rastningarna.

The most basic sense of the verb relieve is, according to Longman dictionary of American English (2008:854), ‘to make a pain, problem, bad feeling, etc. less severe’.
The contextual sense however, is that of ‘emptying one’s bladder or passing motion’. The basic sense and the contextual sense are contrasting, but it is possible to understand the contextual sense based on the basic sense since urinating or defecating can be understood as removing a problem or a bad feeling from your body. Hence, the word *relieve* is, according to the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007), metaphorically used in this context.

Since the expression *relieve yourself* is found in *Merriam Webster learner’s dictionary* with the meaning of ‘to pass waste from your body’, it is classified as a lexicalized metaphor in accordance with Dickins’ (2005:9) classification.

When looking at the translation strategies used, one can see that the SL metaphor has been translated in three different ways. In example (11), the ST metaphor *relieve himself* has been translated as *uträtta sina behov*. The translation strategy used is that of ‘metaphor into a different metaphor’ which has the same meaning. The TL expression *uträtta sina behov* is considered to be metaphorically used since the basic sense of *behov* is *efterfrågan* (demand) or *önskan* (wish) according to *Svenskt språkbruk* (2015:93), but the contextual meaning of the expression is to urinate or defecate. This way of translating the metaphor means that the vehicle is changed while the topic is kept.

In example (12), the ST metaphor has been translated with the target language expression *gå ut* (go outside). The translation strategy used here could be seen both as ‘metaphor into metaphor’ if one considers *gå ut* as a metaphor for urinating or defecating, but as ‘metaphor into a non-metaphor’ if one considers it to mean literally going outside. In this study, it has been considered as a metaphorically used expression for urinating or defecating. This way of translating means that the vehicle is lost, while the topic is kept.

In example (13), there is no clear trace of the ST metaphor in the TT, thus the translation strategy used is ‘metaphor into zero’.

There is no real reason as to why the ST metaphor *relieve himself* could not have been translated as *uträtta sina behov* in all three examples above. In fact, that is the translation strategy used for five of the seven instances of the expression in the ST. The other two examples of translation, i.e. *gå ut* and the removal of the metaphor are instead used to create variation in the TT due to the translator’s own preferences.

In the next section, there will be a quantitative overview and discussion of the results.
4 Results and discussion

In this quantitative overview, the translation strategies used when translating the different metaphors are presented in order of number of hits. The SL metaphors are categorized according to whether they are lexicalized or non-lexicalized.

Table 1. Translation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation strategy</th>
<th>Lexicalized metaphors</th>
<th>Non-lexicalized metaphors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metaphor into a non-metaphor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphor into the same metaphor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphor into a different metaphor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphor into 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of metaphors</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in table 1, a total of 58 metaphors were found in the source text. Apart from these SL metaphors, a further six instances of a SL non-metaphorical expression transferred as a TL metaphor were found. But since the SL non-metaphorical expressions cannot be classified as either a lexicalized or a non-lexicalized metaphor, they have been left out of the table, but will nevertheless be discussed below. Furthermore, no instances of the translation strategy ‘0 into metaphor’ were found in the present study and this strategy has therefore not been included in the table either.

The majority of the SL metaphors, i.e. 49 of them, were found to be lexicalized and only nine were non-lexicalized. What these numbers tell us first of all, is that 84 per cent of the metaphors in the source text are metaphors found in dictionaries and 16 per cent are non-lexicalized. Since the majority of the metaphors are found in a dictionary, it means that they have a fairly fixed meaning and thus, they are most likely not particularly difficult to understand for the ST reader, while the non-lexicalized metaphors have to be seen in their context to be fully understood.

According to Newmark’s (1981) prescriptive translation theory the preferred translation strategy is to translate a SL metaphor using the same metaphor in the TL, followed by translating the SL metaphor with a different TL metaphor. In fact, these are the first two strategies mentioned by both Toury (2012:108–109) and van den Broeck (1981:77) as well, though their theories are descriptive rather than prescriptive.
However, as can be seen in the table above, this is not the single most common translation strategy used in the present translation (see appendix A for a pie chart view). Instead, the single most common way of translating a lexicalized SL metaphor into Swedish was by translating the ‘metaphor into a non-metaphor’, i.e. by paraphrasing it using a non-metaphorical expression in the TL. However, if one puts the translation strategies ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’ and ‘metaphor into a different metaphor’ together, one will see that it was slightly more common to translate a lexicalized SL metaphor by using either the same or a different metaphor (vehicle) while keeping the topic of the SL metaphor (55 percent as opposed to 44 per cent for paraphrasing).

‘Metaphor into non-metaphor’ (paraphrasing) was slightly more common for the non-lexicalized metaphors as well when looking at the single translation strategies. However, if the strategies ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’ and ‘metaphor into a different metaphor’ are put together, then this way of translating a non-lexicalized SL metaphor is as frequent as ‘metaphor into non-metaphor’ and ‘metaphor into 0’.

