

International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies

ISSN: 2308-5460



Translation of Metaphors in Saleh Hosseini's and Khojasteh Keyhan's Persian Translations of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*: A Comparative Study Based on Newmark's and Lakoff and Johnson's Classifications of Metaphors

[PP: 94-106]

Majid Amerian

Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities
Arak University, Arak, **Iran**

Moussa Ahmadian

Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities
Arak University, Arak, **Iran**

Rezvan Derispour

Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities
Arak University, Arak, **Iran**

ABSTRACT

The present study was devoted to compare the use of most frequent kinds of metaphors in Woolf's (1994) *To the Lighthouse* and two Persian translations of this novel by Hosseini (2008) and Keyhan (2007) based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) and Newmark's (1988) classifications of metaphors. The study also aimed to find out how much the source text and the two translations are similar in using metaphors. Following the model Emami (1993) used in the analysis of *The Adventures of Haji Baba of Isphahan*, 45 pages of *To the Lighthouse* were chosen from the first, middle, and final sections of the novel for the metaphorical analyses. The results of the study revealed that ontological metaphors and standard metaphors were used more frequently than the other kinds of metaphors in the source text and the two translations. The results of chi-square tests showed that in terms of Lakoff and Johnson's classification, there were no statistically significant differences between either of the two translations and the source text and no statistically significant differences between the two translations. On the other hand, regarding Newmark's classification, though there were no statistically significant differences between the two translations, there were statistically significant differences between either of the two translations and the source text. Moreover, the two classifications of metaphors were put together to see how much correspondence exists between them. The results indicated that ontological, orientational, and structural metaphors are highly correspondent to standard metaphors.

Keywords: Translation, Metaphor, *To the Lighthouse*, Newmark's Classification, Lakoff and Johnson's Classification

ARTICLE INFO

The paper received on: **04/08/2015**, Reviewed on: **19/10/2015**, Accepted after revisions on: **31/12/2015**

Suggested citation:

Amerian, M. Ahmadian, M. & Derispour, R. (2015). Translation of Metaphors in Saleh Hosseini's and Khojasteh Keyhan's Persian Translations of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*: A Comparative Study Based on Newmark's and Lakoff and Johnson's Classifications of Metaphors. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 3(4), 94-106. Retrieved from <http://www.eltjournal.org>

1. Introduction

The great influence Aristotle's accounts of metaphor continue to have on any writing or study of metaphor justifies revisiting his ideas. According to Gibbs (1994), 'the reason for starting with Aristotle is not simply chronological but is that Aristotle's views have been so influential in both traditional and contemporary discussions of metaphor interpretation' (p. 210). In *Poetics*, Aristotle defines metaphor as 'the application of an alien name by transference either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or by analogy, that is, proportion' (Butcher, 1902, pp. 77-79). Aristotle believed that we learn the most from metaphors and it is by means of such learning that we are attracted to them. Mahon (1999) and Cameron (2003) have argued against some long-lasting false assumptions directed toward Aristotle. Mahon points out to some remarks that have resulted in a controversy which centers on at least four claims concerning metaphor and presents his arguments against them. Cameron (2003) argued that Aristotle's view of metaphor is much more complicated than articulated by some authors (e.g. Black, Aitchison, Gibbs, as cited in Cameron 2003) as "a renaming or substitution of one term by another".

Specific characteristics of literary translation mean each literary genre needs to be translated with special care to its unique features. In this regard, translation of metaphor is an area of serious challenge for the translators of literary texts. Lack of proper attention to translating metaphor has been acknowledged by some authors (e.g., Broeck, 1981; Gentzler, 2000). Hanne (2006) believed that 'metaphor may be said to be impossible for much the same reason as translation, in that the making of metaphors suggests equivalence between

semantic domains which have little in common' (p. 210).

During the long history of metaphor studies many linguists and theorists have given their own definition of metaphor and its parts (e.g., Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Broeck, 1981; Newmark, 1988; Black, 1993). On the other hand, metaphors have been classified in many different ways by different authors including Black (1993), Newmark (1988), and Lakoff and Johnson (1980). For the purposes of this study, Newmark's and Lakoff and Johnson's classifications are taken into consideration. Newmark distinguishes six types of metaphors: dead, cliché, stock, adapted, recent, and original. The conceptual metaphor theory or the *Cognitive Theory* put forward by Lakoff and Johnson has influenced discussions of metaphor to a large extent. Lakoff and Johnson distinguish three types of metaphors: structural metaphors, orientational metaphors and ontological metaphors.

