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Abstract

This essay investigates the author’s translation of a non-fiction text about literary theory. The study examines the metaphors found in the original text and how they have been translated from English to Swedish.

The analysis uses Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) description of conceptual metaphors to categorize the metaphors found in the text. Conceptual metaphor theory suggests that the understanding of metaphor is mainly based on cultural experience which complicates the translatability of metaphors. In addition, the investigation draws on Newmark’s (1981) prescriptive framework for translation studies and Schäffner’s (2004) study on micro- and macro-level metaphors.

The findings in this essay suggest that the most common type of conceptual metaphor in the translated text is the ontological metaphor, probably due to the high number of personifications. The findings also indicate that three translation strategies are preferred when translating metaphors, namely to reproduce the same image in the target language, to replace the image in the source language with a standard image in the target language, and to convert metaphor to sense. The results also suggest that changes on the macro-level seem unavoidable unless it is possible to reproduce the same image as in the target language and that changes on the micro-level might occur even if the macro-level is the same in both the source text and target text. However, no certain conclusions are made due to the limited sample of metaphors in the study.
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1 Introduction

Translation is more than translating word for word. It is about translating the underlying meaning of the source text. When it comes to metaphors, this is especially true. As a translator, one has to understand the underlying reality to which the metaphor is referring. It is only then that the metaphor can be idiomatically expressed in the target language. This might be a reason why metaphors can be considered a problematic area in translation.

Rojo et al. (2014) have shown that when we read we are affected by the presence of metaphors and that the consequence of translations that lack the same imagery, created by the metaphors in the source text, evoke other emotions in the reader of the translation compared to the reader of the source text. So, the debated question is whether it is possible to completely transfer the image created by the metaphor from one language to another when metaphors are usually rooted in a specific culture?

Metaphors are, for many people, just a way to embellish our use of language. However, metaphors have proven to be very common in our everyday language. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 3) suggest that our thoughts and our actions and our conceptual system, e.g. how we conceptualize the world around us, are metaphorical in nature. Rojo et. al (2014: 31) claim that people tend to prefer to use metaphors when referring to aspects of our reality when the aim is to evoke emotions. Furthermore, Rojo et al. (ibid: 32) suggest that since metaphorical expressions may be more emotionally engaging, they are often preferred over their literal counterparts. They further suggest that the pervasiveness of metaphors both in text and spoken language, is one reason why metaphors are a challenge for the translator (ibid).

The analysis part of this study will investigate and discuss my own translation of a passage from the book How to Read Literature written by Terry Eagleton (2014), focusing on my translations of metaphors. This analysis will use Lakoff & Johnson’s (1980) conceptual metaphor theory to identify and categorize the metaphors found in the translation. Furthermore, this study will use Newmark’s (1981) prescriptive framework to identify the strategies that have been used to implement the translation of the same metaphors. Lastly, this investigation will with inspiration from Schäffner (2004) analyse a few of the metaphors on their macro-level and micro-level to identify differences or similarities between the source text (from here on referred to as ST) and the target text (from here on referred to as TT).

One interesting form of metaphor that occurred quite frequently in the source text is personification. As shown in example (1) below, the written text itself is given human traits.
Virtuous literary characters may not be exactly enthralling, but there are novels and plays which seem to be aware of the fact.

In this example, the text gives novels and plays a consciousness. This is a case of personification since this is a human trait that non-living things do not possess. In other words, the author’s awareness is expressed through the text. The metaphor in the TT has been translated by reproducing the image presented in the ST (Newmark, 1981).

Studying the macro- and micro-level of metaphors, this analysis will suggest that the macro-level stays intact when the ST image is reproduced in the TT. See example (2) below:

We are presented with a society in which everyone is his or her own measure.

This example shows no change on the macro-level, but due to a difference in the literal meanings of the words, measure and måttstock, there might be a change on the micro-level. Example (2) will be further discussed in section 3.2.7.

1.1 Aim and research questions

The aim of this essay is to investigate how conceptual metaphors in an English ST are translated into Swedish. The aim is also to analyse the metaphors on a micro- and macro-level and, additionally, to discuss the challenges that may occur while translating conceptual metaphors and the strategies that have been used to translate these. The following research questions will be addressed:

• How many and what kind of conceptual metaphors can be found in the source text, and what translation strategies are used to translate them in the target text and how frequent are the different strategies?

• Analysing micro- and macro-levels of the metaphors in the text, has either of these been affected by the translation process? If so, what is the reason?
1.2 Material and method
In this part of the paper, the methodical framework for this study will be discussed. In section 2.1, the primary material for this study will be presented more thoroughly, and, in section 2.2, the method used to answer the research questions will be presented.

1.2.1 Material
The primary material for this study is my own translation of the first 22 pages of chapter 2 ‘Characters’ in the book *How to Read Literature* by Terry Eagleton (2014). Terry Eagleton is a literary theorist, critic, and professor of English literature. Since the translation used for this study was made by me, the author of this paper, there is no possibility to evaluate if all the metaphors have been translated successfully. The translation is coloured by my own language processing, which means that the TT may not be representative of how most metaphors are translated from English to Swedish. Still, this study might provide some insight into how metaphors can be processed and rendered in translation.

The ST was chosen due to the high number of metaphorical expressions and its colourful and humorous style of writing. The purpose of the ST is primarily to educate since it is used as a textbook in courses on literary theory and therefore the target reader is probably a student or someone particularly interested in literary theory. The text assumes that the reader has some previous knowledge of literature due to the many references to literary works and authors as well as the use of terminology. However, despite the reader’s previous knowledge, the author knows more and, according to Biber & Conrad (2019: 70) these characteristics are typical for textbooks. This particular chapter uses vivid examples from literary works and quotations to illustrate and explain to the reader how the concept of ‘character’ could be interpreted as well as analysed in works of literature.

The author expresses his own opinions and experiences resulting in a style that is personal. Despite the high number of metaphorical, colourful, and humorous expressions, the language is formal due to its academic characteristics.

1.2.2 Method
This section presents both the method for translation and the method used for the analyses of metaphors.

The ST was to some extent translated with the help of corpora, such as the monolingual BNC and COCA for English, Språkbanken Text for Swedish, and the parallel corpus Linguee.
This helped determine preference and frequency for different translation solutions. The sample of metaphorical segments in the ST and TT was analysed and collected manually according to the same method for translation used in Merakchi and Rogers’ (2013: 353–355) corpus-based study of culturally bound metaphors. According to this method, a close reading of both texts is carried out with the help of monolingual dictionaries (ibid: 353). The TT was closely read with the support of Svenska Akademiens Ordbok and the ST was closely read with the support of The Oxford English Dictionary. According to Merakchi and Rogers (2013: 353–354), a segment was considered metaphorical in cases where the contextual meaning of the word in the TT or ST was different from the basic meaning stated in the dictionary as a result of cross-domain mapping.

The translation approach used to translate the ST was to make this text, which, unlike many other theory books is rich in humour and imagery, accessible also to a Swedish audience interested in analysing literature. The TT has been adapted to a Swedish reader by giving titles of literary works in Swedish instead of English (but if an English title lacks a Swedish equivalent the English title has been used). Figurative language and more particularly metaphors were an important aspect. Metaphors tend to have an impact on the reader and the text itself. The translation aimed to provide the reader of the TT with the same image as was presented in the ST.

