Set texts (all students should have read these by the end of the course)

Deignan, A. **2005**. Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Introduction, plus chapters 1, 2 and 3

Steen, G., Dorst, A., Herrmann, B., Kaal, A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. **2010**. *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: from MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Chapter 2

Arduini, S. **2014**. Metaphor, translation, cognition. In Miller & Monti (eds), *Tradurre Figure / Translating Figurative Language*. Bologna: Bononia University Press, 2014, pp41-52.

Kövecses, Z. **2014**. Conceptual metaphor theory and the nature of difficulties in metaphor translation. In Miller & Monti (eds), pp.25-39

Shuttleworth, M. **2014**. Translation studies and metaphor studies: possible paths of interaction between two well-established disciplines. In Miller & Monti (eds), pp53-65

Steen, G. **2014**. Translating metaphor: what's the problem? In Miller & Monti (eds), pp.11-24.

How the course is structured.

The 30 hours of the course will be delivered in weekly 2-hour lessons; 10 lessons in semester 1 and 5 in semester 2. An additional lesson will be included in semester 2 to welcome a visiting scholar with expertise in cognitive linguistics.

In each lesson, we will learn about theoretical and methodological aspects (normally via student seminars dealing with selected texts provided by the professor), then we will analyse a text for translation. You should translate the text at home for discussion the following lesson: your (draft) translations – in electronic form – should be submitted no later than 5pm on the day before your lesson, so that we can discuss the translation choices you have collectively made (the texts will always be anonymised if shown in the classroom). Please note that submission of translations is a course requirement and contributes to your final grade.

Assessment

You will be assessed during the course (no final exam)

Seminar work =40%. The seminar you prepare and deliver is worth 30% of your final grade (qualitative assessment: see details on *pagina docente*), while your participation in the seminars given by your peers is worth a further 10% (based on *frequency* and *quality* of interaction. Please note that *this does not constitute an obbligation to attend* all lessons, but when you do attend, you are expected to be an active participant. The seminars will normally be held by two students, each taking responsibility for a 10-15 minute presentation, followed by open discussion. The topics will be assigned during the first lessons, and copies of relevant texts will be provided to the student(s) presenting the topic.

Translations = 20%. This score is *numerical*, not *qualitative*. You will get 2 points for each *draft* translation you submit, up to a maximum of 20 points (max 10 translations). Please note: you are not expected to produce perfect texts – they are for a training exercise, not a qualitative assessment. **Send your texts to the dedicated gmail account, `gill.cilta@gmail.com` indicating the TITLE of the text in the "Subject" heading** (copy and paste it from your electronic file).

Language exam: 40% Exam based on lettorato course delivered by David Tannert and Masturah Alatas. The overall grade will be espressed as a *giudizio*, i.e. sufficiente (18-20/30), discreto (21-23/30), buono (24-26/30), molto buono (27-29/30), eccellente (30-30L/30).

Provisional calendar of lessons: topics, texts to comment and translate, tasks to complete

DATE	TOPIC	Text for discussion (seminar)	Text to analyse in class and translate for next lesson
27/9/2016	Introduction to metaphor in thought and language	'Analogie nella mente' (Mente & Cervello 124/2015; pp49-55)	Paxman, "Introduction" to Orwell *Shooting an Elephant and other essays*
4/10/2016	The decorative view of metaphor	Deignan 2005: Introduction, pp1-9	Gupta, *Re-Reading Harry Potter*. p17-18.
11/10/2016	Conceptual Metaphor Theory	Deignan 2005 Chapter 1, pp13-24	Bryson, *A Short History of Nearly Everything*, p416-417
18/10/2016	Linguistic and conceptual metaphors	Deignan 2005 Chapter 1, pp24-32, and Chapter 2, pp33-36	Orwell, *The prevention of literature* (extract)
25/10/2016	Metaphors dead and alive: Lakoff and Goatley's models	Deignan 2005 Chapter 2, pp36-47	*Grenache wine grapes*
1/11/2016	NO LESSON		
8/11/2016	Metaphor and grammar: content and structure words	Deignan 2005 Chapter 2, pp47-52	Packard, *The Hidden Persuaders*. pp99-100.
15/11/2016	Metonymy, and metonymy-based metaphor	Deignan 2005 Chapter 3, 53-58; 59-69	Herman, *The Scottish Enlightenment: The Scots' invention of the modern world*, p404-405
22/11/2016	Deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor	Steen 2014	Bragg, *The Adventure of English*, pp300-30
29/11/2016	Image metaphors	Shuttleworth 2014 (+ Newmark 1985[1])	*Wine tasting notes*
6/12/2016	Cultural aspects of metaphor	Kövecses 2014 (+Kövecses 2008[2]);	Warner, *Learning my lesson* (extract)
13/12/2016	*(Recupero)*		
[fine 1° sem] – Read: Arduini 2014			
TBA Feb '17	the MIP metaphor Identification procedure	Steen et al. 2010 Chapter 2 (+Pragglejaz Group, 2007[3]);	Orwell, "Bookshop memories", *p44-45*
TBA Feb '17	MIP: problematic areas	Steen et al. 2010 Chapter 2 (+Pragglejaz Group, 2007);	Dayell, "On the Decline of Intelligent Government"
TBA Feb '17	Four translation problems	explicitation, simplification, normalization, levelling-out (*or* flattening) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*	Lee, "What Contemporary Art Means to Me"
TBA Mar '17	Translating metaphor	Prandi 2010[4]	Letters. *London Review of Books* 37 (7) (April 2015).
TBA Mar '17	Conclusion	De Boton, *Religion for Atheists*, p175	

