Translation studies and metaphor studies: Possible paths of interaction between two well-established disciplines

Mark Shuttleworth

School of European Languages, Culture and Society, University College London

Abstract

The objects of study of these two disciplines are etymological cognates, the meaning that lies at the heart of both *translation* and *metaphor* being that of transfer. The study of metaphor in translation therefore involves tackling the complexities of a double act of transfer through the use of methodologies that are correspondingly subtle.

The article aims to investigate what the disciplines of translation studies and metaphor studies have in common and what the potential for interdisciplinary research might be. As argued by Israel (2011), having absorbed numerous research models and approaches from other disciplines over the last few decades, translation studies is in a strong position to share its insights and perspectives with these same disciplines. In the case of research into metaphor in translation, although the centres of gravity of translation studies and metaphor studies are rather different there is great potential for a two-way interaction between these two disciplines. On the one hand, it is now virtually inconceivable that a study of metaphor in translation should not take full account of work by scholars specialising in metaphor studies. On the other hand, translation studies can provide metaphor scholars with mono-, bi- and even multilingual data from its case studies to supplement their own descriptive work. There do of course exist a number of caveats regarding the compatibility of material from the two disciplines. However, in many cases the result of such research has been work worthy of the attention of scholars working within both disciplines. The article focuses specifically on text-based research but is of relevance to other approaches as well.

Keywords: translation, metaphor, interdisciplinary, translation studies, metaphor studies.

Biographical information

From November 2000 until September 2013 Mark Shuttleworth was a Senior Lecturer in Scientific, Technical and Medical Translation at Imperial College London where he was in charge of the MSc in Scientific, Technical and Medical Translation with Translation Technology. Since October 2013 he has been a Senior Lecturer at UCL. He is an established PhD supervisor and as and when time permits he is also active as a translator. His publications include the *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, which appeared in 1997 and which was translated into Chinese in 2005, as well as works on metaphor in translation, translation technology, translator training and medical translation.

1. Introduction: the metaphorics of metaphor and translation

Metaphor and translation, the two main keywords of this article, have etymologies that are very similar: both convey the meaning of movement from one place to another, of transfer. Thus anyone unwise enough to write about metaphor in translation has to think simultaneously in terms of two separate types of meaning transfer.

The origin of the word *metaphor* is indeed Greek (*meta-* "change (of place, order, condition, or nature)" and *pherein* "to bear/carry"), while *translate* comes from Latin (*translātus*, the past passive participle of *transferre* "to transfer", from *trans-* "across, to or on the farther side of, beyond, over" and *ferre* "to bear/carry") (*The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*). The idea of transfer is also reflected in the terminology of both metaphor and translation studies, as evidenced in the twofold use of the terms *source* and *target*. In the former discipline, these two terms respectively refer – in one major theory of metaphor at any rate – to the two domains of experience brought together in a metaphor, the one providing the words and concepts in terms of which the other is spoken, written or (possibly) even thought about, while in the latter discipline they denote the original and receptor texts, languages or cultures between which the act of translation takes place.

It should of course be emphasised that in other languages the etymologies of these two words may be totally different, and indeed not related to each other (see for example Tymoczko 2007: 68-77 for a discussion of words for translation, for example). However, in the case of many of the languages in the Indo-European language group at least, the notions of metaphor, transfer and translation are closely related etymologically as well as conceptually. Along similar lines, the concept of literalness can easily take on a double meaning: privileging source-text wording over sense in relation to translation, and non-figurative over figurative meanings in relation to metaphorical language. It is against this background that we will be discussing possible interaction between translation studies and metaphor studies.

2. The discipline of translation studies

The discipline that is now known as translation studies properly originated in about the early 1960s. Up until that time the study of translation had been largely non-systematic and sporadic, and had focused largely on normative questions of quality, accuracy, translatability and the correct way to translate, almost invariably with reference to either literary or religious texts. Much has changed in the last 40-50 years, however, and translation studies has formed itself into a fully-fledged discipline complete with theoretical paradigms and a non-prescriptive approach to the investigation of translation as both process and product, and of its function in a particular social, cultural or political context. In line with this, translation is now seen as an act of communication situated within a concrete linguistic and cultural context and influenced, for example, by genre conventions, audience expectations and the translator's own manipulative activity, whether this be unknowing or intentional (see Hermans 1985: 11). This is indeed a very different – and more highly nuanced – vision from that which was generally current in the 1960s, at the time when translation studies was still relying on paradigms that had been developed within the context of other disciplines.