The translator must consider the ST’s function while translating as functions might require that some areas are more prioritised than others (Reiss, 1977, in Munday, 2016: 121). Despite the imagery in the ST that aims to elicit emotional responses from the readers, it is primarily an informative text. This means that if the aesthetic function affects the informative function, the informative function has been prioritised according to Reiss’ model (ibid). This might result in a TT with less aesthetic function than the ST. However, the informative function is the same (ibid).

To answer the research questions stated in section 1.1, this study will adopt a combined quantitative and qualitative approach in the analysis. The first 22 pages of chapter 2, from the text chosen for this study, resulted in a ST consisting of 6424 words and 377 sentences. 119 metaphorical expressions were identified in the ST. Some metaphors occur more than once in the ST but have all been counted individually since they appear in different contexts. The ST refers to literary works and provides long quotations from novels and plays already translated into Swedish [e.g. a longer passage from Shakespeare’s play The Tempest]. This occurs three times in the ST and these parts have not been translated and are therefore excluded from the study. In the quantitative part of this paper, all the metaphors from the ST and TT have been
collected and categorized according to the different types of conceptual metaphors presented in Lakoff and Johnson (1980). These are structural metaphors, orientational metaphors, ontological metaphors, and metonymies. The categorization of metaphors helped to identify if a certain category of metaphors tends to prefer a specific translation strategy. This analysis will also investigate which one of Newmark’s (1981) procedures has been used while translating the metaphorical segments from English to Swedish. This will help to specify the different strategies used to overcome the obstacles that may occur, due to cultural differences, while translating metaphors.

In the qualitative analysis, the translation result will be discussed concerning micro- and macro-levels of the metaphors with support from Schäffner’s (2004) investigation. Schäffner (2004) conducts a study focusing on the final product of the translation. This study will like Schäffner (2004) investigate the final result of the translation. However, in cases where the thought process leading up to the translation or in cases where various translations were possible, these may be discussed further. A difference between Schäffner’s (2004) investigation and this one is that she studies published translations, whereas I analyse examples from my own translation. Schäffner (2004) focuses on analysing not just the metaphorical unit and the equivalent translation, in the TT but rather the context of the macro-level metaphor first and secondly analyse expressions on the micro-level. This study intends to use the same approach.

2 Background

This chapter provides a presentation of the theoretical framework and the translation studies used in this investigation, and it also presents and discusses previous studies and terminology relevant to the analysis. Section 2.1 will introduce the term metaphor, present the conceptual metaphor and introduce conceptual metaphor theory. Section 2.1.1 will focus on figurative language and discuss differences and similarities between metaphors, idioms and similes. The categories of conceptual metaphors will be presented in section 2.1.2. Section 2.2 will present previous studies that have investigated the translation of metaphors.

2.1 Metaphor and conceptual metaphor theory

Most of us have a general idea of what a metaphor is, can recognize it, and understand how they are used. For example, it is more or less common knowledge that if we refer to someone
as “an early bird” we mean that this person wakes up early in the morning. However, the definition of the concept of metaphor may not be as simple as our understanding of its usage within figurative language. Schäffner (2004: 1254) writes that, in the traditional sense, metaphor is defined as “a linguistic expression that is substituted for another expression (with a literal meaning), and whose main function is the embellishment of the text.” However, a slightly more descriptive definition is found in The Oxford English Dictionary, where a metaphor is described as a “figure of speech in which a name or descriptive word or phrase is transferred to an object or action different from, but analogous to, that to which it is literally applicable” (metaphor, 2021). Traditionally, there seems to be an idea that metaphors exist to embellish our language (Ortony & Fainsilber, 1987: 181). Nonetheless, according to Oliynyk (2014: 123), a metaphor has two functions, namely to be connotative and aesthetic. The connotative function refers to the fact that metaphors can describe concrete and abstract concepts while the aesthetic function refers to the fact that metaphors can have an impact on the reader that creates interest and surprise (ibid). Neurological studies conducted by Citron et al. (2019: 234) indicate that “reading metaphorical expressions leads to significantly stronger activation of brain structures associated with the processing of highly arousing emotional stimuli compared to matched literal counterparts.” Therefore, Citron et al. (ibid) suggest that metaphors and figurative language are appropriate to use when the writer or speaker wants to convey affect.

Most people seem to think that the usage of metaphors is unnecessary because they are viewed as words rather than actions or thoughts (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 3). However, Lakoff & Johnson claim (ibid) that they have found that our conceptual system, the way we think and act, is “fundamentally metaphorical in nature”. With this, they seem to mean that we, without being aware of it, conceptualize and process our reality through metaphors. This forms the theory, which is referred to as a conceptual metaphor theory. A conceptual metaphor is defined by Kövecses (2002: 4) through a cognitive point of view as the understanding of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain. For example, we usually think about life and love in terms of a journey, or we think about an argument in terms of war (ibid). Examples of the concept of an argument as war would be; “I never won an argument with him”; “His criticisms were right on target.” and “He attacked every weak point in my argument.” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 4). When we say these things in our everyday life, we do not seem to consider them to be metaphors since they are so integrated into our way of thinking. This study will include all metaphors, both the apparent and the less apparent. However, the discussion will focus on conceptual metaphors, the ones we do not always consider to be metaphors.
2.1.1 Metaphors, idioms and similes

Metaphors, idioms, and similes are all parts of figurative language. But how do they differ and what are their similarities? Idioms are described as multi-word expressions by Citron et al. (2019: 234) and they argue that these expressions are a challenge to the models in which we process language. Citron et al. (2019) compare idioms to metaphors and claim that:

In contrast to most metaphors, idiomatic meanings are highly conventionalized and cannot be inferred from their constituent words since the relationship between lexical items (*He was over the moon*) and phrasal meaning (*He was extremely happy*) is often arbitrary and learned (2019: 234).

However, this could also be true for conceptual metaphors which are also learned and vary between different cultures. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) claim that all cultures do not share the same metaphorical concepts and therefore these may not be transferable from one culture to another. This indicates that it is hard to say that idioms and metaphors are completely different things and therefore, this study will not distinguish between the two and include idioms under the umbrella term metaphor.

The difference and similarities between metaphors and similes are discussed by Chiappe et al. (2003). Similes and metaphors are similar as they both relate a topic (the subject of the metaphor) and a vehicle (the term that is used metaphorically), and they can be used interchangeably for comparisons (ibid: 85). Chiappe et al. (ibid: 88) claim that metaphors can strengthen similes and that similes may function as a hedge for metaphors. Chiappe et al. (2003: 88) describe the concept of aptness and claim that people prefer using metaphors when there is a high degree of similarity between the topic and the vehicle, allowing for the possibility of expansion. Similes are preferred when the similarity decreases, resulting in fewer possibilities for expansion (ibid).

Haught (2013: 263) concludes that metaphors can be categorical or comparative while similes are only comparative. Haught (ibid: 273) claims that apt metaphors “are processed as categorizations, whereas similes and inapt metaphors are likely to be processed as comparisons.” Metaphors and similes are not identical and they do not have to have the same meaning (ibid). This study will not include similes in the analysis due to their scarcity in the ST.

