

Högskolan i Skövde
School of Humanities and Informatics
English

Structural Metaphors in George Eliot's
Middlemarch, and their Swedish
Translations

Linn Ericsson
English C-Course
Autumn 2007
Tutor: Ingalill Söderqvist

Table of Content

Introduction 1

1. Background 2

1.1. The Concept of Metaphor 2

1.2. Structure and Form of the Metaphor 5

1.3. Content of the Metaphor 7

2. Method and Material 8

2.1. Method 8

2.2. Material 10

3. Analysis 11

3.1. Result 11

3.1.1. Result of the Categories 11

3.1.2. Result of the Structural Comparison 12

3.1.3. Result of the Semantic Comparison 14

3.2. Discussion 14

3.2.1. Discussion about the Categories 14

3.2.2. Discussion about the Structural Comparison 16

3.2.2.1. Difference in the Constituents of the Noun Phrase 17

3.2.2.2. Difference in Singular and Plural Forms 19

3.2.2.3. Difference in Specific and Generic Reference 19

3.2.2.4. Another Construction than a Noun Phrase 20

3.2.3. Discussion about the Semantic Comparison 21

3.2.3.1. Semantic Difference in the Vehicles 21

3.2.3.2. Semantic Difference in the Entire Metaphors 24

Conclusion 26

Works Cited 27

Appendix 1. Result of the Investigation 29

Appendix 2. Comparison of the Vehicles 34

Introduction

Most literature on George Eliot's language is written with a literary focus, and many of them focus on Eliot's figurative language. This study will focus on linguistics and structure. The aim of the essay is to investigate whether Swedish translations of metaphors following a certain structure, are translated according to the same pattern as the English ones are. In order to reach this aim, metaphors of a certain structure will be investigated in Eliot's novel *Middlemarch*.

There are many kinds of metaphors, and to be able to undertake an investigation it is necessary to decide what kind of metaphors to investigate. The background research of this essay is a summary of four different scholars' theories about metaphors. The scholars studied are George Lakoff, Andrew Goatly, Staffan Carlshamre, and Lennart Hellspång. Even though they all discuss the same phenomenon, their theories differ.

The model of metaphors this essay focuses on is completely structural, and a blend of two theories, i.e. the theories of Goatly and Hellspång. The metaphors searched for in *Middlemarch* are those in which the image part of the metaphor is a noun phrase. Even though the model used is completely structural, there will be semantic discussions as well since these two areas are often intertwined and related. Since this essay also concentrates on translation, semantic discussions are necessary in the comparison between the English and Swedish metaphors. To have an overview, the metaphors will all be categorised into three different groups, depending on how the parts of the metaphors are connected. This division is partly influenced by Hellspång's theory of dividing metaphors according to different rhetoric groups, even though other categories have been added. The investigation of the Swedish translations will be a linguistic comparison between the English and the Swedish noun phrases. This comparison consists in two parts. The first part focuses on structure and syntax, while the second part focuses on meaning and semantics.

Chapter 1 of the essay is a presentation of the four scholars mentioned above. This chapter is divided into three parts, the first concerning the concept of the metaphor, the second the structure of the metaphor, and the third the content of the metaphor. The first part of chapter 2 is a description of the investigation of metaphors in *Middlemarch*, and how the results will be presented. The second part of this chapter focuses on what material, i.e. which editions of the novels, will be used in the investigation. Chapter 3 includes a presentation of the results from the three parts of the investigation, i.e. the categorisation, the structural

comparison, and the semantic comparison. Chapter 4 is the chapter of analysis. Here, the results of all three parts of the investigation will be analysed and discussed. The Conclusion concerns the results of the analysis, and thus also the results of the whole essay.

1. Background

This chapter will give a short presentation and a comparison of four different scholars who studied the concept of metaphor, and there will be a focus on what distinguishes them from each other. Lakoff considers metaphors as part of human reason and thought, and not as part of the language (Lakoff and Johnson 3), while Goatly focuses more on linguistics in his theory (Goatly 42). Carlshamre is, to a large extent, a follower of Goatly's theory, even though there are some differences between them (Carlshamre 2-3). Even though Hellspong does not completely focus on structure, he is the most linguistic scholar among the ones studied here. His theories include almost no discussion about the content, and his structure of different metaphors follows the classical division used within the area of rhetoric (*Konsten att Tala* 123-25).

The chapter is divided into three parts. The first part is a brief introduction of the four theories. The second part focuses on the four scholars' structure of the metaphor, while the third part deals with the content of the metaphor.

1.1. The Concept of Metaphor

A metaphor is a construction in which one of the parts is expressed through an image created by the other part. The traditional theory of language states that the concept of metaphor is a linguistic phenomenon (Lakoff 202). This means that "the word 'metaphor' was defined as a novel or poetic linguistic expression where one or more words for a concept are used outside of their normal conventional meaning to express a "similar" concept" (Lakoff 202). However, it is possible to look at metaphors from different points of view. There are those, for example George Lakoff, who choose to concentrate on metaphor as a concept in human thought and reasoning, rather than as a linguistic construction. According to Lakoff, "[t]he essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff and Johnson 5), and language is metaphorically structured only because the concept of metaphor originally is metaphorically structured in our minds. Other scholars, such as Andrew Goatly and Staffan Carlshamre, combine the linguistic and the cognitive aspect of

metaphor. There are also scholars, such as Lennart Hellspång, who still keep to the thought of the metaphor being, almost completely, a linguistic phenomenon rather than a cognitive one.

Trying to find one definition for metaphor is almost impossible for, as Carlschamre says “there are no generally accepted definitions of “metaphor”, even for specialized purposes” (1). However, Carlschamre himself does give a definition, “[a] metaphor is a use of language that has not been foreseen by the lexicon and the “ordinary” rules for generating meanings for complex expressions, but is derived from lexicalized uses by a mechanism that the theory of metaphor aims to describe” (4). He also claims that a metaphor could be metaphorical for one person but not for another. Goatly, on the other hand, gives the following general definition:

Metaphor occurs when a unit of discourse is used to refer unconventionally to an object, process or concept, or colligates in an unconventional way. And when this unconventional act of reference or colligation is understood on the basis of similarity, matching or analogy involving the conventional referent or colligates of the unit and the actual unconventional referent or colligates. (8)

Two terms in this quote, *colligation* and *collocation*, need further explanations. The term *colligation*, is “a syntactic relationship between ... two words” (Goatly 8). Thus, it differs from *collocation* in the sense that collocations are “any kind of co-occurrence of words in the text” (Goatly 8), while colligation is restricted to syntax. In other words, collocation concerns meaning, and colligation concerns grammatical rules.

More easily, Goatly’s definition could be explained as, according to Lakoff, the traditional theory of language defines metaphors, i.e. where “words ... are used outside their normal conventional concept to express a “similar” concept” (Lakoff 202). As already mentioned, Lakoff rejects this definition of metaphor as part of the language, while Goatly partly realises the importance of linguistics, whilst he also acknowledges what Lakoff claims. Lakoff defines metaphor as “a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system” (Lakoff 203), which emphasises what is mentioned above, that Lakoff only regards metaphor as a concept of human thought.

Table 1, on the following page, gives an overview of how the four scholars discussed in this chapter explain and structure the concept of metaphor. The table covers the different structures, the content of metaphors looked upon from different points of view, and the terms used by the different scholars of how a metaphor is constructed. The metaphor used here, “love is a journey”, was originally used by Lakoff (Lakoff 206). The following two parts of the chapter will present deeper discussions about the sections of the table referred to as

“structure/form” and “content”, and this part will focus on how a metaphor is constructed as well as more closely explain the terms.

Table 1.

