

Beyond Literal Translation

by

FEDERICA LORGIO

TRABAJO PARA EL TÍTULO DE MÁSTER

Entregado en el Área de Atención Integral

al Estudiante (ARATIES)

de la Universidad de Almería

como requisito parcial conducente

a la obtención del título de

**MÁSTER EN ESTUDIOS INGLESES: APLICACIONES PROFESIONALES
Y COMUNICACIÓN INTERCULTURAL**

2015

Itinerario 1 Investigación y docencia

Federica Lorgio AO5160523

Nombre estudiante y D.N.I.

Nobel A. Perdú Honeyman 45586631X

Nombre director TFM y D.N.I.

Firma estudiante

Firma director TFM

17 julio 2015

Fecha

I, the undersignedFederica Lorgio....., as a student of the Faculty of Humanities and Psychology at the University of Almeria, hereby declare under the penalty of perjury, and also certify with my signature below, that my Master's Thesis, titled:“Beyond Literal Translation”.....is my own work, except where indicated by the reference to the printed and electronic sources used according to the internationally accepted rules and regulations on intellectual property rights.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Nobel Augusto Perdú Honeyman, for his help, enthusiasm and careful guidance for carrying out my research.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my family and Sara for their persistent support.

Contents

Introduction & Methodology	3
Chapter 1 Translation as a science	5
1.1 From Cicero to the nineteenth century	5
1.2 The twentieth century	7
1.3 The influence of time on translation	8
1.4 Classifications of translation	9
Chapter 2 The figure of the translator	12
2.1 The translation competence	12
2.2 Translation as an innate or acquired ability	13
2.3 The notion of problem solving	15
2.4 The operative knowledge by Anderson	16
Chapter 3 The Strategies of translation	19
3.1 Procedures, strategies, methods of translation: a general terminological view	19
3.2 The concept of strategy and technique	21
3.3 Different approaches in problem-solving	24
3.4 Translation methodology	26
3.5 The categorisation of the procedures	27
Chapter 4 Translation of metaphors	33
4.1 An introduction to the problem of translating a metaphor	33
4.2 How to translate a metaphor: different approaches	34
4.3 The conceptual metaphor	37
4.4 The case of the Bible	41

4.5 A global view	41
Chapter 5 Automatic translation vs. Translators	43
5.1 The notion of translation.....	43
5.2 The limits of automatic translation.....	44
5.3 About the quality of machine translation	48
Analysis of Results & Conclusions	51
References	53

Introduction & Methodology

The present Master's Thesis addresses the procedures applied when the literal translation fails. This problem has been taken into consideration by many illustrate scholars as Vinay & Darbelnet, Vázquez Ayora and Peter Newmark, therefore I paid more attention to them, considering their theories the basis of the discussion that till today involves translation studies. This topic seems very interesting because through the comparison of the most important theories, it is possible to notice that the debate has plenty of different points of view that give the impression to be connected to each other. The study could be considered as a digression from the general notion of translation passing through the specific problem of literal translation, going more deeply in the case of the translation of metaphors, and, in conclusion, dealing with machine translation, which is more close to the daily life of everyone, and therefore they are interesting in connection to literal translation.

This research is structured in the following way: Chapter 1 deals with the concept of translation as a science through an excursus from Cicero to the twentieth century; the approach to translation in a literal or free way was felt from the beginning and this topic is still in the centre of the scholars' discussion. This chapter is an introduction to translation in general in order to show how approaches, classifications and theories have changed according to the historical, scientific, aesthetical and political characteristics of a specific epoch. Chapter 2 aims to define the figure of the translator as novice or expert, the skills of the expert according to the abilities to solve a problem in translation, among them the knowledge of the strategies that are analysed in Chapter 3. Chapter 3 concentrates on the strategies that the translator has to apply whenever he/she faces a problem in translation, the theories of the most

important scholars of the twentieth century are exposed; in particular I have taken into consideration the contrastive approach of Vinay & Darbelnet, the linguistic approach of Vázquez Ayora, the approach of Peter Newmark based on literal translation and the pragmatic approach of Chesterman. Chapter 4 aims to analyse the problem of translation of a metaphor, the linguistic approach of Peter Newmark is contrasted with the Cognitive Theory of the Conceptual Metaphor of Lakoff and Johnson. Chapter 5 takes into consideration the case of automatic online translation, how it works and why it cannot substitute the translator. Basically it works the same as literal translation, so this chapter concludes my study as one more demonstration that literal translation is not the most suitable approach to a translation.

Since translation studies do not give the possibility to have a unique answer for a problem, I found interesting studying the various procedures suggested by the most important scholars.

Regarding the objectives and the motivations of this particular research, the main purpose is demonstrating that literal translation cannot solve all the aspects that a language includes as context, cultural aspects and idiomatic expressions; indeed these aspects cannot be considered by a translation machine, therefore the figure of the translator appears as the only one able to reach an acceptable result in translation.

The methodology used is the comparison and analysis of the bibliographic references, indeed this study aims to show the proposals of the eminent figures in the field of translation and how they have faced the problem, through the classification of the possible procedures of adaptation and equivalence.

Chapter 1 Translation as science

Translation is a very old human activity, full of changes and vicissitudes, with its own history; the beginning of the oral translation began when the commercial interchanges started and therefore its beginning is lost in history. Written translation began just after the consolidation of the writing system and the first proofs have their origin in the eighteenth century B.C.; these are Sumerian texts literally translated into Acadian. Herodotus speaks about the importance of the interpreters in the Pharaohs' Age: they were high civil servants and the job of the translators' boss was a job that passed from father to son. Despite the very old origin of translation, the theoretical reflection was not practiced that much, and in the West, Cicero is considered the beginner of the translation studies.

1.1 From Cicero to the nineteenth century

The first reflections about translation appeared in Rome with Cicero, Horace, Pliny and Quintilian. Cicero opened the discussion about literal and free translation, he said that the translation "verbum pro verbo" (word for word) does not work. Horace, in his *Epistola ad Pisones*, affirms that word for word translation is not adequate and he introduced the term "fidelis" (accurate) that will be present from now on.

The Middle Age is a period of recovery of the ancient knowledge and of creation of literary bases for all the European countries through the translation of the Latin and religious texts. In this period, the school of translators in Toledo was one of the most important centres of investigation, because it included Jew, Arab and Christian cultures. During the Middle Age, we can observe two different kinds of translation: one is the translation of religious texts and the other is the translation of profane

texts. The respect to the Holy Scripture required a high adherence to the text, therefore literal translation was considered the most suitable choice. The profane texts did not require any specific technique, therefore their translation is more free from the source text. Translation was becoming a central topic of discussion in the religious and political debate, especially in the Renaissance.

In the Renaissance, translation became very important because of the invention of the printer machines, the development of the translation as a job, the birth of the national languages and the need to transmit the ancient culture (Hurtado Albir 2001:107). In this period, there are, also, martyrs of translation, as Dolet and Fray Luis de León (2001:107). The translation became an important part in the codification of the national languages, therefore it took a main part in the political debate and the preface was the place where the translator explains his translation choices. About religious translation, the different tendencies of the Reform supported the translation in vulgar language according to the target language, while the Catholic Church supported the literal procedure.

In the seventeenth century we can notice the appearance of the French concept of “belles infidèles”, it concerns the translation of classic texts using linguistic and extra-linguistic adaptations, because refinement, linguistic difference, cultural distance and ageing became very central concepts (Hurtado Albir 2001:110). But in the second half of the seventeenth century, again, a strong critic demanded more adherence to the text, suggesting translation rules, for example Tende (1660) in *De la traduction ou règles pour bien comprendre à traduire* theorised some rules about translation (2001:110). In England, apart from a short period of preference for literal translation, the most used procedure was the free one, with Cowley, Chapman, etc.

During the eighteenth century, the proliferation of general and technical dictionaries, the growing interest for foreign languages and the intellectual interchange provoked a huge attention to translation, especially in England, France, Germany, Spain and Switzerland. In France, Marmontel distinguished version (the literal translation) from translation (when the source text is adapted to the target one). In England, there was a debate about the critical attitude of the translator in relation with the source text. Most problems were facing the translation of the Bible, Campbell

in the introduction of a *Translation of Four Gospels* (1789) suggested: “fidelidad al sentido, respeto al espíritu y al estilo del autor, y claridad del texto de llegada que debe funcionar como un original” (quoted in Hurtado Albir 2001:114). About the profane translation the most important exponent was Tytler, in the debate of literal and free translation, he concentrated his analysis on the reader: the target text has to provoke the same impression that the speakers of the source text have reading the original text.

The nineteenth century involved the industrial, commercial, scientific and technical expansion. The international meetings and organizations provoked an intense interchange among different languages, therefore the necessity for translators was very strong. During this century, it is possible to notice the rejection of the French concept of “belles infidèles” and the support of literal translation, above all in Germany. The romanticists followed two different points of view: the respect of the source text that makes the target text artificial, or the respect to the target text.

1.2 The twentieth century

The twentieth century was characterised by the creation of governmental and non-governmental organisations and technological development. Especially after the Second World War with the intensification of international relations, new kinds of translation appeared such as simultaneous translation, dubbing, automatic translation, and also, more specific varieties of translation such as scientific, technical and economic. In this period, the discussion about translation was dominated by three kinds of supporters: supporters of literal translation, supporters of the middle way and supporters of free translation. Literal translation included the notion of loyalty; middle translation does not have a specific definition; and free translation concerns all the adaptations.