2.1.2 Conceptual metaphors and their categories

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 56) argue that the human’s normal conceptual system is metaphorically structured, meaning that we to some extent understand concepts in terms of
other concepts. This means that conceptual metaphors can be used to conceptualize feelings with the help of bodily experience (ibid). With this Lakoff & Johnson (ibid: 56–57) seem to suggest that we create human spatial concepts such as UP-DOWN (Concepts tend to be written in capital letters and therefore are capital letters used from here on) and FRONT-BACK, based on our movements. In other words, we create spatial concepts based on our interaction with the physical environment.

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), conceptual metaphors can be divided into three subcategories: structural metaphors, orientational metaphors, and ontological metaphors. These categories exemplify how abstract concepts can be conceptualized. The category of structural metaphors describes how we can structure concepts through something different to make them comprehensible and distinct. Lakoff and Johnson (ibid: 7–8) provide the example that we understand \textit{time as money}, which can be expressed in ways such as \textit{``He has wasted her time''}, \textit{``we are running out of time''}, \textit{``the grandmother is living on borrowed time''} and \textit{``he invested time in that''}. Today, the concept of \textit{TIME IS MONEY} is also conceptualized in practice. For example, after committing a crime, \textit{time is served} to society, hotel rooms are usually rated by \textit{number of nights} and we pay our employees by the \textit{hour}.

The second category is orientational metaphors. These metaphors are usually related to spatial orientation (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 14). This category of metaphors is not arbitrary, instead Lakoff and Johnson (ibid) argue that these metaphors are structured based on our physical and cultural experiences. This means that the orientational metaphors may vary from one culture to another (ibid). An example of a concept of orientational metaphors is \textit{HAPPY IS UP}. This concept results in English expressions like \textit{``I am feeling up today''} or \textit{``[y]ou’re in high spirits''} (ibid: 14–15). We also have the concept of \textit{SAD IS DOWN} which results in English expressions such as \textit{``[h]e is really low these days''} and \textit{``[m]y spirits sank''} (ibid: 15). Lakoff and Johnson (ibid) give other examples of orientational metaphors such as \textit{``I am on top of the situation''}, \textit{``[h]e fell ill''} and \textit{``[h]e rises early in the morning''}.

The third category of conceptual metaphors is ontological metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 25) claim that this category deals with how we understand our experiences based on objects and substances. This category is divided into two subcategories called entity and substance metaphors and container metaphors (ibid). If we refer to abstract concepts as entities we are, according to Lakoff and Johnson (ibid), able to \textit{``refer to them, categorize them, group them and quantify them''}. By bringing the abstract concepts down to a physical level, it is easier for us to understand them (ibid: 26). Examples of the subcategory entity and substance
metaphors would be “Inflation is lowering our standard of living” or “We need to combat inflation” (ibid).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggest that container metaphors expose how humans as physical beings see themselves as containers in the world. By the surface of our skin, we are set apart from the world which results in a so-called in-out orientation (ibid: 29). This orientation is functional to other containers as well, both obvious ones such as rooms and houses, but also to other less obvious containers such as the woods (ibid). Lakoff and Johnson (ibid) give examples of “being in the clearing or out of the clearing” and being “in the woods or out of the woods”. It is important to consider that even if there is no natural boundary there might still be one. Humans tend to create boundaries or borders to certain areas. We like to put up fences or draw lines on maps to claim that a certain area is mine (ibid: 29–30). Lakoff and Johnson (ibid: 30–31) also describe non-physical objects as containers such as events, states, activities, and our field of vision. Examples of this could be that you have someone in sight, that you are in love, or that someone is in a race (ibid: 30–32).

Personification is considered to be a part of the category of ontological metaphors. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 33), personification is when a physical object is specified as being a person or having human traits. We often see personifications in situations like the disease is battled or that a fact argues. Non-human concepts are not just treated as human; they are also given a specific role. Lakoff and Johnson (ibid: 33–34) give the example “Inflation has attacked the foundation of our economy”. In this case, inflation is not just a person, but an adversary – something that we are fighting against. Lakoff and Johnson (ibid: 34) claim that the adversary metaphor provides us with a certain way of thinking about a specific concept and a way of reacting toward the concept. They further argue that personifications help us humans understand phenomena in the world in human terms. Terms that are based on our own characteristics, actions, goals, and motivations (ibid).

Metonymy is, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 35), when one entity is used to refer to something that is related to it or, as Kövecses (2002: 171–172) describes it when one entity gives mental access to another entity. An example of metonymy is “the chicken salad is waiting for her check”. In this case, the chicken salad is referring to a person sitting in a restaurant ordering a chicken salad and not the actual salad. Another example would be “I am reading Shakespeare, meaning I am reading a work written by Shakespeare” (ibid). Metonymy differs from personification in such a way that in cases of personification, we are assigning human qualities to non-human things. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 35) claim that when it comes to metonymy, we always refer to an actual person. Metaphors and metonymy are different
processes and they have different functions. Metaphors are mainly a way of imagining one thing in terms of another with the function of understanding (ibid: 36). Metonymy, on the other hand, has a referential function, allowing us to let one entity stand for another (ibid). However, how we refer to something or someone does provide understanding since the part used for the metonym puts focus on the aspect we consider important. Lakoff and Johnson (ibid) give the example “we need some good heads for this” meaning that intelligent people and not just anyone is needed.

Similar to metaphors metonymies are systematic and do not appear in isolated instances. Kövecses (2002: 172) argues that we can see that metonymies are systematic since they can be categorized into groups based on the particular relationship between the two kinds of entities. Groups that can be found in our culture are producer for the product, the place for the event, the place for the institution, the controller for the controlled, an object used for the user, part for whole, whole for the part, instrument for action, effect for cause, place for action, destination for motion and place for product and time for object (ibid: 172–173). An example of a part for whole relationship would be “get your butt over here!” and an example of a producer for the product would be “he bought a Ford”. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 38). Despite metaphors and metonymies being different processes with different functions, they are closely related (Mol, 2003: 89–90), and this essay will therefore include metonymy under the umbrella term of metaphorical expressions.

To conclude this section, metaphors are more than linguistic features. They are an important part of how we conceptualize abstract ideas, but also an important part of how we communicate with each other. By using metaphors, we can use imagery to discuss a certain topic. Cheetham (2016: 242–243) argues that conceptual metaphors which are a conventional use of metaphors are not always recognized as metaphors since they are thought of as being trivial and less creative. In this study, all metaphors, creative or not, will be considered and taken into account since both the creative and the more unnoticed conventional metaphors influence our understandings (ibid: 243). All categories of conceptual metaphors mentioned in this section are represented in the analysis. However, ontological and structural metaphors account for the majority of the metaphorical expressions. The most common strategy to translate all the categories is to reproduce the ST image in the TT. However, the analysis will discuss cases where other strategies were preferred.
2.2 Translating metaphors

It is of great importance that metaphors are translated correctly since they do have a large influence on the reader. Rojo et al. (2014: 31) claim that “[m]etaphors determine not only the linguistic expressions that we use to describe reality but also the way we think about and conceive the world around us”. Rojo et al. (ibid) further argue that metaphors help us to structure our experiences and are therefore a part of all our interactions with the world. According to Cheetham (2016: 243), the meaning or the significance of a metaphor can help to create a certain picture of a certain topic. However, metaphors are deeply entrenched in our culture and can be very difficult and perhaps sometimes more or less impossible to transfer from one context to another (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 12). This analysis will show some examples where this is the case. According to Schäffner (2004: 1253), this is the reason why metaphors are considered to be a translation problem. Linguistic and cultural differences can hamper the translator in his or her work of translating the metaphor from one language and culture to another (ibid). There is no simple answer to how metaphors should be translated. Dagut (1976: 32) suggests that they are heavily influenced by cultural experiences and semantic associations and to which extent they can be transferred, without causing bewilderment for the reader of the TT, depending on each metaphor. If the image that the metaphor creates is translatable depends on if there is a shared cultural experience between the target language (from here on referred to as TL) and the source language (from here on referred to as SL) (ibid: 28).

