A Systematic Critique of the Persian Translator's Performance in Translating Metaphors from English to Persian

HAMIDREZA ABDI

Abstract

Subjectivism poses a significant challenge in translation criticism, often stemming from constraints imposed by commissioners or, more critically, the critic's unfamiliarity with diverse theoretical models or their practical use. Therefore, translation critiques should be made according to a systematic model or well-defined criteria to ensure objective judgement and minimise subjectivity. This study systematically critiques the Persian translation of Fitzgerald's (1925) The Great Gatsby using Larson's (1984) evaluation model, focusing on how Emami (2006) translated metaphors. By applying Larson's taxonomy of translation strategies, the research identified the specific methods Emami used for both live and dead metaphors at the micro level, as well as his overall strategy at the macro level. The findings reveal that Emami utilised all of Larson's strategies, favouring target text-oriented ones, which aligns the translation more closely with the structure and expectations of the Persian language. Statistical tests showed no significant relationship between the types of strategies and their frequency of use. Emami effectively applied diverse translation strategies to maintain accuracy and clarity while aiming for naturalness in Persian. The study concludes that Emami's translation successfully communicates with the Persian audience through appropriate metaphorical translation strategies, offering valuable insights for translation students, critics, and educators.

1. Introduction

A critique of a translation aims to provide an objective assessment of the translated text, identifying the translator's strengths and weaknesses to improve their performance. Abdi (2021a), who coined the term *trancism* and used it as an alternative to translation criticism, defines it as "a fair judgment that enables the translator to improve the translation through the constructive comments provided by the critic" (Abdi, 2021b, p. 11). Mahmood (2009) emphasises the importance of objectivity in trancism due to the critical role of translation and the inherent subjectivity involved.

Hadla (2017) also stresses that a translation critic should strive to be as objective as possible when evaluating the quality of a translation. According to Abdi (2024), trancism involves "an impartial assessment conducted by a critic on the translated text for the target reader" (p. 1). For criticism to be *objective*, *fair*, or *impartial*, a constructive judgement must be made using a systematic model. Valero (1995) refers to this as *a general model*, Zabalbeascoa (1996) calls for *clear criteria*, and Reiss (2000) speaks of *relevant criteria*. Hence, systematic evaluation avoids reflecting the intuitive, critical impressionist attitudes and positions as Holmes (2004) states.

One significant issue contributing to subjectivity is the critic's lack of familiarity with a broad range of theoretical trancism models or their practical application. This trend is evident among Iranian translation critics, including both students and researchers, who tend to rely on a limited set of models, such as House's (2015) translation quality assessment. This unfamiliarity may stem from the insufficient emphasis on trancism by course designers and translation instructors responsible for educating students and researchers. Consequently, university curricula often prioritise theory over practice, resulting in theory-based translation programs.

Another factor leading to subjective judgement is the constraints imposed by commissioners on critics. These restrictions, often dictated by publishers, institutions, or organisations, can skew the judgement towards unfairness and subjectivity. Sherrif (2008) notes that critics may encounter limitations on the depth of their analysis due to word limits, a challenge known as *problems of space*.

Additionally, external factors such as power dynamics and spatial constraints frequently lead critics to focus on negative and downgrading comments, as Desai (2020) argues.

When it comes to *metaphors*, trancism becomes a more complex and challenging practice. This complexity arises from the multifaceted and dynamic nature of metaphors, which demand a deep understanding of both the source and target languages, along with the cultural and contextual factors that influence language use. This challenge is heightened for translators dealing with cultural items, which Newmark (1988) considers *a problem*, van den Broeck (2009) sees as *a phenomenon*, and Toury (2012) regards as *a solution*. Therefore, translators must balance literal accuracy and creative adaptation to ensure the translated text conveys the original metaphor's essence and impact.

Larson (1984) proposes that the critic should assess metaphor translations by analysing both the types of metaphors and the translation strategies used by the translator. Essentially, the critic should first determine whether the translator has accurately identified *live* and *dead* metaphors, and then evaluate whether the appropriate strategies were applied for translating each type. Following Larson's (1984) model, the present study aims to systematically evaluate translators' performance in translating metaphors from English to Persian.

The critical analysis focuses on metaphor translation, examining how the Persian translator handled cultural elements to communicate effectively with target readers. Additionally, the study seeks to identify the translation strategies employed for different types of metaphors using Larson's (1984) taxonomy. This analysis provides insight into the translators' overall strategies and approaches to translating metaphors. Moreover, Emami's translation of metaphors was assessed in terms of *accuracy*, *clarity*, and *naturalness*. To achieve the objectives of this study, the following questions are raised:

1. Which of Larson's (1984) translation strategies did the Persian translator use at the micro-level to translate metaphors from English to Persian?

2. According to Larson's (1988) evaluation model, what was the overall strategy of the Persian translator at the macro-level in translating metaphors from English to Persian?
3. How did Emami (2006) perform in translating both types of metaphors regarding accuracy, clarity, and naturalness?
4. Were Emami (2006) able to establish effective communication with the target audience using the implemented metaphor solutions?

This research can provide insights into the cognitive and cultural processes involved in translating figurative language. This may result in more refined translation theories that address the complexity of translating metaphors. Additionally, the study can reveal differences in how English and Persian use metaphors, contributing to our understanding of how cultural context influences translation choices and helps translators bridge cultural gaps.

The research can also enhance our understanding of how metaphors are interpreted and translated, contributing to theories of semantics (meaning) and pragmatics (contextual usage) in both languages. Furthermore, the findings can support or challenge existing theories of linguistic relativity, which suggest that the structure of a language affects its speakers' thinking and worldview.

Beyond its theoretical contributions, this research has practical implications for improving the quality of translations. Identifying effective and ineffective strategies for metaphor translation can lead to the development of best practices and guidelines for translators. Additionally, insights from the study can be used to improve translator training programs, focusing on the specific challenges of translating metaphors and developing the skills needed to overcome these challenges.

Moreover, the study provides valuable insights for translation professionals looking to improve their work. By demonstrating the application of Larson's (1984) model in practical scenarios, the research offers practitioners the tools and perspectives necessary to tackle translation challenges, especially in metaphor translation, with greater skill and accuracy. Iranian translators, categorised as freelance and in-house professionals, often have limited opportunities to

engage with a broad range of critical models and their application to trancism, largely due to the scarcity of relevant seminars and workshops. However, articles, alongside universities where they acquire theoretical insights into trancism, can play a vital role in strengthening their practical understanding and skills in this area. Consequently, the critical approaches outlined in this study can be especially beneficial for Iranian translators, helping them improve the quality and accuracy of their translations.