In the second half of the twentieth century, translation studies became more descriptive and systematic. In the seventies, the theories were focused on the analysis of translation procedures and on the recognition of textual characters of the translation. In the eighties, the strategies were concentrated on the relation between source and target texts, and the importance of the context; these strategies acquired

a descriptive and explicative character. Hurtado Albir in his book *Traducción y Traductología. Introducción a la Traductología* (2001) distinguishes five theoretical approaches:

- 1) Linguistic approach: comparison and description of two languages without considering the textual character (Vinay & Darbelnet, Malblanc, Vázquez Ayora, Larson, Gamier, etc.). It is divided in other six sub-approaches that are:
 - traditional comparative linguistic: lexicon, morphology, syntax;
 - comparative stylistic: loans, calque, literal translation, modulation, etc.;
 - grammatical comparison;
 - the application of many procedures of linguistic analysis;
 - the semantic approach;
 - the semiotic approach.
- 2) Textual approach: comparison of text considering macrostructure, microstructure, textual typology (Seleskovitch, House, Neubert, Baker, etc.).
- 3) Cognitive approach: the study of mental processes of translator (Bell, Gutt, Kiraly, Wilss, Kussmaul, Lörsher, etc.).
- 4) Communicative and socio-cultural approach: focuses on the contextual aspects, cultural elements and comprehension of the text (Nida & Taber, Toury, Robinson, Simon, etc.).
- 5) Philosophical and hermeneutic approach: when the translation reflects hermeneutic and philosophical aspects, for example the case of the Bible (Berman, Gavronsky, Derrida, Schökel, etc.).

1.3 The influence of time on translation

As we have seen above, the socio-cultural context influences translation; many theories and various approaches always suggested different characteristics and peculiarities for translation. The time distance, between the appearance of the text and its translation, influences the translation process.

The historical adaptations influence translation because the conception of translation, the taboos, the aesthetic preferences, the state of the language and the ideology lead the translators in their work in one way or another; as we saw in the

case of France, with the conception of “belles infidèles”: literal translation was almost abandoned because it did not correspond to the aesthetic taste of that period. One of the historical adaptations that appears more frequently is the linguistic adaptation: the translator applies linguistic rules, belonging to his period to an old text, where there might be linguistic elements in disuse, therefore the translator tries to bring the source text closer to his epoch, provoking a renewal of the text.

Beyond the linguistic adaptations required by the time distance between the appearance of the source text and its translation, there might be other adaptations, for example of extra-linguistic elements (habits, traditions, food, etc.). The same text can be translated in different ways according to the period of the translation:

Pensemos en las innumerables traducciones de los textos homéricos: unas en verso, otra en prosa, traducciones más literales efectuadas línea por línea, traducciones anotadas que dan prioridad a aspectos filológicos e históricos, traducciones con finalidad pedagógica, adaptaciones para niños, etc. (Hurado Albir 2001:600)

The historical adaptation does not affect only the target text, but also the source text, in this case it is possible to talk about inner translation or intra-linguistic translation. It appears when the source text has changed in order to become more adaptable to the current period and more acceptable by the audience. In the various editions of the same text we find linguistic changes (orthography, lexicon, syntax), extra-linguistic changes and adaptation for children and large audience, bilingual edition, etc. (Hurtado Albir 2001:604).

1.4 Classifications of translation

The classification of translation is not a modern concept, Cicero talked about literal translation, St. Jeronimo about religious and profane translation, etc. The traditional categorisation classifies translation from two different points of view:

- 1) Thematic classification: as religious vs. profane translation; scientific vs. literary translation.

- 2) Methodological classification: it predominates until the second half of the twentieth century. It concerns: literal vs. free translation; the middle way proposed by Steiner (1975); and sense for sense translation. (Hurtado Albir 2001:44)

In the second half of the twentieth century, the technical, social and scientific changes provoked new classifications: dubbing, simultaneous translation, subtitling; and also classification according to the specific kind of text: scientific, economic, technical, etc. Hurtado Albir, in his book *Traducción y Traductología. Introducción a la Traductología* (2001: 43-49), analyses six criteria of classification:

- 1) Code change: it makes differences individualising transformations among different codes (inter-semiotic, intra-linguistic, inter-linguistic aspects);
- 2) Grade of translation: it refers to the relative, partial and optimal translation depending on the grade of translation of the source text;
- 3) Methodological differences: it concerns the method applied (literal and free translation, semantic and communicative translation);
- 4) Conventional areas: concerns the general, literary and specialised translation;
- 5) Textual typological differences: based on the typological adscription of the text (denotative, connotative, pragmatic and literary texts);
- 6) Differences of means and mode: the variation of the means (sound, images) and the modes (oral spontaneous, non-spontaneous or written to be read with low or loud voice).

The different translation approaches depend on the type of text that the translator is dealing with. In the case of specialised text, the translator has to know the specific language of the text taken into consideration. There are very specific languages, in the case of mathematical or scientific texts, and other less specific, as in law or banking texts. When there is a lack in the translator's knowledge, he has to provide the information in order to fill the gap. The amount of non-specialised texts is more extended than the specialised one, we can consider non-specialised texts, all literary and unliterary texts (magazines, adverts, etc.).

The knowledge of the literary translator has to be wide, because of many characteristics of literary texts. In order to deal with the different textual types

(narrative, conceptual, etc.), the different themes, the alternative use of dialogue and narration, the dialectal words, the cultural references, etc., the translator's knowledge has to include literary and cultural knowledge, writing and creative abilities:

Dicha competencia le permitirá enfrentarse a los problemas específicos que plantea su traducción: problemas derivados de la sobrecarga estética (de estilo, connotaciones, metáforas, etc.), del idiolecto propio del autor, de la relación con las condiciones socioculturales del medio de partida, de la intervención de la dimensión diacrónica (la traducción de textos antiguos), etc. (Hurtado Albir 2001:64)

In conclusion, thanks to many theories, approaches and classification, translation became a source for analysis and studies. Nowadays, it seems clear that the translation process is an operation of adaptation and cultural and intellectual negotiation, beyond the linguistic transposition.

Chapter 2 The figure of the translator

Translation is not a mechanical process, the figure of the translator is very important because many aspects have to be taken into consideration in translation. For this reason in this chapter we analyse the figure of the translator as novice or expert, the qualities of each one, how the expert faces a problem and, finally, the theory of Anderson about the knowledge of translators.

2.1 The translation competence

The first concept that should be explained is the idea of “competence” considered by Hansen (1997) as skills and abilities, in the first and second language, as talent, empathy, creativity, responsibility, judgement, tolerance, etc. (Hurtado Albir 2001:386).

Competence in translation is considered by House (1980) as a part of the knowledge of a language, with oral and written expression, written and oral comprehension, indeed in Italy is a part of the written exams in the faculties of languages. But a specific theory is given by Toury, he described the translation competence as: the ability to distinguish important elements, the ability to understand the genre of the treated text, the ability of individualizing the problems and solving them (Toury 1974:88).

Moreover, Wilss (1996) describes the translation competence as the union of three competences: the competence to receive a language, the competence to produce a language, both of them in a supercompetence that allows to transfer messages between two languages; with his words:

Translation competence is partially an interlingual competence, it is clearly marked off from the four traditional monolingual skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Because translation competence is a supercompetence, it requires not only a comprehensive syntactic, lexical, morphological knowledge of the respective source and target language but a complete stylistic (textual) knowledge of the respective source and target language text worlds as well. Finally, the supercompetence implies the ability to synchronize these two (source and target) monolingual knowledge areas and bring about a communicatively affective interlingual and inter-textual transfer. (Wilss 1976: 120, qtd. in Kiraly, 1995:15)

2.2 Translation as an innate or acquired ability

Whether the translation competence is an innate or an acquired ability has been discussed by many scholars. Toury (1974) and Lörcher (1991) sustain the notion of “natural translation”, because the translation competence is a subcompetence integrated with the general communicative competence of a bilingual individual. The purpose of the training of the translator should consist in improving the natural development of his competence and helping these students in order to manage the translation in a quick and effective way, thus they can become expert translators.

In contrast to Toury and Lörcher, Hönic (1988) considers translation as a strategic process. He thinks that a text translated by an uneducated person it is not translated in a precise way, because he does not take into consideration the various aspects that influence the translation, the useful strategies to treat these aspects correctly and the criteria to understand whether the translation is correct or not.

Furthermore, PACTE¹ defines the notion of translation competence as: a dynamic process that from a translation pre-competence of the beginner becomes a translation competence of the expert; he needs learning strategies that he manages elaborating the process of translation, these strategies will be analysed in the following chapter.

¹ The investigation group PACTE is comprised of the following members: A. Beeby, M. Fernández, O. Fox, A. Galán, A. Hurtado Albir, A. Kuznik, W. Neunzig, P. Rodríguez, L. Romero, M. Taffarel, S. Wimmer.

Regarding the concept of “expert” translator, it could be considered very simple: usually the expert is the one who constantly produce important contributions in a specific field. Anderson (1983) defined the expert knowledge as automatic and procedural, because the experts in translation solve problems quickly and efficiently; it is abstract because the expert learns theoretically, constructing categories and models that give him the possibility to figure out the most important aspects of a problem in a short time; all these aspects are the starting points in order to apply the correct procedures.

Furthermore, for Anderson, the knowledge of the expert translator is strategic, because, in a global plan for problem solving, he has to choose the method in relation with it. Certainly beyond all the strategies and tactics that the translator can learn, there is a spontaneous attitude that whoever wants to translate in a correct way should have, but Hönig (1991) claims that the translation competence is not innate and he prefers to substitute this concept with the one called “strategic competence”:

It is safe to assume that problem-solving strategies are an integral part of any translation task, and it therefore follows that innate translation competence has to be supplemented by strategic competence in order to create an overall translation competence. (Hönig 1991:83)

In order to understand how a translator becomes “expert” Dreyfus & Dreyfus (1986) categorized five phases in order to acquire the expert knowledge:

- 1) the novice, who uses the procedures without consider the context;
- 2) the advanced beginner, who applies the procedures consciously;
- 3) the competence, belongs to the translator who can classify the data;
- 4) the proficiency, when the translator is able to individualize the problem and solve it;
- 5) the expertise, the last step that the translator reaches when he solves the problems automatically (Dreyfus & Dreyfus 1986:50).