The Different Scholars’ Way of Explaining the Concept of Metaphor

	Structure/form	Content	“Love is a journey”
George Lakoff	Metaphorical mappings; image mappings and conceptual mappings.	The whole concept of metaphor is content, and is not related to language at all.	Source Domain/Target Domain
Andrew Goatly	Conceptual mappings, but with more focus on linguistics, i.e. to which word class the Vehicle term belongs.	The associations the vehicle term evokes.	Topic/Vehicle/Grounds
Staffan Carlshamre	Cognitive and linguistic metaphors. Referential metaphors and metaphorical predication.	Similarity between the Tenor and the Vehicle, and the ways these are expressed; abstraction hierarchies, and deletion and addition of semantic features.	Tenor/Vehicle
Lennart Hellspong	Rhetorical form (image/pure metaphor, simile, allegory, personification) Grammatical form (the form and function of the image part)	The areas of meaning and the phenomena the image part and the topic part belong to and stand for.	Topic part/Image part

All four scholars divide the metaphor into two parts; one part which is the image, and another which is what the image refers to. One dissimilarity between the scholars is that they use different terms for the two parts. Lakoff refers to the two parts of metaphor by using source domain for the concept described, and target domain for the concept working as the image. Goatly explains his different parts of a metaphor as follows: “[t]he conventional referent of the unit is the Vehicle. The actual unconventional referent is the Topic. The similarities and/or analogies, involved are the Grounds” (9). In the “love is a journey” metaphor, journey is the vehicle, love is the topic, and the similarities between these two

expressions, and thus also the fact that it is possible to use them together in a metaphor, are the grounds. This essay will use the terms of Goatly, i.e. the topic as the referent, and the vehicle as the image part. Carlshamre uses approximately the same terms, but topic is instead called tenor. Hellspång's terms are originally called *sakled* and *bildled*. In this essay, Hellspång's Swedish terms are replaced with my own translations of these terms, topic part and image part.

1.2. Structure and Form of the Metaphor

The section on structure and form gives a clear image of the differences between the scholars discussed here. As mentioned earlier, Lakoff regards metaphor as a concept of human thought, and consequently language is not important in his structure of a metaphor. Instead he uses the term "metaphorical mappings" which means that metaphors are "mappings across conceptual domains" (Lakoff 245). Lakoff develops his theory of mappings by saying that there are two types of mappings, conceptual mappings and image mappings. The first one mentioned means that one expression is conceptualised as another expression, e.g. love is conceptualised as a journey. The image mappings are "metaphors that function to map one conventional mental image onto another" (Lakoff 229). "A conventional mental image" means that the words in the utterance create an image, e.g. "[m]y wife . . . whose waist is an hourglass" (Lakoff 229). The difference between these two kinds of metaphors is that in conceptual mappings there are several concepts mapped onto other concepts, but in image mappings only one image is mapped onto one other image (Lakoff 229).

Even though many scholars nowadays accept Lakoff's theory, most others choose to see metaphor partly as a linguistic phenomenon. Goatly is one of these scholars mostly because his study is built on Lakoff's thoughts. He uses the idea of conceptual mappings and also includes linguistics since "[c]ognitive metaphors have to find expression in some medium, and when that medium is language the form of the expression will have important consequences for their recognition and interpretation" (42). This means that the language is crucial in how metaphors are interpreted. Goatly focuses on the vehicle term of the metaphor, and to which word class this term belongs. His theory states that the clearest and most prominent word class to be recognised as metaphor is nouns, mostly because they "reveal very strongly the clashes between conventional and unconventional reference" (83).

Conventional and *unconventional* in this context mean that the "use of a lexical item [can be] more or less conventional than another use" (107), i.e. one meaning of a lexical item is often

more or less conventional than another use of the same lexical item. Goatly uses the example “fox”. The meaning “dog-like mammal” is more conventional than the meaning “cunning person” (Goatly 107).

Carlshamre firstly divides metaphors into the two categories “cognitive metaphors” and “linguistic metaphors”. These are simply the categories that divide the four scholars studied here. Lakoff’s theory belongs in the first category, while the theory of Hellspång belongs in the second. Both Goatly and Carlshamre place themselves somewhere in between. Carlshamre’s second division includes “referential metaphors” and “metaphorical predication”. The former includes metaphors where the understanding of the metaphor “primarily consists in grasping to whom it refers” (2). Thus, these kinds of metaphors belong to a theory called the substitutional view, where a proper name is substituted for something else (Carlshamre 2). This theory is, according to Carlshamre, a theory that most scholars have abandoned. An example of a referential metaphor is “I told John I was broke and asked him to give me my money back, but *the pile of shit* refused” (Carlshamre 2), where “John” is referred to as “*the pile of shit*”. The latter term, “metaphorical predication”, means that “a literally identified subject is given a metaphorical predicate” (Carlshamre 2), i.e. that a subject is understood in terms of another subject. This is how Carlshamre describes the kind of metaphors discussed by Lakoff, e.g. “love is a journey”.

Since Hellspång is a follower of the classical theory, i.e. the theory which focuses on metaphors as a completely linguistic phenomenon, his structure consists of linguistic terms, and both grammatical and rhetorical form. The grammatical form means, just as in Goatly’s model, to which word class the vehicle term, or as Hellspång puts it, the image part, belongs. The rhetorical form, on the other hand, has to do with what figure of speech the metaphor is. Hellspång distinguishes between *bild* or *ren metafor* (image, or pure metaphor), *liknelse* (simile), *allegori* (allegory), and *besjälning* (personification) (*Konsten att Tala* 123-26). Thus, it is obvious that Hellspång’s structure is more of the linguistic sort, while Lakoff presents a completely, and Goatly and Carlshamre a partly, cognitive structure to explain the phenomenon of the metaphor.

1.3. Content of the Metaphor

The structure of metaphors most clearly shows the differences between the scholars, and this section of the chapter emphasises these differences. Lakoff's theory is only about content, and is not at all related to language or linguistics. His idea of metaphor being a way of describing abstract concepts proves this statement since his structure gives an image of how abstract concepts can be realised and understood through another concept we already recognise. "Love is a journey" (Lakoff 206-49) is a good example of a metaphor that shows how this is realised. What we know is true of journeys is also true of love and relationships. A love relationship is often described in words connected to journeys, such as "it's been a *long, bumpy road*" (Lakoff 206).

Goatly follows Lakoff's example of the metaphor, to a large extent, being a way of expressing abstract phenomena in the language, but since he includes linguistics in his theory, his explanation of content is different. He says that the structure, what word class the vehicle term belongs to, is a beginning of understanding the content. For example, when the vehicle is a noun, the content of the metaphor is what associations the noun phrase evokes to the reader. According to Goatly, nouns are most commonly used as vehicles since this word class most easily creates an image of something else (Goatly 83). Basically, this is the same idea as Lakoff has, only Goatly explains it by beginning within the area of linguistics. The noun phrase gives a clear image of the abstract concept described, and through this image the reader is capable of understanding, and recognising, the meaning of the concept.

In the area of content, Carlshamre focuses on the similarity between tenor and vehicle, and also the way in which they are expressed. To explain the "abstraction hierarchy", he says that the similarity between the tenor and the vehicle is crucial, but this similarity can be found on "more "abstract" levels of description" (8), as the parts of a metaphor do not share all meanings, but there are certain areas in which they both belong semantically. That is why it is possible to understand the concepts of e.g. love in terms of the concepts of a journey. His next term, "deletion and addition of semantic features", can be explained in terms of semantic hierarchies, i.e. in terms of the hierarchy of meaning. Using a more general term, and thereby "climbing an abstraction hierarchy" (Carlshamre 9), means deleting semantic features. For example, the word "human" belongs to the group of, and is more specific than, "animal". So, using animal instead of human means deleting semantic features. The opposite, i.e. using human instead of animal is adding semantic features, and creates a more specific reference.

The notion of semantic hierarchies is discussed by other linguists as well, e.g. Christina Alm-Arvius. She claims that “a lexical unit with a more general sense is a **superordinate term** (or **hypernym**) in relation to an item with a more specific sense, and the latter is then a **hyponym**” (Alm-Arvius 51), which is what Carlshamre claims within the area of content of the metaphor.

Also Hellspång, despite him being almost completely interested in form and structure, touches the area of content. Hellspång’s idea of content is what area of meaning, or what phenomenon, the image part of the metaphor relates to in its literal meaning (*Metaforanalys* 5). This idea of content is not further developed, but just as Goatly, Hellspång begins in the area of linguistics, and then continues into the area of content, but he does not explore this area as deeply as Goatly does.

2. Method and Material

The first section of this chapter will explain the investigation, and the table of results. The second part will briefly give the publication information of the novels used in the investigation.

2.1. Method

To find out whether linguistic metaphors occur in George Eliot’s language, there will be an investigation of the structure of metaphors in Eliot’s novel *Middlemarch*. To have a completely random result, the investigation will be made on every 25th page in *Middlemarch*. The structure used for the metaphors is influenced by Andrew Goatly, and includes metaphors in which the vehicle term, i.e. the image part of the metaphor, is a noun phrase. The terms for the two different parts of the metaphors that will be used in this essay are the terms of Goatly, i.e. topic for the referent, and vehicle for the image. The metaphors found will thereafter be compared with the Swedish corresponding passages, and it will be examined whether the structure of the English metaphors is transferred to the translations. The translations will also be compared to the English originals in terms of meaning to see whether the Swedish metaphors correspond semantically to the English ones. The metaphors found are listed in a table which is found as Appendix 1.

There are cases on the pages investigated which could be interpreted as metaphorical, and are therefore open for discussion. One example is the clause “the banker was evidently a

ruler” (Eliot 128). This could be interpreted as “the banker is as a ruler”, or simply as a verification of his nature. There is a difference in meaning even though it is small, but it is worth mentioning that there are cases such as this one. However, the before mentioned clause has not been interpreted as a metaphor in this essay, and therefore it is not included in the table of results. Clauses which are descriptive, but do not follow the structure of this essay, have not been included either. To mention one example, there is “... of which country practitioners have usually no more notion than the man in the moon” (Eliot 103). Even though this is an image, it does not have a clear referent but is simply a comparison. Therefore, this kind of metaphor is not included in the essay even though it is a metaphor.

In the table, the whole metaphor is listed in both English and Swedish. The topic term is underlined, and the link between the topic and the vehicle, if there is one, is made extra bold. The vehicle terms are listed in columns next to their respective language. For example, “a voice **like** music” is the whole metaphor where “a voice” is the topic, “**like**” is the link, and “music” is the vehicle. The metaphors in the table are numbered and listed according to the categories mentioned above.

Firstly, the metaphors are categorised into three groups, A, B, and C, depending on the link between the two parts of the metaphor, i.e. the topic and the vehicle. This is done in order to see whether a specific structure of metaphors is used. The categorisation is partly influenced by Lennart Hellspong, who divides metaphors according to their rhetoric function. The three different categories are called simile, image without a phrase, and synecdoche. Group A, simile, includes metaphors in which a phrase or a word, such as *like*, *as*, *in the shape of*, is used. Group B includes metaphors where the topic term is clear but where comparing words or phrases similar to the ones mentioned in category A, are missing. These are the metaphors which Hellspong refers to as pure metaphors. And finally, group C, includes metaphors of the synecdoche type. These are metaphors where a small part of something, e.g. a part of the human body or an object, represents a larger whole. Thus, the categorisation of the metaphors is an investigation of the link between the topic and the vehicle.

Secondly, the English metaphors are compared structurally with the Swedish ones. This is done by comparing the vehicles. The noun phrases which represent the vehicles are examined by dividing the noun phrase into different constituents according to the model by Sidney Greenbaum and Randolph Quirk. Their division of the noun phrase includes the constituents determiner, premodification, head, and postmodification (Greenbaum and Quirk 363-64).). In this model, both determiner and head are obligatory in a noun phrase, while the

modifiers are optional (Greenbaum and Quirk 364). In English noun phrases where there is no determiner there is, according to Greenbaum and Quirk, a zero determiner (73). This kind of determiner occurs in cases where the head is either a non-count noun or a count plural noun (Greenbaum and Quirk 81). The Swedish passages corresponding to the English noun phrases are divided in the same way, and thereafter they are compared with their English equivalents. The divisions of the English and the Swedish vehicles are found as a table in Appendix 2.

Thirdly, the English metaphors and their Swedish translations are compared semantically. This comparison is made mainly between the vehicles, but also between the entire metaphors. The Swedish words and phrases will be compared to the English words and phrases, to see whether the translations are direct or not in terms of meaning. Semantic comparisons between the entire metaphors will only be a small part of this essay, since the focus is of a structural nature.

There will be analyses and discussions for all three parts of the investigation. The discussions will focus on metaphors where there is a difference between the original and the translation. Since structure and semantics often are intertwined, and sometimes closely related, analyses of structure will sometimes raise semantic discussions, and vice versa.

2.2. Material

To investigate George Eliot's metaphorical language, the novel *Middlemarch* will be used. The version of *Middlemarch*, which is to be used, was published by Wordsworth Edition Limited in 1994. A new introduction and notes were added in 2000. The introduction and the notes are written by Doreen Roberts. The translation of the novel is made by Elsie and Håkan Tollet, and was first printed by Natur och Kultur in 1961. The version used here was printed in 1997.

3. Analysis

This chapter will first present the result of the different parts of the investigation. Secondly there will be discussion about the cases where there is a difference between the English original and the Swedish translation.

3.1. Result

This chapter will present the results from the investigation. The results will be presented in three sections, one section for each part of the investigation. The first section will include the number of metaphors in each of the three categories, A, B, and C, in both English and Swedish. In the second section, the structural comparison between the English and Swedish metaphors will be presented. The third section will present the result of the semantic comparison, both between the vehicles exclusively and between the entire metaphors. In total, 28 pages have been investigated, and on these pages 40 metaphors in which the vehicles are noun phrases were found.

3.1.1. Result of the Categories

The categorisation is an investigation of the link between the topic and the vehicle in the metaphors. The results of the categorisation of both English and Swedish metaphors are found in tables 3.1. and 3.2. in the end of this section.

In most of the metaphors, there is a word or phrase which binds the two parts of the metaphor together. Thus, the majority of metaphors belong to category A, which includes the metaphors referred to by Hellspong as *similes*. The words and phrases used as links are for example *like*, *as*, and *in the shape of*. Of totally forty metaphors, twenty-one belong to category A. Most of the translations of these twenty-two metaphors follow the same pattern as the originals. Seventeen of these translations are constructed as similes. Furthermore, there is one metaphor, number 31, which in its original belongs to category B. So totally, there are eighteen Swedish metaphors in category A. Metaphor number 31 will be discussed in the chapter of analysis. Comparing with the twenty-one English metaphors in category A, there are four Swedish ones which are not appropriate to this category. These four metaphors, numbers 4, 5, 8, and 14, do not belong to any of the other two groups used in the

categorisation of the English metaphors because of a different construction of the vehicle. These five metaphors will all be discussed in the chapter of analysis.

The second largest category is group B, which includes metaphors in which the referent to the image part is clear, but where a comparing word or phrase is missing. Of the English metaphors, thirteen belong to this group. As in group A, a majority of the Swedish equivalents are, in terms of the link, direct translations. Ten of the translations are appropriate to category B. As already mentioned, one of the translations not following the same pattern as its original belongs in category A. The remaining two metaphors, numbers 29 and 33, do not belong in any of the three categories, and will be discussed in the analysis.

The third category, C, includes the metaphors of the synecdoche type. In this group, there are six English metaphors. Five of the Swedish translations follow the same pattern as the English examples, but number 37 is different. This example is not metaphorical in Swedish and will therefore be further discussed.

Table 3.1. Categorisation of English Metaphors

	A. Simile	B. No Word or Phrase	C. Synecdoche
Number of Metaphors	21	13	6
Totally	40		

Table 3.2. Categorisation of Swedish Metaphors

	A. Simile	B. No Word or Phrase	C. Synecdoche	D. Others
Number of Metaphors	18	10	5	7
Totally	40			

3.1.2. Result of the Structural Comparison

The structure used in the investigation of the vehicles, i.e. the noun phrases, follows the pattern of determiner, premodifier, head, and postmodifier. Logically, all English vehicles are noun phrases since that is the structure of metaphors investigated in this essay. Therefore, the investigation is a comparison between the different constituents of the English vehicle and the

constituents of the vehicle of the corresponding translations. The results of this comparison are found in Table 3.3. in the end of this section.

Of totally forty vehicles found, twenty-four are direct translations. In this group there are also examples in which the English noun phrase has a determiner in the shape of the definite article *the*. The Swedish examples, on the other hand, have only a head in its definite form. Since this is only an obvious difference in the syntax rules of the two languages, these metaphors will be considered direct translations and will not be further discussed.

The Swedish translations of the vehicles which are not direct translations can be divided into four groups depending on the kind of difference between the original and the translation. The first group includes the vehicles in which the constituents of the noun phrase differ. In this group there are nine vehicles. For example, the English vehicle can include a determiner, a premodifier, and a head, while the Swedish vehicle includes a determiner, a head, and a postmodifier. The vehicles in which there is a difference in singular and plural between English and Swedish appear in the second group. Two vehicles are found in this group. In the third group the vehicles in which there is a difference in specific and generic reference are found. This group includes three vehicles. In all cases there is generic reference in English and specific reference in Swedish. The remaining three vehicles are constructed completely differently in Swedish than in English. None of these are metaphorically translated, mainly because of the verb linking the topic and the vehicle. This verb makes it impossible for the vehicles of creating an image to the topic. All Swedish vehicles which are not direct translations of their English correspondences will be discussed further in the analysis of the structure.

Table 3.3. Structural Comparison of the English Metaphors and their Swedish Translations

	Direct Translations	Difference in the Constituents of the Noun Phrase	Difference in Singular and Plural	Difference in Specific and Generic Reference	Not Metaphorically Translated
Number of Translations	23	9	2	3	3
Totally	40				

3.1. 3. Result of the Semantic Comparison

The semantic comparison does not at all concern structure but only differences in meaning between the English and the Swedish metaphors. The comparison is made between the vehicles exclusively. However, there are entire metaphors which will be discussed in the analysis, because of them being idiomatic expressions, or because the meanings of the translations do not correspond to the English meanings. The results of the semantic comparison will not be divided into any groups depending on the type of difference in the translations, but only according to whether the translations are direct or not.

Twenty-five vehicles are, semantically, directly translated. The remaining fifteen are interesting in some way, for example because of difference in meaning caused by a difference in structure, or because of a word whose meaning does not entirely correspond to the original. These fifteen vehicles will be further discussed.

3.2. Discussion

The discussion is divided into three sections, one for each part of the investigation. It is mainly the differences between the English originals and the Swedish translations that will be analysed. In the first section the translations of the metaphors which do not belong to any of the categories used for the English metaphors will be discussed. The second section will analyse the structural comparison, and the third section will analyse the semantic comparison between the two languages.

3.2.1. Discussion about the Categories

Here, the links between the topics and the vehicles in the metaphors will be analysed, and the focus will be on the differences in translation between these links. There will also be suggestions for the reasons of the translators' choice.

Among the translations of the English metaphors in category A, there are five which did not follow the same pattern as the originals. Metaphors number 4, "sweet laughs for bird-notes", and 5, "blue eyes for a heaven", are two of the metaphors which are not directly translated. Even though both of them are metaphors, they are less metaphorical than their English correspondences. The reason for this is the link between the topic and the vehicle. In

the English metaphors, the topics can easily be substituted by the vehicles, e.g. “sweet laughs” can easily be replaced by “bird-notes”. In the translations, on the other hand, this kind of substitution is not as obvious. The Swedish metaphors are verb phrases, i.e. the two parts of the metaphors are connected by a verb, “*består av*”. Because of the verb, the vehicles of the Swedish metaphors appear to be a part of a larger whole, i.e. a part of the topic. This is what creates the impression of the Swedish examples being less metaphorical than the English ones. However, the Swedish vehicles do give other images to their topics, and will therefore be regarded as metaphors in this essay.

As in the previous metaphors, there is no link in the translation of number 8, “Farebrother as a pattern of what a clergyman ought to be”. This translation is, as the above discussed, a verb phrase, “*Farebrother är idealet för en präst*”, in which a link is impossible. Like numbers 4 and 5, the translation of this metaphor can be said to be metaphorical. The vehicle gives an image of the topic, which in this case is a person. Still, the translation is not as metaphorical as the original.

The translation of metaphor number 14, “the excellent farm and homestead ... as a residence”, is also a verb phrase. The Swedish translation is “*det förträffliga lantbruket och den vackra boningen ... dit han ämnade flytta*”, where there is no link as in the English original. As in the previous cases, the difference in the structure of the vehicle makes it impossible to have a link in the translation. Consequently, this is not a metaphor, and will be further discussed in the analysis of structure.

The translations of the metaphors of category B which do not belong in the same category as their English equivalents are the examples 30, 31, and 33. In number 30, “she might be the mercy for those sorrows”, the translation does not give an image. What links the topic and the vehicle together in the Swedish translation is the verb “*känna*”, which implies action from the subject. The vehicle of the English metaphor clearly gives an image of the topic, even though there is no word or phrase as in the metaphors of category A. It is possible to add a word so that the comparison between the topic and the vehicle becomes clearer: “She might be *as* the mercy for those sorrows”. In the Swedish translation there is no such possibility, because of the verb implying an action. This translation will be further discussed in both of the following analyses.

Metaphor number 31, “he believed it to be a chastisement and admonition ... that Mr Farebrother ‘read himself’ into the quaint little church”, is translated as a metaphor. What differs in the link between the English and the Swedish metaphors is that the Swedish metaphor is a simile, “... *att Mr Farebrother “läste in sig” i den säregna lilla kyrkan ... tog*

han som en näpst och tillrättavisning ”. In other words, the link is included so that the Swedish metaphor would rather belong in category A, than in B. The reason for this change might be a change in order of the topic and the vehicle. In the English metaphor, the topic is placed after the vehicle. The Swedish order is the opposite. The English order would probably not seem natural in Swedish because of different syntax rules in the languages. Because of the Swedish order, it is necessary to add the comparing word which makes the Swedish metaphor a simile.

Another metaphor worth discussing is number 33, “his tenderness towards her, which was both an emotional prompting and a well-considered resolve”. This metaphor can be compared to numbers 4 and 5 discussed above since all three of them are constructed with the same verb in Swedish, “*bestå av*”. Thus, also this metaphor is a verb phrase in Swedish, but this does not mean it is not a metaphor. The translation of number 33 is metaphorical, even though it is not as metaphorical as the English metaphor. Like 4 and 5, the vehicle gives the impression of being a part of a larger whole, i.e. a part of the topic. The reason for this impression is the Swedish verb, “*bestå av*” (consist in), does not create an equivalence between the topic and the vehicle.

One metaphor from category C does not follow the same pattern as its original, i.e. metaphor number 37, “fastidious gentlemen stood for borrows”. The verb “stood for” can be interpreted as “represent”. Thus, it is clear that the English topic is a part of a larger whole, i.e. the vehicle which is “boroughs”. In the Swedish translation, “*de granntyckta gentlemän som skötte den kommunala förvaltningen*” there is no such verb. The verb used here, “*skötte*” is instead more of an action verb, which does not imply a relation between the topic and the vehicle as in the English original. And consequently, the Swedish translation cannot be interpreted as a metaphor.

3.2.2. Discussion about the Structural Comparison

In the analysis of the structural comparison between the vehicles of the English metaphors and their Swedish translations, focus will be on the examples where there is a difference in translation. The metaphors will be discussed according to the groups mentioned in the above chapter, i.e. according to the kind of difference between the English construction and the Swedish translation.

3.2.2.1. Difference in the Constituents of the Noun Phrase

In the group which includes the translations which differ from the English originals by containing diverging constituents of the noun phrase, the examples which will be discussed are numbers 2, 6, 7, 11, 20, 22, 32, 33, and 35. In the translation of number 2, “*farbröderna där hemma*”, there is a postmodification which does not exist in the English noun phrase, “uncles”. The reason for this change cannot be seen by looking only at the vehicle of the metaphor, since the English correspondent is found in the topic term of the metaphor. The whole English metaphor is “until domestic reality met them in the shape of uncles”, where “domestic reality” is the topic. “Domestic” is the English word corresponding to the postmodification of the Swedish vehicle, “*där hemma*”.

The English vehicle of metaphor number 6, “a gracious indication”, contains determiner, premodifier, and head. In the Swedish translation, “*ett tecken från ovan*”, the premodifier has become a postmodifier. This structural change, and also the change in metaphor number 2, creates a semantic change. It can be discussed whether the change is made for semantic or structural reasons. Most probable is that it is semantics that creates a difference in structure since meaning is the most crucial factor to a translator. Therefore, these examples will both be further discussed in the semantic analysis.

In number 7, “a reformer”, there is a determiner and a head in the English noun phrase being the vehicle. The Swedish phrase, “*reformator*”, consists of a head only, which indicates that the rules for zero determiners differ in English and Swedish. Zero determiners occur in Swedish as well, but according to rules different from the English rules mentioned in the chapter of Method. There is no difference in meaning between the English and Swedish noun phrases in metaphor number 7, so the reason for the change in translation is purely structural.

In the translation of the vehicle of metaphor number 11, “*allas favorit*”, a premodifier from the English noun phrase, “a general favourite”, has been taken away. The direct translation of the English noun phrase, “a general favourite”, would be “*en allmän favorit*”. However, the current translation is “*allas favorit*”, (“everybody’s favourite”). In Swedish, the direct translation would probably seem unnatural. Since this change in structure does not create a major semantic change, the translation chosen is probably the best.

The English vehicle number 20, “a damaged ear of corn”, consists of determiner, premodifier, head and postmodifier. In the Swedish translation, “*ett sädesax av svartrost*”, the constituents are determiner, head, and postmodifier. Again, the reason for change is probably

not structural but semantic. Therefore, number 20 will be deeper discussed in the semantic analysis.

Number 22, on the other hand, is relevant for a structural discussion. The English vehicle, “the last doom of ignorance and folly”, consists of determiner, premodifier, head, and postmodifier. In the corresponding Swedish noun phrase, “*all okunnighets och dårskaps fördömelse*”, there is no postmodifier. In this case, it is obvious that the difference between the languages depend on diverging syntax rules of English and Swedish. The postmodification of the English example is a genitive construction, and since all genitives in Swedish stand before their head, the change is not only appropriate but also necessary.

The English noun phrase in number 32, “much unutterable language into his outstretched hands”, consists of determiner, premodifier, head, and a postmodifier. The clause element of the postmodifier is an adverbial of place. In the Swedish noun phrase there is only a determiner and a head, “*det osägbara*”. The adverbial, “*med händernas ordlösa språk*”, corresponding to the English adverbial, “into his outstretched hands”, cannot be seen by only looking at the vehicle of the metaphor. A comparison between the entire metaphors gives a clear reason for the missing adverbial. The order of the adverbial and the head is the opposite in the Swedish metaphor from that of the English one. Furthermore, the Swedish metaphor is an adverbial of manner, and not an adverbial of place. The premodifier existing in the English noun phrase, “unutterable”, is deleted in Swedish. The semantic meanings of the English premodifier and the English head have been put together into only a head in Swedish, “*osägbara*”. The reason for this change could be different syntax rules in the two languages, since it is more often possible to make a noun of an adjective in Swedish than it is in English. Therefore this construction is shorter in Swedish than in English.

The change in metaphor number 33 will be further discussed in the semantic analysis since the difference between the English and the Swedish noun phrases is worth discussing also semantically. In the English noun phrase, “an emotional prompting and a well-considered resolve”, the constituents are determiner, premodifier, and head. The Swedish noun phrase, “*en känsla och ... ett noga övervägt beslut*”, consists of determiner and head. In fact, the adjective, which represents the English premodifier, has become a noun and part of the head in Swedish. The head of the English example has simply been deleted, and does not exist in the Swedish example.

The last example to be discussed here is number 35 which can be related to the noun phrase just mentioned. Also in this noun phrase one constituent of the English noun phrase has been deleted in the Swedish translation. The English noun phrase is “many Therasas”,

while the Swedish translation is “*Teresor*”. It is the determiner which has been taken out, so that the Swedish noun phrase consists only of a head. In this case, the structural change creates a semantic change and therefore this example will be analysed in the semantic discussion as well.

3.2.2.2. Difference in Singular and Plural Forms

In this section, only two cases will be discussed, i.e. numbers 4 and 19. In number 4, both the English and the Swedish noun phrases consist of only a head. The English vehicle is “bird-notes”, and the Swedish is “*fågelsången*”. According to Greenbaum and Quirk, zero determiners, in English, occur where the head is a count plural noun (81), as in this example. According to Swedish rules, determiners of this kind are put at the end of the head, as this example clearly shows. The determiner added here does not only create a difference in singular and plural, but also a difference in specific and generic reference. The English noun phrase has generic reference, and the Swedish one has specific reference. The reason for these changes are probably that a noun in singular with specific reference is more idiomatic in Swedish than a direct translation would be.

In number 19 there is also a difference in singular and plural between the English and the Swedish noun phrases. In this case, another translation is possible. The English topic, “money”, appears in the singular while the Swedish topic, “*pengarna*”, is in the plural. According to English rules, “money” cannot appear in plural. In Swedish, the topic being in the plural is idiomatic Swedish. Since the whole metaphor is “money as a bribe”, the vehicle must agree with the topic, and therefore there is a difference between the two languages. On the other hand, the Swedish topic being in the plural is no guarantee for also the vehicle being in the plural, since it is possible to use *pengarna* (money) in the plural and the vehicle in the singular, i.e. *en muta* (a bribe). But such a discussion would rather be of Swedish grammar rules, and not of translation.

3.2.2.3. Difference in Specific and Generic Reference

This section will discuss the noun phrases in which there is a difference in generic and specific reference between English and Swedish. The vehicles which will be discussed are numbers 5, 8, and 23. In number 5, the English noun phrase has generic reference, “a

heaven”, and the Swedish noun phrase has specific reference, “*himlen*” (the heaven). In Swedish it would be possible using generic reference and following the English construction, i.e. using “*en himmel*” (a heaven). When the entire translation of number 5, “*himlen [består av] blåa ögon*”, is examined the reason for choosing specific reference is clear. The topic and the vehicle of this metaphor are linked with a verb, and not with a preposition as in the English metaphor, “blue eyes for a heaven”. Furthermore, the vehicle is placed before the topic. Therefore, a generic reference for the Swedish vehicle is not possible in this case.

In number 8, the English noun phrase, “a pattern of what a clergyman ought to be”, has generic reference, and the Swedish one, “*idealet för en präst*”, has specific reference. A generic reference in Swedish, “*ett ideal*”, would not be idiomatically correct, and the reason for this change is rather semantic, and not structural, because of the word chosen.

In the translation of number 23, there is also a difference in reference. The English noun phrase, “an eternal cherub”, has generic reference while the Swedish one, “*den eviga keruben*”, has specific reference. If a noun phrase with generic reference had been chosen in the Swedish translation, a word linking the topic and the vehicle would be recommended, so that the Swedish metaphor would have been a simile, “... *som en evig kerub*”. This change would not have created any difference in meaning, but on the other hand, neither does the difference in reference.

3.2.2.4. Not Metaphorically Translated

In this group, none of the English metaphors are translated as metaphorically. Since the Swedish construction is totally different from the English one, it is not possible to find a vehicle term in the Swedish metaphors belonging in this group. However, it is possible to find the word or expression corresponding to the English vehicle even though this word or expression does not give another image to the topic. These words or phrases are the ones included in the list of results, as well as in the list of the division of the noun phrases. The metaphors which will be discussed in this section are numbers 14, 30 and 37.