The issue of translating metaphors has previously been studied and discussed. Mol (2003) did a corpus-based study focusing on the lexemes head and heart, in Norwegian and English, used as both metaphors and metonymy. She found that the lexemes were more often used as metonymy and that the majority of instances of head/hode and heart/hjerte seem to be translation equivalents which indicates that many of the same metaphors and metonymies exist in both Norwegian and English (ibid: 107). The result of Mol’s study seems to suggest that Norwegian and English to some extent share the same cultural experiences.

The translation of personifications has previously been studied by Shahabi and Roberto (2015) and Bormanis (2022). Bormanis (2022: 99) investigates the link between personification and embodiment in the short story “The Bottle Neck”. He presents translations of the same text in English, Latvian, and Russian to illustrate the cultural and linguistic differences which occur when personification and embodiment appear in the same text (ibid). Bormanis (ibid: 104) found that personifications, body metaphors, and embodiment interact to create the figurative network presented in the text and that the Latvian translation omitted many of the
personifications from the ST. Shahabi and Roberto (2015) study the animal personifications presented in the novel *Animal Farm* and its Persian translation. They claim that not enough studies have been made on the translation of personifications but that these expressions could cause problems for the translator since differences between cultures form variations in the use of personifications (ibid: 1–2). Shahabi and Roberto’s (2015) investigation compares the characteristics with which the animals are personified in English and Persian dictionaries and contrast these with the ST and TT. Their main purpose is to investigate what strategy the translator should use to translate those personifications that do not match the target culture’s expected characteristics of the animal (ibid). An example of such a personification would be that in English an owl is personified as being ‘wise’ while in Persian it is personified as being ‘ominous’ (ibid: 1–2). Shahabi and Roberto (ibid: 9) conclude that the animals in the novel are inviolable and therefore unchangeable characters. They therefore suggest that when the translator finds differences between the metaphorical meaning of the animal in the SL and the TL he or she should use a strategy such as substitution or provision of brief explanations in footnotes or endnotes to help the reader understand the author’s intention (ibid).

Merakchi and Rogers (2013: 341) conducted a corpus-based case study on culturally bound metaphors translated between English and Arabic. Their main focus was on pedagogical metaphors in popular science texts since these cause translation challenges in language pairs that are culturally distant (ibid). At the end of Merakchi and Rogers’ (ibid: 364–365) study, they conclude that strategies such as adaptation, addition, deletion, reduction to sense, and the use of a couplet were used, while translating metaphors and making them accessible for the target audience, to compensate for the loss in meaning due to the lack of equivalent culture elements in the TL. Deletion or reduction to sense was used when the loss of a linguistic metaphor did not affect the overall meaning, while adaptation was used when the broad conceptual metaphor is shared between the languages but when cultural artefacts differ. The use of a couplet was a suitable solution when a cultural element in the ST is unknown in the TT (ibid: 365).

Metaphors have also been studied by Svanlund (2007: 49) where he discusses metaphors concerning conventionality and strength. Svanlund (ibid: 81) claims that even if many metaphorical concepts are widespread, since some physical experiences are shared by all people, this does not mean that differences appear. He argues that even if metaphors can be shared between language pairs, the secondary word meanings do not have to be identical. Svanlund (ibid) presents the example of the Swedish word *tung*. This adjective can be used metaphorically to specify intensiveness in abstract domains, however, the English
corresponding word *heavy* is used more widely. Translating the expression “*heavy storm*” literally from English to Swedish would result in a more figurative and metaphorical expression (ibid).

Newmark’s (1981: 109–111) prescriptive framework consists of seven procedures listed in order of how he thinks the translator should approach the translation of a metaphor. The procedures are listed below:

1. Reproduce the same image in the TL, e.g. *Time is money – Tid är pengar* [my own example].
2. Replace the image in the SL with a standard TL image that fits within the TL culture, e.g. *On cloud nine – I sjunde himlen* [my own example]. This procedure always results in a change in meaning, even if only slightly (Newmark, 1981: 109).
3. Translate metaphor by simile, retaining the image even if the image might turn out to be marginally weaker (Newmark, 1981: 110), e.g. *She is a fish in the water – Hon är som en fisk i vattnet* [my own example].
4. Translate metaphor or simile by simile or metaphor plus sense. This procedure results in the same meaning but is presented differently. Newmark (1981) presents the following example: *I can read him like a book – ich kann ihn wie in einem Buch lesen* (literally meaning: ‘I can read him as in a book’) (1981: 110).
5. Convert metaphor to sense, e.g. *He is on the fence – Han är osäker* [my own example]. This procedure should be used when the TL image is not suitable to the register (Schäffner, 2004: 1257) However, this results in the loss of emotive influence (Newmark, 1981: 110).
6. Delete the metaphor in the TL if it is redundant. An example of this presented by Newmark is *sharp, razor-edge wit* (1981: 111). This expression could be translated into *skarpt intellekt* in Swedish, deleting *razor-edge*.
7. Use the same metaphor in combination with sense to enforce the image. This procedure keeps some of the emotional and cultural effects for readers that are familiar with the metaphor in the SL but also give an explanation for readers not familiar with the SL (Newmark, 1981: 110).
Newmark’s (1981) prescriptive framework has been chosen for this study due to the large number of strategies presented, although it can be questioned if all the strategies are relevant to the translation of conceptual metaphors. This study can hopefully indicate if some strategies are more useful than others. Despite many strategies, there might be one procedure missing since it has been suggested by Ingo (2007: 145) that one more procedure is possible, the one of adding a metaphor in the TT. This could maintain the style of the ST in cases where other metaphors have been omitted (ibid). The analysis of this paper will focus on the metaphors presented in the ST and their translations in the TT. However, in cases where the translation might be more figurative or might evoke more emotion, this procedure might be interesting to keep in mind. For instance, an example from this analysis, the translation of he is also an occasion – han är också ett verktyg (p. 21), might suggest that there is a somewhat stronger or clearer metaphor in the TT compared to the ST (see discussion in section 3.2.2).

Newmark’s framework has previously been used in other studies such as in Chita & Stravrou’s (2020) analysis. They view the translation of metaphors as a cultural concept and compare the metaphors from the novel The Picture of Dorian Grey to their translations in the Greek and German versions of the book (ibid: 117). Their result shows that all metaphors considered in the study were maintained in the translations. However, Chita and Stravrou (ibid: 128) suggest that there might be more similarities in the metaphorical expressions between English and German than there are between Greek and English. Chita and Stravrou (ibid) also conclude that many of the intents to reproduce the metaphor in the TT were not successful probably since metaphors cannot always be transferred intact from one language to another. In contrast to Chita & Stravrou’s (2020) study, this analysis will show examples where the metaphors have been converted into sense instead of being reproduced.