Therefore, it is possible to affirm that Dreyfus & Dreyfus and Anderson consider the notion of “expert knowledge” acquired by the translator when he is able to decode an issue spontaneously, therefore more experience less perception of a problem.

The same opinion is expressed by Chesterman (1997), who considers the expert knowledge as a process that goes from the recognition of the peculiarity to the global knowledge, from the conscious answer to the unconscious answer, from the analytic decision to the intuitive one, from the diagnosis to the result. As Dreyfus & Dreyfus, Chesterman distinguished five steps in order to have an expert knowledge:

- 1) the identification of characteristics and predetermined rules;
- 2) the identification of the relevant characteristics, but not defined;
- 3) deciding in a hierarchal way in order to reach the purpose;
- 4) the intuitive understanding that provokes the final result;
- 5) the execution of the task in a rational way (Chesterman 1997:150).

According to these authors, it is possible to conclude that an expert knowledge in translation is acquired by the translator when he works intuitively and when he uses the procedures of problem solving automatically and properly in the case of unusual problems or in the identification or explanation of possible solutions. In Kiraly's opinion (1995) the difference between the expert and the novice translator is not only in the automation of solving a problem, but in the level of consciousness when a problem appears; more specifically, the differences are based on: knowing how to solve a problem in the best way, knowing when there is a problem and there is not a problem in the translation, evaluating one possible solution for the problem (1995:110).

2.3 The notion of problem solving

One of the important characteristics of an expert translator is the ability to find a solution when he faces a problem, in order to do it he has to learn different strategies from the ones used by the novice. Beyond that, he wastes a short time in the resolution of an issue because he identifies it quickly and, automatically, applies the solution rapidly and efficiently.

In the translation field the notion of problem is very significant, but, despite its importance, few scholars deal with its definition: as Hurtado Albir (2001) claims, there is no classification of problems as translation problems. Also as Wilss (1996)

observes, the translation problems are not precisely defined; indeed he affirms: "Translation Study has had, and still does have, great trouble in defining a suitable and reliable conceptual framework for problem-solving" (Wilss 1996:47).

We can consider the classification suggested by Krings (1986), who distinguishes forming problems from reception ones, or we can take into consideration the problem classification by Presas (2000): he makes a distinction between intra-textual problems (as cohesion and coherence); extra-textual (as acceptability and informativity); inter-textual (genre standards) (Presas 2000:19-31).

Moreover, Mackenzie (1998) proposes a different point of view, he makes a connection between problem solving and creativity; he identifies a difference between open (without a solution) and closed (with a known solution) problems in translation: in the case of open problems the translator has to use his innate inspiration.

In order to solve a problem, many scholars have conceived different opinions, because the knowledge of procedures is not the only tool that they use. The linguistic rules are not the only tools that the translator has to know, the first step is the recognition of the problem: "The student should develop the ability to recognize and solve these translation-specific problems: problem recognition is a pre-requisite for problem-solving" (Scott-Tennent *et al.* 2000:108). De Beaugrande (1978), in the case of poetry, suggests a model of the qualities that the translator should have, beyond the linguistic competence and the poetic competence, he adds the poetic translating competence, which is more specific. This competence includes: the structuration competence, which is the ability of interpreting or producing a non-ordinary use of the language; the poetry experience; the experience of a specific author; the knowledge of the historical context in which the text was written; and the interests which motivated the selection of a text (De Beaugrande 1978:22-23).

2.4 The operative knowledge by Anderson

Anderson (1983) defines the theoretical, controlled and easy to be explained knowledge as “declarative”, and the gradual, practical and automatic knowledge as “operative”. In his opinion the knowledge of the translator, in order to be appropriate, should be converted from the declarative to the operative one. Since this process is mechanical, the translator can face more difficult problems, becoming an expert one. Many times the translator is able to solve the problem that he encounters, but the most difficult thing is explaining how he handles it.

Many scholars criticize Anderson’s theory, for example Shiffrin & Schneider claim that the procedures are not always automatic, there are cases where the translator adapts a strategy consciously:

Automatic processing is learned in long-term store, is triggered by appropriate inputs, and then operates independently of the subject's control. An automatic sequence can contain components that control information flow, attract attention, or govern overt responses. Automatic sequences do not require attention, though they may attract it if training is appropriate, and they do not use up short-term capacity. They are learned following the earlier use of controlled processing that links the same nodes in sequence. In search, detection, and attention tasks, automatic detection develops when stimuli are consistently mapped to responses; then the targets develop the ability to attract attention and initiate responses automatically, immediately, and regardless of other inputs or memory load. Controlled processing is a temporary activation of nodes in a sequence that is not yet learned. It is relatively easy to set up, modify, and utilize in new situations. It requires attention, uses up short-term capacity, and is often serial in nature. Controlled processing is used to facilitate long-term learning of all kinds, including automatic processing. In search, attention, and detection tasks, controlled processing usually takes the form of a serial comparison process at a limited rate. (Shiffrin & Schneider 1977:51)

Moreover, Pozo *et al.* criticised Anderson’s theory, because they thought that the declarative knowledge cannot be only descriptive, so they introduced a new concept: the explicative knowledge, which consists in the consideration of the how, why and

what is used to solve the problem (Pozo *et al.*1994:184). They also define the characteristics of the use of the strategies by the beginner student in translation studies; the application of the strategies would not be automatic, but controlled, and connected with his own psychological process; the student has to know many strategies in order to choose the correct one and use it in a professional way for his translation; each strategy should be composed by easy techniques in order to use the correct strategy according to the case that he faces. Therefore, according to them, the student first of all has to decide which strategies are more admissible according to the text and its context, dismissing the less adequate ones; and then, he will use the strategies that he learnt in order to solve the specific problems of the translation, adopting techniques and skills of rhythmic, metric and linguistic knowledge, and his capacity of reconstruction and re-expression (Pozo *et al.*1994: 185). Consequently, it appears possible to conclude that the operative knowledge includes strategic and the technical procedures; some of them will be analysed in the following chapter.

Chapter 3 The Strategies of translation

When the expert translator faces a problem in translation, for example when the word does not exist in the target language, in the case of idiomatic expressions etc., he is able to apply some procedures in order to solve the issue. Many scholars have theorised the different procedures that should be used by the translator. In this chapter we will analyse the terminology and the various theories of the most important scholars.

3.1 Procedures, strategies, methods of translation: a general terminological view

The procedures that can be applied, in the case of a translation matter, have been called with different names as processes, strategies, rules, techniques, and sometimes the scholars use the same terminology but with different meanings; or they use different terminologies with the same meaning.

One of the eldest definitions of the operative knowledge of the translator is “technical procedure of translation” (*procédé technique de la traduction*) by Vinay & Darbelnet (1958): all the process of linguistic transference that are used in translation, based on the equivalence between the source and the target language that regards semantics, lexicon and morphological syntax. In their opinion, these procedures are not only used comparatively, but also they are a spontaneous mental phenomenon. Gerd Wotjak (1981) thinks that all the procedures, used in order to transfer meanings from one language to another, are translation techniques in communication, but he also uses other terms as strategy, procedures and rules.

Gerardo Vázquez Ayora, in his work *Introducción a la traductología, curso básico de traducción*, introduces the definition of “technical procedures of stylistic execution” (procedimientos técnicos de ejecución estilística) that are linguistic tools in order to help the translator:

Sólo la práctica metódica puede proporcionar al traductor el dominio de estos procedimientos con los cuales logrará seguridad, facilidad y rapidez. Sin el conocimiento de las técnicas que la lingüística contemporánea ha puesto a su alcance, el traductor empírico seguirá envuelto en constantes perplejidades que le consumirán un tiempo precioso y, lo importante en esencia, le condenarán al literalismo, causa universal de toda clase de errores. (Vázquez Ayora 1977: 251)

Moreover, Vázquez Ayora introduces a new concept that makes him different from the other scholars: the difference between “technical procedures of stylistic execution” and “general procedures of translation”, the first one includes two kinds of translation, the literal and the dynamic one, the second includes the project and the review of the translation.

Furthermore, Nida defines these procedures “techniques of adjustment”, the aims of these are:

- 1) Fixing the shape of the message according to the target language,
- 2) Producing equivalent semantic structures;
- 3) Using the proper stylistic tools;
- 4) Recreating the correct communication (Nida 1964:23).

Another distinction is theorised by Peter Newmark, he distinguishes the procedure of translation from the method of translation, the first concerns small linguistic units, while the second one is related to the all text. More recently, Ian Mason (1994) talks about methods, procedures and techniques of translation interchangeably. Also, López Guix & Minett Wilkinson use the term “procedures of translation” as a synonym of strategy. Furthermore, Kohn & Kalina associated the concept of strategy with the interpretation, they distinguish two concepts: “strategic processes” and “strategic action”:

In order to cope with the manifold difficulties inherent in interpreting, interpreters attempt to convert their knowledge into strategic action -including an ultimate emergency strategy of “requirement reduction”. These difficulties and corresponding strategic processes can be identified with reference to the determining factors of interpreting. (Kohn & Kalina 1996:126)

The term most used referring to the mental mechanisms of the translator is “translation strategies”; in general it is related to the concept of “technical procedure of translation” by Vinay & Darbelnet, but for some scholars the “strategy” acquires a different meaning. For example, Robert de Beaugrande, in his work *Factors in a Theory of Poetic Translating* (1978), divides into three groups the “strategies for equivalence” in the translation process:

- 1) Analysing the differences between the source and the target language;
- 2) Individualising the use of the language in a specific kind of text;
- 3) Selecting the equivalent elements according to the context.