The number of studies that have adopted the cognitive view of metaphor, or more specifically, Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classification of metaphors as the basis of their analyses is limited and none of the studies done on translating metaphors from English to Persian or vice versa has studied the translation of metaphorical expressions based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) and Newmark's (1988) classifications of metaphors simultaneously. On the other hand, taking into account the metaphors' contribution to language learning and teaching, the vital role metaphors play in developing the sociolinguistic competence of EFL learners, the problems associated with the translation of metaphors, and somehow the ignorance of the problems associated with the translation of prose, the researchers hope this study sheds light on some problems



associated with the translation of metaphors in EFL setting.

It should be noted that although many researchers have chosen metaphor as the subject field of their study and some theories have been proposed for the translation of metaphor, there is not any unanimously agreed theory for the translation of metaphor and the study of the choices made by different translators may lead to understanding the nature of metaphor translation. Studies devoted to the translation of metaphors in the context of Iran have mainly dealt with Newmark's (1988) proposed procedures for the translation of standard metaphors and their application by the translators in poetry, novels, subtitling, etc. In this study, the researchers mainly focused on the *kinds* of metaphors in selected pages of *To the Lighthouse* (1994) and the corresponding pages in Hosseini's (2008) and Keyhan's (2007) translations of this novel based on both Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) and Newmark's (1988) classifications of metaphors, so in addition to be a comparative study dealing with two translations, this study is concerned with two well-established classifications of metaphors simultaneously and examines the degree of correspondences between these two classifications, a point which has not been addressed previously in the domain of Persian language to the best of the researchers' knowledge. The simultaneous adoption of these two classifications of metaphors as the basis of the analyses is justified by the apparent correspondences between these two classifications. For the purpose of analyzing the degree of correspondences between the two classifications, Table 1 was designed.

Table 1: General Model for the Percentages of the Correspondences between Lakoff and Johnson's

(1980) and Newmark's (1988) Classifications Separately for the Two Translators

Lakoff and Johnson Newmark	Ontological in Hosseini's Translation (%)	Ontological in Keyhan's Translation (%)	Oriental in Hosseini's Translation (%)	Oriental in Keyhan's Translation (%)	Structural in Hosseini's Translation (%)	Structural in Keyhan's Translation (%)
Standard						
Dead						
Cliché						
Original						
Adapted						
Recent						
Total						

2. Literature Review

Etymologically speaking, 'metaphor derives from the Greek word *metapherein* in which *meta* means "over" and *pherein* means "to bear" or "to carry", so metaphor means the carrying of meaning of one word to another word' (Gentzler, 2000, p. 941). On the other hand, metaphors have been classified in many different ways by different authors including Black (1993), Newmark (1988), and Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

The largely diverse views of metaphor mainly fall into two groups: the traditional metaphor theory and the modern metaphor theory. In the traditional theory of metaphor, metaphorical expressions and everyday language are assumed as two distinct areas which have no communality. This means the absence of metaphors in everyday language and according to Lakoff (1993), the belief in metaphors' use of "mechanisms outside the realm of everyday conventional language". Lakoff and Johnson (1980) oppose the conventional view that metaphor is just a poetic device and believe that metaphor is not only a matter of language, but also a matter of thought and action. It is pervasive in everyday life.

The conceptual metaphor theory chiefly draws our attention to the fact that metaphor is not only a matter of language but also a matter of cognition. As Lakoff and Johnson assert in the *Afterword Section* added to their book (1980), 'in the twenty-five years since

we first discovered conceptual metaphor, researchers in fields as diverse as literary theory, legal studies, linguistics, and the philosophy of science have made exciting applications of the theory' (p. 273). The possible effects of developments in cognitive linguistics may be evident in translation studies. Schaffner (2004) has argued that the conceptualization underlying any given metaphorical expression is related to its translation, too. In fact, in responding to the question of translatability of metaphors, instead of considering solely the metaphorical expression identified in ST, we should consider the conceptual systems of both source and target culture to explore similarities and differences between them and thereby, translate the metaphorical expressions more precisely.