Schäffner (2004) analyses the language pair English and German and studies how metaphorical expressions have been translated within political discourse. Schäffner (2004) uses a conceptual approach to different translation methods and compares them to the prescriptive framework presented by Newmark (1981).

Schäffner (2004) describes some approaches to the translation of metaphors from one language and culture to another. Linguistic-based approaches mean that the sign in the TL should be translated as closely as possible to the sign in the ST, content, and form. Schäffner (2004: 1254–1255) continues to write that a textlinguistic approach focuses on the text as a whole and considers situational factors, genre, text functions, target reader, etc., and not just the translation of the specific sign. A functionalist approach focuses on the function of the text within the target culture.
Schäffner (2004: 1257) argues that the approach presented by Newmark (1981) is based on the idea that the metaphorical expression is “treated as a unit of translation”. However, Schäffner (ibid: 1258) claims that when it comes to conceptual metaphor theory, translatability is no longer connected to “the individual metaphorical expression” but instead “linked to the level of conceptual systems in source and target culture.”. This makes Schäffner (ibid: 1259) question if it is possible to apply the seven procedures presented by Newmark (1981) on conceptual metaphors.

To illustrate how macro-levels and micro-levels of metaphors are necessary within conceptual metaphor theory, Schäffner (2004: 1259) uses two examples: Brücke über den Atlantik (literally meaning: ‘bridge across the Atlantic’) translated into Transatlantic bridge, and der Freundschaftsbrücke über den Atlantik (literally meaning: ‘the friendship bridge across the Atlantic’) translated into transatlantic friendship. Schäffner (ibid: 1260) identifies the macro-level of both metaphors to be INTIMACY IS CLOSENESS, since a friendship between states is indicated. However, there is a difference between the metaphors on the micro-level since the translation of friendship bridge is transatlantic friendship (ibid). While the macro-level of the two metaphors is identical in both ST and TT there is a change in how the specific expression is presented on the micro-level (ibid). Schäffner (2004) concludes that different cultures may or may not use the same conceptual metaphors. Schäffner (ibid: 1267) also found, among other things, that a conceptual metaphor can be identical in the ST and the TT on the macro-level, even if there might be a slight difference in the metaphorical expression on the micro-level.

3 Analysis

In this chapter, the translation of the metaphors found in the ST will be presented and discussed. In section 3.1, the quantitative findings will be presented and discussed. In section 3.2, the qualitative analysis will be presented. Here, examples will be presented and discussed more in-depth based on translation strategy and changes on the micro- and macro-levels of metaphors.

3.1 Quantitative overview of conceptual metaphors and translation strategies

Table 1 below shows that ontological metaphors are the most common category of conceptual metaphors found in the ST and that metonymy only appears twice.
Table 1 Types of conceptual metaphors in the ST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of metaphor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontological metaphor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural metaphor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientational metaphor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metonymy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 1, ontological metaphors are the most frequent metaphors in the ST, representing 50% of the metaphorical expressions identified in the ST. The second most frequent category is structural metaphors, amounting to 37% of the metaphorical expressions. The orientational metaphors represent only 11% of the metaphorical expressions. Metonymy was by far the least frequent category. The reason why ontological metaphors represent half of the metaphorical expressions in the ST might have to do with a large number of personifications, more exactly 22 of them, which is 37% of the ontological metaphors. Personifications will be discussed further in section 3.2.5. The three categories of metaphor are used a lot more than metonymy. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 35), the reason for this might be that metonymical expressions may be more bound to referential situations while according to Chiappe et al. (2003: 88), structural, orientational, and ontological metaphors seem to be more apt since they have a lot of micro-level expressions. Metonymy will be further discussed in section 3.2.1.

In Table 2, the results of the translation strategies (i.e. the procedures) used are presented.
Table 2 Frequency of translation procedure by category of conceptual metaphor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1. Reproduce the same image in the TL</th>
<th>2. Replace the same image in the SL with a standard TL image</th>
<th>3. Translate the metaphor with simile</th>
<th>4. Translate the metaphor or the simile by simile + sense</th>
<th>5. Convert the metaphor to sense</th>
<th>6. Delete the metaphor in the TL if it is redundant</th>
<th>7. Use the same metaphor + sense to enforce the image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural metaphors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientational metaphors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontological metaphors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metonymy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 above shows the frequency of the usage of Newmark’s translation procedures while translating the conceptual metaphors in the text. The table shows that procedure 1 is used to translate more than half of the metaphorical expressions. The usage of procedures 2 and 5 is roughly the same. The high number of cases where the metaphorical expression has been retained suggests that there is a cultural coherence between the SL and the TL (Dagut, 1976: 28), but this also indicates that these metaphors have comparable levels of aptness in both the SL and the TL (Chiappe et al., 2003 & Haught, 2013). However, the level of aptness is rarely identical (Svanlund, 2007: 81), making other procedures useful as well. The cultural coherence and similar levels of aptness could be a reason why procedures 3, 4, 6, and 7 were not used at all in the translation. To use similes, deletion or explanations might not be necessary when culture is shared to a high extent. Around 80% of the metaphorical expressions in the ST were expressed metaphorically in the TT, either by reproducing the same image or by creating a new image. This indicates that the metaphorical expressions found in the ST are more categorical than comparative, and consequently not translated by simile since they are considered to be inapt according to Haught (2013: 273) and Chiappe et al. (2003: 85).
Unlike the results of Chita & Stavrou’s (2020) study, this investigation shows that the translator has chosen to not reproduce the metaphor in the TT in cases where it was not possible to do it successfully in the target culture. Since a metaphor should be translated with the same image in the TT, if possible (Newmark, 1981), examples of the usage of procedure 1 may not create much of a discussion. Because the examples of the usage of procedure 1 do not show much difference between the ST and the TT as well as low difficulty in translating, the analysis will focus more on providing translation examples using procedures 2 and 5, for a more in-depth discussion.

3.2 Qualitative analysis

In this part of the analysis, some examples from the translation will be discussed more in-depth. This section will focus on describing the translation result in relation to Newmark’s (1981) processes as well as changes on the micro- and macro-level of the metaphor inspired by Schäffner’s (2004) study. In the following sections, examples from the different categories of conceptual metaphors (structural, orientational, ontological), as well as metonymy, will be discussed.

3.2.1 Metonymy

As previously mentioned in section 3.1, it seems like metonymical expressions are more bound to referential situations while the other three categories of metaphors are more apt due to a high number of micro-level expressions this might be a reason for the limited number of metonyms in the translation. Another reason for the limited examples of metonymy in this study could be a coincidence due to the limitation of the selected material. One of the examples of metonymy found in the ST can be seen in example (3) below:

(3) Once the Victorian middle classes had defined normality as thrift, prudence, patience, chastity, meekness, self-discipline and industriousness…

När den viktorianska medelklassen väl hade definierat normalitet som sparsamhet, försiktighet, tålmod, kyskhet, ödmjukhet, självdisciplin och arbetsamhet...