De Beaugrande’s perspective is different from the one of Vinay & Darbelnet because for him the strategies of translation are tools that can be used facing a problem, while for the scholars the procedures are basis of a general translation theory; the equivalence, in his opinion, is based on “rule-guided strategies for translating” and on concrete tools related to a certain text and moment, with his words:

It is inappropriate to demand that translation theory provide a set of patent solutions for every type of translation problem, the theory should rather account for the principles and strategies needed to approach such problems. (De Beaugrande 1978:14)

3.2 The concept of strategy and technique

Until now, the concept of procedure has been used as interchangeable words for

technique or strategy, but other scholars distinguish the concept of strategy from the technique. As a definition of these two terms, it is possible to use the words of Zabalbeascoa:

A strategy is a specific pattern of behavior aimed at solving a problem or attaining a goal; in translation, the goal is the TT according to its specifications. Strategy is proposed here as any conscious action(s) intended to enhance a translator's performance for a given task, especially in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Strategies of this kind cannot be discovered by descriptive studies of the texts alone since the underlying principle is that a given result might be reached by different paths. (Zabalbeascoa 2000: 120)

Therefore, according to Zabalbeascoa, strategies are the actions that the translator adopts before translating, as reading the text, analysing it, etc. On the other hand, the technique is «a concept that is not usually associated to a decision-making process, but to an acquired skill to be applied according to a prescribed method or procedure» (Zabalbeascoa 2000:121); those are the technical procedures mentioned by Vinay & Darbelnet that are possible to be considered acquired abilities.

Not all the scholars define the concepts of strategy and techniques, but, for example Kussmaul (1995), analysed the mental process of the translator starting from the problems that he faces, that he calls “unsuccessful processes”, concluding that the strategies and the techniques have to solve the problem. He considered the translation problem, unsuccessful processes, metaphorically, as a disease: the symptoms are the mistakes in the target text, the diagnosis is the analysis of the mistakes and the therapy is the correction of the mistakes through the strategies and the techniques; the strategies and the techniques should be internalised and used unconsciously, while the procedures of problem solving should be conscious:

If translation were a skill like, say, driving a car, professionalism could be achieved once and for all (...) With a problem-solving activity like translating,

internalization of strategies and techniques is only part of the process. There will be always situations when we have to make a conscious effort (...) The reason seems to me that translation is not only a skill, but also a problem-solving process. (Kusmaul 1995: 9)

Moreover, Hurtado Albir tries to clarify the concepts of technique, strategy and method of translation. He considers the strategy as individual and procedural and it is used in order to solve a problem; the technique is the concrete and recognisable application applied in short parts of the text, and finally, the method is general and conscious and it concerns the whole text. Basically, in his opinion, the difference between the strategy and the technique is that the strategy is “problem-solving oriented” during the translation, while the technique is defined when the method is established.

According to Hurtado Albir, the strategies, because of their procedural nature, are organized during the translation procedure; while the relation between technique and method are classified only after the translation; indeed, it appears that their relation is very close, because the technique becomes the concrete application of the method. Hurtado Albir defines the translation strategy as a procedure:

- 1) Individual;
- 2) Conscious or unconscious ;
- 3) Verbal or non-verbal;
- 4) Internal (cognitive) or external (Hurtado Albir 2001:276).

Finally, other scholars did not want to deal with the complex terminology among techniques, methods, strategies and procedures, therefore they decided to introduce new concepts, as trajections: “A trajection may be characterized as any of a number of basic plerematic translational patterns into which a given source-target pairing may partially be resolved” (Malone 1998:15). In other words, the trajections are the translation tools that are applied during the practice and the analysis of the text.

3.3 Different approaches in problem-solving

The scholars taken into consideration do not expect to have theoretical rules that have to be applied in order to make the translation an automatic and mechanical process, because they do not think that there is a solution for every problem. Vinay & Darbelnet (1958), in their work *Stylistique comparé de français et de l'anglais*, connect the translation with the comparative stylistics: the translator uses the rules of the comparative stylistics in order to build his translation. Vázquez Ayora (1977) considers translation as a part of applied linguistics, basing translation on the structural comparison and the more actual theories. Newmark considers translation grounded on the literal translation and the personal interpretation: “[...] the only unit of translation is the text, and almost any deviation from literal translation can be justified in any place appealing to the text as an overriding authority” (Newmark 1987: 68).

He, also, sustains some of the procedures suggested by Vinay & Darbelnet, based on the comparison of linguistic structures. López Guix & Minett Wilkinson (1997), more recently, categorise the technical procedures following the theory of Vinay & Darbelnet and adding other procedures based on the application of comparative linguistics on translation.

Furthermore, the cause-effect relation that exists between problem and strategy has modified the concept of operative knowledge of the translator. One of the first scholars that identified the importance of the notion of translation problem was Wotjak. He claims that the translation techniques are motivated procedures that occur when the situation requires them. He theorises three main causes of the use of translation techniques: linguistic causes (when grammatical phenomena or lexical units do not exist), meta-linguistic causes (the case of jokes, the use of dialect) and extra-linguistic causes (humoristic allusions, social and cultural differences). Also, De Beaugrande understood the importance of the notion of the problem in order to study the strategies and the techniques of translation, therefore he individualises three

strategies that lead the translation process:

A theoretical model is needed for co-ordinating these three levels (language system, poetic use of language in texts and translator as reader/writer). In particular, equivalence can be obtained only by identifying and overcoming a complex spectrum of potential problems on these three levels. (De Beaugrande 1978:13)

Obviously, the strategies cannot solve all the problems; in his opinion it is impossible to expect that translation theory can offer a solution for every problem, but it can put the basis in order to reach the solution.

Moreover, Andrew Chesterman thinks that the strategies have to be applied only when there is a problem:

If the goal is the end-point of a strategy, what is the starting point? The simple answer is: a problem. A strategy offers a solution to a problem, and is thus problem-centred [...] the translation process too starts with problems. (Chesterman 1997:89)

Besides, Lörscher considered the concept of strategy as indiscernible from the notion of problem and he distinguishes the translation process in strategic phases and non-strategic phases: "The translation process contains both strategic phases, which are directed towards solving translational problems, and non-strategic phases, which aim to accomplishing tasks" (Lörscher 1991:119); in other words, the first one solves the problem, while the second one accomplished the purposes.

The same opinion is shared by Kiraly, but he distinguishes problem unit and non-problem unit: the first one requires more attention from the translator and the application of conscious and potentially conscious strategies; the second one, apparently, does not require the application of strategies, because the solution is spontaneous and intuitive. In addition, he places the first one in the "controlled processing", and the second one in the "intuitive workspace", but when the automatic and intuitive process is not able to solve a problem, it passes to the control

processing centre, where the possible strategies, in order to solve the problem, are detected. According to his data, the relation between intuitive process and translation problem is not always working as he theorised; indeed he claims:

The data analysis showed that only some translation problems appeared to be focused upon for controlled processing. The verbalizations revealed that potentially conscious strategies were implemented only when subjects were unable to produce an acceptable translation solution for a source text element through spontaneous association or other unidentifiable uncontrolled processes. The absence of logical sequences of controlled processes leading to accepted solutions suggests that translation strategies are used to provide material for uncontrolled processes. It is significant that the final decision made in the processing chain for each translation unit was in almost every case an intuitive one. (Kiraly 1995: 143)

A completely different position is taken by Mackenzie, who defines the resolution of translation problems as a creative activity. She divides the problems into open and closed ones. The open problems do not have a pre-determined solution, and their solution cannot be subjected to an absolute verification, in this case a resolution given by the creativity is required; the creative process is composed by the preparation (the collection of information), the incubation (an unconscious mental process begins), illumination (the solution emerges) and the verification (the elaboration of the solutions) (Mackenzie 1998: 201).

3.4 Translation methodology

The theories about the procedures, techniques and strategies can be divided into two groups that are concentrated on the analysis of the process and the product. The scholars of the first group base their study on the nature of the mental process and on the procedures that occur in translation, among them Kiraly (1995) and Lörcher (1986). On the contrary, the scholars that mostly analyse the product follow the

comparative stylistics and the contrastive linguistics. Among the scholars of comparative stylistics, we can consider Vinay & Darbelnet (1958), Vázquez Ayora (1977) and Wotjak (1981); they basically use the same comparative strategy between two languages: collecting the data and contrasting them with the other language, elaborating very important tools in applied and contrastive linguistics. Others scholars based their theories on comparative linguistics, such as Newmark (1987) and López Guix & Minett Wilkinson (1997), although they did not express clearly which methodology they use in order to classify the procedures (Newmark categorises eighteen procedures and López Guix & Minett Wilkinson ten). During the seventies and the eighties translation studies have been concentrated on the comparative and descriptive processes that improve the knowledge between the source text and the target text. About it De Beaugrande affirms:

While we cannot see into the translator's mind, it should be possible, using the descriptive techniques [...] to derive evidence about competence from a sample translation. In this fashion, we might have a basis to undertake the criticism and evaluation of translation. (De Beaugrande 1978:121)

In his opinion, the translation cannot be based only on the comparison of the source and target texts, but also on the interaction among the author, the translator and the reader. Eventually, Chesterman (1997) based his study on the comparative analysis: he elaborated thirty procedures from his didactic experiences.

3.5 The categorisation of the procedures

As we said above, Vinay & Darbelnet organised their translation procedures based on the contrastive analysis of two different linguistic systems. In the analysis, they distinguish three levels that they call "les trios plans de la stylistique externe": the lexical, the morph-syntactical and the pragmatic. They conceive two kinds of translation: the direct and literal, and the oblique translation. In the first category are

included the concepts of borrowing, calque and literal translation; in the category of the oblique translation are included modulation, equivalence, adaptation, and transposition.