These days it hardly needs to be pointed out that translation studies is not simply contrastive linguistics by another name (nor, indeed, is it merely a branch of applied linguistics). To understand one of the main reasons for this we must look at a distinction make by the early twentieth-century Swiss linguist Saussure. According to Saussure, within the general concept of language it is necessary to distinguish two separate notions, those of *langue* and *parole* (Saussure 1986: 9-10, 15). This is a distinction that has been highly influential in twentieth-century linguistics. *Langue* represents the theoretical, abstract concept of a language as a rule-governed system, while *parole* denotes instances of specific language usage that are produced in response to a particular set of stimuli. Thus for example formal grammar, lexical semantics and contrastive linguistics are predicated on *langue* while discourse analysis and pragmatics take *parole* as their main object of study. Translation studies, which focuses on analysing real acts of communication and on language use within authentic contexts, is also a discipline that

is primarily dependent on the study of *parole*. Metaphor studies – or, at any rate, cognitive linguistics – arguably concerns itself with both but is ultimately interested in building up our understanding of how metaphor functions as part of a language system (i.e. *langue*) and, indeed, of human psychology. This fundamental distinction is therefore important for understanding the different focuses of these two disciplines.

Metaphor is of course only one of many possible objects of research within translation studies. In a highly programmatic article originating from the early 1970s, which has played a very significant role in lending the discipline its current shape, Holmes defines translation studies as consisting of three branches, the theoretical, the descriptive and the applied (1971/2004: 184-91). Holmes' overall vision of the discipline is often presented visually as a map (see for example Toury 1995: 10). While purely theoretical work is certainly being carried out – either on a "general", all-encompassing theory or on more specific partial ones (1971/2004: 186) – most of the research that is not of an applied nature takes place within the descriptive branch, the aim of which is to investigate translation as both a product and a process, and also the functions of translation within a given cultural, social or political context (1971/2004: 184-5). The term "descriptive translation studies" implies a non-prescriptive approach to researching a wide range of topics, firmly oriented towards the target rather than the source text and context (Toury 1995: 23-39), and committed to the analysis of unpredictable, messy real instances of translation rather than basing theoretical arguments on neat, invented examples. Furthermore, since the "cultural turn" the discipline has greatly diversified and now largely concerns itself, for example, with translation norms (see Hermans 1999), rewriting and manipulation (Lefevere 1992), postcolonial contexts (Niranjana 1992; Robinson 1997), gender issues (Simon 1996; von Flotow 1997), questions of translators' visibility (Venuti 1995) in the texts they produce and the application of narrative theory (Baker 2006) to acts of translation. Holmes' map has been extended too, most notably perhaps by van Doorslaer (2007).

Interestingly, many fascinating insights into translation have been gained through the deliberate exploitation of old metaphors, or the intentional introduction and exploration of new ones. St. André (2010) offers a collection of articles that present a wide range of these (see for example Tyulenev 2010 for translation as smuggling; see also Hönig 1997 for translation as bridge-building; Johnston 1999 for translation as simulacrum; Vieira 1999 for translation as cannibalism and vampirism; Hermans 2007 for translation as transubstantiation; Evans 1998 for a general discussion).

There are in fact a wide range of different areas that form the objects of text-based research that focuses chiefly on matters of language. However, instead of analysing translated material against a particular "correctness notion" (Hermans 1991: 166), translation is seen as a process of decision-making that leads to both loss and gain. There are not considered to be any "right" or "wrong" translations – just degrees of appropriateness. Mistranslations and mistakes are not of significant interest to the discipline. In line with this, a move has occurred away from focusing on translation shifts – that is, minor rewordings – that are caused by small incompatibilities of grammar and lexis, the situation that we see in Catford's understanding of the notion (1965: 73-82) and that was presumably caused by the influence of paradigms derived from contrastive linguistics. Instead, what we see now is a focus on shifts that are optional and reflect conscious decisions made by translators in an attempt to produce a viable solution to a real translation problem. In other words, what is now often of interest is the target context: what the translator chose to say as opposed to what could have been said. In addition, translation studies no longer places its exclusive attention on studying single words, phrases and sentences in isolation but now also examines what happens to higher-level entities – such as an extended

section of discourse, a whole metaphorical structure, a line of narrative, an authorial voice or an entire text – when translated into a different language.

