Linnéuniversitetet
Kalmar Växjö

In other words
Metaphorical concepts in translation

Författare: Jenny Sundqvist
Handledare: Jenny Ström Herold
Examinator: Fredrik Heinat
Termin: VT18
Ämne: Engelska
Nivå: Magister
Kurskod: 4EN31E

Linnéuniversitetet
Kalmar Växjö

Abstract

Awareness of metaphors brings awareness to how language is structured in a text. This study, based on Lakoff & Johnson's theory of conceptual metaphors, will discuss the different types of metaphorical concepts found in the source text and target text during the translation of two articles by the author Mohsin Hamid. The quantitative part of the study will present different types of metaphors and how they translate into Swedish. The qualitative part will focus on how the author uses, and constructs his own, structural metaphors as a rhetorical device. Newmark and Schäffner's translation strategies for metaphors will be considered and applied in combination with two translation theories: Nord's theory of text functions alongside Venuti's foreignisation theory. The findings will suggest that an increased awareness of metaphorical concepts can be beneficial for translators and assist them in understanding how the author of the source text has structured the language and thought content in the text.

Thank you

Linnéuniversitetet
Kalmar Växjö

Contents

1 Introduction

Metaphors are everywhere, and this becomes evident when you begin to look for them. Metaphors are not just figurative speech used to embellish a text; instead there is in fact much to learn from them in terms of how thoughts and concepts are structured. According to Lakoff & Johnson (2003 [1980]: 3), metaphors reveal how we as humans perceive the world and structure our experiences, as well as how we relate to these and to other people. Metaphors can illustrate such everyday aspects as how we express ourselves about mood: as in feeling up or maybe down (ibid.: 15), similarly they can be used in elaborate ways to make an abstract experience, like love, more concrete by describing this experience in terms of a journey, a disease, magic, war, or as a physical force (ibid.: 49). Therefore, understanding how writers use metaphors could be a great help for translators in order to better understand and convey the texts they are working on.

Mohsin Hamid, the author of the source text (ST) used for this study, is a writer who continuously reinvents ways of telling a story, and he often uses metaphors as a distinct way of making and putting a point across. Hamid tells real and fictive stories about the world and its people; he touches upon subjects such as politics, religion, identity and immigration, and it is done in a style that is a pleasure to read whether it is in the form of novels or non-fiction articles. Two articles published in the literary section of the British newspaper *The Guardian* will be the basis for this study. Although they are non-fiction texts they display many literary qualities; they are written in first and second person perspective respectively, where the author uses metaphors and inventive descriptions that results in two original and expressive texts. The two articles are perceptibly informal even though their content is political and significant. In order to translate a text like the ST it has been important to find strategies that can help the translator to deal with the text's expressive style as well as its content. Finding the right balance between content and expression can be difficult, especially when both are equally important functions that make the text successful as a whole, and that is what this paper will explore further.

1.1 Aim

This study will focus on the difficulties that a translator might come across when translating a text that is particularly challenging in terms of style and expression. The feature that might contribute to this ST being expressive and stylistically challenging is the elaborate use of metaphors and figurative language. The aim is to identify the metaphors that are used in the ST and discuss:

- What kinds of metaphors does the ST contain and which strategies are needed to translate them?

- How does the ST author use and construct his own structural metaphors?

- In what way can an awareness of metaphors help during the translation process?

1.2 Material

For this study, two articles from the British newspaper *The Guardian* have been translated into Swedish. The first article: "Mohsin Hamid on the dangers of nostalgia: we need to imagine a brighter future" was published on the 27th of February 2017 and the second "Mohsin Hamid on the rise of nationalism: In the land of the pure, no one is pure enough" was published on the 27th of January 2018. Both articles were published in the newspaper's literary supplement *Guardian Review* and pose questions such as what kind of role literature has in our contemporary world and how it can be used to imagine a brighter future as well as a potential antidote to fear and xenophobia. The ST author is a novelist and political writer who has previously published four novels and a collection of essays. The two articles are quite informal even though their content is political and significant. Example (1) illustrates how the author's writing style is conversational, playful and has a distinct personal tone.

(1)   For you, of course, possibly more obviously a mongrel than many others, writing has become a way of life, the way of *your* life, because it was not clear to you that a life such as yours had a way without it.

This is a typical sentence that can be perceived as a bit of a mouthful in terms of structure and style. The sentence contains the structural metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY, which has been connected to the act of writing – presented here as a concrete entity that defines the author's way of life. Both texts are generally informal and informative with a clear political message and a number of cross-references to world events but also to science. The author often constructs his own metaphors as a way of making a point and this results in a text that can be rather challenging to translate. The target reader of these two articles would be someone with an interest in literature as well as political issues regarding immigration, multiculturalism and human rights. The target reader for the translation would be a Swedish speaker with similar interests and knowledge of politics, culture and literature.

1.3 Method

The ST was translated using a combination of Nord's functionalist theory of text functions (2006, 2016) and Venuti's theory of foreignisation (2004, [1995]). The two theories were helpful when confronted with complex translation problems that occasionally required a choice between adhering to the text's content and its expression. Adapting this focus on different functions and linguistic needs of the text was one attempt at bridging the gap between content and expression.

For the translation both texts were divided into translation units which each contain one sentence. Dividing the text into smaller segments makes the translation more manageable. Due to the ST author's writing style, the sentences vary in length from containing as little as one word and up to 103 words. In general most of the longer sentences contain around 40 words. The punctuation in the target text (TT) has been kept very much the same as in the original text, even though some sentences are excessively long and could benefit from editing. The reason for this is that the mix of

short sentence fragments combined with the longer sentences is part of the ST author's distinct style and contributes to conveying his voice into the TT.

The analysis will be both quantitative and qualitative. First of all, metaphors used in the ST, as well as the TT, have been counted and divided into four subtypes according to Lakoff & Johnson's definitions (which will be further explained in section 2.1 below): structural, orientational, and ontological metaphors (where the last one divides into personification, entity and container metaphors) as well as metonymy (2003[1980]: 10-33). The metaphors recorded in the ST have also been categorised according to the three translation strategies that were used (direct; substitution; metaphor into sense, which will be presented in section 2.2 below). A selection of examples that demonstrate the ST author's use and construction of metaphors will be presented and discussed in relation to the two aforementioned approaches to translation.