As stated before, the vast majority of studies devoted to the translation of metaphors from English to Persian or vice versa have been dealing with the analysis of the strategies employed by the translators based on seven procedures for the translation of stock metaphors proposed by Newmark (1988). Studies carried out with reference to Newmark's procedures show the practicability of these procedures in translating metaphors in as diverse domains as dialogues and subtitles of films, sonnets etc. Iranmanesh (2009) analyzed the dialogues and subtitles of the American film *Sin City* based on Newmark's (1988) proposed procedures for the translation of metaphors and concluded that Newmark's strategies appear to be practical in the subtitling of metaphors. On the other hand, these studies somehow indicate the predominance of reproducing the same image in the TL over other strategies. Navidpour (2010) carried out a study which set out to examine the applicability of the principles of relevance to the Newmark's translation strategies for translating

metaphors and determine efficiency of each strategy. The results of this study indicated that reproducing the same image is the most frequently used strategy in translating metaphors into Persian and the relevance theory is capable of explaining these results. Rastad (2010) carried out a study in which he sought to find out which strategy is the most frequent strategy in translating metaphors into English in Sa'di's *Bustan* according to the strategies of translating metaphors proposed by Newmark (1988). Like Navidpour, Rastad concluded that reproducing the same image in the TL was the dominant strategy used by the translators. Moreover, he found out that the translators had a tendency toward a more literal translation. Nekooeeyan (2012) analyzed strategies for the translation of metaphors in two different translations of Shakespeare's sonnets by Tafazzoli and Moghaddam in a descriptive, corpus based research. The researcher investigated these two Persian translations to find their most and least used strategies for translation of metaphors; the framework by the researcher was Newmark's (1988) seven proposed procedures for the translation of stock metaphors. It was concluded that in Tafazzoli, reproducing the same image in the TL was the most frequently used strategy, so this translation was analogous to the SL regarding figurative language and literary devices. In Moghaddam, reproducing the same image in the TL was used less than Tafazzoli. In other words, Navidpour, Rastad, and Nekooeeyan obtained similar results: the tendency of the translators toward reproducing the same image in the TL and a literal translation. Jafari (2008) investigated the approaches and strategies employed by Iranian translators in the translation of metaphors used in six subtitled films into Persian. The results of this study were different from the



other above-mentioned studies: the Iranian translators converted metaphors to their sense.

However, some researchers have also paid attention to the cognitive view of metaphor and focused their attention on the translation of metaphors based on the cognitive view. Ahvaziyan (2009) investigated the translatability of metaphors based on the conceptual metaphor theory. For this purpose, she analyzed three English novels and their Persian translations. The translators employed three strategies for handling such metaphoric expressions: transferring the image, giving an equivalent image, and paraphrase. The findings of this study showed that the majority of English metaphoric expressions were translated metaphorically. In another study, Amiri (2012) attempted to find the most frequent strategies in translating metaphors from English to Persian in seven lyrics books based on the cognitive approach to metaphor. In her study, she used Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classification of metaphors and the cognitive translation schemes proposed by Kovecses (as cited in Amiri, 2012). After categorization and the analysis of the data, it was concluded that these two languages share a wide variety of metaphorical concepts or conceptual mappings. On the other hand, the Iranian translators showed a tendency toward reproducing the similar metaphorical concepts and similar metaphorical expressions in the TT. Abdullah, Awal, and Safarnejad (2013) examined the translation of emotive metaphorical expressions of happiness from Persian to English in "Savushun", a Persian novel by Simin Daneshvar. In this study, the basis for the investigation of the metaphorical expressions was the metaphor identification procedure (MIP), proposed by the Pragglejaz group and

general framework of the conceptual metaphor theory (CMT). The results of the study were indicative of both similarities and differences between the source text and the two translations in terms of the conceptual metaphors. The three strategies employed by the translators in Ahvaziyan's study, that is, transferring the image, giving an equivalent image, and paraphrase, the tendency of translators toward reproducing the similar metaphorical concepts and similar metaphorical expressions in Amiri's study, and the case of both similarities and differences between the source text and the two translations in Abdullah et al's (2013) study reveal the potential similarities between the conceptual metaphors of English and Persian languages.

In both of the above cases, the researchers have not considered the translation of metaphors based on Newmark's and Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classifications simultaneously which is the focus point in this study.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Questions

To investigate the above mentioned points, this study addresses the following questions:

1. Is there any difference between Hosseini's (2008) and Keyhan's (2007) translations of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* in the translation of metaphors based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classification of metaphors?
2. Is there any difference between Hosseini's (2008) and Keyhan's (2007) translations of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* in the translation of metaphors based on Newmark's (1988) classification of metaphors?