3. The discipline of metaphor studies

The academic discipline that focuses on the study of metaphor does not have a universally accepted name – with metaphor scholars frequently referring to themselves more specifically as cognitive linguists, pragmatists or whatever – although if a term is to be used then "metaphor studies" is probably the one that enjoys the greatest currency. Unlike translation studies, however, as far as I am aware metaphor studies possesses no founding document or "map" to rival that of Holmes (1971/2004) in terms of its programmaticity.

Like translation studies, contemporary metaphor studies can in many ways be described as an interdiscipline, with metaphor scholars drawn from a wide range of different disciplines, including cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, psychology, anthropology, literary studies, philosophy and rhetoric. At the same time, the discipline can informally be considered to have the same three broad divisions as were proposed by Holmes with reference to translation studies. Much of the theoretical work is centred around a number of different theories (Gibbs 1999: 29, for example, lists nine other than the conceptual metaphor theory). Within conceptual metaphor theory (see for example Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 1999), in which broad framework most work is now probably situated, theoretical work would include the detailed elaboration of the nature of conceptual metaphors (see for example Kövecses 2006: 116-26), theoretical approaches to metaphor identification (Steen 1999; Pragglejaz Group 2007), the concept of embodiment (Lakoff & Johnson 1999; Gibbs 2005), the interrelation between metaphor and culture (Kövecses 2005, 2006) and a range of newer theoretical concepts such as mental spaces (Fauconnier 1994) and conceptual blends (Grady, Oakley & Coulson 1999; Fauconnier & Turner 2002). Descriptive studies focus on the following topics and approaches, among others: metaphor within a particular subject area or discourse type (e.g. science, education, politics or literature: Semino 2008); description of a particular metaphor or group of metaphors (see for example Kövecses 2000, 2008 on the subject of metaphors of emotion); non-verbal types of metaphor (Forceville & Urios-Aparisi 2009); the textual or psychological aspects of metaphor (Musolff & Zinken 2009; Gibbs 1994), and the use of corpora in metaphor research (Deignan 2005, 2008; Semino 2008). Finally, applied studies are concerned with topics such as metaphor in language learning (Littlemore, Chen, Koester & Barnden 2011), the role of metaphor in psychotherapy (McMullen 2008) and the development of automatic metaphor identification systems (Hardie, Koller, Rayson & Semino 2007), to name but three.

4. Metaphor in translation

The more traditional way of referring to this area of study, "the translation of metaphor", now sounds prescriptive and somewhat old-fashioned. The formulation, "metaphor in translation", places the emphasis on metaphor and locates the discussion of it precisely where it should be – firmly in the broader context of general metaphor research. The alternative term "metaphor *and* translation" would be another possibility, and one that is more neutral in terms of the disciplines to which it is appealing. Interestingly, in the Subject Index to *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* Toury refers to this research topic as "metaphor in/and translation" (1995: 304).

Since the discussion of metaphor in translation was initiated more than forty years ago by Kloepfer (1967) much has been written on the topic and a number of important debates have been pursued. One of the earliest of these concerned the extent to which metaphor constituted a problem for translators (whether there was "no problem" or "no solution": see Dagut 1976: 25) and the fallout from Kloepfer's controversial remark that "the bolder and more creative the

metaphor, the easier it is to repeat it in other languages" (1967: 116; translation taken from Snell-Hornby 1995: 57). Besides this, as discussed below many writers have proposed lists of procedures for translating metaphor. In addition, there has been a gradually awakening awareness that metaphors can play a vitally important structural role in texts rather than appearing simply as isolated expressions (see for example Crofts 1982).

In the last thirty years or so the situation has been rather different, with questions of metaphor in translation attracting growing interest within the discipline. The articles by Dagut and Newmark were fairly quickly joined by others – most notably those of van den Broeck (1981) and Mason (1982) – while since that time an increasing number of papers have been appearing in various translation studies journals, more and more of which have taken the interesting work carried out on metaphor in other disciplines (such as cognitive linguistics) as their starting-point. This steadily increasing flow has served to keep the subject on the agenda, and in line with this development at least another three important and widely-discussed works – Gutt (1991), Toury (1995) and Snell-Hornby (1995) – include passages discussing the area in some detail.