[1] Newmark, P. (1985). The translation of metaphor. In W. Paprotté & R. Dirven (Eds.) *The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought* (pp. 295-326). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Available in various reprints and variations, including as a chapter in Newmark *A Textbook of Translation* (1988), which we have in the library at Palazzo Ugolini

[2] Kövecses, Z. (2008). Universality and Variation in the Use of Metaphor. In N.-L. Johannesson & D.C. Minugh (Eds.), *Selected Papers from the 2006 and 2007 Stockholm Metaphor Festival* (pp. 51-74). Stockholm: Department of English, Stockholm University. free pdf download

[3] Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22, 1-39. – ask me for a copy

[4] Prandi, M. (2010). Typology of metaphors: Implications for Translation. Mutatis Mutandis, 3, 304-332. – ask me for a copy

Overview/summary of set texts from **Tradurre Figure / Translating Figurative Language** by Donna R. Miller & Enrico Monti (eds). Bologna: Bononia University Press, 2014.

(abbreviations used: SL source language; ST source text; TL target language; TT target text)

In his first trans-linguistic application of MIPVU (Steen at al 2010), **Gerard Steen** contends that deliberate and non-deliberate metaphors require different approaches in translation. Basing his argument on a range of parallel text extracts (Italian-Dutch, Latin-English, Italian-English, and English-Dutch) Steen illustrates the strength of adopting a consistent method for identifying metaphor in texts as a means for examining how metaphor is translated, especially, as he points out, "if many metaphors do not function metaphorically, why would it be important to translate them as metaphors? If metaphors are not always recognised as metaphors by readers, that is, if metaphors do not always cause readers to set up cross-domain mappings in their minds, then not every metaphor in a ST requires a metaphor in a TT" (p16). He notes that L1 conventional, lexicalised metaphors tend to be translated with L2 conventional, lexicalised metaphors, and that the metaphorical image – a central concern in most theoretical accounts of metaphor translation (e.g. Newmark 1985, Al Harrasi 2001, Schäffner 2004) – apparently need not be preserved at all. More important seems to be the metaphor's pragmatic meaning in context, rather than any image it might evoke. Or so things are with non-deliberate metaphors, those expressions which "just use language that is technically (probably historically) metaphorical to talk about time or argumentation in the conventionally available terms" (p17). Much literary use of metaphor ,however, is deliberate, with "a linguistic and rhetorical structure of comparison that is functional in the source text" (p18); in other words, when the L1 metaphor is innovative, poetic, out-of-the ordinary, or one of a cluster or a component of a text-organising conceit, the imagery resumes its central role and requires attention in translation. Steen's distinction between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor uses is neither new nor is it uncontroversial (see the special edition of *Metaphor and the Social World*, 2011). However, it does help us to refine our translation strategies, placing emphasis on the fact that metaphor is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon but rather, as Hanks (2006) has demonstrated, gradable. From this viewpoint, the limitations of Newmark's (1985) recommendations become evident: it is not acceptable to ignore metaphors which are difficult to translate, nor is it acceptable to focus on the image and fail to take into consideration other facets of metaphorical meaning such as pragmatic force, evaluative polarity, and, indeed, the semantic field of the words themselves – particularly when we are dealing with an interplay between individual metaphors and the clustering of semantically related metaphors into metaphor 'scenarios' (Musolff 2004) in a text, and progress can be made to address the translation of low- to middling metaphoricity which has tended to be ignored in the translation studies literature.