2. Review of the Related Literature

2.1. Divers Perspectives on Trancism

Reiss (2000) asserts that achieving a conclusive evaluation of a translation requires a comparison between the translation and the original text. Central to this evaluation is the principle of complete fidelity to the original author's intent, which Reiss considers paramount for translators. The author argues that criticism based on the source language (SL) is crucial for an objective and relevant evaluation, as it considers the linguistic and non-linguistic factors influencing the original text's form. To facilitate an objective critique, Reiss proposes three categories—literary, language, and pragmatic-each essential for analysing a translated work objectively. Berman (2021) offers an alternative perspective, advocating for an examination of the *system of textual deformation* inherent in every translation. Through his *analytic of translation*, Berman aims to uncover the unconscious tendencies or forces that cause translations to deviate from their intended aim, analysing these forces in both Cartesian and psychoanalytic senses. This approach seeks to illuminate where and how these forces manifest within the text.

Van den Broeck (1985) adds to the discourse by highlighting the importance of systematic description in trancism, emphasising the significance of comparative analysis between the ST and the TT. The author argues that criticism should focus on stylistic choices and methods used, aligning them with the intended purpose and target audience. Lambert and van Gorp (2014) stress the necessity of considering the relations within and between the source and target text systems in translation analysis. They advocate for analysing

translational strategies within the text itself to understand these relations and achieve an acceptable translation. Through a microscopic analysis supported by statistical data, they suggest observing the consistency and hierarchical structure of the translational strategy to draw provisional conclusions about individual fragments.

2.2. Categorisations and Translation Strategies for Metaphors

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) argue that metaphor is deeply ingrained not only in language but also in human thought processes, shaping our very concept of argumentation. They contend that the language of argument is not merely poetic or rhetorical but fundamentally metaphorical and literal. The authors assert that metaphors in language stem from the metaphorical structure of human conceptual systems. Thus, the systematic nature of language reflects the systematicity of our conceptual frameworks. They propose categorising metaphors into three types: *structural*, *orientational*, and *ontological*. Structural metaphors involve structuring concepts through analogies to make them tangible and understandable. Orientational metaphors, linked to spatial orientation, can vary across cultures based on how individuals perceive themselves in the physical world. Ontological metaphors, on the other hand, relate to how we understand experiences in terms of objects and substances.

Newmark (1988) suggests that the selection of a translation method for a text is crucial, with the translation of metaphor presenting a unique challenge. Metaphors serve both cognitive and aesthetic purposes, illustrating similarities between entities and representing a process rather than just a function. Translating cultural metaphors can be particularly challenging, as language serves as a means of expressing culture and conveying both universal and individual identity. Newmark (1981) divides metaphors into *dead*, *cliché*, *stock*, *adapted*, *recent*, and *original*, and then introduces seven translation procedures to translate them. This includes: 1) reproducing the same *image* in the TL, 2) changing the *image* in the SL into a standard image in the TL which is not

contrasted to the TL culture but as a metaphor (stock metaphor), proverb et cetera, 3) to translate metaphor with simile by maintaining the image, 4) to translate metaphor or simile with simile but by adding the meaning or sometimes translate metaphor with metaphor plus the meaning, 5) to change metaphor to be a meaning, 6) to omit it, 7) to combine the metaphor with the meaning.

Schäffner (2004) argues that in cognitive linguistics, the term *metaphor* refers to conceptual mapping, while *metaphorical expression* denotes a linguistic expression rooted in conceptualisation and sanctioned by a mapping. The author emphasises the importance of developing potential translation procedures when dealing with metaphors and suggests that a cognitive view of metaphor provides new insights for Translation Studies. This perspective challenges the validity of traditional translation procedures in handling conceptual metaphors. Schäffner's analysis of political documents identifies several cases that may be candidates for potential translation strategies: 1) a conceptual metaphor is identical in ST and TT at the macro-level without each manifestation having been accounted for at the micro-level, 2) structural components of the base conceptual schema in the ST are replaced in the TT by expressions that make entailments explicit, 3) a metaphor is more elaborate in the TT, 4) ST and TT employ different metaphorical expressions which can be combined under a more abstract conceptual metaphor, 5) the expression in the TT reflects a different aspect of the conceptual metaphor.

Toury (2012) criticises the traditional approach to translating metaphors, which focuses on identifying ST metaphors and replacing them with assumed translations. The author argues that this approach often leads to judgements of the replacements' quality based on preconceived notions of balance between the original metaphor's features, such as meaning and metaphoricity. Building on this critique, Toury proposes six translation strategies for handling metaphors, which include 1) metaphor into *the same* metaphor, 2) metaphor into *different* metaphor, 3) metaphor into non-metaphor, 4) metaphor into 0, 5) non-metaphor into metaphor, 6) 0 into metaphor. The author explains that when analysing the TT, the four basic pairs (1-4) are quickly followed by two opposing

alternatives. In these alternatives, the idea of *metaphor* emerges in the target context rather than the source context, serving as *a solution* rather than *a problem* (the final two basic pairs 5-6).

2.3. Larson's Model of Metaphor

In his work, Larson (1984) explores the intricate nature of metaphors, emphasising their common occurrence in various languages along with similes. The author outlines their structural essence, which consists of two propositions—one representing the topic and the other conveying a comment—that are crucial for understanding the underlying comparison. By analysing examples such as *The Moon is Like Blood*, Larson explains how metaphors encode implicit information, requiring the identification of the *topic*, *image*, *point of similarity*, and *nonfigurative equivalent*. Additionally, Larson categorises metaphors into *live* and *dead* types, distinguishing between those integrated within idiomatic language structures and those spontaneously created for illustrative purposes.

However, Larson (1984) cautions against a literal translation approach for metaphors because of the potential for misinterpretation. The author highlights several factors contributing to possible misunderstanding, including unfamiliarity with the metaphorical *image* in the TL, implicit and culturally nuanced *points of similarity*, and differences in the frequency and usage of metaphors across languages. Furthermore, Larson stresses the importance of considering the broader linguistic and cultural context to ensure *adequate translation*, as the metaphorical meanings and interpretations may vary based on cultural conventions and existing linguistic associations within the TL.

Larson (1984) suggests that the first step in tackling this challenge and creating a successful translation of a metaphor is to differentiate between a *live* metaphor and a *dead* one. In the case of the latter, keeping the *image* is not needed, and the meaning can be translated directly. However, for the former type, a thorough analysis of the metaphor is necessary, and both propositions should be clearly stated, including the topic, the image, and the point of similarity. The author presents five translation strategies for translating metaphors. These strategies include:

1. The metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers);
2. A metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as);
3. A metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted;
4. The metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained (that is, the topic and/or point of similarity may be added); and
5. The meaning of the metaphor may be translated without keeping the metaphorical imagery.