3.2. Corpus of the Study

Woolf's English novel, *To the Lighthouse* (1994) (Text A) and the two Persian translations of this novel by Hosseini (2008) (Text B) and Keyhan (2007) (Text C) were chosen as the corpus of this study. Forty five pages of the total one hundred and fifty nine pages of *To the Lighthouse* were chosen in a systematic way to conduct the study, that is, the first fifteen pages, the middle fifteen pages, and the final fifteen pages of the novel were chosen for the analysis of metaphors based on Newmark's (1988) and Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classifications of metaphors. This model of choosing samples from different parts of the novel was adopted following the model Emami (1993) used in the analysis of *The Adventures of Haji Baba of Isphahan*. As far as metaphors do not occur at just a single specific level of discourse, their analysis was not limited just to one of these levels in this study and they were analyzed variably at the level of the word, phrase, and sentence.

3.3. Procedure for Data Collection and Classification

The first step to conduct the study was to identify and classify metaphorical expressions in Texts A, B, and C. In order to collect the relevant data, either of Texts A, B, or C was studied separately; that is, Text A was studied for the metaphorical expressions and after identifying the metaphorical expressions, the corresponding expressions (whether metaphorical or non-metaphorical) in the other two texts were identified. These steps were also applied separately to Texts B and C. 579 metaphorical expressions were found as the results of the analyses in Woolf's (1994) novel, Hosseini's (2008) and Keyhan's (2007) translations. Then, these data were presented in a table for comparative analyses. In the course of finding the metaphorical expressions, the researchers also took into account those metaphors of Text A which were dealt with

as non-metaphor in Texts B or C and also those non-metaphorical expressions of Text A which were translated metaphorically in Text B or Text C.

4. Analysis and Discussion

In order to make a comparison between the translations of metaphors in Texts A, B and C, first, the frequencies and percentages of different kinds of metaphors based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) and Newmark's (1988) classifications were calculated in the three texts (Table 2 & Table 3).

Table 2: Frequencies and Percentages of the Metaphors Based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Classification in the Source Text and the Two Translations

			Lakoff and Johnson			Total
			Ontological	Orientalional	Structural	
Translator	Original (Text A)	Count	339	51	19	409
		% within Translator	82.9%	12.5%	4.6%	100%
	Hosseini (Text B)	Count	399	47	17	463
		% within Translator	86.2%	10.1%	3.7%	100%
	Keyhan (Text C)	Count	277	46	12	335
		% within Translator	82.7%	13.7%	3.6%	100%
Total		Count	1015	144	48	1207
		% within Translator	84.1%	11.9%	4.0%	100%

According to Table 2, the use of ontological, orientational, and structural metaphors follow the same order in Texts A, B, and C: ontological metaphors have been used more than the other kinds of metaphors and the next frequent kinds of metaphors are orientational and structural metaphors, respectively.

Table 3: Frequencies and Percentages of the Metaphors Based on Newmark's (1988) Classification in the Source Text and the Two Translations



			Newmark				Total
			Standard	Cliché	Dead	Original+ Recent+ Adapted ¹	
Translator	Original (Text A)	Count	237	17	38	85= (41+42+2)	377
		% within Translator	62.9%	4.5%	10.1%	22.5%	100%
	Hosseini (Text B)	Count	266	70	70	41= (41+0+0)	447
		% within Translator	59.50%	15.65%	15.65%	9.20%	100%
	Keyhan (Text C)	Count	175	46	56	30= (30+0+0)	307
		% within Translator	57.0%	15.0%	18.2%	9.8%	100%
Total		Count	678	133	164	156	1131
		% within Translator	59.9%	11.8%	14.5%	13.8%	100%

According to Table 3, the uses of standard metaphors exceed the uses of the other kinds of metaphors suggested by Newmark (1988) in Texts A, B, and C. However, the orders of the uses of metaphors do not follow a similar path in the source text and the two translations.

In order to see the extent of similarity between either of Texts B or C and Text A in the use of metaphors suggested by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Pearson's chi-squared test was administered; the results of which are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Chi-Square Test for Comparing Hosseini's (2008) and Keyhan's (2007) Translations with Woolf's (1994) Novel Based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Classification

		Lakoff and Johnson	
		Chi-Square	3.511
		df	2
Hosseini's (2008) Translation and Woolf's (1994) Novel	Asymp. Sig.		0.173
Keyhan's (2007) Translation and Woolf's (1994) novel	Chi-Square		1.163
	df		2
	Asymp. Sig.		0.559

As Table 4 shows, Asymp. Sig. turned out to be 0.173 and 0.559 for the comparisons between Hosseini's (2008) translation and Woolf's (1994) novel, and Keyhan's (2007) translation and Woolf's novel respectively. As Asymp. Sig. is higher than 0.05 alpha level in both cases, there is no statistically

significant difference between neither of Texts B and C and Text A in the use of the three kinds of metaphors suggested by Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

This leads to the assumption that as far as the conceptual metaphors analyzed in this study are concerned, English and Persian languages share similar conceptual mappings with each other. In order to see what this means, some practical examples such as the following were analyzed.