(p. 7)

Metonymy is when one entity is used to refer to something that is related to it (Lakoff & Johnson: 1980: 35 and Kövecses: 2002: 171–172). In this example, the Victorian middle classes are used to refer to the actual people belonging to that class. The relationship between the entities Victorian middle classes and the people belongs according to Kövecses (ibid: 172–173) to the group of metonymies where the part refers to the whole. This example of metonymy was
translated with the help of Newmark’s (1981) procedure 1, i.e. by reproducing the same image in the TL. The second metonymy found in the ST was translated using the same strategy. This might indicate that some metonymies are available in both English and Swedish, similar to the findings in Mol’s (2003: 107) study. Due to the very small number of metonyms, it is hard to draw any conclusions other than that the strategy of reproducing the same image in the TL is preferred. However, they should not be excluded from the discussion since they do fall under the umbrella term of metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 37 and Mol, 2003: 89–90). Because of the limited number of metonyms, they will not be further discussed unless necessary concerning the other three categories.

### 3.2.2 Structural metaphors

Analysing the results of the translation of the structural metaphors we find that the translation strategy that was preferred in most cases was procedure 1, then followed by procedure 5, and lastly procedure 2. In the following example (4), procedure 5, converting the metaphor to sense, was applied:

(4) Othello is a character without a context – literally so, since as a Moor, a man of mixed Berber and Arab stock, he is something of a displaced person in his adopted city of Venice.

Othello är en karaktär utan sammanhang – bokstavligen, eftersom han som mor, en man av blandad berber- och arabisk stam, är något av en fördriven person i sin 

nyahemstad Venedig.

(p. 20)

In this example, the concept of ADOPTING AS CHOSEN LOCATION is presented in the ST. The word *adopted* in English has two definitions either “legally made the son or daughter of someone other than a biological parent” or “used or chosen in place of or in preference to an original” (Merriam Webster, 2023: adopted). This makes it a possible concept in English. However, translating this metaphor into Swedish is more problematic. According to SAOL only the first definition is acceptable (2023: adoptera). Although, according to *Bonniers svenska ordbok*, a figurative meaning of the word is possible, i.e. ‘make your own’ [my translation] (2006: 16). In this particular case, one might have been able to use the same strategy as Chita and Stravrou (2020), namely to make sure that the metaphor is transferred to the TT, however, it could be questioned how successful that would be. Because the figurative meaning of the word *adoptera* seems to be too creative or innovative for the target culture. If one searches for *adoptera* in the corpus Språkbanken Text, the word appears in contexts related to children or animals in 556 cases out of 557. This indicates that a figurative meaning of the word is not as
accepted in the culture of the TL as in the culture of the SL, which makes it reasonable to convert the metaphor to sense. Merakchi and Rogers (2013: 365) would call this strategy a reduction to sense because the overall meaning is not affected by the loss of the metaphor.

Another interesting example of a structural metaphor can be seen in example (5) below:

(5) Hamlet is not simply a despondent young prince; he is also an occasion for certain reflections by the play as a whole…

In this case, the metaphor has been translated using Newmark’s (1981) procedure 2, replacing the same image in the SL with a standard TL image. However, in this instance, the figurative language seems to be more vivid in the TT compared to the ST.

An occasion is defined as an opportunity, a circumstance, or an incident (Merriam Webster, 2022: occasion). A human can be neither of these things indicating that the usage of the expression is metaphorical. The definition of verktyg is ‘an implement for processing materials’ [my translation] (SAOL, 2022: verktyg). The very different definitions suggest that there is a difference in meaning between the ST and TT.

Newmark’s procedures (1981) do not consider the possibility that a non-metaphorical segment in the ST could be translated into a metaphorical segment in the TT. This possibility has been proposed by Ingo (2007: 145). This analysis does only consider the seven procedures presented by Newmark (1981). However, it could be discussed if this particular example could be considered to belong to an eighth procedure like the one presented by Ingo (2007: 145).

This example also shows the creativity and freedom that certain metaphors give the translator (Cheetham, 2016: 243). The word occasion has several translations in Swedish, however, none of them would be translatable in this context, forcing the translator to consider culturally bound expressions that express more or less the same image as in the TT. Though, it is important to not do any harm and skew the understanding since metaphors are useful cognitive tools (ibid).

3.2.3 Orientational metaphors

Moving on to the orientational metaphors, the most common strategy for translation was once again procedure 1 then followed by procedure 5, and lastly procedure 2. An example of an
orientational metaphor translated with the help of procedure 5 can be seen in example (6) below:

(6) If the novel itself were not looking out for their welfare, they would probably sink without trace before the end of the first chapter.

Om romanen i sig inte såg till deras välbefinnande, skulle de förmodligen försvinna spåröst före slutet av det första kapitlet.

(p. 11)

This metaphor in the ST would fall under a concept such as NEGATIVE IS DOWN (inspired by Lakoff and Johnson’s examples (1980: 13–17). However, the Swedish translation lacks the same orientational concept. A literal translation would not be idiomatic in the ST and it is therefore necessary to convert the metaphor to sense. A similar example can be seen below:

(7) There is a theory that he returns to the Liverpool where he was first discovered as a child and grows rich in the slave trade there, but it is equally possible that he sets up a hairdressing salon in Reading.

Det finns en teori om att han återvänder till Liverpool där han hittades som barn och att han blir rik på slavhandeln där, men det är lika troligt att han startar en frisörsalong i Reading.

(p. 1)

Here, the metaphor in the ST falls under a concept such as MORE IS UP. Typically, living things grow upward, and having a lot of money is usually seen as something positive. Once again, Swedish lacks the same orientational concept and the metaphor has to be converted into sense.

3.2.4 Ontological metaphors

The most common strategy to translate the ontological metaphors was to use procedure 1 followed by procedure 2 and lastly procedure 5. Approximately 60% of the ontological metaphors have been translated by reproducing the same image as in the ST. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 14–29), a reason for this could be that these metaphors tend to be more constructed on physical experiences, which makes them commonly experienced crossed cultures. An example of the usage of procedure 2 among the ontological metaphors can be seen in example (8) below:

(8) The English tend to admire curmudgeonly, nonconformist types who make a point of not fitting in with their fellows.

Engelsmännen tycks beundra sura, frikyrkliga typer som vägrar att följa strömmen.

(p. 6)
This is a clear example of how one image is translated into another that fits the target culture and still conveys the same message, however with a slight change in meaning. Based on Svanlund (2007: 81), one could argue that the metaphor above is an example where similar metaphors between the languages can be found but where the secondary word meanings differ. The Swedish translation seems to be more figurative since ‘to go with the flow’ in English would probably be interpreted more literally. A possibly more interesting example of an ontological metaphor can be seen in example (9) below:

(9) If Fanny is something of a drag, it is not her fault. Om Fanny är något av en tråkmåns så är det inte hennes fel. (p. 9)

The noun *drag* is defined as “something heavy that is being dragged along the ground or over a surface” (OED, drag, 2023). However, the OED also includes a figurative meaning of the noun which means “[a] heavy obstruction to progress” or “[an] annoyance, a bore; a dull or boring person” (OED, drag, 2023). The figurative meaning of the noun seems to derive from the first definition which indicate that the character Fanny in the example above is described as boring through the attributes of an object, sort of a reversed personification or dehumanization. In this case, the experience of the character Fanny is understood through the object making this an ontological metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 25). The Swedish non-metaphorical expression *tråkmåns* on the other hand means ‘a boring person’ [my translation] (SAOL, tråkmåns, 2023) which create a slight difference in meaning. This is an example where one might question whether procedure 2 or 5 has been used in the translation. What speaks for procedure 5 is that a metaphorical expression is translated into a non-metaphorical expression. However, despite the ST not being metaphorical, it creates more or less the same image or interpretation of the expression which supports the usage of procedure 2. This example has been counted as a metaphor translated by procedure 2 in the quantitative analysis of this study.