Identifying metaphors for this study has been done using a deductive approach. Steen et al. define this approach as when "a set of conceptual metaphors is assumed by the analyst and used for the detection of related linguistic expressions of these metaphors in a set of material" (2010: 768). The set of conceptual metaphors that will be assumed by the analyst (me) will be Lakoff & Johnson's (2003[1980]) definitions of structural, orientational, ontological metaphors as well as metonymy. Both the ST and TT have thus been searched for linguistic expressions that relate to these metaphorical concepts (described further in section 2.1). For example, structural metaphors were often found looking at verbs in both ST and TT (*navigate; fought; composed; retreat*) that may have alternative meanings in a different context than the one used in the text. Verbs were also a good indication when abstract concepts such as *time, stories* and *religion* were presented as concrete entities. For example: stories *have* the power *to liberate* us. Steen et al. state that metaphor will always be a relational term and short for "metaphorical to some language user" (2010: 771). Consequently, the results in this study will be subject to my interpretation and may therefore deviate slightly from other studies of conceptual metaphors.

The problem with a deductive approach, according to Steen et al, is that there is no established adequate and exhaustive list of well-defined conceptual metaphors,

which means that some metaphors may be unidentified in the text (2010: 768-9). However, for this small-scale study, the theories of Lakoff & Johnson (2003[1980]) provided a sufficient starting point for identifying conceptual metaphors in both ST and TT. Instead, Steen et al. prefer to recommend the inductive approach to identifying metaphors (2010: 769). This means that each word is examined and tested to establish whether it has alternative meanings in other than the given context (ibid.). While this approach is clearly defined and structured, I find it more relevant to identify metaphorical concepts related to expression and meaning in the ST rather than metaphorical potential in individual words. Therefore, in the case were a unit contained several ontological entity metaphors, only one was recorded if they referred to the same subject entity. Also, in units that contained structural metaphors all other entity metaphors were ignored if they referred to the same subject. As a result, according to Steen et al.'s method, the ST would possibly contain more metaphors than have been recorded.

2 Theoretical background

This section will present definitions and different categories of conceptual metaphors that have been recorded and analysed in this study; strategies for translation of metaphors; theory on the importance of an awareness of metaphor; and finally the two translation theories that were used when translating the ST.

2.1 Metaphors

Metaphor, in a cognitive linguistic view, can be defined as "understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain" (Kövecses. 2000: 4) For example, in the metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY, which was mentioned in section 1.2, one conceptual domain (life) is understood in terms of another conceptual domain (journey).

Kövecses (ibid.: 4) uses the term *source domain* for the conceptual domain from which the metaphorical expression is drawn (journey), and *target domain* for the conceptual domain that is understood in this way (life). "The target domain is the domain that we try to understand through the use of the source domain" (Kövecses. 2000: 4). According to Lakoff & Johnson (2003 [1980]: 3), language is filled with metaphorical concepts that reveal how speakers conceptualise and make sense of the world. Lakoff & Johnson divide metaphors into three categories: structural, orientational and ontological. *Structural* metaphor is where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another (2003 [1980]: 14). As in the example above, or TIME IS MONEY/ A COMMODITY which is the underlying structural metaphor for expressions like: *spend time, waste time, running out of time* and even *budget one's time*. *Orientational* metaphors organise a system of concepts in a spatial relation to each other (ibid.: 14). They are deeply ingrained in language and can therefore be difficult to notice, but they also reveal how a specific language culture conceives of various experiences and abstracts concepts. For example the concept that GOOD IS UP and BAD IS DOWN noticeable in expressions like: things are looking *up,* we hit a *peak* last year, I am feeling *down*, or it's all *downhill* from here (ibid.:16). *Ontological* metaphors identify abstract experiences as entities or substances, which makes the experiences easier to reason about as we can refer to, categorize, group and quantify them (ibid.: 25). One example of referring to something abstract in terms of an entity could be: my *fear of insects* is driving my wife crazy (ibid.: 26).

Lakoff & Johnson divide ontological metaphors into three categories: *entity* (as in the example above), *container* and *personification.* A container metaphor refers to abstractions like events, actions, activities, but also the visual field, as containers (2003 [1980]: 30). They can be found in expressions like: I *have* him *in* sight; are you *in* the race? How did Jerry *get out of* washing the windows? (ibid,: 30-31). Personification allows an abstract phenomenon like *inflation* to be presented as an entity or even as a person: *inflation is lowering* our standard of living; we need to *combat inflation* (ibid.: 26). This metaphor helps us to understand nonhuman entities in terms of human activities and motivations (ibid.: 33). The example above does not only present *inflation*

as a person, but also as an adversary and thereby we have a way of acting or positioning ourselves in relation to the abstraction (2003 [1980]: 34).

The final category that will be identified here is *metonymy*. Metonymy is not exactly the same as metaphor. Lakoff & Johnson describe the two as different kinds of processes where both provide the function of understanding: while metaphor is a way of conceiving one thing in terms of another one; metonymy allows us to use one entity to *stand for* another (2003 [1980]: 36). Metonymy is frequently used in everyday speech and serves its communicative and figurative function as long as we understand the referential meaning of it. For example: he bought *a Ford* (producer instead of product); the *buses* are on strike (objects for the user); *Wall Street* is in panic (the place for the institution) (ibid.: 38). Metonymy will be included in this study because whilst counting metaphors in the ST it became evident that both texts contained them, and by identifying this feature it could be distinguished from ontological metaphors.

The dividing of metaphors into different categories is something that Lakoff & Johnson later revised and called artificial:

> All metaphors are structural (in that they map structures to structures); all are ontological (in that they create target domain entities); and many are orientational (in that they map orientational image-schemas) (2003: 264).

Despite Lakoff & Johnson's revised thoughts of the theory, the original categories have been used for this study since they provide a concrete framework that can be used for identifying and relating to metaphorical concepts in the language of the two texts.