Direct translation

Borrowing: The SL word is transferred directly to the TL (Lili Ni 2009:78).

Calque: It is a strategy to 'borrow' the SL expression or structure and then transfer it in a literal translation (2009:79).

Literal translation: A 'word-for-word' translation. It is a translation strategy used 'most common between languages of the same family and culture' (130). In their opinion this process is unsuccessful when: it gives another meaning, it has no meaning, it is structurally impossible, it does not have a corresponding expression within the meta-linguistic experience of the TL, it has a corresponding expression, but not within the same register (Lili Ni 2009:80).

Oblique translation

Transposition: it involves 'replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the message' (81).

Modulation: refers to 'a variation of the form of the message, obtained by a change in the point of view' (81).

Equivalence: refers to a strategy to describe the same situation by 'using completely different stylistic or structural methods' for producing 'equivalent texts' (81).

Adaptation: refers to a method 'used in those cases where the type of situation being referred to by the SL message is unknown in the TL culture' (82).

Another scholar that deals with the theorisation of the translation strategies is Vázquez Ayora (1977). His aim is to compensate for the lack of translation teaching. First of all, he distinguishes two categories technical procedures of execution (*procedimientos técnicos de ejecución*) and general procedure of translation (*procedimiento general de traducción*). The general procedure concerns the previous project of the translation and its final review. The technical procedures are divided by

Vázquez Ayora into literal and oblique or dynamic translation; he defined the literal translation as:

Si dos oraciones, una en inglés y otra en español, existe entre ellas una correspondencia precisa de “estructura” y de “significación”, y la equivalencia se cumple monema por monema, se produce la traducción literal, y se la puede aplicar sin riesgo. (Vázquez Ayora 1977:257)

He distinguishes the notion of literal translation from the “literalism” that is the mechanical translation, which involves only mistakes and it is not worth being studied; this conception is contrasted by Peter Newmark (1987), as will be showed below.

The oblique translation is divided into two categories: the main procedures and the complementary procedures. Vázquez Ayora defines it as:

La traducción fiel a la intención del autor y respetuosa del genio de la lengua, a lo cual es imposible llegar con un apego servil a la letra ni con métodos aleatorios y amorfos, sino con procedimientos y técnicas probados y sistemáticos, cuya aplicación requiere del traductor conocimientos lingüísticos y documentación, además de la intuición y del propio juicio. Estas técnicas, aplicadas con probidad y responsabilidad, sacan al traductor de su camisa de fuerza, le conceden la libertad y latitud que necesita para lograr esos dos fines que hacen de la traducción una disciplina rigurosa y formal. (Vázquez Ayora 1977:290).

Main procedures:

Transposition: “el procedimiento por el cual se reemplaza una parte del discurso del texto de LO por otra diferente que en el texto LT lleve el principal contenido semántico de la primera” (1977:268).

Modulation: “consiste en un cambio de la «base conceptual» en el interior de una proposición, sin que se altere el sentido de ésta, lo cual viene a formar un «punto de vista modificado» o una base metafórica diferente” (291).

Equivalence: “identidad sémica que, aunque fuera solo parcial, pone en claro el funcionamiento metalingüístico del discurso” (317).

Adaptation: “el proceso de conformar un contenido a la visión particular de cada lengua” (324).

Complementary procedures are: amplification, explicitation, omission and compensation. Vázquez Ayora’s categorisation is different from the one of Vinay & Darbelnet because he considers borrowing and calque unrelated to the translation process and he does not consider the procedures one apart from the other: in other words, for example the difference between transposition and modulation is only a difference in the level of transformation.

Peter Newmark (1987) is a stronger supporter of literal translation, interpreting it as Vázquez Ayora interpreted “literalism”; he does not categorise the procedures explicitly; they are subordinated to literal translation and contextual factors, they are not focused on linguistic agents, but on cultural and extra-linguistic components:

Context is omnipresent, but it is relative. It affects technical terms and neologisms less than general words; it permeates a structured text and touches disjointed texts rather lightly. Where a writer deliberately innovates, the translator has to follow him, and blow the context. (Newmark 1987:80)

His list of procedures contains eighteen procedures, apart from the others already mentioned, he adds:

Naturalisation: “this procedure succeeds transference and adapts the SL word first to the normal pronunciation, then to the normal morphology (word-forms) of the TL” (1987:82).

Cultural equivalent: “this is an approximate translation where a SL cultural word is translated by a TL cultural word” (82).

Functional equivalent: “this common procedure, applied to cultural words, requires the use of a culture free word, sometimes with a new specific term; it therefore neutralises or generalises the SL word” (83).

Descriptive equivalent: when a word doesn’t exist in the TL and a description fills this lack (83).

Recognised translation: the use of “the official or the generally accepted translation of any institutional term” (89).

Couplets, triplets, quadruplets: three of four procedures “for dealing with a single problem” (91).

Notes, additions, glosses: cultural, technical or linguistic additional information.

López Guiz & Minett Wilkinson (1997) recognize the use of the categorization suggested by Vinay & Darbelnet (seven procedures) with three procedures more (expansion, reduction and compensation). Their study is a reflection on the theories, a comment on the practical application of the procedures, a solution for the main problems in translation.

A different point of view is taken by Chesterman. He categorises the procedures as elements that the translator uses in order to adapt the translation to the rules. He distinguishes the comprehension strategies and the production strategies; the first ones are based on a cognitive point of view, and the second ones on a linguistic point of view. His classification can be resumed as “changing something”: the strategies can be considered as the changes that happen passing from one language to another:

This would well illustrate the domain in which strategies operate: the space between source and target texts. “Change something” could be informally glossed as follows: if you are not satisfied with the target version that comes immediately to mind — because it seems ungrammatical, or semantically odd, or pragmatically weak, or whatever — then change something in it. (Chesterman 1997:92)

He divides the strategies into three groups:

- 1) Syntactical-grammatical strategies (literal translation, loan, calque, transposition, unit shift, phrase structure change, clause structure change, sentence structure change, cohesion change, level shift, scheme change);
- 2) Semantic strategies (synonymy, autonomy, hyponymy, converses, abstraction change, distribution change, emphasis change, paraphrase, trope change, other semantic changes);

- 3) Pragmatic strategies (cultural filtering, explicitness change, information change, interpersonal change, illocutionary change, coherence change, partial translation, visibility change, trans-editing, other pragmatic changes).

This classification is very complete and pragmatic because, apart from these strategies, he adds two new concepts:

- 1) The trans-edition: the translator has to edit the original text;
- 2) The partial translation: the phonetic transcription of names, place names, etc. (Chesterman 1997:93-94).

In conclusion, all the scholars taken into consideration conceive their own theories about the translation strategies. In particular, Vinay & Darbelnet base their theories on contrastive analysis; Vázquez Ayora, from the comparison of two languages, gives an important contribution to the theoretical and linguistic analysis; Peter Newmark bases his theory on the assumption that all the strategies are subordinated to literal translation; López Guiz & Minett Wilkinson classify the linguistic characteristics that the translator has to learn in order to use the strategies; and Chesterman, differently from the others, gives a more pragmatic and specific view of the procedures.

Chapter 4 Translation of metaphors

The translation of metaphor has been considered by many scholars as an important matter of translation studies. It is difficult to translate a metaphor because a language is not only a system, but it includes also cultural aspects that have to be considered in the passage from one language to another, and from one culture to another. The case of the translation of metaphors is an example of impossibility to translate a text literally, because the audience cannot catch the sense of the metaphor. Many scholars have discussed the method for solving the cultural distance facing a metaphor in translation. The aim of this chapter is to compare the various theories.

4.1 An introduction to the problem of translating a metaphor

The dilemma of the translator is to choose whether to maintain the metaphorical element or not in the translation; this could seem not important, but there is the possibility for the author to use various metaphors for one metaphorical image.

The scholar Richard Trim, in his book *Metaphor Networks: The Comparative Evolution of Figurative Language* (2007), claims that the translatability of the creative metaphors (new metaphors) depends on the ability of interpreting and transferring the metaphor of the source language. There is also the possibility for the translator to interpret the metaphor, but the metaphor in the target language is not appropriate. In this case, the translator has to decide whether to use the metaphor of the source language or not. Trim defines the impossibility of quantifying the translatability, but he defines it as a gradual stair (2007:67).

Moreover, another scholar, Manson (1982), considered the problem of metaphor translation as not originated by the characteristics of the metaphor, but by the cultural differences between source and target languages and, for this reason, it should be considered as a general problem of translation. In any case, he says, the metaphor has to be translated in all its elements with the cultural connotation, considering the textual context in which the metaphor is used. Furthermore, Mason sustains that it is not possible to create a theory in order to translate a metaphor, but only a theory of translation (Mason 1982:149).

Surely, some aspects of the metaphors, as a cultural peculiarity, can be shared with other parts of the text that have to be translated, but the combination between the figurative language, the potential cultural peculiarity and the dependence on the context places translation in a unique position in translation studies.

The interpretation of the metaphor is very determined in cultural terms. In order to use a metaphor in a new context, the translator can choose among three possibilities: using an equivalent exactly the same as the source metaphor, searching for a metaphorical expression that expresses the same meaning, or substituting the untranslatable metaphor with a literal paraphrase (Dobrzynska 1995: 595-604).

4.2 How to translate a metaphor: different approaches

Some scholars affirmed that an adequate translation of a metaphor is impossible to be achieved, as Nida, or partially impossible. One of them is M.B. Dagut, who states: "The crucial question that arises is thus whether a metaphor can, strictly speaking, be translated as such, or whether it can only be "reproduced" in some way" (1976:21). Therefore, Dagut does not say that the translation is always impossible; he points to the dead metaphors. These metaphors do not constitute a problem either in the source or in the target language, simply because they are not in use anymore.