The use of "the cold Scotch" by Woolf and translating this phrase to "اسکاتلندی های سرد مزاج" /eskatlandi- ha- ye / sard- mazaj/ by Hosseini and Keyhan shows the use of COLD IS UNFRIENDLY as a conceptual metaphor to describe the behavior of Scotch people. The physical basis for this metaphor is that the faster movement in hot objects resembles a more animated and friendly movement, but the slower movement resembles a static and rather dull condition. As a result, ascribing "cold" to Scotch people is a means to show their unfriendliness. As we can see, Persian translators have also made use of the word "سرد" /særd/ (which is corresponding to the English word cold) to describe the unfriendly behavior of Scotch people. This means the conceptual metaphor COLD IS UNFRIENDLY also exists in Persian language.

Lack of significant differences between either of the translations and the source text in terms of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classification is in line with the results obtained in Amiri's (2012) study and Abdullah et al's (2013) study. As stated before, the existence of similarities between Persian and English languages was underlined by the results of these studies. In the case of happiness metaphors, Abdullah et al (2013) point out to the existence of the conceptual metaphor HAPPINESS IS A

FLUID IN A CONTAINER. In the present study, the authors found the existence of the similar conceptual metaphor, that is, HAPPINESS IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER in such linguistic metaphors as his "burning desire" translated as «اشتياق سوزان او» /eshtiagh- e / sozan- e / ou / by Hosseini. In this metaphorical expression, an emotion (desire) is characterized as a fluid capable of burning.

Table 5: Chi-Square Test for Comparing Hosseini's (2008) and Keyhan's (2007) Translations with Woolf's (1994) novel based on Newmark's (1988) Classification

		Newmark
	Chi-Square	173.301
	df	3
Hosseini's (2008) Translation and Woolf's (1994) Novel	Asymp. Sig.	0.000
Keyhan's (2007) Translation and Woolf's (1994) novel	Chi-Square	118.862
	Df	3
	Asymp. Sig.	0.000

As can be seen in Table 5, Asymp. Sig. amounts to 0.000 for the comparisons between either of the two translations and the source text and is smaller than 0.05. In other words, there is a statistically significant difference between either of Texts B and C and the original novel in terms of Newmark's classification.

The findings in Table 5 denote the metaphorical variation by Newmark's (1988) classification when it comes to the cross-cultural metaphorical comparisons. To analyze the reason behind the existence of a significant difference between the two translations and Woolf's novel based on Newmark's classification, we see that the parts of body are included in this classification and fall into the category of dead metaphors. In this study, there are so many expressions which lead to the assumption that English and Persian languages make use of different parts of the body in different ways.

Translating "prospect" to "چشم انداز" /tʃɛʃm ændaz/, "amuse" to "سرگرم" /særgærm kærdæn/, "again" to "از سر نو" /æz sære nou/, "far away" to "دور دست" /du:r dæst/, "take their time" to "سر صبر" /sære sæbr/, "ruthless" to "سنگدل" /sængdel/, and "enrage" to "سرخشم" /sære xæʃm/, "to feel very rough" to "احساس خشم شدید کردن" /ehsase xæʃme ʃædid kærdæn/, indicates how English and Persian languages are different in the metaphorical uses of the parts of the body. In fact, an expression regarded as metaphorical in one of these languages may be non-metaphorical in the other language.

The problems which are associated with making different uses of the parts of the body in different languages are also emphasized by Littlemore and Low (2006). They show, for example, how the metaphoric use of the word "eye" is different in English and French languages. In this study, we see that those parts of the body which lead to the creation of metaphoric expressions in Persian language may not be regarded as metaphoric in English. Accordingly, the results obtained in this study support the point previously mentioned by Littlemore and Low.

Navidpour (2010), Rastad (2010), and Nekooeeyan (2012) concluded that reproducing the same image is the dominant strategy for the translation of metaphors compared with other Newmark's strategies. The use of this strategy corresponds to a more literal translation which is not the case in the present study, because in this study, it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference between the source text and the two translations based on Newmark's (1988) classification. As a result, there has been a tendency toward non-literal translation.