### 3.2.5 Personifications

Since personifications constitute a large part of all the metaphorical expressions found in the TT, they will get their own section in this part of the analysis. The result of the study shows that there are 22 personifications, falling under the category of ontological metaphors. This stands for 18% of the metaphorical expressions and 37% of the ontological metaphors in the TT. The reason for this could be the style of the ST but also the purpose of the text. The purpose of the ST is to educate and explain literary theory to the reader. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 34)
suggest that the information presented in the ST may be more comprehensible for the reader if personifications are used since “they allow us to make sense of phenomena in the world in human terms that we can understand on the basis of our motivations, goals, actions, and characteristics.”

A large majority of the personification occurrences have been translated by reproducing the same image in the TL, namely 17 out of 22. This contrasts with the result of Bormanis’ (2022: 104) study where a large number of the personifications were omitted in the Latvian translation. The differences in the result of this study and Bormanis’ (2022) could be due to choices made by the translator or it could indicate that there is a higher level of shared culture between English and Swedish compared to Latvian and English. Three personifications were translated by replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image and two personifications were translated by converting metaphor to sense. To give an example, the following metaphorical segment can be considered to be a personification:

(10) If love and bottles of Châteauneuf-du-Pape *pass away*, so do wars and tyrants.

---

*Pass away* is often used to refer to the passing or the death of a human or potentially an animal. In this example, the author of the ST gives this human trait to the abstract feeling of love, a bottle of wine, and wars. The only subject in the segment that could potentially *pass away* seems to be the tyrant. Looking at the TT, however, the equivalent *gå bort* (lit. go away) is not a possible translation. According to Ingo (2007: 120), this could be due to different semantic associations or different cultural experiences between the languages. In this example, it therefore seemed reasonable to use Newmark’s procedure 5, which is to convert metaphor to sense. The result of this is unfortunately that the metaphorical expression loses all of its emotional and pragmatic impact which is the same result as found in the study made by Rojo et al. (2014: 38). In cases where personification is not transferable, it could be argued that a translator should use a strategy such as the one presented by Shahabi and Roberto (2015: 9), i.e. giving a brief explanation of the author’s intention in footnotes. However, in this case, the target reader has no expectation of the personifications characteristics in contrast to Shahabi and Roberto’s study on animal personifications, and therefore an explanation seems to be superfluous. An example of how procedure 2 was used to translate a personification can be seen in example (11) below:
(11) They find it hard to let their characters go, as parents sometimes find it hard to let their children go.

De finner det svårt att släppa taget om sina karaktärer på samma sätt som föräldrar ibland finner det svårt att släppa taget om sina barn.

(p. 3)

By replacing the image in the ST with a standard image in the TT, there is a slight change in meaning, but the overall message is the same.

3.2.6 Analysis of the macro- and micro-level of metaphors

The ST contains a number of metaphors that could fall under the topic ‘money’ and possibly more specifically the concept MONEY AS PAYMENT FOR SOMETHING ABSTRACT. See examples (12), (13), and (14):

(12) Pleasantness is for those who can afford it.

Behaglighet är för dem som kan kosta på sig det.

(p. 10)

(13) But the qualities themselves are common currency.

Men egenskaperna i sig är gemensam valuta.

(p. 12)

(14) It is a joke at the reader’s expense.

Det är ett skämt på läsarens bekostnad.

(p. 14)

What these metaphors have in common is that all of them are structural metaphors translated by reproducing the same image in the TT. The macro-level of the metaphors presented above is as mentioned MONEY AS PAYMENT FOR SOMETHING ABSTRACT. In all these cases, human traits, feelings, and qualities are seen as something that can be bought. Since this concept can be transferred to the TT by reproducing the same image, the macro-level is the same in both languages.

Analysing example (12) more closely, one might look at the specific meaning of the word afford. In construction with the word can, as in the example above, the word expresses the possibility or capability of performing actions such as “to have the recourses for” or “to be in a position to offer or purchase”, often in a negative context (OED, afford, 2023). The Swedish translation kosta på sig expresses ‘the possibility to make oneself more comfortable or to indulge’ [my translation] (SAOL, kosta på sig, 2023). The meanings are similar and express more or less the same indicating no change or little change on the micro-level. However, it
would be possible to translate *afford* to the Swedish word *unna* instead meaning ‘to gladly allow someone to have something’ [my translation] (SAOL, unna, 2023). This option would probably bring more positive connotations to the metaphorical expression and therefore derive to some extent from the metaphor expressed in the TT. Newmark (1981: 110) and Oliynyk (2014: 124) advise translators to translate as closely as possible if it is possible for the target audience to understand without difficulties and therefore was the first option of translation chosen for this specific expression.

Considering examples (13) and (14), it was possible to implement literal translations maintaining the same macro- and micro-levels in the TT as in the ST. Therefore, no further discussion will be made. However, the three examples above indicate that even if it seems like a translation using procedure 1 will not change the macro- and micro-level of the metaphor it can be questioned whether there is a slight change on the micro-level (Schäffner: 2004: 1267) – in some cases because the secondary word meaning is not identical (Svanlund, 2007: 81)

The ST also contains a number of metaphors that could fall under the topic ‘violence’ and possibly more specifically under a concept such as VIOLENCE AS INTENSIFICATION. In examples (15)–(19) metaphorical expressions are found that include words related to some kind of violence or force used to enhance the situation described in the text. However, this concept seems to be less acceptable in the target culture and has been expressed in a softer way resulting in a change on the macro-level. Therefore, this concept could be an example of how metaphors can help us create a picture of a specific topic (Cheetham: 2016: 243). But also, this picture is not always translatable due to cultural preferences (Lakoff & Johnson; 1980: 12).

Looking more closely at the micro-level of the metaphorical expressions falling under this theme, changes are found.

[15] Lady Macbeth is what she is because of her ferocious will and *thrusting* ambition, not because she suffers, laughs, grieves and sneezes. Lady Macbeth är den hon är på grund av sin starka vilja och äregirighet, inte för att hon lider, skrattar, sörjer och nyser.

(p. 5)

In example (15) above, we can see the structural metaphor translated with the help of procedure 5, converting the metaphor to sense. The word *thrusting* means ‘to physically press or push something or someone’ (OED, thrust, 2023). In the translation, however, the word ‘thrusting’ has been omitted and the metaphor is translated with the word ‘äregirighet’ and therefore loses the element of violence. Both phrases express that the ambition, described in the context is strong but despite that, the secondary word meaning is quite different. The loss of the metaphor does not affect the overall meaning which supports the action of converting the metaphor to
sense (Merakchi & Rogers, 2013: 364–365). However, the loss of the metaphor affects the emotional impact of the metaphor (Rojo et al. 2014: 38), since the ST seems to convey a stronger, richer, more detailed and more vivid image (Ortony & Fainsilber, 1987: 181).

A similar example can be found below:

(16) It is not to be ripped rudely out of context, as critics used to do when they wrote essays with titles like ‘The Girlhood of Ophelia’ or ‘Would Iago Make a Good Governor of Arizona?’