Dagut distinguishes two other types of metaphors apart from the dead ones. The standard metaphor is one of them; it is translatable, but not easily. The translation process becomes more difficult when the metaphor is very creative, even though this characteristic offers possibilities for the translator to be creative as well.

The last category of metaphors is the one of the new and original metaphor; its translation is impossible because this metaphor contains strong cultural and personal elements that cannot be translated literally. Dagut sustains the originality of every metaphor that does not allow for the discovery of an equivalent in the target language:

Since a metaphor in the SL is, by definition, a new piece of performance, a semantic novelty, it can clearly have no existing 'equivalence' in the TL: what is unique can have no counterpart. Here the translator's bilingual competence is of help to him only in the negative sense of telling him that any equivalence in this cannot be 'found' but will have to be created. The crucial question that arises is thus whether a metaphor can, strictly speaking, be translated as such, or whether it can only be 'reproduced' in some way. (Dagut 1976:21)

As we said before, there are many points of view on the possibility or the impossibility of translating a metaphor. Nida (1964) and Dagut (1976) sustain that the translation of a metaphor results always in another metaphor and that this solution is inexplicable in translation. Mason (1982) treated the translation of a metaphor as a normal translation. Van Den Broeck (1981), Toury (1995) and Newmark (1987) consider the metaphor a unique and special problem in translation "Whilst the central problem of translation is the overall choice of a translation method for a text, the most important particular problem is the translation of metaphor" (Newmark 1987:104). Snell-Hornby (1995) claims that the translation of a metaphor cannot be decided by abstract rules, but it depends on the structure and the function of the metaphor in the text (Sjørup2013:69-70).

Peter Newmark in 1985 theorised a new approach in order to translate metaphors. In his opinion, there are three elements to be considered:

- 1) The kind of literature in which the metaphor is;
- 2) The global characteristics of the metaphor;
- 3) The position of the metaphor in the classification of the analyst. (Newmark 1985: 295-326).

Furthermore, Newmark distinguishes six types of metaphors:

- 1) Dead metaphors: “where one is hardly conscious of the image, frequently relate to universal terms of space and time, the main part of the body, general ecological features and the main human activities” (Newmark 1987:106);
- 2) Cliché metaphors: “metaphors that have perhaps temporarily outlived their usefulness, that are used as a substitute for clear thought, often emotively, but without corresponding to the facts of the matter” (1987:107);
- 3) Stock or standard metaphors: “established metaphor which in an informal context is an efficient and concise method of covering a physical and/or mental situation both referentially and pragmatically [...] and which is not deadened by overuse” (108);
- 4) Adapted metaphors: equivalent adapted metaphors in “sacred” text (111);
- 5) Recent metaphors: “a metaphorical neologism, often “anonymously” coined, which has spread rapidly in the SL” (111)
- 6) Original metaphors: “original metaphors, created or quoted by the SL writer. In principle, in authoritative and expressive texts, these should be translated literally, whether they are universal, cultural or obscurely subjective” (112).

In his opinion a dead metaphor is not a metaphor anymore, as the cliché, unless it does not belong to a legal or literary text, or to an important or official text. He suggests a hierarchical approach to the translation of the metaphor that we can summarize in the following steps:

- 1) Reproduce the same image of the source language in the target language;
- 2) Substitute the image of the source language with an image with the same meaning in the target language;
- 3) Translate the metaphor of the source language with a similitude in the target language;
- 4) Bring back the metaphor to the original meaning;
- 5) Conform/ modify the metaphor;
- 6) Remove the metaphor if it is not necessary;
- 7) Maintain the metaphor of the source language and add explanations (Newmark 1985: 295-326).

This approach basically suggests substituting the semantic element of the source language with another semantic element in the target language in order to achieve the most elevated equivalence between the expressions of the source language and the expressions of the target language. The only thing that the translator has to do is to be sure that all the semantic components of the source language are somehow integrated in the target language, thus Eugene Nida claims:

The correctness of a translation must be determined not in terms of the corresponding sets of words, but on the basis of the extent to which the corresponding sets of semantic components are accurately represented in the restructuring. This is essential if the resulting form of the message in the receptor language is to represent the closest natural equivalent of the source-language text. (Nida 1971:185)

The same opinion is shared by Newmark. About the translation process, he states:

The process of translation is to compare a SL word with a TL word which has a similar meaning, but is not an obvious one-to-one equivalent, by demonstrating first their common and then their differing sense components. (Newmark 1987:114)

4.3 The conceptual metaphor

The metaphor was considered a linguistic tool that reaches artistic and persuasive objectives in literature and rhetoric. With Lakoff and Johnson (1980) the status of the metaphor changed from linguistic to cognitive. They define metaphor as:

[...] one of our most important tools for trying to comprehend partially what cannot be comprehended totally: our feelings, aesthetic experiences, moral practice and spiritual awareness. The endeavors of the imagination are not devoid of rationality since they use metaphor, they employ an imaginative rationality. (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:193)

They claim that almost all the metaphors derive from a very small number of conceptual metaphors. They think that the lexicon and memory are metaphorically structured, in other words they make a connection with the concepts that they have to communicate partially. Therefore Lakoff and Johnson base their theory on the idea that the conceptual ability is constructed metaphorically:

The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor. (Johnson 1981: 287)

The readers, in their opinion, do not have problems with a text where there are many new creative metaphors, because they recognise the conceptual metaphor unconsciously and they can interpret the text correctly.

Lakoff and Johnson assume that the metaphor always depends on language and culture, and this means that it is not possible to translate a metaphor. In the Conceptual Theory of Metaphor we might distinguish the source domain and the target domain, the transfer of meaning between the source to the target domain is the same process of translation. The Conceptual Theory of Metaphor is based on three essential factors:

- 1) - Most of the human thoughts are partially metaphoric, and only literal language is an exception;
 - The conventional metaphors are not dead, they are recognized and they become important in order to understand a culture and a linguistic community
 - Human beings experience reality through a culturally determined conceptual system;
- 2) - The metaphor consists in the partial comprehension of a concept defined with the terms of another concept, originated from another source domain, with a similar cognitive structure;

- Metaphors are not casually connected concepts, the relation has experiential bases;
 - The conceptual system is structured by metaphors, they are put into relation through categorisation, similarity or contrast in source domain, target domain or experiential base;
- 3) - A metaphor can be expressed by images, language, action, etc.;
- There is not a big difference in the origin of meanings and images as mental representations or sensorial perceptions (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:5-6).

In any case, the base of the metaphor is the experience, it explains the origin of the metaphor and the relation between source and target domain.

Moreover, Lakoff and Turner distinguish two levels of metaphors in the conceptual system of the structure: generic level metaphors (abstract relations) and specific level metaphors (conventional and original metaphors). Lakoff and Johnson add a new category which includes the linguistic metaphors that are considered in a lower level than the conceptual metaphors. Furthermore, they theorise that the structure of the metaphorical concept is based on the comparison of image-schemas, that is: "An image schema is a dynamic recurring pattern of the organising activities of perception, image formation, and conceptualisation that makes it possible for us to inhabit a shared world" (Johnson 1993:416). The term image-schema refers to a very general concept, but Lakoff and Turner consider the image-schema in a more specific level: what is important is not the relation between source and target domains, but the effective transfer of the meaning.

The basic problem is understanding that if there is a real difficulty in the translation of metaphors, a solution could be the pragmatic application of the conceptual theory of the metaphor: the translator tries to find the conceptual metaphor in the untranslatable metaphor; once he found it he has the translation of the metaphor in the target language.

Furthermore, Lakoff and Turner distinguish techniques, procedures and strategies that can produce new metaphors (poetic metaphors); two of the most important ones are:

- 1) Extension: the addition of new elements to the meaning of a conventional metaphor;
- 2) Composition: the combination of conceptual metaphors; they meant the simultaneous use of two or more conventional metaphors for the same source domain, and this in only a text or a sentence (Lakoff & Turner 1989:70).

In addition, Zoltàn Kövecses distinguishes three kinds of conceptual metaphors, which show an increase of the cultural influence:

- 1) Core conceptual metaphors that derive directly from image-schemas; this kind of metaphor is not influenced by cultural elements;
- 2) Primary conceptual metaphors that derive from human physical experiences in universal relation; these metaphors are slightly influenced by culture;
- 3) Complex conceptual metaphors that derive from universal human experiences; these metaphors are strongly influenced by culture and therefore almost untranslatable (Kövecses 2007:117).

Moreover, Kenneth McElhanon uses these three kinds of conceptual metaphors theorised by Kövecses in order to elaborate his translation theory:

- 1) Core conceptual metaphors: in order to translate this kind of metaphor the image-schema has to be maintained, a literal translation of the metaphors that derive from image-schemas could be necessary.
- 2) Primary conceptual metaphors: also in this case the translation can be very close to the source text. Metaphors based on parts of the body produce a huge amount of emotions, therefore these metaphors are dynamic; the translator can search the equivalent meaning for these physical metaphors.
- 3) Complex conceptual metaphors: they have an important cultural connotation; therefore the optimal translation could be between a metaphor and a cultural model, protecting the cohesion and integration of the original model (McElhanon 2006:45-46).

These theories are guides for the translator, there is not yet a final method that the translator can apply when he faces the problem of the translation of a metaphor.

4.4 The case of the Bible

The metaphor is a phenomenon present in the Bible and in many religious texts; also in this case, translators search methods for an effective translation. The translators of the Bible facing the problem of the translation of a metaphor usually try to combine, as much as they can, the source and the target language.

When the metaphor is very difficult to be understood, it could be explained more or it could be changed for a similitude; if the result is still not optimal, the translator can add a comparison; if all the options fail, the translator can decide to substitute the original image with an image of the target culture; the last option is removing the metaphor and explaining the source content.