Table 6: Pearson's Chi-Squared Test for Comparing the Two Persian Translations based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1988) Classification and Newmark's (1988) classification



		Comparing the Two Persian Translations
	Value	2.422
	df	2
Lakoff and Johnson's (1988) Classification	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	0.298
Newmark's (1988) Classification	Value	1.044
	df	3
	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	0.791

According to Table 6, Asymp. Sig. is equal to 0.298 and 0.791 for the comparisons between the two translations based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1988) and Newmark's (1988) classifications respectively and is higher than 0.05 alpha level in both cases. In other words, there is no statistically significant difference between the two translations based on Lakoff and Johnson's and Newmark's classifications.

Lack of statistically significant difference between Hosseini's and Keyhan's translations in terms of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classification bears a relation to the principles of the cognitive theory of metaphor. As the cognitive theory of metaphor asserts, a metaphoric nature is considered for our conceptual system and the abstract conceptual domains underlie the linguistic metaphorical expressions in every language. Making comparisons between two languages or even within a language based on the cognitive view of metaphor presupposes analyzing the conceptual metaphors on the basis of which those languages exist. Consequently, the similarities between the two translations based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classification can be justified by the fact that both of the translations are in one single language (Persian) and they share the conceptual concepts existing in one single culture, that is, Persian culture. The following example well shows the similar use of one conceptual metaphor by the two translators:

What a *waste of time* it all was to be sure!
(Woolf)

راستی که چقدر اتلاف وقت بود (Hosseini)

rasti / ke / che / etlaf- e / vaght- i / bod

واقعاً چه اتلاف وقتی بود! (Keyhan)

vaghean / che / etlaf- e / vaght- i / bod

In the above example, both of the translators have used the structural metaphor TIME IS MONEY by making use of the expression اتلاف وقت (waste of time). As a result, they point out to the existence of such conceptual metaphor in Persian language.

The results of Pearson's chi-squared tests in Table 6 indicate that there is not a statistically significant difference between Hosseini's and Keyhan's translations in terms of Newmark's (1988) classification. Due to the particular nature of *To the Lighthouse* and using the stream of consciousness in this novel, it seems that the translators have chosen similar methods for the translation of metaphors in this novel. The reason for making use of the stream of consciousness technique is that representing the internal thoughts and feelings of the characters of the novel is of importance to the author. Consequently, the translators followed Woolf's way of representing the thoughts and feelings of the characters and thereby their translations (in this sense, the translation of metaphors) are by and large similar to each other. The following example is taken from the first part of the novel and is related to presenting Mr Bankes's thoughts through the stream of consciousness which is translated similarly or in other words, non-metaphorically, by the two translators based on Newmark's classification:

one *could carry that point of view* too far
(Woolf)

آدم نباید این قدرها هم سختگیر بوده باشد (Hosseini)

adam / nabayad / in- ghadr- ha / ham / sakht- gir / bode / bashad

نبايد در اين طرز تفكر مبالغه مي‌كرد
 nabayad / dar / in / tarz- e / tafakor /
 mobaleghe / mi- kard

In order to explore the extent to which the metaphors in Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classification are correspondent to the metaphors suggested by Newmark (1988), the metaphors were analyzed and the frequencies and percentages depending on different kinds of metaphors were examined one by one.

Table 7: Total Percentages of the Correspondences between Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) and Newmark's (1988) Classifications in the Two Translations

Lakoff and Johnson Newmark	Ontological (%)	Orientalional (%)	Structural (%)
Standard	59	48	68.75
Dead	14.5	33.3	31.25
Cliché	16.4	14.6	0
Original	10.1	4	0
Adapted	0	0	0
Recent	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100

Table 7 entails the percentages ontological, orientational, and structural metaphors corresponding to the metaphors in Newmark's classification take. The percentages presented in Table 7 indicate that the degree of correspondence between all the three kinds of metaphors suggested by Lakoff and Johnson and the standard metaphor in Newmark's classification is higher. These percentages amount to 59%, 48%, and 68.75% for ontological, orientational, and structural metaphors respectively. These percentages indicate that ontological and orientational metaphors are less clustered around standard metaphors compared with structural metaphors, because there are some degree of correspondence between either of the ontological and orientational metaphors and dead, cliché, and original metaphors.