Furthermore, six of the lexicalized (12 per cent) and three of the non-lexicalized SL metaphors (33 per cent) were not transferred into the TL. These numbers could suggest that a higher number of non-lexicalized metaphors may not be transferred at all into the TL. One reason for this could perhaps be the fact that since the lexicalized metaphors have a fixed meaning and can be found in dictionaries, they are easier to find suitable translation equivalents for than the non-lexicalized which require that the reader sees them in their context to fully understand them. This might therefore make them more difficult to translate and the translator resorts to either paraphrasing them into a non-metaphorical TL expression or simply just not transferring them at all into the translation. The method of choice would presumably depend on the importance of the SL metaphor for the understanding of the TT.

The results of this small scale quantitative study thus show that in the present study the single most common way of translating a SL metaphor, if lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors are considered together, is to paraphrase the metaphor using a non-metaphorical word or phrase in the TL which means that the SL vehicle is lost while the topic is kept. The second most common translation strategy was translating a SL metaphor using the same metaphor in the TL, i.e. both the SL vehicle and topic are kept in the TL, closely followed by using a different TL metaphor, i.e. the SL vehicle is changed while the topic is kept.
The problem when translating metaphors in the present study was more a question of language differences than of the metaphors belonging to a particular field of expertise, different age or culture related. The findings in the present analysis are in line with Toury’s (2012:108) statement that most scholars who have worked on the translation of metaphor tend to come up with the following three strategies: “1) metaphor into the same metaphor, 2) metaphor into a different metaphor and 3) metaphor into non-metaphor”, with an addition of the fact that the strategy ‘metaphor into 0’ should not be overlooked according to the present findings. However, the strategies of translating a SL metaphor with a TL simile or a TL simile plus sense, which are the third and fourth most preferred strategies on Newmark’s list, were not used in the present study which may suggest that these are not very common translation strategies when translating metaphors from English to Swedish.

5 Conclusion

The aim of this essay was to analyse the translation strategies used when translating metaphors in a dog breed book from English to Swedish and to see whether lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors require different translation strategies.

The translation strategies on which the analysis was based were those of Toury (2012) and van den Broeck (1981) according to the following:

1) metaphor into the same metaphor
2) metaphor into a different metaphor
3) metaphor into a non-metaphor
4) metaphor into 0
5) non-metaphor into metaphor
6) 0 into metaphor

As an answer to the first research question the following was found:

In the present analysis, a total number of 58 metaphors were found, 49 lexicalized and 9 non-lexicalized. For the lexicalized SL metaphors, it was found that the single most common translation strategy for the metaphors in the ST was ‘metaphor into non-metaphor’, i.e. the single most common way of translating a SL metaphor was by paraphrasing it into a non-metaphorical expression in the TL.
The second and third most common translation strategies used were ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’ and ‘metaphor into a different metaphor’, i.e. to translate the SL metaphor either by using the same or a similar metaphor in the TL. Furthermore, six of the lexicalized SL metaphors were not transferred at all in the TL, i.e. the translation strategy used ‘was metaphor into 0’.

Additionally, nine instances of non-lexicalized metaphors were found in the ST. The two single most common translation strategies used for these metaphors were again ‘metaphor into non-metaphor’, i.e. the SL metaphor had been paraphrased into a non-metaphorical word or expression in the TT, and ‘metaphor into 0’ which means that the SL metaphor was not transferred in any way into the TL. Both these strategies were used for three of the nine non-lexicalized SL metaphors. Furthermore, ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’ was the translation strategy used for two of the non-lexicalized metaphors and ‘metaphor into a different metaphor’ was used once in the present study.

Thus, in total the ‘metaphor into non-metaphor’ was the most common way of translating a SL metaphor into the TL for both lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors, followed by ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’ and ‘metaphor into a different metaphor’. However, there was a difference in that for the lexicalized metaphors the strategy ‘metaphor into a different metaphor’ was equally common as ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’ while for the non-lexicalized SL metaphors, the strategy ‘metaphor into 0’ was more common than both ‘metaphor into the same metaphor’ and ‘metaphor into a different metaphor’.

In answer to the second research question one can conclude that since the number of both non-lexicalized as well as lexicalized metaphors is so small, it is difficult to come to any definite conclusions as to whether non-lexicalized and lexicalized metaphors require different translation strategies. As can be seen, the result in the present paper indicates that it is possible that it is more common to remove non-lexicalized SL metaphors in the TL than to remove lexicalized SL metaphors.

However, further studies are needed in both the same, as well as different areas, and in the more creative kinds of metaphors found in poetry to see what translation strategies are mainly used when translating metaphors from English to Swedish and whether there are any differences within different areas, as well as within fiction and non-fiction. Nevertheless, being aware of common translation problems and possible translation strategies for metaphors is important for translators since it will increase the
translator’s competence for handling these problems which in turn will lead to better translations.
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