Concerning these solutions given by Larson (1984), a translator will find it easier to do his job especially when he sees any text with metaphoric content. Larson's model can be considered a clear guideline for a translator to transfer the exact message and meaning of the metaphor texts. In a broader sense, the model is more comprehensive compared to other proposed models because it serves as a complete package that includes all necessary tools and guidelines for both translators and critics. This includes the categorisation of metaphors, a taxonomy of translation strategies, the three important paradigms for quality evaluation, helpful suggestions for selecting testers, and so on. That is to say, the boundaries and limitations are sufficiently clear to assist the translator in addressing challenges typically encountered when translating metaphors, while also enabling the critic to systematically and objectively evaluate the translator's performance in this regard.

2.4. Recent Studies in the Field

Recent studies in Iran have more or less explored the translation of metaphors and the difficulties that this cultural dimension of language presents for translators. The studies conducted by Aprouz and Mohammadi (2022), Kuhi et al. (2022), Hesabi et al. (2021), Alibabaei (2020), Moradi and Jabbari (2020), and Gholami et al. (2016) collectively provide a comprehensive understanding of metaphor translation across various contexts. Aprouz and Mohammadi's examination of metaphors in Khayyam's poetry brings to light the common conceptual metaphors found in both

Persian and English, suggesting commonalities in how speakers of different cultures conceptualise reality. Similarly, Kuhi et al. analysed metaphors produced by Iranian high school students, shedding light on learners' beliefs about language learning and emphasising the potential of metaphor analysis in informing language teaching practices.

Conversely, Hesabi et al. (2021) scrutinised the conventionality of metaphors in translation highlighting the complexities of metaphor translation, especially when deciding between using new or established metaphors in various linguistic contexts. Alibabaei's (2020) investigation of metaphor translation in Iranian political news reveals divergences in purpose and reflection between Iranian writers and English translators, suggesting challenges in conveying nuanced meanings across languages. Furthermore, Moradi and Jabbari's (2020) study on metaphor translation in medical texts, along with the research conducted by Gholami et al. (2016) from Arabic into English, provide valuable insights into translation strategies and the role of meaning, form, and fidelity in metaphor translation across disciplines and languages. All in all, these studies contribute valuable insights into the intricacies of metaphor translation, offering implications for translation theory and practice across diverse contexts.

The translation of metaphors has become a focus for international researchers, highlighting the complex relationship between languages and the challenges of conveying metaphorical expressions across linguistic boundaries. The studies conducted by He et al. (2021), Ashuja'a et al. (2021), Hong and Rossi (2021), Kalda (2021), and Dagnev and Chervenkova (2020) offer valuable insights into the translation of metaphors from various perspectives. He et al.'s discussion on aligning conceptual metaphor theory and conceptual blending theory for translation analysis highlights the promising potential of integrating cognitive and linguistic levels to understand metaphor translation within specific cultural-linguistic contexts.

Similarly, Ashuja'a et al.'s (2021) exploration of challenges in translating scientific metaphors from English to Arabic underscores the importance of addressing linguistic variations and cultural

differences, emphasising the need for enhanced translation practice and awareness of metaphoric expressions in both languages. Furthermore, Hong and Rossi's (2021) critical overview of metaphor translation research from a cognitive perspective illuminates the role of cognitive approaches in understanding conceptual transfer and cross-cultural communication in translation. Additionally, Kalda's (2021) analysis of translation processes reveals the multifaceted factors influencing translators' choices, with context, previous experience, and educational background playing significant roles in facilitating or hindering metaphor translation.

Finally, Dagnev and Chervenkova's (2020) examination of conceptual metaphors in English texts and their translations into Bulgarian challenges assumptions about metaphor loss, highlighting the complexities of metaphor translation and its impact on text quality and analysis. Overall, the body of research on metaphor translation, both from Iranian studies and international perspectives, provides a robust foundation for understanding the intricacies of this domain. However, a critical analysis of these studies reveals both significant contributions and notable limitations, while highlighting the distinctiveness of the present study in adopting Larson's (1984) systematic model for evaluation.

The current study distinguishes itself by adopting Larson's (1984) systematic model to evaluate metaphor translation, focusing on *accuracy*, *clarity*, and *naturalness*. This structured approach allows for a comprehensive assessment of the translation process and its outcomes, addressing gaps in previous research. In other words, the current investigation has not only focused on determining the translation strategies employed by the Persian translator for translating metaphors and the challenges that such cultural items pose for the translator but also on the translator's performance in proposing acceptable solutions for metaphors and his success in effectively communicating with target readers.

3. Method

3.1. Design of the Study

The current study employed a descriptive research strategy that utilised both qualitative and quantitative methods to thoroughly investigate the complexities of translation. Descriptive research aims to depict the characteristics of the subject under study rather than delving into causal explanations, as noted by Singh (2023). This methodological approach seeks to capture the essence of a phenomenon or subject under scrutiny.

The decision to integrate qualitative and quantitative methods was grounded in their respective strengths. Qualitative analysis allows for the exploration of non-numerical data, such as textual content, which enables the examination of opinions and concepts derived from the analysis. Conversely, quantitative methods facilitate the statistical analysis of numerical data through various tests, providing a robust framework for quantitative analysis.

By combining these methodologies, the study seeks to offer a thorough grasp of the translation process, blending qualitative observations with quantitative data analysis. The primary focus is on the translation of metaphors, examining how those found in Fitzgerald's (1925) novel *The Great Gatsby* were rendered from English to Persian.

3.2. Corpus

The study focused on two versions of Fitzgerald's novel *The Great Gatsby*: the original English text published by Charles Scribner's Sons in nine chapters, and its Persian translation by Emami (2006) released by Niloofar Publishing Company. The choice of this novel was due to its status as a well-known American classic by a globally acclaimed author, vividly portraying the economic boom, emergence of jazz music, and Prohibition era in post-World War I America.

For instance, Tom Buchanan in the story symbolises the wealthy class of that period, as shown through his affair with Myrtle Wilson, a woman of lower social status. This illustrates a disregard for traditional values and exploitation of the less fortunate. His

authoritative treatment of both Myrtle and his wife Daisy reflects the moral decline prevalent among the upper class during the Jazz Age.