Table 8: Percentages of the Correspondences between Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) and Newmark's (1988) Classifications Separately for the Two Translators

Lakoff and Johnson Newmark	Ontological in Hosseini's Translation (%)	Ontological in Keyhan's Translation (%)	Orientalional in Hosseini's Translation (%)	Orientalional in Keyhan's Translation (%)	Structural in Hosseini's Translation (%)	Structural in Keyhan's Translation (%)
Standard	59.4	58.2	48.9	46.9	80	50
Dead	13.8	15.7	32.6	34.4	20	50
Cliché	16.9	15.7	13.9	15.6	0	0
Original	9.9	10.4	4.6	3.1	0	0
Adapted	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

According to Table 8, in the case of all the three kinds of metaphors suggested by Lakoff and Johnson, the percentages of the correspondences between these three kinds of metaphors and the standard metaphors are greater compared with the percentages of the correspondences between Lakoff and Johnson's suggested metaphors and the other kinds of metaphors suggested by Newmark. The only exception in this regard is for the correspondence between structural and standard metaphors in Keyhan's translation, because in Keyhan's translation, the percentage of correspondence between structural and standard metaphors is the same as the percentage of correspondence between structural and dead metaphors.

Comparing the percentages taken by different kinds of metaphors in the two translations shows that the percentages of the correspondences between each kind of metaphor in Lakoff and Johnson's and Newmark's classifications in the two translations are largely similar. For example, the percentages of the correspondences between ontological and original metaphors in Hosseini's and Keyhan's translations are 9.9% and 10.4%, and the percentages of the correspondences between orientational and dead metaphors are 32.6 and 34.4; this close relationship is true for the comparison of all the metaphors in Lakoff and Johnson's and Newmark's classifications. The only exception in this regard is associated with the correspondences between structural and standard metaphors and also structural and dead metaphors, because in both of these



cases, the difference between the two translations amounts to 30%. As a result, there is a close relationship between the two translations. This close relationship between the two translations in terms of the correspondences is supported by the results of chi-square tests in Table 6, which indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the two translations based on both classifications. The results of the analyses in Table 8 show that not only Hosseini but also Keyhan have mostly translated ontological, orientational, and structural metaphors as standard metaphors.

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), ontological metaphors serve the function of perceiving everyday experiences in terms of discrete entities or substances. On the other hand, Newmark (1988) defines standard metaphors as “efficient and concise methods of covering a physical and/or mental situation both referentially and pragmatically” (p.108). Consequently, there is high degree of similarity between Lakoff and Johnson’s ontological metaphor and Newmark’s standard metaphors in that both of them cover physical situations pragmatically to give a more influential image of the physical situations.

The following example resembles the stated correspondences between ontological metaphors and standard metaphors:

(life) was sealed up there (Woolf)

(زندگی) در آنجا مهر شده بود (Hosseini)

zendegi / dar / anja / mohr / shod- e / bod

(زندگی) در اتاق پذیرایی مانینگ مهر و موم شده

(Keyhan)

zendegi / dar / otagh- e / paziraeey- e /

Manning / mohr / o / mom / shod- e / bod

As is evident in the above example, “life” is characterized as an entity which is “sealed up” like a letter. Besides, Hosseini and Keyhan following the image Woolf used,

have characterized “زندگی” (life) as an entity which is “مهر شده” (sealed up). In fact, an abstract entity (life) is characterized in terms of a physical object (letter). As a result, regarding Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) classification, an ontological metaphor and regarding Newmark’s (1988) classification, a standard metaphor is created.

Based on Table 7, there are no instances of ontological metaphors correspondent to adapted or recent metaphors, instances of orientational metaphors correspondent to recent or adapted metaphors or instances of structural metaphors correspondent to recent or adapted metaphors. The reason for these findings amounting to zero is that whether in Hosseini’s (1991) or Keyhan’s (2007) translation, there are no instances of recent or adapted metaphors. Moreover, in both Hosseini’s and Keyhan’s translations, there are no correspondences between structural and cliché metaphors or between structural and original metaphors. This finding is so interesting in that cliché metaphors possess the feature of being so overused and the original metaphors have the feature of newness. A possible interpretation of this finding may be as follows: the structural metaphors serve the function of understanding a specified concept by means of the structure of something else and this is something which happens in everyday life. As a result, there is no preference for newness or oldness in perceiving “a specified concept by means of the structure of something else”.

5. Conclusion

It has been shown that specific characteristics of literary translation, especially the translation of metaphor poses a challenge for the translators of literary texts. This study dealt with this problem and the translation of metaphors in two Persian translations of *To the Lighthouse* (1994).

The conduction of numerical analyses in the form of chi-square tests and the analyses of some translation examples revealed that Persian and English languages share similar conceptual metaphors; a point also mentioned in previous studies. On the other hand, the principles of the cognitive theory of metaphor explained lack of significant difference between the two translations: as both of the translations are in one single language (Persian), they share the conceptual concepts existing in one single culture.

As shown in this study, Newmark's classification allowed for significant differences between either of the target texts and the source text. Making different uses of the parts of the body in English and Persian languages resulted in such differences. Unlike the comparison between the two languages, the two translations did not have significant differences based on Newmark's classification and this was associated with the particular nature of *To the Lighthouse*, that is using the stream of consciousness.

Moreover, some degree of similarity has been proven to exist between Lakoff and Johnson's and Newmark's classifications. Covering physical situations pragmatically to give a more influential image of the physical situations is regarded as the common point between Lakoff and Johnson's ontological metaphor and Newmark's standard metaphors, the two kinds of metaphors that had the most degree of similarity.

The results of the comparisons between the original novel used in this study and its Persian translations well show the challenges the element of culture imposes on the translation of metaphors. Many metaphorical expressions were found that the translators had translated as non-metaphors based on Newmark's (1988) or Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classifications or totally discarded in their translations. This reveals some practical problems the translators face when

translating metaphors and shows how their options for choosing translation strategies become restricted. As a result, the results drawn from this study can present useful suggestions for the translators when translating metaphors.

On the other hand, as this study deals with an area of translation not yet received proper attention, that is, metaphor translation, the results drawn from it are beneficial for any discussion regarding metaphor translation. The results drawn from this study are also beneficial in translation classes or any foreign language course in which metaphor is seen as a core component of language learning. For example, in classes which are mainly concerned with literary translation, the teachers may refer to the metaphorical expressions analyzed in the present study and give some suggestions to the students for the translation of metaphors.

References:

- Abdullah, I. H., Awal, N. M., & Safarnejad, F.** (2013). Rendering happiness metaphors: a cognitive analysis from Persian into English. *Journal of Language Studies*, 13(2), 193- 205.
- Ahvaziyani, Z.** (2009). Translatability of metaphors: A study of three novels. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz.
- Amiri, M.** (2012). Translation of metaphors in lyrics: a cognitive approach. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran.
- Black, M.** (1993). More about metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 19-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Broeck, V.** (1981). The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation. *Poetics today*, 2(4), 73-87.
- Butcher, S. H.** (1902). *The Poetics of Aristotle*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Cameron, L.** (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Emami, K.** (1993). *The ins and outs of translation*. Tehran: Nilofar Publication.



- Gentzler, E.** (2000). Metaphor and translation. In *Encyclopedia of literary translation into English* (Vol. 2, pp. 941-945). Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Gibbs, R. W.** (1994). *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanne, M.** (2006). Metaphors for the translator. In Bassnett, S. & Bush, P (Eds.), *The translator as writer* (pp. 208- 224). London: Continuum.
- Iranmanesh, A.** (2009). *The translation of metaphors in the subtitling of the American film Sincity into Persian*. In H. C. Omar, H. Haroon, & A. A. Ghani (Eds.), *The sustainability of the translation field* (pp. 164-171). Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Translators Association.
- Jafari, O.** (2008). *Strategies of translating metaphors in foreign movies employed by Iranian subtitlers*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran.
- Lakoff, G.** (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.) *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 202-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, J. & Johnson, A.** (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Littlemore, J. & Low, G.** (2006). Metaphoric competence, second language learning and communicative language ability. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 268-269.
- Mahon, J. E.** (1999). Getting your sources right: What Aristotle didn't say. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 69-80). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Navidpour, P.** (2010). *A relevance theory approach to the Persian translation of metaphoric expressions in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Isfahan.
- Nekoeeeyan, S.** (2012). *The analysis of the translation of metaphors in Shakespeare's sonnets*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Islamic Azad University Central Tehran Branch. Tehran.
- Newmark, P.** (1988). *A Textbook of translation*. London and New York: Prentice Hall.
- Rastad, A.** (2010). *A study of English translations of metaphors in Sa'di's Bustan*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Allameh Tabataba'i University. Tehran.
- Schaffner, C.** (2004). Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1253-1269.
- Woolf, V.** (1994). *To the Lighthouse*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Woolf, V.** (2008). *To the Lighthouse*. (S. Hosseini, Trans.). Tehran: Nilofar Publication.
- Woolf, V.** (2007). *To the Lighthouse*. (K. Keyhan, Trans.). Tehran: Negah Publication.

Endnotes

¹ As the frequencies of the recent and adapted metaphors in Texts B and C are less than 5 (either of these two kinds of metaphors similarly amounts to zero in both of Texts B and C), they are summed up with original metaphors and considered as a single unity in the statistical analyses.