Example (16) translated with Newmark’s procedure 2, also shows a difference on the micro-level. The word *ripped* means “to tear, pull, or cut (something) away from something else in a forceful or vigorous manner” (OED, rip, 2023). On the contrary, the Swedish translation does not imply any kind of violence. Still, both metaphors express the importance of context. Example (17) below has been translated with the help of procedure 2. Like in example (16) the overall message, of language being given a character, is transferred from the ST to the TT.

(17) But the more language he throws at a character or situation, the more he tends to bury it beneath a heap of generalities.

At the same time, there is a change in the secondary word meaning. The word *throw* means ‘to twist, turn, or wrench’ (OED, throw, 2023) while the Swedish translation *lägger* literally means ‘to place’ [my translation] (SAOL, lägga, 2023). The Swedish translation lacks the implication that an action possibly involving force is carried out. However, to make the metaphor accessible to the target audience (Merakchi & Rogers, 2013: 364–365) it was necessary to replace the ST image with a standard TT image.

Looking at example (18), procedure 5 has been used.

(18) This is verbal overkill with a vengeance.

Due to cultural experience the figurative language has been omitted. Unfortunately, the loss of the metaphorical image results in reduced emotional impact (Rojo et al. 2014: 38). The metaphor has been translated to lit. extreme exaggeration. Looking more closely at the
secondary word meaning in the ST, we find the word overkill means “to destroy (a target, etc.) to a greater extent than is necessary or desirable” (OED, overkill, 2023). The usage of the word vengeance in the ST also seems to work as an amplification of the ferociousness expressed in the metaphor. The very different literal meanings of the specific words used in the ST and the TT indicate a great change on the micro-level. In contrast to the four examples above, example (19), translated with Newmark’s (1981) procedure 1, shows no indication of a change on either the macro-level or the micro-level:

(19) They collide randomly with one another rather than interrelating. De kolliderar slumpvis med varandra snarare än att de står i relation till varandra.

This example, even though falling under the same topic as the previous examples there seems to be no change on the micro-level here. The words collide and kolliderar both express ‘a violent contact between things or people’ (OED, collide, 2023 & SAOL, kolliderar, 2023). Based on this, the secondary word meanings seem to be identical which does not align with Svanlund’s (2007: 81) supposition that even similar, cross-cultured metaphors tend to have non-identical secondary word meanings. The examples above might suggest that the translation strategy chosen for a specific metaphor might have an impact on whether or not there is a change on the macro-level as well as the micro-level.

3.2.7 Transferable macro-level but changed micro-level

This section will provide further examples from different categories of conceptual metaphors that show changes and similarities on the micro-level but where the macro-level is intact. Starting with example (20) below:

(20) We are presented with a society in which everyone is his or her own measure. Vi presenteras för ett samhälle där var och en är sin egen måttstock.

This example of a structural metaphor was shortly introduced in the introduction and is as mentioned translated by reproducing the ST image in the TT and there seems to be no indication of a change on the macro-level. However, there is a slight change in the meanings of the words measure and måttstock. The meaning of the word measure is a “prescribed or limited extent, capacity or quantity” (OED, measure, 2023) whereas the word måttstock has a more limited meaning and means ‘measuring tool’ [my translation] (SAOL, måttstock, 2023). An alternative translation could be ‘sitt eget mått’, (lit. their own unit when measuring). Although, the first
option was chosen since it makes the language sound a bit more figurative. It has been suggested by Citron et al. (2019: 234) that metaphor and figurative language are suitable to use when the writer wants to convey affect. By creating a similar image in the TT, the conveyed affect in the ST image is more or less transferable.

A similar change on the micro-level can be found in example (21) below:

(21) They find it hard to let their characters go, as parents sometimes find it hard to let their children go.

De finner det svårt att släppa taget om sina karaktärer på samma sätt som föräldrar ibland finner det svårt att släppa taget om sina barn.

(p. 3)

This example is an ontological metaphor or more specifically a personification where the novel is ascribed the ability to let go of something/someone. This message is conveyed in both ST and TT. Although there is a slight difference in the secondary word meaning from the Swedish translation literally meaning ‘to release the grip’.

(22) It belongs, in a word, to the rise of modern individualism.

Med andra ord så är det en del av den moderna individualismens framväxt.

(p. 5)

Example (22) is an orientational metaphor falling under the concept MORE IS UP (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 15). The macro-level of the metaphor is transferable to the TT. Although once again there is a change on the micro-level. The meaning of the ST metaphor implies an increase whereas the metaphor in the TT implies a growth. This example is comparable to Schäffner’s (2004: 1260), bridge example.

Changes on the micro-level occur and that is perhaps no surprise since metaphors are new semantic novelties and cannot have a precise equivalent in the TL (Dagut, 1976: 24). However, it might not be a surprise that there in many cases are no change on the macro-level in the metaphors translated since there seems to be an overlap of cultural experiences between the SL and the TL, making them relatively transferable (Dagut, 1976: 32).

The examples in this section seem to suggest that it is not the category of the conceptual metaphor that determines whether there is a change in the macro-level or micro-level of the metaphor. The change is more connected to the choice of translation strategy. This section also indicates that there is often a change on the micro-level due to different secondary word meanings, a finding which aligns with Svanlund (2007:81).
4 Conclusion

This study aimed to identify the conceptual metaphors in the translation and then categorize these based on the kind (Lakoff & Johnson’s, 1980, conceptual metaphor theory) and translation strategy (Newmark’s, 1981, prescriptive framework) used to transfer the metaphorical expression from the ST to the TT. Furthermore, the aim was also to investigate any potential differences in the usage of metaphors in the ST compared to the TT as well as investigate whether the translation process has affected the micro- and macro-levels of the metaphor.

The results show that the most frequent category of conceptual metaphors, that can be found in this particular text is ontological metaphors. One reason for this could be the style of the text and the subject discussed as well as the high number of personifications found in the text. The results also indicate that three of Newmark’s (1981) translation strategies are preferred, namely to reproduce the same image in the TT, replace the same image in the SL with a standard TL image, or convert the metaphor to sense. It is recommended by Newmark (1981: 110) to employ the first strategy wherever feasible, given that cultural and linguistic factors allow for it. More than half of the metaphors conducted for this study were translated by reproducing the same image in the TT, indicating that both languages to some extent have a shared cultural experience but are far from identical, supporting Dagut (1976: 28).

Furthermore, the result suggests that the more similar metaphors the less difference on the macro-level and micro-level of the metaphor. The choice of translation strategy may have an impact on the macro-level of the metaphor. Using the procedure of converting a metaphor to sense seems to have more impact on the macro-level than the procedures of reproducing the same image or replacing the image with a standard image in the TT. Changes on the micro-level of the metaphor may occur regardless of the strategy used. However, the difference in the secondary word meaning may be greater using Newmark’s (1981) procedure 2 or 5 than procedure 1. In contrast to Svanlund (2007: 81), it seems that there is no change in the secondary word meaning in some cases.

Cultural and linguistic limitations seem to have an impact on the choice of translation strategy and because of that changes may also occur on the macro-level and the micro-level of the metaphor. According to Schäffner (2004: 1267), this could question whether or not the cultures use the same conceptual metaphor.

It is important to keep in mind that this is a study based on one text translated by a student and therefore can no firm conclusions about the translation of metaphors be drawn. The result
may be a coincidence for the particular text used. However, the findings of this analysis may inspire further research, based on a larger material sample, on this topic.
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