Furthermore, *The Great Gatsby* remains a timeless narrative exploring themes such as desire, excess, and the allure of wealth, transcending both time and place to provide universal insights into human nature. Fitzgerald's (1925) use of metaphors to depict complex social dynamics and moral decay in Jazz Age society posed significant challenges for translators like Emami (2006). This study aimed to investigate how these metaphors and cultural nuances were approached in the Persian translation, emphasising the importance of understanding Emami's methods in interpreting and conveying these cultural elements.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The present study conducted a thorough examination of both Fitzgerald's (1925) original text *The Great Gatsby* and its Persian translation to achieve its research objectives. Initially, the study meticulously identified types of metaphors in the text, utilising Larson's (1984) classification of metaphors (*live* or *dead*), and analysed their corresponding Persian translations. This detailed analysis facilitated a comparison between these elements, employing Larson's taxonomy of translation strategies. The goal of this micro-level analysis was to discern the specific strategies employed by Emami (2006) in translating metaphors.

Subsequently, the study extended its critical analysis to the macro level, utilising Larson's (1984) evaluation model to objectively assess the translator's performance in terms of *accuracy*, *clarity*, and *naturalness*. Hence, the researcher invited 11 evaluators, or what Larson calls *testers*, to assess the accuracy, clarity, and naturalness of Emami's (2006) translations of metaphors. According to Larson, one of the key qualities of a tester is a thorough understanding of translation principles and a strong command of the TL. Thus, the testers were randomly selected from the website www.proz.com based on their expertise: they had more than five years of experience in translation and worked with English to Persian and Persian to English languages.

Initially, the testers were informed of the study's objectives and the significance of their participation in ensuring the validity and quality of the research outcomes. They were provided with both the SL statements and their Persian translations, along with a semantic adequacy evaluation scale. This five-point scale ranged from *None* to *All*, enabling the evaluators to indicate how accurately the meaning of the original text was conveyed in the translation.

Additionally, a second five-point scale, ranging from *Incomprehensible* to *Flawless Persian*, was provided to gauge the clarity of the translations. This scale helped determine how well the translations communicated their intended meanings in Persian. Furthermore, the evaluators were asked to assess the understandability of the translations using a straightforward *Yes/No* judgement.

To provide a quantitative overview of Emami's employed strategies, the study employed Microsoft Excel, as an analytical tool, to transfer all data received from testers. In this way, the percentages of translation strategies were calculated and the results were illustrated in tabular form, categorising the strategies into ST-oriented and TT-oriented approaches. This categorisation facilitated a detailed comparison, highlighting the percentage of each strategy type. Furthermore, to ensure the reliability of the data, three independent raters were enlisted to cross-verify the findings. Additionally, a chi-square (X^2) test was conducted to explore the relationship between the types of translation strategies employed and their number of usages by the translator. This multifaceted approach enabled a critical and comprehensive analysis of the translation process, shedding light on the nuances of strategy selection and their impact on the translation outcome. Inferential statistics, such as one sample Wilcoxon signed ranks test, were also employed to justify the level of accuracy, clarity, and naturalness of the translations.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Quantitative Results

As shown in Table 1, Fitzgerald (1925) employed a greater number of live metaphors ($n = 54$) than dead metaphors ($n = 28$) in his work *The Great Gatsby*.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Types of Metaphors Used by Fitzgerald in His Book *The Great Gatsby*

Metaphors	*f*	%
Live	54	66.0
Dead	28	34.0
Total	82	100.0

Table 2 illustrates the translation strategies used by Emami (2006) to translate both live and dead metaphors in *The Great Gatsby*. For live metaphors, the most frequently used strategy was *the metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is, if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers)* ($n = 21$), while the least used strategy involved *the metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained (that is, the topic and/or point of similarity may be added)* ($n = 3$). Conversely, for dead metaphors, Emami predominantly opted *for the metaphor that may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is, if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers)* ($n = 16$), whereas the least utilised approach involved *a metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as)* ($n = 1$).

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage of the Translation Strategies Used by Emami for Live and Dead Metaphors

Strategies for Live Metaphors	*f*	*%*	Strategies for Dead Metaphors	*f*	*%*
The metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is, if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers)	21	39.0	The metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is, if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers)	16	57.0
The meaning of the metaphor may be translated without keeping the metaphorical imagery	16	30.0	The meaning of the metaphor may be translated without keeping the metaphorical imagery	7	25.0
A metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as)	8	15.0	A metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted	4	14.0
A metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted	6	11.0	A metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as)	1	4.0

The metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained (that is, the topic and/or point of similarity may be added)	3	6.0
Total	54	100.0

Total	28	100.0

According to Table 3, Emami (2006) employed a total of 82 translation strategies at the micro level for metaphors. The most frequently utilised strategy was *the metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is, if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers)* ($n = 37$). In contrast, the least utilised strategy involving *the metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained (that is, the topic and/or point of similarity may be added)* ($n = 3$).

Table 3

Percentages of Translation Strategies Employed by Emami at the Micro Level

Strategies	*f*	%
The metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is, if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers)	37	45.0
The meaning of the metaphor may be translated without keeping the metaphorical imagery	23	28.0
A metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted	10	12.0
A metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as)	9	11.0
The metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained (that is, the topic and/or point of similarity may be added)	3	4.0
Total	82	100.0

According to Table 4, the total of SL-oriented strategies ($N = 37$) employed by Emami (2006) was lower than the total number of TL-oriented strategies ($N = 45$) he utilised at the micro level.

Table 4

Frequency and Percentage of the SL- and TL-Oriented strategies used by Emami at the micro level

SL-Oriented Strategies	*f*	%	TL-Oriented Strategies	*f*	%
The metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is, if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers)	37	100.0	The meaning of the metaphor may be translated without keeping the metaphorical imagery	23	46.0
			A metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as)	10	25.0
			A metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted	9	22.0
			The metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained (that is, the topic and/or point of similarity may be added)	3	6.0
Total	37	100.0	Total	45	100.0

4.1. 1. Reliability Test

The Interrater reliability test was run to check the correlation coefficient among the three raters who were asked to assess the reliability of findings. The results of the test reveal a robust and satisfactory level of correlation among the three raters, signifying a high degree of consensus in their assessments. The strongest correlation was observed between the first and second raters (r = .804), indicating a closely aligned evaluation process. Conversely, the lowest correlation was found between the second and third raters (r = .679), suggesting a slightly weaker but still significant level of agreement in their evaluations.