Metaphors are very frequent linguistic features, according to data analysis carried out by Steen et al. (2010: 765), where an average of one in every seven and a half lexical units were found to be related in some way to metaphors. The same study observed that the use of metaphors could be calculated to 18.5% in academic texts, 16.4% in news and 11.7% in fiction (ibid.: 765). Steen et al. (the Pragglejaz Group) have developed a method for identifying metaphor where each lexical unit (one single word) in a text is tried for metaphorical potential (ibid.: 769). The test is carried out by first establishing the lexical unit's meaning in the written context (taking into account the units that precede and follow); then asking whether it has any basic contemporary

meaning in other contexts than the textual one; decide whether this alternative meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison to it. If the answer is yes, the lexical unit can be marked as metaphorical (2010: 769).

Metaphors have a tendency to group together more densely in some places, and this is called *clustering* (Cameron. 2011: 84). Koller (2003: 120) explains how metaphor clusters have different rhetorical functions in a text. For example in the beginning they help to "set the agenda" that the author has in mind. Clusters in the middle of a text help arguing the author's case and at the end they drive the point home (ibid.) Koller also notes that metaphorical expressions are often organised in chains (ibid.: 117). In these chains the metaphors behave in relation to each other and can for example: elaborate, exemplify, extend, generalise, intensify and echo one another (ibid.: 123). The way metaphors behave in chains will be relevant later when focusing on how the ST author constructs his own original metaphors in the two texts.

2.2 Translating Metaphors

According to Newmark (2008 [1988]: 104), metaphors have two general purposes: the first one is referential, which is used to describe and illustrate mental processes, states, concepts, people, objects, qualities and actions. The second purpose is pragmatic and serves more aesthetic functions that appeals to the senses; please, delight and surprise the reader. A good metaphor should combine these two purposes (ibid.: 104). Newmark uses the word *image* to describe the picture that the metaphor conjures; *object* to denote the event or experience that is actually described; and *sense* to explain the literal meaning of the metaphor (ibid.: 105). Recent theories use the definitions *source* (for image) and *target* (for object) (Kövecses. 2000: 4). I will be using Newmark's terminology to avoid confusion with the source and target terms of translating. Moreover, these are the terms mentioned in the list of translation strategies below and therefore, even though the terminology might be dated, I will use them for consistency. Below is a list of the three translation strategies that have been used for translation of metaphors in the ST, which according to Schäffner (2012: 251) are repeatedly found in literature on translating metaphors:

1. Metaphor into same metaphor: direct translation

2. Metaphor into different metaphor: substitution of the image in the ST by a TL [target language] metaphor with the same or similar sense and/or associations.

3. Metaphor into sense: paraphrase, shift to a non-figurative equivalent.

To illustrate the strategies above, I will use examples from Schäffner's analysis of translations of the term "rettungsschirm", which is a German metaphor that describes emergency funding for members of the Euro zone (2012: 252). A direct translation of this metaphor would be *rescue umbrella*. This translation reproduces the same image in English (rettung = rescue; schirm = umbrella) as in German. However, rescue umbrella is not an established metaphor in English, and therefore this metaphor is mostly translated into sense as bailout/ rescue fund (2012: 256). Schäffner does not mention the occurrence of a different type of metaphor in translation of *rettungsschirm*, even though a potential substitute in English could be the word *safety net*. However, she observes how the metaphor extends into verbs such as: open up, extend and cover, as well as other specific expressions related to weather (ibid.: 257), and this could be a reason why translators have simply opted for translating into sense rather than substituting the metaphor for an established English one. When referring to translations of metaphors in the ST, the terms *direct translation*; *substitution*; [metaphor/translation] *into sense* will be used in section 3 below.

Using Newmark's (2008 [1988]: 112) terminology, Schäffner calls the umbrella metaphor described above an "original" one (2012: 261). The ST contains several original metaphors, and according to Newmark (2008 [1988]: 112) these should be translated directly:

> Original metaphors, created or quoted by the SL-writer, should be translated literally, whether they are universal, cultural or obscurely subjective. I set this up as a principle, since original metaphors (in the widest sense): (a) contain the core of an important writer's message, his personality, his comment on life, and though they may have a more or a less cultural element, these have to be transferred neat; (b) such metaphors are a source of enrichment for the target language (2008 [1988]: 112).

In contrast to this, Crerar-Bromelow (2008: 80) disagrees with the strategy of direct translation for original metaphors. "Doing this, one might well achieve an equivalent

effect, but it would only be by happy accident and not design" (2008: 80). Crerar-Bromelow explains that following Newmark's advice would make poetry the easiest genre to translate since all the translator needs is a good dictionary (ibid.: 80). If the translator does not understand the metaphorical image, or in the case where the target receiver will not share the same knowledge and context to understand the image that is conveyed then a direct translation could potentially empty the metaphor of all meaning and simply result in a text filled with figurative nonsense. As an example Crerar-Bromelow mentions the translation of "Adam's apple" from the bible, which would be completely unintelligible to someone from a language culture that has neither heard of Adam nor apples (2008: 80).

Similarly, Schäffner (2004: 1263) cautions that direct translation might cause miscommunication if cultural differences are not considered. As an example she mentions the German metaphor "feste kern" (meaning hard or firm core) used to express the suggestion for a small inner group of member states in EU documents (ibid.: 1263). The expression was meant to have positive connotations and suggest solidity and wholesomeness but was received in a bad light by the British due to direct translation.

> *Hard core* is associated with people and things that are tough, immoral and incorrigible, and in the English texts, the core was described as an exclusive group with firm, even stubborn, ideas about what the future European Union was to look like (ibid.: 1263).

Ingo (2007: 120) agrees that translators must be careful when recreating metaphorical images and consider the cultural background of the intended reader of the TT since the same image may not be recognised in the culture of the target language. One example is the saying "att bära sitt kors" (ibid.: 120) which in English would be recognised as "a cross to bear". The metaphor is well-known in cultures that are familiar with Christianity, but perhaps not as intelligible to a reader who has never come across stories about the suffering of Christ (2007: 120). This is similar to Crerar-Bromelow's (2008.: 80) observation about cultural contexts, but cultural differences could also amount to everyday differences such as the type of houses people live in or how they

cover their windows. Ingo (2007: 121) mentions a metaphor that describes how a suburb wakes up with: *the houses slowly began to lift their eyelids*. This image refers to blinds that are slowly being rolled up in the morning, and according to Ingo it would not work as well in a culture where houses have shutters instead of blinds (ibid).