4.5 A global view

Studies of the metaphor in translation are less frequent than studies of metaphor in linguistics. Almost all the studies on the translatability of metaphors confirm the variety of possible translations of metaphors, ranging from the total impossibility (Nida), the sometime possible (Dagut), the partial possible (Newmark and Snell-Hornby), to the always possible (Mason and McElhanon). All of them, except Mason, affirm that translation of metaphors is difficult; Mason sustains that the problem of their translation is caused by the cultural differences between the source and the target language and it should be considered as a problem of general translation. In Newmark's opinion, the metaphors that can be translated without any problem are the dead, the cliché, the standard, the recent and the adapted ones; the problem is when the metaphor is original, because it is used for the first time in the source language and it is strongly bound to the cultural context.

The strategies used by the scholars are very different: the approach of Newmark and Toury is source oriented; the one of Snell-Hornby is text oriented; McElhanon thinks that the Conceptual theory of Metaphors of Lakoff and Johnson can be applied in order to solve the problem of the translation of a metaphor.

The theoretical reflection on the translation problem of metaphors became very important but what the translator really needs is a practical method to apply. Scholars such as Newmark, Toury and Dagut give an important contribution, but the study needs a deeper reflection.

Chapter 5 Automatic translation vs. Translators

The use of automatic translation in Internet has enormously increased in recent years, as it is very useful in order to translate quickly and easily. Nevertheless, whoever has experienced a program like Google Translate knows that many times the translation it offers does not correspond to the text. One word alone can be translated in a good way, but the sentences are more difficult to be translated. The failure of automatic translation comes from many reasons: there are idiomatic expressions that cannot be translated in another language; the same word can have different meanings in a language and in order to know which is the correct meaning a context is needed that the automatic translation does not recognise.

5.1 The notion of translation

Translation as science has been studied since the old ages and, as we saw in the first chapter, from the beginning this science aimed to the discussion. It is considered inter-disciplinary because it belongs to the culture, the society, the literature and, of course, the language. George Steiner in *After Babel* (1975) distinguishes three types of translation:

- 1) Literal translation, translating word for word;
- 2) Free translation, translating sense for sense: the translator makes the text understandable for the readers;
- 3) Faithful translation, translating exactly what is written.

The strategy used by the translator depends on the purpose of the translation: if he focuses on the source text or in the target text. In the first case the translator is stuck on the text, therefore he chooses literal translation. If the translator focuses on

the target text, he uses free translation because his purpose is making the text comprehensible. This distinction is important in order to explain the differences between automatic and mechanical translation and the translator. The translator is able to translate sense for sense, what is important in this kind of translation is that the meaning of the word in the target text has to be the same as the one that it has in the source text. The computer is not able to consider the context in which a word is used, so it translates improperly, and therefore it can translate only word for word. Indeed Hutchins claims:

But, as ever, reality is not perfect. There are no 'translating machines' which, at the touch of a few buttons, can take any text in any language and produce a perfect translation in any other language without human intervention or assistance. (Hutchinsweb.me.uk)

5.2 The limits of automatic translation

The term translation machine (MT) has been defined by Hutchins: "the now traditional and standard name for computerised systems responsible for the production of translations from one natural language into another, with or without human assistance" (Hutchinsweb.me.uk).

Nowadays the translation systems have been used very frequently; Google Translate is one of the most used translation machines. It was created in 2006 and it has two hundred million users every month. If Google is used in order to find the meaning of a sentence, the result is not always sufficient; it works in a good way when the word is only one, because many meanings are shown. In the case of a sentence the process is more difficult, because it should take into consideration the order of the words, the context and other aspects mentioned below.

Automatic translation works when many translated texts are collected; these texts set up the knowledge representation that transforms the language of texts into signals that the computer can comprehend, in this way the machine receives the text and can translate it. In other words, during the translation process, the machine has to decode the original text and compare it with the data that it already has:

The system may be designed, for example, to deal with texts limited to the sublanguage (vocabulary and grammar) of a particular subject field (e.g. polymer chemistry) and/or document type (e.g. patents). Alternatively, input texts may be written in a controlled language, which reduces potential ambiguities and restricts the complexity of sentence structures. This option is often referred to as pre-editing, but the term can also be used for the marking of input texts to indicate proper names, word divisions, prefixes, suffixes, phrase boundaries, etc. Finally the system itself may refer problems of ambiguity and selection to human operators (usually translators, though some systems are designed for use by the original authors) for resolution during the processes of translation itself, i.e. in an interactive mode. (Hutchinsweb.me.uk)

Google Translate looks for regularity in the texts translated by human beings; for this reason the computer can calculate which one could be the most correct meaning. Therefore, Google Translate works on statistics: the larger the number of texts it receives the better translation quality it can produce. In order to improve the translation, Google Translate converts the text into English, because there is more and better material: English is the language in which the program was created. Languages with a different disposition of words, such as Japanese that has the verb at the end of the sentence, are more difficult to be translated by a machine. We can consider the example of the Japanese sentence, given by Arnold *et al.* In *Machine translation. An introductory guide* (1994:110):

Satoo-san wa shyushoo ni erabaremashita.

Literal translation in English: Satoo-hon TOP¹ Prime Minister in was-elected

English: Mr. Satoh was elected Prime Minister.

Arnold observes that the Japanese sentence not only has a literal meaning, because it suggests the idea that Mr Satoh did not want to be elected or that the conditions of the election were bad for him.

¹Top: marks the main topic of the sentence.

This is not suggested by the English translation, of course. The translation problem from Japanese to English is one of those that looks unsolvable for MT, though one might try to convey the intended sense by adding an adverb such as unfortunately. The translation problem from English to Japanese is on the other hand within the scope of MT, since one must just choose another form. (Arnold 1994:111)

The computer has limited abilities; therefore, in order to obtain the maximum result the input must be written in a way that the machine can understand, it must contain only terms which have always the same meaning and which are contained in the dictionary of the computer.

The disposition of the words is not the only difficulty that automatic translation can face. One of the problems is the non-existence of a word in translation language, especially when the word is specific of a language or a culture (for example the Portuguese word “saudade” cannot be translated exactly in any language). For these reasons, usually, a paraphrase is used, or a brief explanation of the word, or a word with a similar meaning in the target language. This procedure is called “adaptation” by Vinay & Darbelnet: it involves changing the cultural reference when the word does not exist in the culture of target language.

Moreover, another problem that automatic translation faces is lexical ambiguity (Arnold 1994:106); this is the case of words with many meanings: for example the word “leg” could mean human leg, journey leg, chair leg or animal leg; the context determines not only how to understand a word, but also how to translate it. The machine cannot perceive which specific meaning is the correct one depending on the case. The same situation can be observed in the case of a sentence with many meanings, this is called structural ambiguity (Arnold 1994:107). For example, the sentence:

Cleaning fluids can be dangerous

The word “cleaning” can be a verb or an adjective, if we consider it as a verb the meaning is the act of cleaning the fluids may be risky; if we consider it as an

adjective the meaning is the use of fluids can hurt. In order to choose the correct meaning the computer should have a syntactical knowledge, as Arnold claims:

In fact, arming a computer with knowledge about syntax, without at the same time telling it something about meaning can be a dangerous thing. This is because applying a grammar to a sentence can produce a number of different analyses, depending on how the rules have applied, and we may end up with a large number of alternative analyses for a single sentence. (Arnold 1994:106)

According to what Gleitman (1991) claims, two are the characteristics that a translator should have: the memory and the decision-making. In the case of the automatic translation the memory is easy to be applied, while the decision making is not. Deciding if a word is an adjective, a noun or a verb is difficult for the computer, it should interpret in which sense the word has to be translated according to the specific case.

Furthermore, the idiomatic expressions constitute a problem in automatic translation. Arnold defines idioms as “expressions whose meaning cannot be completely understood from the meanings of the component parts” (Arnold 1994:115); these are sentences that have a metaphorical meaning, therefore it is not possible to translate them literally, because they belong to the idiom of a language and its culture. For example the sentence:

If Sam kicks the bucket, her children will be rich (1994:115).

In this case, kick the bucket means die, but the machine, despite its knowledge about grammar, cannot translate it because this is an idiom. Usually, idioms are translated with a single word, as in this case (die); surely this process is easier than starting from a word and converting it in an idiomatic expression. It is possible, sometimes, to find the corresponding idiomatic expression in the other language: for example the idiomatic expression “take the bull by the horns” can be translated literally in Spanish “coger el toro por los cuernos”² (115).

² Arnold uses French: prendre le taureau par les cornes.

Moreover, proverbs belong to the idiomatic expressions; the proverb is a sentence with a metaphoric and concrete meaning, known by all speakers of the same language. It can happen that there are similar proverbs in two different languages, but these have to be adapted to the culture and the language of the translation language; Vinay & Darbelnet call this procedure “equivalence”, as we saw in Chapter 3.

5.3 About the quality of machine translation

The discussion about the quality of translation machine became very strong, especially in recent years, because it is thought that it cannot translate literature; it is useless because of its low quality; it threatens the translators’ job. Arnold takes into consideration some popular conceptions and he discusses them. For example, in the case of literary translation he claims that in order to translate a literary text, translators have to learn special skills, therefore not only the machine cannot do it, but neither can translators without a specific knowledge. Also, he adds that literary translation is a small part of the wider field of translation: “The criticism that MT systems cannot translate Shakespeare is a bit like criticism of industrial robots for not being able to dance Swan Lake” (Arnold 1994:6).