4.1.2. Chi-Square (X²) Test

The chi-square (X^2) test was conducted to assess the association between the types of translation strategies and the total number of strategies utilised. According to the results of the test, the computed p-value was .441, which exceeds the conventional significance level of .05 (p > .05). Thus, based on this analysis, it can be inferred that there is no statistically significant relationship between the types of translation strategies employed and the overall number of strategies utilised by Emami (2006).

4.1.3. Accuracy Evaluation

The results of the accuracy analysis indicate that the testers agreed with the accuracy of a significant portion (79%) of Emami's (2006) translations. Specifically, 42% of the translations were deemed completely adequate, and 22% were considered most adequate. Additionally, the testers believed that a smaller portion (21%) of the translations were somewhat accurate.

A one-sample Wilcoxon signed ranks test was used to determine the testers' agreement on the accuracy of the Persian translations produced by Emami (2006). The sign value of this test was calculated, and according to Table 8, the p-value was 0, which is lower than 0.05 (p < 0.05). Additionally, the mean score of total answers to the 82 statements was 4.13 out of a maximum score of 5, which is higher than the midpoint of the scale (4.13 > 2.5). This indicates that the testers generally agreed significantly with the accuracy of Emami's Persian translations of the 82 statements.

4.1.4. Clarity Evaluation

According to the results of the clarity evaluation, the testers agreed on the clarity of almost all translations (95%). That is to say, 38% of the translations were rated as *Flawless Persian* and 57% as *Good Persian*. The raters considered 5% of the translations to be more or less clear.

Considering the results of the total answers to all statements, the *p*-value was higher than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Moreover, the total mean score of the answers was 4.22, which is higher than the theoretical mean/median of 2.5. Therefore, the testers' agreement was significant and differed from the theoretical mean. This indicates a high clarity in the Persian translations produced by Emami (2006).

4.1.5. Naturalness Evaluation

The results of the natural evaluation show that two-thirds of the statements (71%) were produced naturally, while 29% were considered unnatural from the testers' viewpoints.

According to the results of the one-sample Wilcoxon test, the *p*-value of the test was higher than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Hence, the testers' opinions were somewhat significantly different from the theoretical mean/median of 1.5. The mean score of the given answers was lower than the theoretical mean/median, indicating a higher-than-average naturalness ($M = 1.28$).

4.2. Qualitative Results

4.2.1. Live Metaphors

According to the findings, Emami (2006) employed various translation strategies for live metaphors in his rendition of Fitzgerald's (1925) text. For instance, consider the metaphor, *reserving judgements is a matter of infinite hope*, which suggests that refraining from judgement allows optimism that individuals may grow into their best selves or be better understood beyond initial impressions. Emami chose to use the strategy of *the metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained,* resulting in a Persian translation that captures and maintains the essence of the original metaphor: leading خودداری از گفتن خوب و بد دیگران خود حاکی از امیدواری بی نهایت است, to accuracy of his translation.

Moreover, Emami preserves both the topic, *reserving judgements,* and the point of similarity, *infinite hope*, which are translated into respectively حاکی از امیدواری بی نهایت and خودداری از گفتن خوب و بد دیگران to ensure that the metaphor's imagery remains intact. This clarified the translation, making it clear and understandable, while the phrase naturally conveys the idea of withholding judgement due to a hopeful outlook. This adjustment helped the text read naturally in Persian and integrate well within the cultural and linguistic context.

In another example, the metaphor, *the moon had risen higher, and floating in the sound was a triangle of silver scales*, compares the moon's reflection on water to a *triangle of silver scales*, vividly illustrating moonlight shimmering on the Sound's surface. Emami (2006) employed the strategy of *a metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as)* to clarify the comparison, resulting in: ماه بالا رفته بود و در تنگه بصورت مثلثی از فنسهای سیمین شناوربود. Here, he added بصورت (like) in Persian to make the metaphor clear for Persian readers.

Additionally, the translation accurately captures the imagery of the moon's reflection appearing as a triangle of silver scales. The translation is somewhat natural, though the word فنسهای سیمین (silver scales) might seem unusual. A more common term, such as قطره‌های, for *scales*, might enhance naturalness because it can evoke a sense of small, shiny objects floating on the water's surface.

Similarly, using the same strategy, Emami (2006) accurately translated the metaphor, a *wafer of a moon was shining over Gatsby's house* into Persian into ماه کلوچه مانندی بر فراز خانه گتسبی میدرخشید, adding مانند (like) to capture Fitzgerald's (1925) comparison of the crescent moon to a wafer, emphasising its delicate and transient nature. In these instances, Emami's strategic translations ensure that the metaphorical depth and imagery from Fitzgerald's original text are effectively conveyed to Persian-speaking readers. This made the translation quite natural, although the word کلوچه (cookie) may not evoke the same delicate imagery as *wafer* does in English.

Fitzgerald (1925) used the metaphor *old sport* in the statement *It's pretty, isn't it, old sport* to convey a sense of camaraderie, closeness,

or even affection between Gatsby and Nick Carraway, where Gatsby refers to Nick as *an old sport*. Emami (2006) translated this metaphorical expression into جوانمرد by using the strategy of *a metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted*. That is to say, the translation Emami (2006) produced was accurate because the term جوانمرد (chivalrous or noble person) captures the camaraderie and affection implied by *old sport*. This led the translation to be clear and effectively communicate the intended meaning. Moreover, it reads naturally and fits well within the Persian cultural context.

Similarly, he employed the same strategy for the metaphor *no— Gatsby turned out all right at the end*, translating it into نه، گتسبی آخرسر درست از آب درآمد. This Persian translation is an idiomatic expression that conveys the idea of someone or something turning out well or successfully, utilising figurative language related to water, which is metaphorical. This Persian idiomatic expression is not only accurate but also clear and easy to understand for Persian readers. The translation is also natural and fits well within the Persian linguistic context.

In another instance, Fitzgerald's (1925) metaphor, *her voice is full of money* characterises Daisy's voice as embodying wealth, suggesting her manner of speaking reveals her privileged background and lifestyle. To translate this metaphor, Emami (2006) used the strategy of *the meaning of the metaphor may be translated without keeping the metaphorical imagery*, resulting in the literal translation صداش پرازپول بود, but accurate in terms of word-for-word meaning. In terms of clarity, this approach was not entirely successful in conveying the metaphor's imagery to the target readers. Moreover, the Persian translation feels somewhat unnatural in Persian, as it lacks the metaphorical depth of the original. A more idiomatic expression might better capture the intended meaning, such as حرفاش بوی پول میداد (her words smelled like money).