The three theorists above bring up issues that emphasise the importance of being aware of nuances and cultural differences when translating. The preceding list of translation strategies provides translators with accessible guidelines to follow when translating metaphors, however, the list offers options but no tools for considering language nuances and cultural differences. Therefore, a more comprehensive method could be useful as an alternative to Schäffner's list. In section 2.2 I will present two theories that have been used to justify some of the decisions that were taken during the translation of the ST.

2.3 Skopos theory and text functions

Nord's theory of text functions builds upon Vermeer and Reiss' Skopos theory (2014: 86). The Greek word *skopos* can be translated into English as aim or purpose, and if a translator understands the intended purpose of the ST then that knowledge will be of guidance when translating and making sure the TT contains the same aim or purpose as the ST. The problem is, according to Nord, that meaning or function cannot be extracted just by anyone who knows the code of the language (2006: 44). The receiver of the text interprets the purpose, but different text receivers will find different purposes (ibid.: 44). Therefore, she proposes that translators concentrate on the *function* of the text, which will be based on the receiver's point of view, and the goal when translating is to reach an agreement, congruence, between the author's intended purpose and the translator's perceived function (Nord. 2006: 45). The four text functions are: *Phatic function* – found in the communicative channel between sender and receiver (2016: 6). This is done through greetings, varying forms of address and politeness markers (2006: 48). The ST does not contain obvious markers of phatic function and therefore this function will not be mentioned further. *Referential function* – the transfer of information and content in the text (2016: 7). To achieve congruence here the translator should consider

how much implicit and explicit knowledge the target reader may have of the information that the text conveys (2016: 7). The mention of the phrase "make America great again" was for example not translated into Swedish due to its referential function. Most Swedish readers will recognise the phrase used by Donald Trump, and from many other contexts just by following the news and world events. *Expressive function* – can be recognised as the author's attitude and opinions regarding the text's content and how this is being expressed (2006: 49). The ST contains many examples of expressive functions since the text is very much an opinion piece, and metaphors are often used to exemplify and express the points that are made. *Appellative function* – the aim of this function is to make the audience react or respond in a certain way (2016: 9). This function is often used in advertising and the translator needs to take into account the potential knowledge and shared values of the target audience in order to communicate this function successfully (ibid.: 9).

Functionalist and *Skopos* theories have been criticised for putting too much emphasis on the TT as an original text production, which turns the translator more into a text producer rather than a mediator, whilst the ST is being dethroned (Jabir 2006: 37). Newmark describes and summarises the theory pointedly when he says that it is pretending too much and going too far to base a translation theory on the translation of the Greek word for "aim" and then adding the moral factor of loyalty as an afterthought (2000: 83). Both of them certainly have a point in that an exclusive focus on the text's function rather than textual content and qualities could result in a translation process where too much liberty is taken in constructing a TT that deviates from the ST. However, is there not always a risk that human translators interpret theory in a way that will suit their own aims for the translation? I find Nord's emphasis on a text's different functions vastly helpful when translating particularly challenging texts, and that it helps when difficult decisions need to be made in terms of which textual feature should take priority over another. To sum up, Nord's text functions can be used to describe how texts create communication, convey information, express opinions, and appeal to the reader in the purpose of achieving a certain response or reaction.

2.4 Foreignisation and the translator's visibility

In contrast to functionalist theory's strong focus on the TT, Venuti (2004 [1995]) highlights the importance of preserving and communicating the linguistic and foreign expression of the ST, even if that results in a TT that is not perfect in the target language. Venuti uses the term "invisibility" to describe translations that flow so naturally that the reader is unaware of it being a translated work (2004 [1995]: 1). The longstanding tradition of judging a translation based on the fluency of the language in the TT is questioned. There is, according to Venuti, a risk that when the target language flows naturally and the text reads like an original work the reader will no longer be aware that they are reading a translated text, which could result in increased ethnocentricity among readers (ibid.: 2). Instead, Venuti suggests a method of "foreignisation".

> Foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only   by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language. In its effort to do right abroad, this translation method must   do   wrong   at   home,   deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience (Venuti.   2004 [1995]: 20).

 Venuti's theory might be slightly provocative to an aspiring translator. To consciously produce a translation that is not fluent and that may deviate from the native norms can seem rather risky considering that fluency is the norm and others might read it as a badly translated text. On the other hand, there is something inspiring about the idea of making the reader aware of reading a foreign text. Venuti also means that keeping the translator invisible perpetuates the profession's long history of low status and pay (ibid.: 17). One problem with Venuti's theory of foreignisation is that if a translation is too overtly foreign it might lose its value as a target text (Myskja 2013). According to Myskja (2013: 6), a foreignised translation might cloud its own surface and perhaps even remind the reader that only the true meaning can be found in the source text. "In this it may be said to be striving to de-legitimise itself" (2013: 6-7). There is certainly a need for the right balance of foreign aspects in a translation. The reader should be made aware of how the ST author (and the foreign language) structures thought processes and

expresses experiences, but not to the extent of being an unintelligible read. If a visibility of foreign ways of thinking and structuring of experiences are needed in a translation then metaphors might be an ideal feature to focus on.

3 Analysis

This section will first of all focus on the quantitative analysis of the ST and TT. Section 3.1 will present the amount of metaphors found in the text and how these were translated according to the three strategies: direct, substitution and metaphor into sense. Moreover, I will identify the different types of metaphors and compare their distribution between ST and TT; and finally, to illustrate these findings I will briefly analyse how some of the ontological (as well as metonymy) and orientational metaphors have been used by the ST author and discuss how they translated into Swedish.

During this study it became apparent that although difficult to identify, ontological metaphors and metonymy are not particularly challenging when translating. These metaphors were however found to be invaluable guidelines as to how the ST author have structured the two texts in terms of language and expressions; they reveal how metaphorical concepts can be found in how we refer to entities in both languages, but they do not contribute greatly to the texts' expressive style. Instead, it is through structural and original metaphors that images are being presented and thought patterns revealed, which results in the texts' inventiveness. These metaphors are representative of some of the more difficult decisions that occurred during the translation. Therefore, for the qualitative analysis of how metaphors are used to structure and communicate thought content, section 3.2 will focus more in depth on some of the structural metaphors found in the text and in addition to this section 3.3 will present and analyse how the ST author structures his own original metaphors.