In number 14, the English vehicle is “a residence”. However, there is no word or expression in the Swedish translation corresponding to the English word. Instead there is a whole clause, and a verb phrase, “*dit han ... ämnade flytta*” (where he planned to move), describing the English noun. Probably, there is no Swedish word corresponding to the English “residence”, and therefore the translators had to choose a different construction. Because of

this being mostly connected to words and their meaning, number 14 will be discussed semantically as well.

The translation corresponding to the vehicle of number 30 is also a verb phrase. The English vehicle, “the mercy for those sorrows”, is translated with “*bli i stånd att känna misskund med honom i denna sorg*”. The Swedish equivalent of “mercy” is “*misskund*”, which semantically means the same, but “*misskund*” cannot be structurally compared to “mercy” even though they are both nouns. “*Misskund*” cannot follow the verb “to be”, but has to follow a verb implying action. Therefore, it is also clear that the Swedish vehicle does not provide an image to the topic.

In metaphor number 37, the English vehicle is “boroughs”. The Swedish translations of this is “*den kommunala förvaltningen*.” (the municipal administration). This is rather a semantic discussion. Probably, there is no good Swedish translation for “boroughs”, so therefore the translators chose to rewrite the English word into a Swedish expression. Because of this, number 6 will be further discussed in the semantic analysis.

3.2.3. Discussion about the Semantic Comparison

The analysis of the semantic comparison has two points. First, the semantic differences between the vehicles will be discussed, and secondly there will be a discussion about entire metaphors in which the Swedish translation is unexpected or unnatural.

3.2.3.1. Semantic Difference in the Vehicles

Even though the vehicles of metaphor number 1 consist of the same constituents in both English and Swedish, the meanings are not totally the same. In the vehicle of the English metaphor, “two fawns”, the determiner, “two”, is not directly translated into Swedish. The Swedish equivalent, “*ett par*” (a couple of) does not completely mean the same thing. The English determiner does not imply any connection between the fawns, which the Swedish translation does. “*Ett par*” is often connected to humans, and since the head, “fawns”, is an image of two persons, the Swedish translation manages to show this certain bond between the persons. On the other hand, the Swedish translation is not as fixed as the English “two”. In the English example it is completely clear that there are two persons, but the Swedish example is more vague and expresses a feeling of uncertainty.

In number 2, the Swedish vehicle, "*farbröderna där hemma*", includes a postmodification which does not exist in the English vehicle, "uncles". When the entire metaphor is examined, the reason for this is understood. The premodification of the English noun phrase, which represents the topic, is translated as a postmodification of the Swedish vehicle. This change creates a totally new meaning, since the meaning of the whole English metaphor, "domestic reality met them in the shape of uncles", is that the uncles represent a reality of a home. In the Swedish translation, the reality which the uncles represent can be any reality, and not specifically the reality of a home. Instead, the uncles are described as being at home, so that any kind of reality is represented by the uncles who are at home.

In the translation of the vehicle of metaphor number 6, a premodifier is changed to a postmodifier. The English vehicle is "a gracious indication", and the Swedish translation is "*ett tecken från ovan*". The premodifier of the vehicle in the English example, "gracious", has become a postmodifier in the Swedish vehicle, "*från ovan*" (from above). One meaning of the adjective gracious is connected with God and religion, as the Swedish translation implies, and this is probably the meaning of the English word. But nevertheless, the Swedish expression does not mean exactly the same, and there are probably other Swedish words which could have been used instead, for example "*nådig*".

The translation of the vehicle of metaphor number 14 is no image to the topic since this example is no metaphor in Swedish. The English vehicle, "a residence", is translated with a whole clause, "*dit han ... ämnade flytta...*", and there is no word corresponding to the English vehicle. The meaning of a residence is, on the other hand, what is described in the Swedish clause, i.e. a place, or a house, to which you move, and in which you intend to live permanently. Thus, the Swedish construction is longer, and more complicated than the English one, but probably there is no word completely correspondent to the English original. If so, the choice of rephrasing is good since it is important that the meaning of the original text is transferred to the translation.

The translation of number 20 is interesting since it is more specific than the English metaphor. In this case, it is not the structure which makes the Swedish example more specific, but the meaning of the words. In the English metaphor a person compares himself to a "damaged ear of corn". This implies only that the ear of corn is damaged in some way, not in which way. In the translation, "*ett sädesax av svartrost*", the ear of corn suffers from a specific type of damage, which is called "*svartrost*" (black rust). Perhaps the damage of an ear of corn most often is of the black rust type, and therefore the translators chose to describe the

damage in this way, but there is no lead in the English text of the damage being of this specific type.

In number 22, one word from the English vehicle, “the last doom of ignorance and folly”, has been deleted so that the Swedish translation is “*all okunnighets och dårskaps förbannelse*”. The equivalent of the English premodifier, “last”, does not exist in Swedish. The head in Swedish, “*fördömelse*”, is not a direct translation of the English head “doom”. A possible reason for these two changes could be that the meaning of the Swedish head includes the meaning of the English premodifier. Thus “last doom” would mean “*fördömelse*”. Furthermore, the connotation of “the last doom” is religious, or at least connected to religion, while the Swedish word does not necessarily give the same connotation. The discussion about religious connotation could be compared to the above discussed number 6. Another change in the translation of this vehicle is the determiner, which is “the” in English but “*all*” (all) in Swedish. This change would probably be related to the conclusion made in the analysis of structure above, i.e. that the Swedish genitive is always placed before its head. However, the Swedish translation does not mean exactly the same as the English original does.

In number 27, the only difference lies in the translation of the premodifier. The English vehicle is “a painful affair”, and the translation of this is “*en sorglig historia*”. In English “painful”, is translated with “*sorglig*” (sad) in Swedish. The meaning of these two words is not the same. The Swedish equivalent of “painful” would rather be “*plågsam*”. The reason for the change is because of the word following the noun. “*En sorglig historia*” is perhaps more frequent idiomatically than “*en plågsam historia*”.

In the translation of the vehicle of metaphor number 33, the premodifier of the English example is removed in Swedish. The English vehicle is “an emotional prompting and a well-considered resolve”, and the Swedish translation is “*en känsla ... och ett noga övervägt beslut*”. To be exact, the meaning of the English premodifier “emotional” has not been removed since it is made a head in the Swedish translation. What has been deleted semantically is a part of the English head, i.e. “prompting”. The corresponding Swedish part of the head is instead “*känsla*” which is the corresponding noun to the English adjective “emotional”.

In the translation of number 35, the determiner from the English vehicle, “many Therasas”, has simply been deleted in the translation so that the Swedish vehicle consists of a head only, “*Teresor*”. This deletion does not seem justified, since there is no syntactical problem in keeping the determiner also in the translation. Since the English determiner has no

Swedish equivalent, the meaning is much changed. In the Swedish translation, there is no indication of how many Theresas there are, or have been.

The other example in which “Theresas” is used as an image is number 36. The English vehicle, “these later-born Theresas”, implies that the persons talked about here are those named Theresa who have been born after the first Theresa, or perhaps the Theresa mentioned earlier in the context. The Swedish translation, “*dessas sena tiders Teresor*”, speaks of Theresas born recently, which does not present the same meaning as the English metaphor does. Not much differs between the two examples, but the reason why the translators chose to make this small, and rather insignificant difference in meaning, can be that a construction similar to the English one would not seem idiomatic in Swedish.

The translation of the vehicle of number 37 does not provide another image to the topic of the metaphor since this case is not translated as a metaphor. However, there is an expression in the Swedish translation corresponding to the English vehicle. The vehicle of the English metaphor, “boroughs”, is translated as “*den kommunala förvaltningen*”, (the municipal administration). Since the original meaning of borough is town, there is a connection in meaning between the translation and the original, but the translation is more specific than is the original. Perhaps, the translators chose a Swedish expression which approximately corresponds to the English one. Names of institutions in society, such as health care, school, etc. are often difficult to translate because of differences in systems. It is also necessary to remember that Eliot’s novel was written over a hundred years ago, and these phenomena have most probably changed during this time.

3.3.3.2. Semantic Difference in the Entire Metaphors

In this section two cases will be discussed, i.e. numbers 25 and 29. Number 25 is odd both in the original and in the translation. At first sight, the English metaphor, “he took a wife ... to be a little moon that would cause hardly a calculable perturbation”, seems to contain a fixed expression, “to be a little moon”. But a closer investigation of the expression showed that there is no such expression in the English language, but instead this means that the moon, which is an image for a wife, provides tranquillity in the situation. It is connected to science since the word “perturbation” is a disorder created by the moon. The translation, “[*han tog] sig en hustru ... för att vara en liten måne som knappast skulle förorsaka några märkbara*

störningar”. “Att vara en liten måne”, is not a very good translation, since it is translated word by word and being a little moon does not mean anything to Swedish readers. In fact, it is not even possible to connect it to the following word, “*störningar*”, as in English since this connection is not obvious in Swedish. Probably, the translators did not understand how to interpret the English text, and therefore they simply used the Swedish equivalents of the English words. It is a beautiful image of a person, but unfortunately the translation is meaningless.

Number 29 is interesting because of it being an idiomatic expression. The English metaphor is “a rector in the twin parish who was a gentleman to the backbone”, and its Swedish translation is “*kyrkoherden i tvillingförsamlingen, som var en gentleman ut i fingerspetsarna*”. Idiomatic expressions are difficult to translate, and therefore also interesting to examine. The expression used in the English metaphor is “a gentleman to the backbone”, which is translated into “*en gentleman ut i fingerspetsarna*”(a gentleman to his fingertips). According to a word by word translation, these do not mean the same thing at all, but because of them both being idiomatic expressions, the meanings created through the fixed expressions are the same in both languages.

Conclusion

The aim of this essay is to find out how structural metaphors in George Eliot's language are translated into Swedish. To reach this aim, metaphors of a certain structure have been investigated. The novel used for the investigation is Eliot's *Middlemarch*.

The model of the metaphors searched for follows a completely structural model inspired by Andrew Goatly, and includes metaphors in which the vehicle term is a noun phrase. To have a possibility of comparing the English vehicles with the Swedish ones, Greenbaum's and Quirk's model of a noun phrase was used. The investigation included totally twenty-eight pages from *Middlemarch*, and on those pages, forty metaphors were found. The most common type of metaphors were of the simile type.

The majority of the metaphors were translated into Swedish as metaphors but there were also cases in which the Swedish vehicle did not provide an image to the topic, mostly because of the use of different verbs connecting the topic and the vehicle. Most of the Swedish noun phrases were constructed in the same way, i.e. with the same constituents as their English correspondences. The result of the structural comparison is that most of the Swedish translations follow the same structure as their English equivalents. Even though there were sometimes differences in structure, most Swedish vehicles were translated as noun phrases as well.

In the semantic part of the investigation, a pattern of the translators' way of working was discovered. In most cases, the translations are word by word translations, and there are no large divergences between the originals and the translations. Many of the differences found, both structural and semantic, depend on diverging syntax rules in English and Swedish. Freer translations would not have been surprising since translations of metaphors need to create the same image as they do in the source language. Therefore, other words and constructions might be expected in translating figurative language.

To summarise, the Swedish translations of the metaphors in which the vehicle terms are noun phrases are metaphorically translated. Both structurally and semantically, the metaphors are mostly direct translations of the English originals, even though there are some cases in which the meaning is changed. Considering these results, it can be concluded that the Swedish translation of George Eliot's structural metaphors most commonly are metaphorical also in the translations.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Eliot, George. *Middlemarch*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Edition, 1994.

Eliot, George. *Middlemarch*. Trans. Elsie and Håkan Tollet. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 1997.

Secondary Sources

Alm-Arvius, Christina. *Introduction to Semantics*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 1998.

Carlshamre, Staffan. "Metaphors in Text Semantics: Problems and Prospect". STTS Report 4 (1988): 1-13.

Goatly, Andrew. *The Language of Metaphors*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Greenbaum, Sidney and Randolph Quirk. *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman, 1990.

Hellspång, Lennart. *Konsten att tala: Handbok i praktisk retorik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 1992.

---. "Metaforanalys." Metoder för Brukstextanalys. Studentlitteratur. 17 December 2007.
<<http://www.studentlitteratur.se/files/sites/metoder7556/manalys.pdf>>.

Lakoff, George. "Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." Metaphor and Thought. Ed. Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 202-51.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Appendices

1. Result of the Investigation of Metaphors in *Middlemarch*.
2. Comparison of the Vehicles.

1. Result of the investigation of metaphors in *Middlemarch*

Number (Category)	Page (Chapter)	English	Vehicle	Swedish	Vehicle
1. (A)	3 (Prelude)	Out <u>they</u> toddled from rugged Avila, wide-eyed and helpless-looking as two fawns	Two fawns	Bort från det kärva Avila traskade <u>de</u> , storögda och hjälplösa som ett par hjortkalvar	Ett par hjortkalvar
2. (A)	3 (Prelude)	Until <u>domestic reality</u> met them in the shape of uncles	Uncles	Ända till dess <u>verkligheten</u> , i gestalt av farbröderna där hemma	Farbröderna där hemma
3. (A)	3 (Prelude)	She found <u>her epos</u> in the reform of a religious order	A religious order	Hon fann <u>sitt hjältedåd</u> i reformeringen av en religiös orden	En religiös orden
4. (A)	78 (11)	Sweet laughs for bird-notes	Bird-notes	Fågelsången består av <u>ljuva skratt</u>	Fågelsången
5. (A)	78 (11)	Blue eyes for a heaven	A heaven	Himlen [består] av <u>blåa ögon</u>	Himlen
6. (A)	103 (13)	<u>Your advent to this town</u> as a gracious indication	A gracious indication	<u>Er ankomst till den här staden</u> som ett tecken från ovan	Ett tecken från ovan
7. (A)	103 (13)	By presenting <u>yourself as</u> a reformer	A reformer	<u>Ni</u> ... genom att själv framträda som reformator	Reformator
8. (A)	153 (18)	<u>Farebrother as</u> a pattern of what a clergyman ought to be	A pattern of what a clergyman ought to be	<u>Farebrother</u> är idealet för en präst	Idealet för en präst
9. (A)	178 (22)	That I would rather feel that <u>painting</u> is beautiful than have to read it as an enigma	An enigma	Att jag hellre skulle vilja uppleva att <u>en målning</u> är vacker än att vara tvungen att tyda den som en gåta	En gåta

10. (A)	253 (32)	He was squinting ... like the gypsies	The gypsies	Han skelade ... alldeles som zigenarna	Zigenarna
11. (A)	328 (39)	He ... had been inclined to regard <u>himself as</u> a general favourite	A general favourite	Han ... hade varit benägen att betrakta <u>sig själv</u> som allas favorit	Allas favorit
12. (A)	353 (42)	The image of <u>him</u> , like a shadowy monitor	A shadowy monitor	En bild av <u>honom</u> som en skugglik förmanare	En skugglik förmanare
13. (A)	428 (53)	He had bought <u>the excellent farm and fine homestead</u> simply as a retreat	A retreat	Han hade köpt <u>det förträffliga lantbruket och den vackra boningen</u> uteslutande som en fristad	En fristad
14. (A)	428 (53)	<u>The excellent farm and fine homestead</u> ... as a residence	A residence	<u>Det förträffliga lantbruket och den vackra boningen</u> ... dit han ... ämnade flytta	Dit han ... ämnade flytta
15. (A)	453 (56)	<u>A voice</u> like music	Music	<u>En röst</u> som är som musik	Musik
16. (A)	478 (58)	<u>His rank</u> penetrated them as if it had been an odour	An odour	<u>Hans börd</u> skulle tränga in i dem som om den hade varit en doft	En doft
17. (A)	578 (70)	<u>Signs in the shape of</u> hotel-bills	Hotel-bills	<u>Bevis i form av</u> hotellräkningar	Hotellräkningar
18. (A)	603 (72)	<u>Opening the subject with Lydgate</u> ... he would probably take it as a deadly insult	A deadly insult	<u>Föra saken på tal med Lydgate själv</u> ... Han skulle förmodligen ta det som en dödlig förolämpning	En dödlig förolämpning

19. (A)	603 (72) 628 (76)	<u>Money as a bribe</u>	A bribe	<u>Pengarna som</u> mutor	Mutor
20. (A)	628 (76)	<u>I am simply blighted – like a damaged ear of corn</u>	A damaged ear of corn	<u>Jag är helt enkelt besmittad – som ett sädesax av svartrost</u>	Ett sädesax av svartrost
21. (A)	653 (81)	<u>The tones ... like a low cry from some suffering creature in the darkness</u>	A low cry from some suffering creature in the darkness	<u>Rösten ... som ett dämpat skrik från en lidande varelse i mörkret</u>	Ett dämpat skrik från en lidande varelse i mörkret
22. (B)	28 (3)	<u>That self-satisfaction which was the last doom of ignorance and folly</u>	The last doom of ignorance and folly	<u>Den självbelåtenhet som var all okunnighets och dårskaps fördömelse</u>	All okunnighets och dårskaps fördömelse
23. (B)	28 (3)	<u>She pinched Celia's chin ... fit hereafter to be an eternal cherub</u>	An eternal cherub	<u>Hon nöp Celia i hakan ... lämpad att i nästa liv vara den eviga keruben</u>	Den eviga keruben
24. (B)	53 (7)	<u>The words ... perform a sort of minuet</u>	A sort of minuet	<u>Orden ... utföra en sorts menuett</u>	En sorts menuett
25. (B)	78 (11)	<u>He took a wife ... to be a little moon that would cause hardly a calculable perturbation</u>	A little moon that would cause hardly a calculable perturbation	<u>Tog han sig en hustru ... för att vara en liten måne som knappast skulle förorsaka några märkbara störningar</u>	En liten måne som knappast skulle förorsaka några märkbara störningar
26. (B)	128 (16)	<u>Their support was a compromise</u>	A compromise	<u>Deras medhåll var en kompromiss</u>	En kompromiss
27. (B)	203 (24)	<u>Life was already a painful affair</u>	A painful affair	<u>Var livet verkligen en sorglig historia</u>	En sorglig historia
28. (B)	253 (32)	<u>Jonah was the wit</u>	The wit	<u>Jonah var kvickhuvudet</u>	Kvickhuvudet

29. (B)	328 (39)	<u>A rector in the twin parish</u> who was a gentleman to the backbone	A gentleman to the backbone	<u>Kyrkoherden i tvillingförsamlingen</u> , som var en gentleman ut i fingerspetsarna	En gentleman ut i fingerspetsarna
30. (B)	353 (42)	<u>She</u> might be the mercy for those sorrows	The mercy for those sorrows	<u>Hon</u> måtte bli i stånd att känna misskund med honom i denna sorg	Misskund ... i denna sorg
31. (B)	428 (53)	He believed it to be a chastisement and admonition ... <u>that .. Mr Farebrother</u> ‘read himself’ into the quaint little church	A chastisement and admonition	... att <u>Mr Farebrother</u> “läste in sig” i den säregna lilla kyrkan ... tog han som en näpst och tillrättavisning	En näpst och tillrättavisning
32. (B)	453 (56)	<u>A profound reverence for this mighty structure of tones</u> ... throwing much unutterable language into his outstretched hands	Much unutterable language into his outstretched hands	<u>En djup vördnad för musikens mäktiga struktur</u> ... med händernas ordlösa språk ge uttryck för det osägbara	Det osägbara
33. (B)	578 (69)	<u>His tenderness towards her</u> , which was both an emotional prompting and a well-considered resolve	An emotional prompting and a well-considered resolve	<u>Hans ömhet för henne</u> , som bestod både i en känsla och i ett noga övervägt beslut	En känsla och ... ett noga övervägt beslut

34. (B)	653 (81)	<u>Rosamond</u> ... the fragile creature who was crying close to her	The fragile creature	<u>Rosamond</u> ... den spröda gestalten som grät tätt intill henne	Den spröda gestalten
35. (C)	3 (Prelude)	Many Theresas have been born	Many Theresas	Det har fötts Teresor	Teresor
36. (C)	3 (Prelude)	These later-born Theresas	These later-born Theresas	Dessa sena tiders Teresor	Dessa sena tiders Teresor
37. (C)	78 (11)	Fastidious gentlemen stood for boroughs	Boroughs	<u>De granntyckta gentlemän</u> som skötte den kommunala förvaltningen	Den kommunala förvaltningen
38. (C)	253 (32)	This one pair of eyes – image for <u>one person</u>	This one pair of eyes	Detta enda ögonpar – bild för <u>en person</u>	Detta enda ögonpar
39. (C)	253 (32)	The four eyes – image of <u>two persons</u>	The four eyes	De fyra ögonen – bild för <u>två personer</u>	De fyra ögonen
40. (C)	353 (42)	The light advanced up the stairs ... <u>her husband</u>	The light	Kom ljuset långsamt uppför trappan ... <u>hennes man</u>	Ljuset

2. Comparison of the Vehicles

Number	Determiner	Premodification	HEAD	Postmodification	Semantically
1	Two		Fawns		
	Ett par		Hjortkalvar		
2			Uncles		
			Farbröderna	Där hemma	
3	A	Religious	Order		
	En	Religiös	Orden		
4			Bird-notes		
			Fågelsången		
5	A		Heaven		
			Himlen		
6	A	Gracious	Indication		
	Ett		Tecken	Från ovan	
7	A		Reformer		
			Reformator		
8	A		Pattern	Of what a clergyman ought to be	
			Idealet	För en präst	
9	An		Enigma		
	En		Gåta		
10	The		Gypsies		
			Zigenarna		
11	A	General	Favourite		
	Allas		Favorit		
12	A	Shadowy	Monitor		
	En	Skugglik	Förmanare		
13	A		Retreat		
	En		Fristad		
14	A		Residence		
			Dit han ... ännade flytta		
15			Music		
			Musik		
16	An		Odour		
	En		Doft		
17			Hotel-bills		
			Hotellräkningar		
18	A	Deadly	Insult		
	En	Dödlig	Förolämpning		
19	A		Bribe		
			Mutor		

20	A	Damaged	Ear	Of corn	
	Ett		Sädesax	Av svartrost	
21	A	Low	Cry	From some suffering creature in the darkness	
	Ett	Dämpat	Skrik	Från en lidande varelse i mörkret	
22	The	Last	Doom	Of ignorance and folly	
	All	Okunnighets och dårskaps	Fördömelse		
23	An	Eternal	Cherub		
	Den	Eviga	Keruben		
24	A	Sort of	Minuet		
	En	Sorts	Menuett		
25	A	Little	Moon	That would cause hardly a calculable perturbation	
	En	Liten	Måne	Som knappast skulle förorsaka några märkbara störningar	
26	A		Compromise		
	En		Kompromiss		
27	A	Painful	Affair		
	En	Sorglig	Historia		
28	The		Wit		
			Kvickhuvudet		
29	A		Gentleman	To the backbone	
	En		Gentleman	Ut i fingerspetsarna	
30	A		Mercy	For those sorrows	
			Misskund	I denna sorg	
31	A		Chastisement and admonition		
	En		Näpst och tillrättavisning		
32	Much	Unutterable	Language	Into his outstretched hands	
	Det		Osägbara		

33	An	Emotional	Prompting and a well- considered resolve		
	En		Känsla och ... ett noga övertvägt beslut		
34	The	Fragile	Creature		
	Den	Spröda	Gestalten		
35	Many		Therasas		
			Teresor		
36	These	Later-born	Therasas		
	Dessa	Sena tiders	Teresor		
37			Boroughs		
	Den	Kommunala	Förvaltningen		
38	This	One	Pair	Of eyes	
	Detta	Enda	Ögonpar		
39	The four		Eyes		
	De fyra		Ögonen		
40	The		Light		
			Ljuset		