In view of the considerable upsurge in interest in the area seen in recent years it is understandable that these days writers on metaphor in translation no longer complain that their subject has always been somewhat neglected. As of February 2013 there are sixty articles listed in the St. Jerome Publishing Translation Studies Abstracts Online (Harding, Saldanha & Zanettin 2013) that were published between 1981 and 2012 and that contain the word *metaphor* in their title. (There are of course many more – 151, in fact – that have this term as a keyword.) Interestingly, only a minority of the sixty refer to metaphor theory in their abstracts: fifteen mention the word *conceptual*, fifteen the rather less polysemic *cognitive*, six *pragmatic*, five *Lakoff* and two *relevance* (as in *relevance theory*), for example. This indicates that, while much has been achieved, much remains to be done to establish a firm link between translation scholars and the ideas of academics working on metaphor.

While there are a relatively large number of translation scholars with an interest in metaphor, there seems to have been less interest shown by metaphor scholars in translation. In terms of major works, Kövecses (2005: 133ff.) offers one of the few detailed discussions of metaphor in translation by a metaphor scholar, while another extended treatment is provided by Knowles and Moon (2006: 61-72). The special issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics* (issue 36 (7)) on "Metaphor across Languages" is for the most part only tangentially about translation. Newmark (1985) offers one of the first discussions of metaphor in translation to have appeared in a major work devoted to metaphor rather than to translation, although his article has more recently started to be joined by others (for example, Schaeffner 2004; Samaniego Fernández 2011). To date, almost nothing of relevance to translation has appeared in *Metaphor and Symbol*.

Over the years, much effort has been devoted to constructing classifications to account exhaustively for the procedures that translators employ when translating metaphorical expressions. Newmark's classification of the procedures that translators use to translate what he terms *stock* metaphors, for example, is very representative of the type of scheme that has been proposed. In all he identifies eight procedures, which he lists in order of preference:

1. Reproducing the same image in TL, "provided the image has comparable frequency and currency in the appropriate register"[1]

[1] The abbreviations SL and TL stand for 'source language' and 'target language' respectively. Similarly, ST and TT denote 'source text' and 'target text'.

2. Replacing the image in SL "with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture"
3. Translating the metaphor by a simile, "retaining the image"
4. "Translation of metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense (Mozart method)." (I.e. the addition of explanatory material: for Mozart, a piano concerto had to please "both the connoisseur and the less learned".)
5. Conversion of the metaphor to sense
6. Modification of the metaphor
7. Deletion
8. Using the same metaphor combined with the sense

(1985: 304-311)

What such lists try to achieve, while it clearly is of great value, does not coincide with the aims of descriptive translation studies as such taxonomies are essentially prescriptive. Furthermore, as a result of the considerable work already devoted to producing classifications of this type, this area is probably quite well charted; few if any further significant strategies have been proposed, any minor modifications or additions being little more than footnotes to Newmark's scheme.

By way of a contrast to Newmark's proposals Al-Harrasi's list of procedures uses conceptual metaphor theory, hinging to a large extent on the interplay between image schemas and rich images. In this way it sites itself totally within the bounds of descriptive translation studies:

1. Instantiating the Same Conceptual Metaphor
1.1. Same Image Schematic Representation
1.2. Concretising an Image Schematic Metaphor
1.3. Instantiating in the TT only a Functional Aspect of the Image Schema
1.4. Same Image Schema and Rich Image Domains
1.5. Same Rich Image Metaphor but Alerting the Reader to the Mapping
1.6. Using a Different Rich Image that Realises the Same Image Schema Realised by the Rich Image in the Source Text
1.7. From the Rich Image Metaphor to Image Schematic Representation
1.8. Same Mapping but a Different Perspective
2. Adding a New Instantiation in the Target Text
3. Using a Different Conceptual Metaphor
4. Deletion of the Expression of the Metaphor (2001: 277-88)

As far as I am aware, this is one of the most detailed attempts to date to produce an alternative taxonomy based on metaphor theory, and one that opens up a whole new possible direction for research.