3.1 Types of metaphors

To begin, table 1 presents all the metaphors that were found in the ST and shows how the three different translation strategies have been applied when translating.

Table 1. Translation of metaphors

Type of metaphor	Direct translation	Substitution	Metaphor into sense	Total
All	180 (76 %)	31 (13 %)	27 (11 %)	238 (100 %)
Structural	39 (78 %)	5 (10 %)	6 (12 %)	50 (100 %)
Orientational	2 (33 %)	4 (67 %)	-	6 (100 %)
Entity	65 (74 %)	13 (15 %)	10 (11 %)	88 (100 %)
Container	27 (75 %)	6 (17 %)	3 (8 %)	36 (100 %)
Personification	32 (86 %)	-	5 (14 %)	37 (100 %)
Metonymy	15 (71 %)	3 (14 %)	3 (14 %)	21 (100 %)

*Percentages rounded to the nearest integer, therefore some rows amount to 99 %.

Table 1 shows that 76 % of all of the recorded metaphors in the ST were directly translated. This result could partially highlight that the two languages are similar in how metaphorical concepts are structured; however, the high number is also a reflection of the translator's decision to foreignise the TT, as well as adhering to Newmark's advice to translate original metaphors directly (where appropriate). Substitution was used in the translation of 13 % of the metaphors in the ST. This strategy was generally applied when there was an established word /metaphor available in the target language that conveyed a similar image and the same sense in the TT. 11 % of the metaphors in the ST have been translated into sense. This strategy was most often applied when a direct translation, and foreignisation, would have resulted in an unnecessary long and complicated sentence unit, and where the actual referential function of the content

would have been lost.

Next I will present the types of metaphors that were found in the ST and TT, and briefly describe how some of them were translated. Focusing first on the amounts of metaphors to translate, the ST contains 238 metaphors. Considering that the entire ST contains a total of 252 translation units this means that there is one metaphor for almost every sentence (94 % of all translation units). However, compared to the amount of words in the text, the ST contains one metaphor for every 18 words. This is a low amount compared to the study of Steen et al. (2010), which found one metaphor for every 7.5 words. As stated in section 1.3 this study did only record one metaphor where more than one referred to the same subject entity; therefore, as expected, these numbers are lower than those of Steen et al. I will however regard this text rich in metaphor considering that on average 94 % of all units in the ST contains some metaphorical concept primarily expressed in more than one single word. In contrast to this high number there is a noticeable pattern of metaphor clustering in both ST and TT, which unfortunately will not be visible looking at these tables. Generally, the units that contained metaphorical concepts held between 1-3 metaphorical features, while other units (often several in a row) where recorded as not containing any metaphors at all. As seen in table 2 below, after translation the TT contained slightly less metaphors than the original text, but the distribution of different categories appears very similar to the ST.

Table 2. Type of metaphors in the ST and TT

	Structural	Orientational	Ontological	Metonymy	Total	Translation units
ST	50	6	161	21	238	252
	(21 %)	(3 %)	(68 %)	(9 %)	(100 %)	*
TT	46	7	153	18	224	
	(20 %)	(3 %)	(69 %)	(8 %)	(100 %)	

* Percentages rounded to the nearest integer, therefore this row amounts to 101 %.

Most noticeable is perhaps the low number of orientational metaphors where experiences are measured in terms of spatial relation to one another. One reason why there may have been so few of them recorded in the ST could be that these are so ingrained in language that usually we do not recognise them as metaphorical. It is possible that if each lexical unit had been tested for metaphorical properties, like Steen et al. (2010) did in their study (see section 2.1) then perhaps more orientational metaphors had been registered. The low number could also depend on the fact that orientational metaphors tend to describe how people feel, what they do, and how they see themselves and others. "They have a basis in our physical and cultural experience" (Lakoff & Johnson 2003 [1980]: 14). The low number could then simply be a result of the ST author having a different way of expressing his cultural and physical experiences. As we will see further on (in section 3.3) the ST author also constructs his own structural metaphors. Example (2) below presents the orientational metaphors that were recorded in both ST and TT.

(2)	We are *growing* terrified of the future.	Vår rädsla inför framtiden *växer* allt mer.
	Instead we see upheaval and uncertainty *ahead*	Istället ser vi omvälvning och osäkerhet *framför oss.*
	Since *well before* the dawn of history.	Sedan *långt före* historiens gryning.
	The futures that we suspect are likely to occur…	De framtidsutsikter vi ser *framför oss*...

In the first ST sentence the word *growing* indicates a spatial relation to an increase in fear. This can be associated to the orientational concept of MORE IS UP AND LESS IS DOWN. Semantically, the translation of this sentence has been changed slightly: *We are growing terrified* has been translated into *our fear […] is growing;* yet the meaning of the two sentences is the same. Growing terrified is synonymous to an increasing (growing) amount of fear, which means that both the image and sense of the metaphor remains the same in the two texts and therefore (in accordance with the list presented by Schäffner in section 2.2) this metaphor has been directly translated.

The other orientational metaphors in example (2) describe a relation to time. Two

of these are based on the FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS ARE UP (and AHEAD) metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson. 2003 [1988]: 16) and these suggest that future events can be seen in front of us. Please note that in the last sentence in example (2) this metaphor only features in the TT. The same sentence unit from the ST was in fact marked as an entity metaphor where the abstract concepts *futures* are described as several entities but also as upcoming events: something that is likely to occur. In translation this entity metaphor has been substituted for an orientational one, however the meaning (sense) is the same: that future events is something that will eventually appear or be made visible.

Both texts feature large quantities of ontological metaphors where abstract concepts and experiences are treated as entities. For example, *nostalgia* is being referred to as an entity seven times, and ST2 refers to *purity* and *impurity* as entities 23 times throughout the text. When looking at the three different types of ontological metaphors there is still a majority of entity metaphors recorded in the text. Entities were mostly directly translated in both texts, but they did not always keep the same metaphorical function in the TT, hence the slight variations seen below.

Table 3. Type of ontological metaphors

	Personification	Container	Entity	Total
ST	37	36	88	161
	(23 %)	(22 %)	(55 %)	(100 %)
TT	15	21	39	75
	(20 %)	(28 %)	(52 %)	(100 %)

Container metaphors are fairly frequent, and most of them refer to time: we are *pulled out of* the present moment; the worlds we live in; as the world *outside* my screen goes unnoticed; culture and TV programmes are described as containers that nostalgia can manifest itself in, but the container metaphor also highlights how for example films and TV shows are alternate worlds that the audience can come in and out of.