In the phrase *as if he were related to one of those intricate machines that register earthquakes ten thousand miles away*, Fitzgerald (1925) metaphorically compares Gatsby to an earthquake-detecting machine. This metaphor highlights Gatsby's extraordinary sensitivity and ability to detect subtle, distant disturbances or

changes, much like an earthquake-detecting machine senses seismic activities from far away. Emami (2006) translated this metaphorical phrase into Persian as گویی به یکی از آن دستگاه‌های پیچیده‌ای متصل بود که وقوع زمین لرزه را از فاصله ده‌ها هزار کیلومتر ثبت می‌کنند by using the strategy *the metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits*.

This approach allowed him to directly transfer the original metaphor into Persian, preserving the metaphorical imagery and making his translation accurate. Furthermore, Emami produced an understandable translation by clearly conveying the metaphor and making the comparison comprehensible. The translation also reads naturally and integrates seamlessly into the Persian linguistic context.

Emami (2006) also successfully employed the retention strategy in translating the metaphor, *the pressure of the world outside* into فشار جهان خارج, accurately conveying the emotional weight and stress Daisy experiences due to external challenges. The term *pressure* suggests a forceful and potentially overwhelming influence from the outside world, maintaining the metaphor's essence. The Emami's choice of the SL metaphor enhanced the clarity and naturalness of his translation because it is easily understood and fits well within Persian language use.

Although Emami (2006) was mostly successful in translating metaphors, there were some instances where he failed due to inappropriate use of the strategy; the *metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits*. For example, in the statement *a singing compulsion, a whispered Listen, a promise*, the metaphor *a singing compulsion* was translated as یک جور کشش و جبر آوازخوان. Emami aimed to retain the metaphorical imagery while ensuring it fits naturally in Persian, directly preserving the metaphor, *a singing compulsion* in the TT without additional explanation or modification.

The Persian translation یک جور کشش و جبر آوازخوان was not considered suitable for directly retaining the metaphor, a *singing compulsion* because it did not effectively convey the original meaning to the target readers. A more appropriate translation could be آوای شور و هیجان (the sound of enthusiasm and excitement), which

captures the idea of a vibrant and exhilarating energy that is difficult to resist or ignore, closely mirroring the metaphorical imagery of a *singing compulsion*. Thus, his choice significantly lacked accuracy, clarity, and naturalness.

Similarly, Emami (2006) made a comparable mistake in translating the metaphor, a *deep vinous sleep* into خواب سنگین شراب آلود. Fitzgerald (1925) used this metaphor to emphasise the profoundness of the woman's sleep at one of Gatsby's parties, induced by excessive wine consumption. To better convey the meaning of this metaphor, Emami could have employed the strategy *the metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained* and suggested (the خواب سنگین شراب آلود، خوابی که از نوشیدن شراب زیاد، عمیق شده بود sleep that was deepened by drinking a lot of wine). This approach retains the metaphor while adding an explanatory detail to clarify its meaning for the target readers.

4.2.2. Dead Metaphors

As the results indicate, Emami (2006) employed four out of five of Larson's (1985) translation strategies to handle dead metaphors. These strategies include *the metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits*, *the meaning of the metaphor may be translated without keeping the metaphorical imagery*, *a metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted*, and *a metaphor may be translated as a simile*. For example, the metaphor *you can hold your tongue* was translated into آدم میتونه جلوی زبونشو بگیره using the strategy *the metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits*. This was an appropriate choice because the phrase is understood by Persian speakers and sounds natural in the context of keeping silent or refraining from speaking, similar to its use in English.

Using the same strategy, Emami (2006) rendered the SL metaphor *a brisk yellow bug* into سوسک چابک زردرنگی. Fitzgerald (1925) used this metaphor to describe the station wagon used to transport people to and from trains throughout the day and into the night. Although this translation may not be as familiar or evocative to target readers and does not convey the exact meaning of the SL metaphor, Emami attempted to retain the metaphor with the perception that it would be

clear and effective in the Persian language. This made his translation somewhat unnatural, yet accurate and clear, as it conveyed the imagery of a quick, yellow insect, even though it might not evoke the same vivid image of a station wagon for Persian readers.

In another instance, the SL metaphor *I jumped out of bed* was accurately translated by Emami (2006) into از رختخواب بیرون جستم using the strategy that *the metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits*. This choice not only retained the metaphorical expression but also effectively conveyed the action of quickly getting out of bed as intended in the original English metaphor to the target readers. This led to its clarity and naturalness.

The SL metaphor, *reach me a rose,* was accurately translated as بی‌زحمت یک دانه گل رز بچین بده من using the strategy of *the meaning of the metaphor may be translated without keeping the metaphorical imagery*. This translation directly means, *pick and give me a rose, please*, conveying the literal action without retaining any potential metaphorical imagery from the original phrase. The translation was clear, though it lost the metaphorical potential of the original. Additionally, it sounded natural and polite, fitting well in Persian.

Similarly, Emami (2006) employed this strategy for the SL metaphor *he was cleaned out*, translating it as موجودیش را پاک باخته است to convey the meaning of losing all of Ferret's money in gambling, one of those who came to Gatsby's house that summer, without preserving the original metaphorical imagery. The Persian idiomatic expression was clear and effective and fit well within Persian idiomatic expressions.

In his translation, Emami (2006) chose to convey the meaning of the SL metaphor *left word with the butler* using the same strategy, translating it as به پیشخدمت دستور داد, which effectively communicated the intended meaning. His choice was made accurately and well understood by the target audience.

For the metaphor *the rock of the world*, which reflects Gatsby's belief in the power of imagination and the transient nature of worldly things, Emami (2006) used the strategy of *a metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted* and translated it as سنگ شالوده دنیا. This ensured that the metaphorical

imagery was preserved in a culturally and linguistically relevant way for Persian-speaking readers, leading to its accuracy and clarity. Emami also employed this strategy to translate *brought to light* as پرده برداشت, effectively replacing the metaphorical expression with a Persian equivalent that conveys a similar meaning of revealing or exposing something. This approach enhances its understandability and naturalness in Persian.

In another instance, Emami (2006) substituted the SL metaphor with a TL metaphor when he translated, *he was on the point of collapse* as چیزی نمانده بود از پا درآید. This translation maintains a figurative language comparable to the original metaphor, preserving the metaphorical imagery and conveying a similar sense of being on the verge of breaking down.

The SL metaphor *to make a Christmas tree of Gatsby's enormous garden* was translated by Emami (2006) as برای تبدیل باغ بزرگ گتسبی به یک کاج نوئلی using the strategy of *a metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as)*. In Fitzgerald's (1925) original text, this metaphor vividly describes Gatsby's Garden adorned with coloured lights, comparing it to a Christmas tree decorated extravagantly for the holiday season. Emami's translation skillfully transforms the metaphor into a simile by directly comparing Gatsby's Garden to a Christmas tree using به یک (be yek), which means *like* or *as*. This allows Persian readers to grasp the festive and extravagant atmosphere conveyed by the original metaphor.