Steen is followed by another familiar name in metaphor studies, **Zoltán Kövecses**. Translation scholars unfamiliar with the author's work will find here a succinct overview of the author's influential integration of culture into Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), together with some useful terminology (especially pp28-30). Metaphor scholars, on the other hand, will find little here that is new –the author himself points out that it is essentially a synopsis of previous studies, notably Kövecses (2005) – but his efforts to press existing considerations into the service of translation studies is welcome.

Kövecses addresses three issues, all from the viewpoint of what he calls the "pressure of coherence"; "when people use metaphors they tend to adjust them to various aspects of the communicative situation; they try to be coherent with the contextual factors that characterize the situation" (p31). In other words, although a range of systems operate simultaneously in the production and interpretation of metaphor, in the choice of conceptual systems, and in their lexicalisation, but ultimately, the words that are used are chosen and comprehended because they are the ones that make most sense in the context tof utterance. Finally, he asserts that abstract language in the ST must necessarily be translated into abstract language in the TT because it is not possible to render an abstract concept literally (cf. Kövecses 2005). While this is difficult to argue with on a theoretical level, it becomes far less clear-cut if we acknowledge that metaphoricity is gradable (Hanks 2006), dynamic (Müller 2011) and not necessarily used for its metaphoric (i.e. figurative, image-evoking) potential. Such quibbles aside, this is a useful introduction to Kövecses'

main areas of study within CMT and raises points which could be fruitfully investigated with source texts and their translations.

Moving away from metaphor theory and into the realm of translations studies, **Stefano Arduini**'s chapter traces the history of translational approaches to figurative language within the history of translation studies itself. He reminds readers of translation studies' long-standing distrust and eschewal of linguistics which, in terms of the treatment of metaphor in translation theory, has meant that the Aristotelian 'decorative' view of metaphor has prevailed. Decoration is ultimately superfluous and can be eliminated if overly problematic in translation, which is the stance taken by Nida & Taber (1969) and Newmark (1985), amongst others. But viewing metaphor as decorative means that its cognitive and cultural aspects are brushed aside when in fact they are integral aspects of its meaning, and ignores the fact that metaphor very often has an explanatory function which makes it possible to build and transfer concepts. These are not aspects that can simply be done away with because they present difficulties for the translator!

But within the current prevailing view that translations should conform to TL norms, unusual, non-native-sounding metaphors rarely raise their heads above the parapet: they tend to be modified, neutralized, domesticated, demetaphorised; annexed (Meschonnic 1999) to the TL cultural norms. In this light, Arduini views the preservation of a SL metaphor as a way of enriching the TL: "translation cannot be simply intended as the transformation of something unfamiliar into something known" (p49), he says. By "introducing strange and peculiar metaphors, [we introduce] new concepts and new worlds" (ibid.).

Mark Shuttleworth voices a number of concerns and exposes some of the problems that future translation approaches to metaphor (and metaphor approaches to translation) need to address if the field is to advance further. Some of these are of a technical nature, involving terminology, identification protocols and the classification of different types of figurative language. For example, he notes the confusion which arises in the terminological use of *source* and *target* in the different areas of study, and the different range of interpretation of *literal* (meaning *not figurative* in metaphor studies but *word-for-word* in translation). Yet such matters can be overcome; more important, perhaps, is his plea that translation scholars stop redefining what metaphor is, and instead start making reference to the burgeoning metaphor studies literature dealing with identification procedures and typological frameworks. Other criticisms are levelled at interpretative aspects. He laments what he sees as unwarranted attention to metaphorical imagery, characteristic of both translation and cognitive-conceptual approaches to metaphor. It is a commonplace that metaphors evoke mental images yet, despite suggestions that image-schematic metaphors are common – even 'typical' – it turns out that they are not (p61, see also Shuttleworth 2013). Excessive interest in imagery therefore diverts attention away from the vast majority of metaphors which are image-poor, but equally in need of scrutiny. Finally the author addresses the aims and applications of translation/metaphor studies. Translation is mainly viewed as an applied branch of linguistics, whereas metaphor straddles the theoretical and the applied. This inevitably leads to ambiguities which arise from the alternation between the abstract and the concrete, in the form of metaphor-as-concept and metaphor-as-linguistic-form respectively. Within translation studies, as in other areas of text-linguistics, the focus is primarily on the concrete, i.e. linguistic metaphors within a linguistic system of *parole*; yet some form of reconciliation with the abstract must be sought – both regarding the cognitive sphere of conceptual metaphors and the ephemeral linguistic system of *langue* – if translation studies is to make meaningful contributions to the study of metaphor in texts, in language systems and in cognition.