The majority of these container metaphors could be directly translated into

Swedish. However, two container metaphors did not show up in the corresponding translation units of the TT. Example (3) will highlight this.

(3) Donald Trump emerged victorious *in the US election*

Donald Trump *vann* det amerikanska presidentvalet

And stories helped me find *a future in which,* I such a mongrel, could be comfortable

Och berättelser hjälpte mig att hitta *en framtid* där en blandad byracka som jag kunde känna sig bekväm.

Both the US election and the future have been presented as containers in the ST but not in the TT. An election could be described as a container in Swedish, and an alternative would have been to describe how Trump came victorious *out of* the election (kom segrande ur). The sentence, which was one of the longer ones in the ST, begins with Trump being victorious in the election and ends with drawing a comparison to the country being victorious in the Second World War. Even though the Swedish translation could have included an equivalent expression this option made the sentence unnecessarily convoluted and disrupted the flow of the text. The decision was then made that the referential function of the text was more important than expression and style. Rather than foreignising the TT I therefore opted for deleting the container metaphor and translate the main clause of the sentence simply into its meaning: Trump *won* the election.

Personification is frequent in both texts. The challenge is at times to remind oneself that the difference between this one and the entity metaphor is that personification describes abstractions not just in a concrete way but presents them as if they were humans that act and can be related to. Personification was most often directly translated into Swedish as can be seen in example (4).

(4) And so we seek to resist *time.*

Så vi försöker stå emot *tiden.*

We rebel against *it.*

Vi gör uppror mot *den.*

Metonymy features 21 times in the ST. For example, *Islamic State*, *al-Qaida* and *Brussels* were recorded as metonymy as they all refer to a few people behind a general

collective term. As with personification, this feature was most often directly translated into Swedish and did not lose its function in the TT. Example (5) shows how metonymy is used to present a situation without pointing accusing fingers at specific individuals, whilst at the same time to highlight political similarities:

(5) […] *a politics of Hindu purity* is wrenching open deep and bloody fissures

[…] *a politics of Buddhist purity* is massacring and expelling *the Rohingya.*

[…] *a politics of white purity* is marching in white hoods and red baseball caps

[...] river *hinduismens renhetspolitik* upp djupa och blodiga sprickor

Buddismens renhetspolitik [...] massakrerar och utvisar rohingyafolket.

I USA marscherar *den vita renhetspolitiken* i vita kåpor och röda kepsar.

This concept of "institution for people responsible" (Lakoff & Johnson. 2003 [1980]: 38) is cleverly used to highlight the likeness between three cultures that otherwise might be perceived as each other's opposites, and draw parallels between the three types of politics. An awareness of this feature, and its function, helps the translator to maintain both the referential and appellative functions that can be found in the ST.

Investigating the translation of the conceptual metaphors that have been presented above did perhaps not result in findings that revealed how different the two languages are in relation to each other. On the contrary, it revealed that many conceptual metaphors, the ones so well engrained in both languages that they are mostly not noticed, are often easily translated into Swedish. A reason for this result could be that the two language cultures are both similar since they share the same Germanic language root and that they are representative of a European and western world way of conceptualising the world. However, recording the different types of metaphors became a good starting point for an increased awareness of how metaphors are structured and used in a written text. This awareness could then be used when considering several options for translations and this often resulted in translations that were closer to the ST than previous solutions. For example, the first sentence in example (2) *we are growing terrified* had initially been translated into: *vi blir allt mer rädda* (we become more and more scared). This sentence was changed into *our fear grows* after the orientational

metaphor had been identified, and even though it might be a minor detail this change reflects the ST author's expression better rather than simply conveying the text's referential function and meaning. Therefore, recognising even the hidden metaphorical aspects of language can be an additional help for a translator when trying to adhere to both content and writing style. Furthermore, this awareness can be a great help for understanding and analysing the more complex metaphorical constructs that the ST contains.

3.2 Translating Structural Metaphors

Section 3.1 showed that the ST is rich in metaphor where some kind of metaphorical concept can be found for almost every translation unit, and that a majority of these translated directly into the TT. Roughly a fifth of the metaphors that were recorded were recognised as *structural* i.e. where one concept is structured in terms of another (Lakoff & Johnson. 2003 [1980]: 14). This section will focus on structural metaphors that were used in the ST and how they translate into Swedish.

The structural metaphors in the ST describe abstractions such as time, change and life in terms of more concrete experiences: TIME IS MONEY/A COMMODITY; CHANGE IS MOVEMENT; and finally the metaphorical concept LIFE IS A JOURNEY which can be found in example (6):

(6) We human beings exist by being first in one moment […] *until we reach our end.*

För oss människor innebär existens att vi först befinner oss i ett ögonblick [...] *tills vi nått vårt slut.*

The journey metaphor is structured around a timeline, which has a beginning and an end. This metaphor can be found in Swedish as well and was therefore directly translated. The metaphor returns later in the text, with a more nautical theme, where a metaphorical chain can be identified. See example (7).

(7) We are becoming *unmoored* just as the *currents* around us are growing swifter.

Vi håller på att tappa vår *förankring* i takt med att *strömningarna* omkring oss växer sig starkare.

[---] And so we are *left stranded*: unstable in the present…	[---] Och så befinner vi oss *på grund*: vacklande i nuet...

The ST author often uses the journey metaphor when he describes himself dealing with issues in the past and his current life. The verb *navigate* is regularly used as a metaphor for relating to issues and finding the right solutions. In example (7) the journey metaphor modifies into LIFE IS A JOURNEY – AT SEA. The metaphor appears twice in the same sentence and then reappears four sentences later, thus creating a chain where the metaphor is first established, then elaborated upon, and finally echoed in the final sentence. The whole chain of this metaphor was directly translated into the TT. Example (8), however, presents a part of the same metaphor that had to be substituted into a different structural metaphor in Swedish.

(8)	The importance (and intricate *navigation*) of clan, family (…) must have been a useful education to this (…) boy *finding his way* in Pakistan.	Vikten (och det invecklade *samspelet*) av samhörighet, släktskap (...) måste ha varit användbar kunskap för denna pojke (...) som *nu skulle hitta ett nytt sätt att fungera* i Pakistan

This sentence from the ST uses the LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor where a way of relating to family, clan and a long list of other aspects of life has been structured along the conceptual domain of being on a journey and finding the right way as if there were actual maps for such life experiences. To some extent this metaphor is found in Swedish, as seen in example (6) and (7), however, it does not translate well in this particular context. Once again, as in example (3), the metaphor appears in one of the longer sentences and the option of foreignising the translation has been ruled out in favour of content and coherence. The referential and expressive functions in this sentence, the information and opinions of the author, might simply be lost if the metaphor is translated into images that could be confusing to the target readers. As a consequence, the metaphor *navigate* has been substituted for the Swedish image of *interplay* where the metaphor suggests that LIFE IS COOPERATION. The second metaphor in the chain has also been substituted for a more Swedish way of describing *finding his way* with: *finding a way to function*. Substitution often works well for transferring the

image or sense into the TT. However, in some situations it can be more appropriate to translate the metaphor into sense as a way of adhering to the cultural context of the ST. Example (9) has been translated into sense rather than substitution.

| (9) | The Brexit campaign *was fought with a rallying cry o*f taking back control from Brussels… | Kampanjen för Brexit *genomfördes med ett stridsrop* om att ta tillbaka kontrollen från Bryssel... |

Example (9) shows a metaphor that could be structured along the lines of: A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN IS A BATTLE. This is not an unusual way of referring to election campaigns in English. In Swedish however, the direct translation of *fought – utkämpades* is not commonly used to describe the same process. A non-figurative equivalent then had to be used (*carried out*) since there is no similar metaphor in Swedish. Meanwhile, the modifying phrase *with a rallying cry* has been directly translated into Swedish. Therefore this metaphor did partly translate in the same sense, and even though one battle aspect has been lost the sentence keeps the image of the Brexit campaign being fought as a battle. One alternative could have been to try and substitute the metaphor for one that would be used in Swedish: perhaps one that describes a political campaign as a competition or sports event. However, that would have potentially domesticated the translation and seeing as Brexit is an exclusively British experience the translation should rather reflect a British description of that event.

In this section we have looked at how a couple of structural metaphors have been used and translated in the two texts. The metaphorical concept LIFE IS A JOURNEY is one of the recurring structural metaphors in ST1 and it could be found in metaphorical chains that elaborated and echoed the concept across several translation units. Metaphorical chains often occur where the ST author has constructed his own original metaphors. In the next section I will attempt to map this structuring of original metaphors.

3.3 Structuring own original metaphors

The ST is also filled with structural metaphors that the ST author has constructed. Newmark calls these *original* metaphors and prescribe direct translation as a general rule (2008 [1988]: 112). In this section I will present three original metaphors that the author has structured himself and discuss how these metaphors are constructed, used and translated. First of all, example (10) shows how the author establishes the metaphor by presenting the object, *the past*, as an entity that can be shaped, examined and interacted with:

(10) […] we are pulled out of the present moment to constantly *shape and examine and interact* with carefully curated pasts.

[...] dras vi hela tiden ut ur nutiden för att istället *forma och undersöka och kommunicera* med en noggrant utformad dåtid.

Similar to Koller's (2003: 123) explanation (see section 2.1): once the object has been established as an entity, the author continues to elaborate and exemplify the metaphor into a metaphorical chain that is easy to follow. The process continues in example (11).

(11) I can *sift* endlessly through these archives of past moments, *commingle* them with present choices and likes and filters, and *craft* new past-present hybrids, dancing across time, sometimes alone, sometimes with others […]

jag kan *bläddra* ändlöst genom dessa arkiv av ögonblick som varit, *blanda* dem med nutidens val och likes och filter, och på så vis *skapa* nya dåtid-nutidshybrider som dansar genom tiderna, ibland ensamma, ibland med andra [...]

This metaphor now conveys the image of past times and memories as something concrete that could fit into an album or a scrapbook. The sense of the metaphor is actually that social media essentially is similar to a scrapbook where every moment can be examined and looked at repeatedly. Last of all, the author extends the metaphor and describes how memories become hybrids; almost something alive that is dancing across time with others and alone. This metaphor translates directly into Swedish as it simply creates the image of the point that the ST author wants to make. The metaphor is not culturally bound in language, and requires no further shared knowledge and cultural context than a familiarity with social media, which is something that most adult readers

in the Western culture will have. Another example of how easily original metaphors can be established simply by stating a similarity and then elaborating upon this will be presented in example (12).

(12) Writing and reading are, *as sex is,* a commingling.

Literature is the practice of the impure.

Written words might articulate demands and justifications for purity, but the fact that such words are written and read means they are, by their very nature, impure – *prudes perhaps, but inescapably engaged in an orgy.*

Att skriva och läsa är, *liksom sex* är, en sammanslagning.

Litteratur är utövandet av det orena.

Det skrivna ordet kan uttala krav på, och rättfärdigande för renhet, men det faktum att dessa ord är nedskrivna och kan läsas innebär att de, till sin natur, är orena – *de må vara pryda, men likväl medverkar de oundvikligt i en orgie.*

In the first sentence, the author draws a comparison where the common denominator is *sex*. He then makes another statement that literature is the practice of the impure – a concept that can also be associated with sexuality. Once this connection has been put into words the author exemplifies and elaborates whilst creating a chain that once again helps him to make a point that is easy to follow. The content is, as in example (11) familiar enough to most readers and therefore this metaphor can be directly recreated in the TT and should be understandable to Swedish readers who may not have come across a similar metaphor before.

The previous examples showed the structuring of original metaphors with images that translated directly into Swedish. In example (13) below an original metaphor was translated directly, according to Newmark's advice, but not without cause for concern.

(13) I loved Mad Men and my wife loved Downton Abbey; (…) it has only intermittently struck us *that they are imaginative vehicles hurtling back and away* from our vastly non-all-white present-day planet.

Jag älskade Mad Men och min fru älskade Downton Abbey (...) att vi bara nyligen insett att *de är fantasifulla fordon som rusar bakåt och bortåt* från vår enormt icke-helt-vita nutidsplanet.

This structural metaphor has its foundation in the conduit metaphor, but the author turns it into his own original metaphor by spelling it out. Lakoff & Johnson (2003 [1980]: 10)

present the conduit metaphor in three parts: IDEAS ARE OBJECTS; LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS; COMMUNICATION IS SENDING. The TV shows, along with the ideas and expressions they send out, are being presented as objects contained in vehicles that travel backwards very quickly, thus conveying how the shows represent thought content that is moving back and away whilst sending viewers' minds backwards and away from the present time and this planet that has achieved some kind of progress.

Much thought went into this sentence before translating it literally. A direct translation sounded wrong, but there was no equivalent image in Swedish that could be substituted in the TT. *Vehicle* is often used metaphorically in English to describe how one thing influences another in a constructive and often positive way. An equivalent Swedish image could be the word for *tool* (verktyg). However, substituting *vehicle* for *tool* would require restructuring of the whole image and that could potentially change the sense of the whole metaphor. Whilst a direct translation would sound too foreign it could at least convey the expressive function in the text. There is no guarantee that a Swedish reader will completely understand the referential and expressive functions of this metaphor. However, the sentence has been foreignised and both Newmark and Venuti should agree that at least the reader has the opportunity to partake of the author's original thought content and language style.

So far in this study I have found that well structured metaphors can in fact be rather helpful for the translator, as they can become a rhetorical map of how the author has structured the content of the text. Original metaphors can be directly translated as long as image and sense are clearly communicated and can be connected to the target reader's language culture. Awareness of metaphorical concepts can also make the translator more aware of nuances in the language and help towards a closer translation that retains some of the foreign aspects of the language. When the thought content is displayed in clear images that would be as natural to the receivers of the TT as they are for the ST receivers then there should be no reason to fear metaphors. However, this might not always be the case, and this does certainly not mean that the translation of the ST will be effortless.

4 Conclusion

The aim of this study has been to explore translation difficulties relating to a text that has a specific expressive style, with particular interest in how metaphors contribute to this aesthetic expression. Based on Lakoff and Johnson's theory of conceptual metaphors I have identified four types of metaphorical concepts in the ST, and also found that the text contained almost one metaphorical concept for every sentence, although often appearing in clusters and thereby also revealing parts of the text that were not found to contain conceptual metaphors.

Even though a number of the conceptual metaphors were relatively effortless to translate directly or substitute, paying attention to them, and how metaphors are structured, provided a better understanding for how the ST author uses language and presents his thought content. This awareness often resulted in a translation that was more close to the ST than first anticipated. The translation was done based on Nord's theory of text functions whilst also taking into account Venuti's theory of foreignisation that may contain foreign aspects from the ST author's language as opposed to aiming for a fluent translation. I find these theories to be vastly different and therefore highly compatible since the need for potential foreignisation can be offset against the functional requirements of the text. The two translation theories are also excellent complements to Schäffner's three strategies for translation of metaphor. Direct translation can either require foreignisation or result in a domesticated metaphor where one is available; as seen in example (9), even though a potential substitution is available the text might benefit from a foreignised translation of metaphor into sense to communicate a cultural experience. However, translating with a heightened awareness for metaphors turned out to be the most valuable strategy in many ways as it made me pay attention to potential metaphorical concepts otherwise hidden in everyday language. Metaphors are truly everywhere; the reader may have noticed how concepts are occasionally presented as images in this text too. The more you look for them, the more you will find.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Mohsin Hamid. 2017. Mohsin Hamid on the dangers of nostalgia: we need to imagine a brighter future. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/books/2017/feb/25/mohsin-hamid-danger-nostalgia-brighter-future [accessed on 30.07.2018].

Mohsin Hamid. 2018. Mohsin Hamid on the rise of nationalism: In the land of the pure, no one is pure enough. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/books/2018/jan/27/mohsin-hamid--exit-west-pen-pakistan [accessed on 30.07.2018].

Secondary sources

Cameron, Lynne J. 2011. *Metaphor and Reconciliation: The Discourse Dynamics of Empathy in Post-Conflict Conversations.* New York: Routledge.

Crerar-Bromelow, Grace. 2008. "Can an awareness of Conceptual Metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) aid the Translator in His/Her Task?" *Selected Papers from the 2006 and 2007 Stockholm Metaphor Festivals*, eds. N.-L. Johannesson & D. C. Minugh, 75-84. Stockholm: Department of English, Stockholm University.

Ingo, Rune. 2007. *Konsten att översätta. Översättandets praktik och didaktik.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Jabir, Jawad Kadhim. 2006. Skopos Theory: Basic Principles and Deficiencies. *Journal of the College of Arts. University of Basrah 41.* 37-46.

Koller, Veronika. 2003. Metaphor Clusters, Metaphor Chains: Analyzing the Multifunctionality of Metaphor in Text. *Metaphorik.de.* 115-134.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. *Metaphor: A practical Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By.* London: The University Chicago Press.

Myskja, Kjetil. 2013. "Foreignisation and resistance: Lawrence Venuti and his critics." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12(2): 1-23.

Newmark, Peter. 2008 [1988]. *A Textbook of Translation.* New York: Prentice Hall international.

Newmark, Peter. 2000. The deficiencies of Skopos Theory: A Response to Anna Trosborg. *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training.* Christina Schäffner, ed. 2002. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Nord, Christiane. 2002. Manipulation and Loyalty in Functional Translation. *Translation and Power, Special Issue of Current Writing 14/2.* 32-44.

Nord, Christiane. 2006. Translating for Communicative Purposes across Culture Boundaries. *Journal of Translation Studies 9, 43-60.*

Nord Christiane. 2016. Meaning, sense, function – What is transferred? *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences 231,* 3-10.

Reiss, Katharina & Hans J. Vermeer. 2014. *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action, Skopos Theory explained.* New York: Routledge.

Schäffner, Christina. 2004. Metaphor and Translation: Some Implications of a Cognitive Approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1253-1269.

Schäffner, Christina. 2012. Finding space under the umbrella: The Euro crisis, metaphors, and translation. *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 17, 250-270.

Steen, Gerard J. et al. 2010. Metaphor in usage. *Cognitive Linguistics* 21-4, 765-796.

Venuti, Lawrence. [1995] 2004. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation.* New York: Routledge.