4.3. Discussion

As the results indicated, Emami (2006) utilised all of Larson's (1984) translation strategies to handle live metaphors from English to Persian. While Emami generally applied the strategy *the metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits* appropriately, there were instances where this approach was less successful (see section 4.2.1). However, Emami's (2006) translations for live metaphors were generally accurate and clear, with varying degrees of naturalness. While some translations effectively conveyed the original metaphors and fitted well within the Persian linguistic context, others felt less natural and could benefit from more idiomatic expressions or additional explanatory details.

Similar to his treatment of live metaphors, Emami (2006) effectively employed four out of five of Larson's (1984) translation strategies for dead metaphors, clearly conveying them to the target readers. He showed a strong preference for using ST-oriented strategies rather than TT-oriented ones when dealing with dead metaphors. Although Larson suggests that it is not necessary to retain the image of a dead metaphor during translation, Emami skillfully used *the metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits* strategy for more than half of the metaphors, preserving the metaphorical imagery and making its picture clear for the target readers.

Moreover, Emami's (2006) translations of dead metaphors are generally accurate, clear, and natural. He skillfully uses different strategies to maintain the original metaphors' meaning and imagery. However, some translations, like *a brisk yellow bug*, may not evoke the same vivid imagery in Persian culture, indicating the challenge of cultural differences in metaphor translation.

This study's findings contrast with Zhuo and Zhu's (2021) study, where a preference for literal translation, an ST-oriented strategy, was observed in handling metaphors. Similarly, Ashuja'a et al. (2019) reported that literal translation was the most frequent strategy, while explication, a TT-oriented strategy, was the least frequent. In contrast, this study aligns with Sitangang and Tambunsaribu's (2023) study, showing a preference for TT-oriented strategies over ST-oriented ones. Putri's (2023) study also reflects a similar trend, with a strong preference for TT-oriented strategies.

It is essential to recognise the constraints of this research. Primarily, it examined only the Persian translation of Fitzgerald's (1925) *The Great Gatsby*, using the most complete version available during the study. The research was limited to the issues encountered in translating metaphors between English and Persian. Furthermore, the analysis centred on the translator's approaches at both micro and macro levels, within the framework of Iranian culture. Future studies might broaden their scope to include various languages and cultural settings, providing a more thorough insight into the difficulties and methods of metaphor translation.

5. Conclusion

This study systematically made an objective judgement on the translator's performance in rendering metaphors from English to Persian based on *accuracy*, *clarity*, and *naturalness* in the context of metaphor translation. The primary aim was to critically analyse metaphor translation and the strategies employed by Emami (2006) to handle these cultural elements and effectively communicate with the target audience.

The findings indicate that Emami applied all of Larson's translation strategies for both live and dead metaphors. Emami showed a preference for TT-oriented strategies over ST-oriented ones, indicating an effort to make the translation more comprehensible to the target readers. Such a translation aligns with Larson's suggestion for translators to "avoid wrong, zero, or ambiguous meaning" (p. 278), as conveying the meaning of most metaphors to target readers is often challenging when employing ST-oriented strategies like literal translation or retention strategies.

In conclusion, Emami (2006) demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of both *death* and *live* metaphors in his translations of *The Great Gatsby*. He effectively applied diverse translation techniques to maintain accuracy and clarity while aiming for naturalness in Persian. His translations generally successfully convey Fitzgerald's (1925) metaphorical imagery and intended meanings to Persian readers, though there are occasional challenges posed by cultural or linguistic differences. Emami's approach ensured that the depth and complexity of metaphors were preserved, enabling Persian readers to appreciate the literary nuances of the original text. According to Larson's (1984) evaluation model, the Persian translator excelled in translating metaphors from English to Persian, successfully establishing effective communication with the target audience through suitable metaphorical translation strategies and solutions.

The present study provides recommendations for translation students, prospective critics, and translation teachers. For translation students and critics, it is advised to first enhance their theoretical understanding of translation and familiarise themselves with various

models in the field. They should then apply these models in practice, which can be facilitated through self-taught methods. This involves studying existing research that utilises these models to gain practical insights. Importantly, the choice of translation model should align with the specific focus of their evaluation. For instance, Larson's (1985) or Lakoff and Johnson's (2003) models may be suitable for evaluating metaphors in literary texts, while Schäffner's (2004) model could be appropriate for judging metaphors in political texts.

Attending domestic and international seminars and workshops is recommended to further refine their knowledge and skills in translation. Translation teachers play a pivotal role in promoting and expanding this area within Translation Studies. It is kindly suggested that they integrate trancism into their syllabi and support students who wish to explore trancism as a research area for their theses and dissertations.

The present study is limited to Fitzgerald's (1925) *The Great Gatsby* and its Persian translation produced by Emami (2006), which may not represent broader trends in Persian translations of English literature. Moreover, the analysis is confined to metaphor translation, excluding other figurative language forms or translation challenges. The study is also limited to English-to-Persian translation, which might not address metaphor translation challenges in other language pairs. Additionally, the reliance on Larson's (1984) taxonomy may limit the scope to predefined categories, potentially overlooking other nuanced strategies.

References

ABDI, H. (2024). An Objective Criticism of the Persian Translation of Dickens' *Hard Times* According to Broeck's Systemic Model of Trancism. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 9*. 1-10.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100764

ABDI, H. (2021a). Examining the Appropriateness of Reiss's Functionalist-oriented Approach to Trancism. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *11*(5). 561-567.
http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1105.15

ABDI, H. (2021b). Providing a Critical Appraisal of the Persian Translation of Coelho's the Devil and Miss Prym on the Basis of House's Revised Model of Trancism. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies, 2*(2). 10-18. https://doi.org/10.48185/jtls.v2i2.286

ALIBABAEI, F. (2020). English Translation of Persian Metaphors in Iranian Political News Discourse: A Relevance Theory Approach. *Journal of Language and Discourse Practice, 1*(2). 1-10. https://doi.org/10.14744 /ldpj.2020

APROUZ, H., & MOHAMMADI, R. R. (2022). Translation Quality Assessment of Metaphors in Omar Khayyam's Quatrains: Conceptual Metaphor in Focus. *Journal of Language and Translation, 12*(2). 59-71. https://doi.org/10.30495/ttlt.2022.690706