5. Translation studies and metaphor studies: Possibilities and limitations

In spite of the interesting work that was being conducted by translation scholars within their own discipline, in the mid-1990s Mandelblit stated that the treatment of metaphor in translation studies was "thoroughly at odds with the findings of the Cognitive Linguistics research on metaphor" (1995: 485). Indeed, several years later Samaniego Fernández was still commenting that the translation of metaphors was "one of the main stumbling blocks within the scope of Translation Studies today" (2002: 47), in the sense that it was an area that needed to catch up with the descriptive and theoretical work that was being carried out in metaphor studies. Whether or not these are totally fair assessments, some scholars interested in metaphor in

translation have been attempting to draw increasingly systematically on the insights of this other discipline, recognising the great scope for further interaction that exists between the two fields.

With this in mind, it should be expected that any proper metaphor in translation research that has absorbed significant insights from metaphor studies should be in a position to feed findings and results back into that discipline, even if that is not the primary aim of the research and such findings and results are only a kind of by-product. It is true, however, that some of the claims made by translation scholars as to the centrality of translation to the study of metaphor will probably strike most metaphor scholars as somewhat overstated. For example, Dagut declares that "it is translation theory that holds the key to a deeper understanding of metaphor" (1976: 32). For van den Broeck metaphor is, more realistically, "a pivotal issue in translation", but one that has, however, received "only random attention" (1981: 73). More concretely, Guldin lists three "points of contact" between the two disciplines: the use of specific metaphors to describe how translation functions, the use of the concept of translation as a metaphor for exchange and transformation in different types of discourse, and the question of developing procedures for the translation of metaphors (2010: 161-2). To these he adds a fourth, that of the structural similarities and etymological parallels that exist between the concepts of translation and metaphor (2010: 162), as noted in Section One above. In addition to Guldin's valid observations, it is likely that translation studies can provide many case studies – mono-, bi- and even multilingual – to supplement the descriptive work of metaphor scholars.

The conceptual metaphor theory as presented by Lakoff and Johnson is not perhaps the most ideal framework for translation studies research, firstly because of its downplaying of the extent of interlingual and intercultural variation in metaphor (see for example Engstrøm 2000: 268), and secondly because in the form in which it was originally formulated it does not recognise the importance of basing arguments on authentic rather than made-up, idealised examples. However, the way in which this theory has been implemented by a large number of other metaphor scholars, who recognise the importance of language and culture and analyse metaphor in authentic texts, provides a much more promising starting-point for metaphor in translation research (see for example Gibbs 1999; Dobrovol'skij & Piirainen 2005; Kövecses 2005, 2006). Similarly, the highly data-driven approach employed by many contemporary metaphor scholars (see for example Charteris-Black 2004; Deignan 2005) contrasts sharply with the dependence on invented examples that is seen in a number of core works on cognitive linguistics (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 1999). In this differently interpreted form it becomes far more germane to translation studies, and seems in fact to be the most frequently adopted theoretical framework for research into metaphor in translation, the relevance theory of Sperber and Wilson (1986) coming a very distant second.

Translation scholars are generally not only bilingual but also bicultural, and they can provide an excellent source of data regarding interlingual and intercultural variation to counterbalance these universalist tendencies of the conceptual metaphor theory, which still survive in some parts of the discipline. However, it needs to be borne in mind that the kind of data that their work offers is fundamentally different from that supplied, for example, by a *langue*-based discipline. This is because translation studies data cannot be relied on to reflect target language norms in an unbiased manner, influenced as it is by the source language, by the translator's preference for a particular set of solutions, and so on, all of which factors not only place this data firmly in the domain of *parole*, as argued above, but also mark it out as having a twofold provenance and therefore running the risk of offering mixed or confusing insights. In other words, as instances of mediated discourse examples of translated metaphorical expressions

cannot always be used as evidence of native target language patterns for mainstream metaphor studies research.

That said, translation-related data can potentially serve as a test-bed for measuring the validity of metaphor studies categories and concepts: one may reasonably argue that, if certain factors influence speakers of a particular language (or of language in general), then they must do the same for translators as they make decisions regarding wording and so forth – whether such factors are universal in nature or bound to a particular language. This fact may of course make data from process-based translation studies research of great interest to metaphor scholars with a particular interest in the psychological aspects of metaphor.

It is, however, vital that the study of metaphor in translation take into consideration theoretical work on metaphor. In practice, this means, for example, using already-existing definitions and taxonomies of metaphor types rather than reinventing them for the purposes of translation studies. If this approach is adopted then new translation studies case studies – at least in their monolingual aspect – will potentially throw further light on these concepts. In addition, translation scholars would be well advised to use existing methodologies for identifying metaphorical expressions in texts and for conducting corpus-based research (see for example the Pragglejaz Group 2007).

The longstanding understanding of translation studies as an interdiscipline referred to above does indeed need to be made to work in both directions: not only should translation scholars absorb concepts and approaches from neighbouring disciplines, but they should in their turn make their theoretical insights and practical findings available to their colleagues from these other disciplines. This point is forcefully argued by Israel, who proposes a practical plan of action for demonstrating the credentials of translation studies as a discipline capable of making a contribution in the context of other fields of research. Her first recommendation, which is broadly in line with what is proposed in this article, is to situate research in the "overlaps" between translation studies and other disciplines and thus approach these other subject areas with new questions (2011: 18). Israel also suggests engaging with other disciplines through book reviews, interdisciplinary conference panels and publishing in non-translation studies journals (2011: 19). Finally, she recommends that translation scholars who are not based in a translation department should capitalise on this position by organising joint research initiatives that will take advantage of areas of common interest (2011: 19).

The possible benefits of these practical measures should be evident. In addition to them, however, it is possible to envisage particular proposals more specific to the particular pair of disciplines involved. In the case of translation studies and metaphor studies, these might fall into one of three categories: firstly, contributions to the development of existing frameworks for analysing metaphorical expressions and/or the proposal of possible new research methodologies; secondly, the reporting of individual insights gained from descriptive case studies; and thirdly, a possible extension to the applied wing of metaphor studies.

What is meant by the first of these is that it is possible to develop or construct detailed methodologies for analysing metaphor in translation that are designed to make use of metaphor studies concepts while operating within the normal paradigms of descriptive translation studies. One obvious way of achieving this is to use dimensions for categorising metaphorical expressions as the parameters (or variables) according to which modifications in the translation process are measured (for possible lists of these see for example Cameron 1999: 123-130; Dickins 2005: 265; Shuttleworth 2013: 40-62). In such descriptive case studies the questions to

be asked would include: can a particular parameter be used to produce an innovative or insightful list of translation procedures? to what extent might such parameters exert an influence on translators' decision-making? do the answers to the previous two questions serve to confirm, qualify or perhaps invalidate the theoretical or psychological significance of a particular metaphor studies concept or parameter?

The second specific proposal for interdisciplinary collaboration is that many insights of interest to metaphor scholars can be obtained by drilling down into the monolingual source-language data (but not, perhaps, the translated data for the reasons discussed above) obtained from the case studies arising from the application of the research strategy proposed in the previous paragraph.

Many examples could be given but for reasons of space I will limit myself to a few points arising from my own work (Shuttleworth 2013) by way of illustration. One of the most interesting, to my mind, concerns image-schematic metaphorical expressions, as it transpires that this type of metaphorical expression, which is considered to be of great importance in conceptual metaphor theory, is in fact very rare, in the popular science texts that I studied at any rate. Only very few metaphorical expressions (around 3.5% of the total) are in fact based on image schemas to any significant degree (2013: 130). On the other hand, while not accorded significant theoretical attention, the category of metaphorical expression known as rich images occurs in an approximate ratio of 40:60 as against non-rich images, which means that in this respect too this work of translation research offers a brief case study on an under-researched topic that is also underplayed in terms of theory (2013: 185). The situation with image metaphors is similar: once again, while these represent a category of metaphor that is downplayed in the literature, they are in fact relatively more frequent at around 7% (2013: 218). Indeed, although the treatment is not as detailed as that of the monolingual studies conducted by Caballero (see for example 2002), I would argue that the findings nonetheless represent an important contribution to the very sparse metaphor studies literature on this topic.

The third and final specific proposal regarding possible paths of collaboration consists of the observation that works on metaphor in translation should be recognised as belonging to the applied branch of metaphor studies that was discussed briefly in Section Three. In the event that the different areas of metaphor studies were to be formally mapped out along the lines of Holmes' proposals for translation studies (1971/2004), metaphor in translation certainly deserves to be included here alongside other topics that have hitherto received greater recognition among metaphor scholars.

6. Conclusion

The aim of this article has been to examine the commonalities that exist between the disciplines of translation studies and metaphor studies and to consider how these can be built on for the purposes of developing collaboration in the area of research. Starting with observations about the conceptual and etymological relatedness of their central concepts, what has been discovered is that there is considerable scope for mutual influence and collaboration between the two disciplines, although also some significant differences in emphasis and approach. In the past, cross-disciplinary influence tended to be from metaphor studies to translation studies, although this article has argued that the latter discipline also has much to offer to the former. In the light of this, the article proposes pathways of collaboration that could lead to the enrichment of both disciplines concerned.

References

Al-Harrasi, A. (2001) *Metaphor in (Arabic-into-English) Translation with Specific Reference to Metaphorical Concepts and Expressions in Political Discourse*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Aston University.

Baker, M. (2006) *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*, London: Routledge.

Broeck, R. (van den) (1981) 'The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation', *Poetics Today* 2 (4), 73-87.

Caballero, R. (2002) 'Understanding is seeing: A discourse perspective on image metaphor', *Cuadernos de Investigación Filológica* 2001-2, 27-8, 81-102.

Cameron, L. (1999) 'Identifying and describing metaphor in spoken discourse', in L. Cameron; G. Low (eds.) *Researching and Applying Metaphor*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 105-132.

Catford, J. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, London: OUP.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004) *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Crofts, M. (1982) 'Classification of metaphors', *Notes on Translation* 90, 16-17.

Dagut, M. (1976) 'Can "metaphor" be translated?', *Babel* 22 (1), 21-33.

Deignan, A. (2005) *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company (Converging Evidence in Language and Communication Research 6).

Deignan, A. (2008) 'Corpus linguistics and metaphor', in Gibbs, R. (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 280-94.

Dickins, J. (2005) 'Two Models for Metaphor Translation', *Target* 17 (2), 227–273.

Doorslaer, L. (van) (2007) 'Risking conceptual maps: Mapping as a keywords-related tool underlying the online *Translation Studies Bibliography*', *Target* 19 (2), 217-233.

Dobrovol'skij, D.; Piirainen, E. (2005) *Figurative Language: Cross-cultural and Cross-linguistic Perspectives*, Oxford: Elsevier.

Engstrøm, A. (2000) 'Review of *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*, by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson', *Metaphor and symbol* 15 (4), 267-274.

Evans, R. (1998) 'Metaphor of Translation', in M. Baker (ed.) *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*, 1st edition, London & New York: Routledge, 149-153.

Fauconnier, G. (1994) *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fauconnier, G.; Turner, M. (2002) *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*, New York: Basic Books.

Flotow, L. (von) (1997) *Translation and gender: Translating in the 'era of feminism'*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Forceville, C.; Urios-Aparisi, E. (eds.) (2009). *Multimodal Metaphor*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gibbs, R. (1994) *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, R. (1999) 'Researching metaphor', in L. Cameron; G. Low (eds.) *Researching and applying metaphor*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 29-47.

Gibbs, R. (2005) *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grady, J.; Oakley, T.; Coulson, S. (1999) 'Blending and Metaphor', in R. Gibbs; G. Steen (eds.) *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 101-24.

Guldin, R. (2010) 'Metaphor as a metaphor for translation', in J. St. André (ed.), *Thinking through Translation with Metaphors*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 161-191.
Gutt, E.-A. (1991) *Translation and Relevance*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Hardie, A.; Koller, V.; Rayson, P.; Semino, E. (2007) 'Exploiting a semantic annotation tool for metaphor analysis', in Davies, M.; Rayson, P.; Hunston, S.; Danielsson, P. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2007 Conference*, University of Birmingham, UK, available at http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/13010 (accessed 20 November 2013).
Harding, S.-A.; Saldanha, G.; Zanettin, F. (2013) *Translation Studies Abstracts Online*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, available at https://www.stjerome.co.uk/tsa (accessed 25 February 2013).
Hermans, T. (1985) 'Introduction: Translation studies and a new paradigm', in T. Hermans (ed.) *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, London: Croom Helm, 7-15.
Hermans, T. (1991) 'Translational norms and correct translations', in K. van Leuven-Zwart; T. Naaijkens (eds.), *Translation studies: The state of the art. Proceedings of the first James S. Holmes symposium on translation studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 155-69.
Hermans, T. (1999) *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Hermans, T. (2007) *The Conference of the Tongues*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Holmes, J. (1971/2004) 'The name and nature of translation studies', in L. Venuti (ed.) *The translation studies reader*, 2nd Edition, London: Routledge, 180-192.
Hönig, H. (ed.) (1997) *Konstruktives Übersetzen*, 2nd Edition, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
Israel, H. (2011) 'Doing interdisciplinary research with disciplined neighbours: The multidisciplinarity of translation studies', unpublished plenary paper, *Research models in translation studies II*, 29 April – 2 May 2011, University of Manchester, abstract available at http://www.llc.manchester.ac.uk/ctis/activities/conferences/researchmodels2/plenary/file uploadmax10mb,179558,en.pdf (last accessed on 27/5/2013).
Johnston, J. (1999) 'Translation as simulacrum', in L. Venuti (ed.) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London: Routledge, 42-56.
Kloepfer, R. (1967) *Die Theorie der literarischen Übersetzung. Romanisch-deutscher Sprachbereich*, Munich: W. Fink (Freiburger Schriften zur Romanischen Philologie 12).
Knowles, M.; Moon, R. (2006) *Introducing Metaphor*, London: Routledge.
Kövecses, Z. (2000) *Metaphor and Emotion*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
Kövecses, Z. (2005) *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kövecses, Z. (2006) *Language, Mind, and Culture: A Practical Introduction*, New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kövecses, Z. (2008) 'Metaphor and emotion', in R. Gibbs (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 380-96.
Lakoff, G.; Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
Lakoff, G.; Johnson, M. (1999) *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, New York: Basic Books.
Lefevere, A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London: Routledge.
Littlemore, J.; Chen, P.; Koester, A.; Barnden, J. (2011) 'Difficulties in metaphor comprehension faced by international students whose first language is not English', *Applied Linguistics* 32 (4), 408-29.
Mandelblit, N. (1995) 'The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory', in M. Thelen; B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.) *Translation and Meaning. Part 3*, Maastricht: Hogeschool Maastricht, 483-495.

Mason, K. (1982) 'Metaphor and translation', *Babel* 28 (3), 140-49.
McMullen, L. (2008) 'Putting it in context: Metaphor and psychotherapy', in Gibbs, R. (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 397-411.
Musolff, A.; Zinken, J. (eds.) (2009) *Metaphor and Discourse*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Newmark, P. (1985) 'The translation of metaphor', in W. Paprotté; R. Dirven (eds.) *The Ubiquity of Metaphor*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 295-326.
Niranjana, T. (1992) *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism and the Postcolonial Context*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Pragglejaz Group (2007) 'MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse', *Metaphor and Symbol* 22 (1), 1-39.
Robinson, D. (1997) *Translation and Empire*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Samaniego Fernández, E. (2002) 'Prescripción y descripción: La metáfora en los estudios de traducción', *Trans: Revista de Traductología*, 6: 47-61.
Samaniego Fernández, E. (2011) 'Translation studies and the cognitive theory of metaphor', in *Review of cognitive linguistics* 9 (1), 262-279.
Saussure, F. (de) (1986) *Course in General Linguistics*, 3rd Edition (translated by Roy Harris), Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company (first published in French in 1916).
Schaeffner, C. (2004) 'Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach', *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (7), 1253–1269.
Semino, E. (2008) *Metaphor in Discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Shuttleworth, M. (2013) *Metaphor in Translation: A Multilingual Investigation into Language Use at the Frontiers of Scientific Knowledge*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London.
Simon, S. (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*, London & New York: Routledge.
Snell-Hornby, M. (1995) *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* [1988], 2nd Edition, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Sperber, D.; Wilson, D. (1986) 'Loose talk', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 86, Oxford: Blackwell, 153-71.
Steen, G. (1999) 'From linguistic to conceptual metaphor in five steps', in R. Gibbs; G. Steen (eds.) *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 57-77.
Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Tymoczko, M. (2007) *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Tyulenev, S. (2010) 'Translation as smuggling', in J. St. André (ed.), *Thinking through Translation with Metaphors*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 241-74.
Venuti, L. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility*, London & New York: Routledge.
Vieira, E. (1999) 'Liberating Calibans: Readings of *Antropofagia* and Haroldo de Campos' poetics of transcreation', in S. Bassnett; H. Trivedi (eds.) *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, London: Routledge, 95-113.