About the quality of machine translation Arnold gives as example the case of a Chinese newspaper that you want to understand because you think it could be important. At least the computer can offer the main idea of the text; as it happens in a human translation, he subdivided the translation into two phases: the first one is the “draft translation”, which is not properly translated; the second is the review and checking; indeed the computer ends its process at the first step. In Arnold’s opinion, machine translation cannot substitute human translation, first of all, because there is a large amount of text to be translated, and, second, because of the limitations and restrictions of the automatic system. But, he adds, in the case of draft translation, the automatic translation is very useful; therefore the translator will have more time to check the style, clarify the meaning, and choose the most proper and accurate terminology.

In order to achieve the maximum result from the automatic translation the text has to be prepared in a specific way. The procedure suggested by Arnold is:

- 1) Keep sentences short.
- 2) Make sure sentences are grammatical.
- 3) Avoid complicated grammatical constructions.
- 4) Avoid (so far as possible) words which have several meanings.
- 5) In technical documents, only use technical words and terms which are well established, well defined and known to the system (Arnold 1994:26).

Obviously not all the texts, which are sent to the machine, are written according to these rules, but the more the input is close to them the better result can be expected; therefore Arnold warns that when the text is intricate and entangled it's better to translate it by yourself or rewrite the complex sentences in the input, with his words:

There will be a cut-off point where the input text is so badly written or so complicated that the raw output requires an uneconomically large amount of post-editing effort. In this case it may be possible to rewrite the problematic sentences in the input text or it may prove simplest to do the whole thing by hand. (Arnold 1994:28)

In conclusion, it is possible to claim that the automatic machine will not substitute the translator at all, but it can help him at least in the first steps of a translation:

the types of errors produced by MT systems do differ from those of human translators. While postediting is the norm, there are certain circumstances when MT output may be left unedited (as a raw translation) or only lightly corrected, e.g. if it is intended only for specialists familiar with the subject of the text. Output may also serve as a rough draft for a human translator, as a pre-translation. (Arnold 1994:12)

The efficient translator has to know perfectly the source and the target language in order to produce comprehensible texts in the target language; he also has to know

how to translate individual words and how to translate them according to the context; having a knowledge of the topic of the text is also important, as the same as having information about the customs, the culture and the social conventions.

Even if translation machines become every day more functional, they will not substitute the translator, just because they are not able to interpret. In many cases, as we saw, it is not possible to translate with equivalent terms; therefore the translator has to interpret the cultural factors and he is the only one who can understand the cultural differences and use the semantic and linguistic elements in order to fill the gap between the source and the target texts.

Analysis of Results & Conclusions

After comparing the theories about the procedures to apply in the case of failure of literal translation of the most well-known scholars in translation studies, we can conclude this research revising the most important differences and common aspects that could be considered as the results of this study.

First of all, I defined the notion of translation as it was seen in the past, starting from Cicero until the twentieth century; this demonstrate that, since the very old times, translation has been a source of analysis and studies. Especially the literal, word for word, or free, sense for sense, approaches were in the centre of the reflection. As a result, we can notice that literal translation was sustained, in the Middle Age, by the religious people in order to avoid changing the message transmitted by the Holy Scripture. This concept, accompanied by many changes in culture, science and politics, has continued being debated until the twentieth century.

The scholars we have taken into consideration deal with this topic from different points of view; we highlight the position of Vinay & Darbelnet, Vázquez Ayora, Newmark and Chesterman. It is possible to conclude that Newmark makes the difference, he started his reflection using the linguistic approach of Vázquez Ayora, although he does not define his approach, adding the procedures of naturalisation, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, descriptive equivalent, recognised translation, couplets, triples, quadruplets and notes, additions and glosses, but, despite the theorisation of eighteen procedures, he is a strong supporter of literal translation and I think this sentence resumes his opinion: “literal translation is correct and must not be avoided, if it secures referential and pragmatic equivalence to the original” (Newmark 1987:66-67).

Furthermore, from the study of the peculiar case of translation of the metaphor, it is possible to consider as a result that it is an open matter that is either considered impossible to face as Nida claims, or partially solvable, depending on the kind of metaphor, as Newmark, Dagut and Snell-Hornby sustain. A very different point of view is the one of McElhanon that deals with this issue supporting the Conceptual theory of Metaphors by Lakoff and Johnson. Despite all these theories, the translator has not yet a pragmatic tool in order to achieve an effective result.

Besides, the reflection on the functions of automatic translation using online instruments, such as Google Translate, can lead us to the conclusion that the figure of the translator is still the only one able to consider all the aspects that a language entails, because the translation machine uses the same principles of literal translation, without considering context, culture, social conventions, proverbs, idiomatic expressions, and the multiple meanings of the same word; therefore its output can only be a rough draft, as Arnold claims.

The comparative study of the procedures proposed by the main scholars in order to solve the problem of the failure of literal translation suggests the need for more observations and studies in general, as well as in the specific case of the translation of metaphors.

References

- Anderson, John R. *The architecture of cognition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Arnold, Doug. *Machine translation. An introductory guide*. Oxford: NCC Blackwell, 1994.
- De Beaugrande, Robert. *Factors in a theory of poetic translation*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1978.
- Chesterman, Andrew. *Memes of translation*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997.
- Dagut, Menachem B. "Can Metaphor be Translated?" *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 22.1 (1976): 21-33.
- Dobrzyńska, Teresa. "Translating metaphor: Problems of meaning." *Journal of Pragmatics* 24.6 (1995): 595-604.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Stuart E. Dreyfus. *Mind over machine*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Gleitman, Henry. *Psychology*. 3rd ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1991.
- Guix, López, Juan Gabriel, and Jacqueline Minett Wilkinson. *Manual de traducción*. Barcelona: Gedisa, 1997.
- Hönig, Hans G. "Holmes' 'mapping theory' and the landscape of mental translation processes." *Translation Studies: the State of the Art. Proceedings of the First*

- James S. Holmes Symposium on Translation Studies*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1991.
- Hurtado Albir, Amparo. *Traducción y traductología, introducción a la traductología*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2001.
- Hutchins, William J. "General introduction and brief history." Retrieved 14 May 2015. <<http://www.hutchinsweb.me.uk/IntroMT-1.pdf>>.
- Johnson, Mark. "Conceptual metaphor and embodied structures of meaning: A reply to Kennedy and Vervaeke." *Philosophical Psychology* 6.4 (1993): 413-422.
- . *Philosophical perspectives on metaphors*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.
- Kiraly, Donald C. *Pathways to translation, pedagogy and process*. Kent: The Kent State University Press, 1995.
- Kohn, Kurt, and Sylvia Kalina. "The strategic dimension of interpreting." *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 41.1 (1996): 118-138.
- Kövecses, Zoltán *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Krings, Hans P. "Was in den Köpfen von Übersetzern vorgeht." *Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Struktur des Übersetzungsprozesses an fortgeschrittenen Französischlernern*. Tübingen: Narr, 1986.
- Kussmaul, Paul. *Training the translator*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- , and Mark Turner, *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

- Lörscher, Wolfgang. *Translation performance, translation process and translations strategies, a psycholinguistic investigation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1991.
- Mackenzie, Rosemary. *Creative problem solving and translator training. Translation strategies and creativity*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998.
- Malone, Joseph L. *The science of linguistics in the art of translation*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1988.
- Mason, Ian. "Techniques of translation revisited: a text-linguistic review of 'borrowing' and 'modulation'." *Estudis sobre la traducció*. Castelló: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I (1994): 61-72.
- Mason, Kirsten. "Metaphor and Translation." *Babel: International Journal of Translation* 28.3 (1982): 140-49.
- McElhanon, Kenneth A. "Simple metaphors to Conceptual Blending: The Mapping of Analogical Concepts and the Praxis of Translation." *Journal of Translation* 2.1(2006): 45-46.
- Newmark, Peter. *A textbook of translation*. New York-London: Prentice Hall, 1987.
- . "The translation of metaphor." *The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins (1985): 295-326.
- Ni, Lili. "For Translation and Theories." *English Language Teaching* 2.2 (2009): 78-83.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Semantic components in translation theory." *Applications of linguistics* (1971): 185.
- . *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.
- PACTE. "Building a translation competence model." *Triangulating translation: perspectives in process oriented research*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John

- Benjamins (2003): 36-60.
- Pozo, Municio *et al.* *La solución de problemas*. Madrid: Santillana, 1994.
- Presas, Marisa. "Bilingual competence and translation competence." *Developing translation competence*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins (2000): 19-31.
- Schneider, Walter, and Richard M. Shiffrin. "Controlled and automatic human information processing: I. Detection, search, and attention." *Psychological review* 84.1 (1977): 1-66.
- Scott-Tennent, Christopher, María González Davies, and Fernanda Rodríguez Torras. "Translation Strategies and Translation Solutions." *Investigating Translation: Selected papers from the 4th International Congress on Translation, Barcelona, 1998*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000.
- Sjørup, Annette C. *Cognitive effort in metaphor translation, an eye-tracking and key-logging study*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School, 2013.
- Steiner, George. *After Babel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Toury, Gideon. "The notion of 'native translator' and translation teaching." *Die Theorie des Übersetzens und ihr Aufschlusswert für die Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschdidaktik*. Tübingen: Narr, 1974.
- Trim, Richard. *Metaphor Networks: The Comparative Evolution of Figurative Language*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Vázquez Ayora, Gerardo. *Introducción a la traductología*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1977.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. *Stylistique comparée de l'anglais et du français*. Paris: Didier, 1958.
- Wilss, Wolfram. *Knowledge and skills in translator behavior*. Amsterdam-

Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996.

Wotjak, Gerd. "Técnicas de translación." *Aspetos fundamentales de la teoría de la traducción*. La Habana: Ediciones Pueblo y Educación (1981): 197-229.

Zabalbeascoa, Patrick. "From techniques to types of solutions." *Investigating translation*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins (2000): 117-127.