ASHUJA'A, A., ALMATARI, S., & ALWARD, A. (2021). Challenges and Solutions of Translating English Scientific Metaphors into Arabic from Students' Perspective. *Alandalus Journal for Humanities and Social Sciences, 8*(45). 361-384. https://search.emarefa.net/en/detail/BIM-1283120-challenges-and-solutions-of-translating-english-scientific-m

ASHUJA'A, A., ALMATARI, S., & ALWARD, A. (2019). Exploring Strategies of Translating Metaphor from English into Arabic with Reference to Scientific Texts. *International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies, 7*(3). 26-38. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.7n.3p.26

BERMAN, A. (2021). Translation and the Trial of the Foreign. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Translation Studies Reader* (4th ed) (pp. 247-260). Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/The-Translation-Studies-Reader/Venuti-Venuti/p/book/9780367235970

DAGNEV, I., & Chervenkova, Z. (2020). *Comparative Study of Metaphor in Literary Texts and their Translations* [Conference session]. *5th International e-Conference on Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*. Center for Open Access in Science. DOI: 10.32591/coas.e-conf.05.09099d

DESAI, V. (2020). Translation and Translation Criticism: Probing a Reciprocal Interrelation. *Translation Today, 4*(2). 21-36.

GHOLAMI, S., MONTASHERY, I., & KHORRAMI, M. (2016). Metaphors in Arabic and English Texts: A Case Study of Translation of Metaphors in the English Versions of Al-Sahifah Al-Sajjadiyyah. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, 21.* 56-66. https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JLLL/article/view/30131

HADLA, L. S. H. (2017). Objectivity in Translation Quality Assessment. *International Review of Management and Business Research, 6*(4). 1360-1365. https://irmbrjournal.com/paper_details.php?id=736

HE, S., SHUTTLEWORTH, M., & WANG, C. (2021). Translating Cognitive and Linguistic Metaphors in Popular Science: A Case Study of Scientific Discoveries. *TransLogos, 5*(2). 1-26. https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/transLogos.45

HESABI, A., BAKHSHI, M., & SADRNIA, P. (2021). Metaphors and the Degree of Conventionality in Translation of Prose Fiction: A Fraction of the Whole in Focus. *Hikma, 20*(2). 153 – 176. https://doi.org/10.21071/hikma.v20i2.13369

HOLMES, J. S. (2004) The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In L. Venuti (Ed.), The *Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 172– 185). Routledge.

HONG, W., & ROSSI, C. (2021). The Cognitive Turn in Metaphor Translation Studies: A Critical Overview. *Journal of Translation Studies, 5*(2). 83–115. https://inserm.hal.science/ LIDILEM/hal-03342406v1

KALDA, A. (2021). Translating Perception Metaphors: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Implications. *Taikomoji kalbotyra,* 16. 86-113. https://doi.org/10.15388/Taikalbot.2021.16.6

KUHI, D., AGHRABAEI-FAM, Y., & REZAEI, S. (2022). Metaphorical Analysis of Iranian High School Students' Beliefs about Conceptual Themes of Foreign Language Education. *International TESOL Journal, 17*(1). 63-91. https://connect.academics.education/ index.php/itj/article/view/372

LAKOFF, G., & JOHNSEN, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. The University of Chicago Press. https://www.textosenlinea.com.ar/libros/

LAMBERT, J., & VAN GORP, H. (2014). On Describing Translations. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation* (pp. 42-53). Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/The-Manipulation-of-Literature-Routledge

LARSON, M. (1984). *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalent*. University Press of America. https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.31.4.18rad

MAHMOOD, A. H. (2009). Objectivity in Literary Translation Assessment: A Model for Teacher of Translation. *Diala*, *1*(33), 1-31. https://djhr.uodiyala.edu.iq/index.php/DJHR2022/article/view/1530/ 1419

Hamidreza Abdi

MORADI, N. & JABBARI, M. (2020). A Study of Rendering Metaphors in the Translation of the Titles of Persian Medical Articles. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education Journal, 3*(1). 540-551. https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v3i1.675

NEWMARK, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hal International Ltd.

NEWMARK, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation.* Pergamon Press.

REISS, K. (2000). Translation Criticism- the Potentials & Limitations: Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality assessment (E. F. Rhodes, Trans.). St. Jerome Publishing.

SCHÄFFNER, C. (2004). Metaphor and Translation: Some Implications of a Cognitive Approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36. 1253–1269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.012

SHERRIF, K. M. (2008). Reviewing Translations: Translator's Invisibility Revisited. *Translation Today, 5*(1&2). 26–31.

SINGH, S. (2023). *What is Descriptive Research? Definition, Methods, Types and Examples. Researcher.Life*. https://researcher.life/blog/article/what-is-descriptive-research-definition-methods-types-and-examples/

SITANGANG, G., & TAMBUNSARIBU, G. (2023). The Comparison of Metaphors Translation Strategies in Subtitling of the King's Speech Film. *Prodi Sastra Inggris UKI*. 66-82. https://doi.org/ I:10.33541/dia.v10i2.5394

TOURY, G. (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. John Benjamins. https://benjamins.com/catalog/btl.100

VALERO, C. (1995). Translation Criticism as an Independent Area of Study: Developing a Framework for Objective Criticism. *Livius,* 7. 201-212. http://hdl.handle.net/10612/6375

VAN DEN BROECK, R. (2014). Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism: A Model of its Analytic Function. In T. Hermans (Ed.), The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation (pp.54-62). Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/The-Manipulation-of-Literature-Routledge

WIDIYANTARI, Y. (2012). The Strategy to Translate Metaphor. *Register Journal, 5*(1). 49-72. https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v5i1.251

ZABALBEASCOA, P. (1996). Translating Jokes for Dubbed Television Situation Comedies. *The Translator, 2*(2). 235-257.

https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1996.10798976

ZHUO, Y., & ZHU, M. (2021). A Study on the Metaphor Translation Strategies in Selected Modern Chinese Essays 1 by Zhang Peiji from the Perspective of Conceptual Blending Theory. *English Linguistics Research, 10*(3). 55-65. https://doi.org/10.5430/elr.v10n3p55

<div align="center">***</div>

About the Author

Hamidreza Abdi

Hamidreza Abdi is a PhD candidate in Translation and Language Sciences at Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain. He is also a freelance researcher in the field of Translation Studies, with over six years of experience. Recently, his interest has been in the concept of *Trancism*, which refers to Translation Criticism.

Email: hamidreza[DOT]abdi[AT]upf[DOT]edu

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0164-2887

Cite this Work: