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Abstract Metaphors are taken to be the most cardinal signifier of nonliteral linguistic communication. transporting the premise that footings literally connected with one object can be transferred to another object. A writer/speaker uses metaphor more frequently than non with the purposes of presenting a new object/concept. offering a more precise significance. or merely showing a more poetic consequence to his text/speech. The chief focal point of this survey is image metaphors of colour in the Shahnameh of Ferdowsi.

The survey set out to find how this peculiar figure of address is rendered by reexamining two English interlingual renditions of the work. The model of the survey was Newmark’s ( 1988a ) seven suggested processs for interpreting metaphors. In add-on to finding which of these processs have been applied in the two interlingual renditions. the survey besides aimed at detecting whether any new processs might hold been applied. The survey besides attempted to happen out whether any sole forms were observed in each translator’s rendition of the discussed points.

The survey concluded that out of the seven processs proposed by Newmark for interpreting metaphors. Warner & A ; Warner applied five processs and Davis applied all seven of the processs in the interlingual rendition of image metaphors of colour. No new process was observed in their interlingual renditions. The translators’ picks of processs for interpreting these specific points showed that Warner & A ; Warner had a inclination towards the first process which resulted in a actual interlingual rendition of the peculiar metaphor. whereas Davis had a inclination towards the other six processs which all led to explicitation. simplification and the production of a reader-oriented text.

Cardinal footings: the Shahnameh. nonliteral linguistic communication. metaphor. image metaphor of colour. interlingual rendition process 1. Introduction Translation. as Catford ( 1965 ) defines it. is “ an act of transference. in which a text from the beginning linguistic communication is replaced by its equivalent in the mark language” ( p. 20 ) . Newmark’s ( 1988b. p. 5 ) more modern version of the term is “ often. though non by any agencies ever. rendering the significance of a text into another linguistic communication in the manner that the writer intended the text.

” Even the mere idea of deducing from these two definitions that the undertaking of a transcriber and the whole interlingual rendition procedure is a simple one seems a naivety on the portion of the inexperient. Any given beginning text intended for interlingual rendition. regardless of its text-type. is required to undergo a close reading in order to understand what it is approximately. and so an analysis from the point of position of the transcriber. The analysis phase consists of finding the purpose of the text – which. harmonizing to Newmark ( 1988a ) . represents the SL writer’s attitude to the capable affair – and besides the manner in which it is written.

Bing attentive to the selected vocabulary. the sentence structure. figures of address. neologies. punctuations. names. and many more is a critical function the transcriber plays in the procedure of interlingual rendition. In the instance of poesy. apart from all the above characteristics there is a excess of sound effects such as rime. metre. vowel rhyme. initial rhyme. emphasis. onomatopoeia. The most common end among transcribers is. and ever should be. to make the same consequence on the mark reader as the original author had intended for his readers.

In Nida’s ain words. “ the relationship between receptor and message should be well the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message” ( Nida. 1964a. p. 159 ) . Understanding and analysing nonliteral linguistic communication in a text. as mentioned above. is one of the hard procedures in interlingual rendition. One of these figures of address is metaphor which is considered by linguists as the most basic where one object is used to depict another object and both objects are basically disparate entities. but common in one or more properties.

In the undermentioned subdivision. the theoretical preliminaries of the survey will be presented. which includes an overview of metaphor. refering its definition. categorizations. designation. and besides interlingual rendition processs introduced by Newmark ( 1988a ) on the interlingual rendition of metaphors in general. The image metaphor of colour in specific will besides be discussed along with several illustrations. Thereafter. a choice of the collected informations will be presented. analyzed and discussed. The last subdivision will include the decision of the survey. 2. Theoretical Preliminaries 2. 1.

Definition of Metaphor Metaphor. as stated in the Merriam Webster online lexicon. is etymologically from Greek. from metapherein. intending ‘ to transfer’ and from meta- + pherein. intending ‘ to bear’ . It is defined by the same beginning as “ a figure of address. in which a word or phrase literally denoting one sort of object or thought is used in topographic point of another to propose a similitude or analogy between them. ” One of Shakespeare’s most celebrated and oft-quoted lines. ‘ All the world’s a stage’ . is an illustration of a metaphor. where he indicates that ‘ the world’ and ‘ stage’ are correspondent.

Harmonizing to Richards ( 1936 ) . a metaphor consists of two parts. tenor andvehicle. besides introduced as object and image by Newmark ( 1988a ) . severally. The tenor is the term to which properties are ascribed and the vehicle is the term from which properties are borrowed. The belongingss of the vehicle which apply to the tenor in a given metaphor are namedgrounds of a metaphor. besides known as the sense of a metaphor. Therefore. in the illustration given above. ‘ world’ is the tenor or object. and ‘ stage’ is the vehicle or image.

The land of this metaphor is more evident when the following two lines are added: All the world’s a phase And all the work forces and adult females are simply participants. They have their issues and their entrywaies This metaphor is extended through adding another brace of tenor and vehicle. i. e. ‘ men and women’ is the 2nd tenor and ‘ players’ is the 2nd vehicle. Therefore. as the histrions on phase have an entryway and besides an issue. the dwellers of the universe do every bit good. their entryway to this universe being ‘ birth’ and their issue being ‘ death’ .

2. 2. Categorizations of Metaphors Metaphors have been categorized in different ways by different linguists. Black ( 1962a. p. 25 ) asserts that “ the merely entrenched categorization is grounded in the banal resistance between ‘ dead’ and ‘ live’ metaphors. ” He adds that “ this is no more helpful than. state. handling a cadaver as a particular instance of a individual: A so- called dead metaphor is non a metaphor at all. but simply an look that no thirster has a pregnant metaphorical use” .

However. he does show a categorization for metaphors. but non before declaring that “ if the ‘ actuality’ of a metaphor … is of import plenty to be marked. one might see replacing the dead and alive contrast by a set of finer discriminations” ; hence. the undermentioned categorization ( ibid. p. 25 ) : 1. nonextant metaphors: looks whose etymologies. genuine or fancied. propose a metaphor beyond resuscitation ( a musculus as a small mouse. musculus ) 2. hibernating metaphors: those looks where the original. now normally unnoticed. metaphor can be usefully restored ( duty as affecting some sort of bondage )

3. active metaphors: those looks. that are. and are perceived to be. actively metaphoric He continues further to know apart between two types of active metaphor: an emphasized metaphor whose “ producer will let no fluctuation upon or replace for the words used” . and a resonating metaphor. which supports “ a high grade of suggestive elaboration” ( ibid. p. 26 ) . On this history. he calls a metaphor of pronounced accent and resonance a strong metaphor. and in contrast. a metaphor of comparatively low accent or resonance a weak metaphor.

Lakoff ( 1977 ) made a radical part to the survey of metaphors when he suggested a new theory of metaphor which fundamentally stated that metaphors are “ fundamentally conceptual. non lingual. in nature” ( Lakoff. in Ortony. 1993. p. 244 ) . which resulted in the coming of the conceptual or cognitive theory of metaphor. In his proposal of the theory. he does non supply us with any specific categorization for metaphors. but instead. he merely refers to them in his Hagiographas as he explains and elaborates on the theory. He states that conceptual metaphors “ map one conceptual sphere onto another” ( ibid. p. 229 ) .

On the other manus. the fresh metaphors of a linguistic communication are. except for image metaphors. “ extensions of this big conventional system” ( ibid. p. 240 ) . Therefore. it can be implied that he believes most metaphors to be ‘ conceptual metaphors’ and some others to be ‘ novel metaphors’ under which ‘ image metaphors’ are subcategorized. However. more than twenty old ages after Black’s declaration of his point of view on the classification of metaphors. Newmark ( 1988b ) was still a faithful truster in the dead/live metaphor categorization. as he distinguishes six types of metaphors. get downing with dead metaphors:

1. dead metaphor: this type of metaphor “ frequently relates to cosmopolitan footings of infinite and clip. the chief portion of the organic structure. general ecological characteristics and the chief human activities” ( ibid. p. 106 ) . Dead metaphors have lost their nonliteral value through overexploitation and their images are barely apparent. Some illustrations of a dead metaphor include ‘ at the underside of the hill’ . ‘ face of the mountains’ . and ‘ crown of glory’ . 2. platitude metaphor: this type of metaphor is known to hold outlived its utility. and is “ used as a replacement for clear idea. frequently emotively. but without matching to the facts of the matter” ( ibid. p. 107 ) .

Some illustrations include ‘ a gem in the crown’ . ‘ to make one’s mark’ . and ‘ backwater’ . 3. stock or standard metaphor: this type of metaphor is defined by Newmark ( 1988b. p. 108 ) as “ an established metaphor. which in an informal context is an efficient and concise method of covering a physical and/or mental state of affairs both referentially and pragmatically. ” He besides states that stock metaphors. in contrast to dead metaphors. are “ not deadened by overuse” ( ibid ) . Examples of this type besides mentioned by Newmark are: ‘ to oil the wheels’ . ‘ he’s in a giving humour’ . and ‘ he’s on the Eve of acquiring married’ .

4. altered metaphor: this type of metaphor is really a stock metaphor that has been adapted into a new context by its talker or author. for illustration. the stock metaphor ‘ carrying coals to Newcastle’ can be turned into an adapted metaphor by stating ‘ about transporting coals to Newcastle’ . 5. recent metaphor: this type of metaphor is produced through coining and is spread in the SL quickly. Examples of this sort are ‘ spastic’ . intending stupid. and ‘ skint’ . significance without money.

6. original metaphor: this type of metaphor is “ created or quoted by the SL writer” . and in the broadest sense. “ contains the nucleus of an of import writer’s message. his personality. his remark on life” ( ibid. p. 112 ) . 2. 3. Identifying Metaphors The acknowledgment of a metaphor in a certain text or address may be instead easy for native talkers. but when it comes to a non-native. the challenge begins. The guess that an look is a metaphor when it yields a false or absurd significance when interpreted literally is non dependable “ because non all metaphors have false actual interpretations” ( Way. 1991. p. 14 ) .

This undependability is proven by Manner when she exemplifies through the undermentioned wordss of a vocal: ‘ A stone feels no hurting. and an island ne’er cries’ . This statement is a metaphor. but it is besides “ literally true ; stones do non experience hurting. and islands are non the sort of things that can cry” ( ibid ) . But how do we place it as a metaphor. even when the actual significance seems true? Way ( 1991. p. 14 ) explains: “ Perhaps because. while non really false. speaking about stones experiencing hurting and islands shouting is surely a curious combination ; possibly we can place metaphors by their uneven apposition of thoughts.

” A more classical manner of placing metaphors. which once more is non dependable. is the signifier ‘ x is a y’ . Although many metaphors do take this signifier. many more do non. As Way exemplifies through Shakespeare’s ‘ Let steal the Canis familiariss of war’ . she states that although this is clearly a metaphor. but “ it does non suit the signifier of ‘ x is a y’ . for we are non comparing Canis familiariss to war. but instead to ground forcess. something which is ne’er explicitly mentioned in the phrase” ( ibid. p. 15 ) . She goes on to explicate that even the syntactic construction of a metaphor can non be cogent evidence of its kernel. as it has no consistent syntactic signifier.

She provides an illustration by Saskice. where it is shown how one “ metaphor can be rephrased as a statement. a inquiry or an exclamation” ( ibid ) : The moonlight slumbers sweetly upon the bank. Does the moonshine slumber sweetly upon the bank? How sweet the moonlight slumbers upon the bank! She besides mentions that a metaphor’s focal point can be of any portion of address. In the undermentioned illustrations by Saskice provided by Way ( 1991. p. 15 ) . it is stated that “ the focal point is foremost a verb. so a noun. and eventually a participle” : The fume danced from the chimney.

The trees bowed in the dance of the seasons. Dancing Waterss surrounded the canoe. Harmonizing to all the above. there is no dependable method for placing a metaphor. The more we strive to analyse a metaphor. the more we understand that its creative activity and comprehension are disputing undertakings. specifically for the non-native talker. 2. 4. Translating Metaphors Newmark ( 1988b ) proposes the undermentioned seven schemes for interpreting metaphors ; the illustrations included for each scheme are provided by Tajalli ( 2005. p. 107 ) : 1. Reproducing the same image in the TL.

Play with someone’s feelings & gt ; ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? 2. Replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image which does non collide with the TL civilization I got it off my thorax & gt ; ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? 3. Translation of metaphor by simile. retaining the image The seashore was merely a long green line & gt ; ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? 4. Translation of metaphor ( or simile ) by simile plus sense. or on occasion metaphor plus sense He is an bird of Minerva & gt ; ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? 5. Conversion of metaphor to feel To maintain the pot boiling & gt ; ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? 6. Omission.

If the metaphor is excess or serves no practical intent. there is a instance for its omission. together with its sense constituent 7. Translation of metaphor by the same metaphor combined with sense. The add-on of a rubric or an account by the transcriber is to guarantee that the metaphor will be understood The lingua is fire & gt ; ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? . ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? 2. 5. Image Metaphors of Color As mentioned earlier. image metaphor is a subcategory of Lakoff’s ‘ novel metaphor’ . He distinguishes between conceptual metaphor and image metaphor due to their distinguishable function procedures.

The conceptual metaphor maps one conceptual sphere onto another. frequently with many constructs in the beginning sphere mapped onto many matching constructs in the mark sphere. whereas the image metaphor maps merely one image onto one other image ; therefore. Lakoff ( 1977 ) calls them ‘ one-shot metaphors’ . The undermentioned verse form. interpreted by Louis Watchman ( as cited in Ortony. 1993. p. 231 ) . contains several image functions: My Equus caballus with a hoof like a stripy agate. with his fetlock like a all right bird of Jove plume: my Equus caballus whose legs are like speedy lightning whose organic structure is an eagle-plumed pointer:

my Equus caballus whose tail is like a trailing black cloud. He continues by explicating that “ Metaphoric image functions work in the same manner as all other metaphoric functions: by mapping the construction of one sphere onto the construction of another. But here. the spheres are conventional mental images” ( ibid. p. 229 ) . Therefore. image metaphors map one property of the beginning sphere onto the mark sphere. Image function may affect physical part-whole relationships. as in the undermentioned illustration extracted from The Descriptions of King Lent. translated by J. M. Cohen ( ibid. p. 230 ) :

His toes were like the keyboard of a spinet. Lakoff explains that “ The words do non state us that an single toe corresponds to an single key on the keyboard. The words are prompts for us to execute a conceptual function between conventional mental images” ( ibid ) . Image function may besides affect a dynamic image. as in the undermentioned lines by Shakespeare ( as cited in Hawkes. 1972. p. 46 ) . where the motion of the drapes is mapped onto the motion of the oculus:

The fringed drapes of thine oculus progress. And state what thou sees yond. Other properties. such as colourss. may besides be mapped. which are the chief focal point of the present survey. The undermentioned lines by Shakespeare ( ibid. p. 47 ) map the whiteness of the lily and besides tusk onto the miss: Full gently now she takes him by the manus. A lily prison’d in a jail of snow. Or tusk in an alabaster set: So white a friend engirts so white a enemy. There are many illustrations of image metaphors of colour in the Shahnameh. where the property of colour has been mapped onto the mark sphere.

The undermentioned interlingual rendition of a pair in the Shahnameh. produced by Warner & A ; Warner. contains four image metaphors ( of which two are similes ) . but merely in two of them is the property of colour intended to be mapped ; the whiteness of camphor is mapped onto the character’s hair. and the inflammation of a rose onto his cheeks: His stature cypress-like. his face a Sun. His hair like camphor and his rose-red cheeks ( Warner and Warner. 1925. vol. 1. p. 191 ) Besides in the undermentioned illustration from the Shahnameh. Davis has compared blood to the inflammation of vino in this metaphor. even including the sense.

But here. the metaphor has been applied merely as a device for doing the text more poetic. as Way ( 1991. p. 33 ) discussed about the permutation theory of metaphor. He saw Sohrab in the thick of the Iranian ranks. the land beneath his pess awash with wine-red blood. ( Davis. p. 205 ) 2. 6. Formal and Dynamic Equivalence Nida ( 1964 ) divides equality in two different types in his article entitled ‘ Principles of Correspondence’ . i. e. formal and dynamic equality. He depicts formal equality as a focal point on the message. in both its formal facets and its content.

Therefore. in a interlingual rendition from “ poetry to poetry. sentence to sentence. and construct to concept” ( Nida. in Venuti 2000. p. 129 ) . the concern is formal equality. In this type of equality. the message produced in the TT should fit the different elements of the ST every bit closely as possible. Nida farther explains that a rubric translationtypifies formal equality. In this type of interlingual rendition. he states. “ the transcriber efforts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the signifier and content of the original” ( ibid ) . In order to be comprehendible. such a interlingual rendition “ would necessitate legion footnotes” ( ibid ) .

This structural equality seems to be instead indistinguishable to Larson’smodified actual interlingual rendition. where the interlingual rendition is fundamentally actual. but with alterations to the order and grammar of the ST. so as to bring forth “ acceptable sentence construction in the receptor language” ( Larson. 1984. p. 16 ) . To a great extent. it besides resembles Newmark’s semantic interlingual rendition. which he states. “ attempts to render. every bit closely as the semantic and syntactic constructions of the 2nd linguistic communication allow. the exact contextual significance of the original” ( Newmark. 1988a. p. 39 ) .

Dynamic equality. on the other manus. maintains that “ the relationship between receptor and message should be well the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message” ( Nida. in Venuti 2000. p. 129 ) . In a interlingual rendition of dynamic equality. the mark readership is non needfully required to understand the SL civilization in order to understand the message.

Most significantly. this type of equality “ aims at complete naturalness of expression” ( ibid ) . and is besides based on the rule of tantamount consequence. which maintains that the transcriber should bring forth the same consequence on his ain readers as the SL writer produced on the original readers. Similar to Nida’s dynamic equality is the traditional idiomatic translationdiscussed in Larson ( 1984 ) . “ The translator’s end should be to reproduce in the receptor linguistic communication a text which communicates the same message as the SL. but utilizing the natural grammatical and lexical picks of the receptor language” ( ibid. P.

17 ) . Besides instead similar to this type of equality is Newmark’s communicative interlingual rendition. which he claims. “ attempts to bring forth on its readers an consequence every bit near as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original” ( Newmark. 1988a. p. 39 ) . Harmonizing to the above-named. after comparing Warner & A ; Warner’s ( 1925 ) and Davis’ ( 2007 ) English interlingual renditions of the Shahnameh with the original. it was concluded that the first interlingual rendition is a semantic interlingual rendition. while the 2nd 1 is a communicative interlingual rendition.

Warner & A ; Warner have translated poesy into poesy and besides strived at continuing the antediluvian tone of the original. Furthermore. they have indicated in their Introduction to the interlingual rendition that many explanatory notes have been added ; therefore taking to a semantic interlingual rendition. Davis. on the other manus. has converted poesy into prose. with occasional lines of poetry in some episodes. He besides explains in his Introduction to the interlingual rendition that he has intended this interlingual rendition for the general reader and non for bookmans ; therefore his version is a communicative interlingual rendition. 3.

Empirical Data 3. 1. Data Collection and Analysis Thirty-three illustrations of image metaphors of colour identified in theShahnameh were located in two English interlingual renditions. i. e. Warner & A ; Warner ( 1925 ) and Davis ( 2007 ) . It is deserving observing that over 45 metaphorical looks of colour were identified in the full Shahnameh. but as Davis’ interlingual rendition is non a complete interlingual rendition. instead an abridged version. merely 33 were applicable to this survey. The first measure in this process was to place all terms/objects in theShahnameh that presented colour imagination.

This information was found in a list provided by Rastegar Fasaei ( 1990 ) . Seventy-nine points were listed. but merely 33 were applicable in this survey. because the list was evidently non intended for metaphors of colour. but instead a list indicatingterms that denote a colour. Many of these footings were basic colour footings. e. g. ? ? ? . which could non bring forth any possible metaphorical look connoting a colour. They were largely used in adjective phrases depicting a peculiar object or event.

Therefore. all colour footings were ruled out. every bit good as other footings which indicated some sort of ‘ brightness’ or ‘ shiny effect’ . e. g. the look? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? . in which the metaphor implies that the blade is really glistening. Unfortunately. about 18 of the points in this list were of this sort. stand foring brightness of an object. colourss of the air. and colourss of the Earth. of which the latter two seemed equivocal and infeasible for this survey. As mentioned earlier. the interlingual rendition by Davis is non a complete interlingual rendition of the wholeShahnameh. as many episodes have been omitted.

Therefore. several of the points in the list have occurred merely in the subdivisions non translated by Davis ; hence. canceling them from the list was inevitable. Many of the footings in the list. unluckily once more. were observed merely in the signifier of similes. and non metaphors ; hence. they could non be applied either. After settling on these 33 points. they were sought in aShahnameh package. in order to turn up the pairs which contained these footings. The following measure was to reexamine each pair to see which one had an image metaphor of colour created with that specific term.

For some footings. the frequence of happening was really high. e. g. about 400 pairs. which caused some troubles in footings of being extremely time-consuming. A lower limit of one pair transporting an image metaphor of colour was chosen for each of the 33 cases via the Shahnamehsoftware. These illustrations were so ab initio located in the interlingual rendition by Davis. as his is an abridged interlingual rendition. Sing this. he states in the Introduction to his book: “ Given the poem’s huge length. some transitions have necessarily been omitted. and others are presented in drumhead form” ( Davis. 2007. xxxiv ) .

After finding which of the illustrations were included in Davis’ interlingual rendition. one pair was finally chosen for each case. and so the corresponding look was located in Warner & A ; Warner’s interlingual rendition. So far. there were 33 Iranian illustrations of image metaphors of colour. along with their corresponding looks in the two English interlingual renditions. These were the stairss taken in the informations aggregation phase. The following measure was to analyse the collected information. which included finding the interlingual rendition processs involved in each of the two interlingual renditions.

The model applied was Newmark’s ( 1988b ) seven processs introduced for interpreting metaphors. The end here was non merely finding which transcriber applied which process ( s ) and the frequence of each process. but besides happening out whether any new processs were applied other than Newmark’s. The survey besides aimed atdiscovering any possible interlingual rendition forms sole to each transcriber. The undermentioned three illustrations were selected as representatives of the collected information in this survey. ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ( ? . ? ? ? – ? ? ? ? )

The dark was like jet dipped in pitch. there lent No planet lustre to the celestial sphere ( Warner & A ; Warner. vol. 3. p. 287 ) A dark every bit black as coal bedaubed with pitch. A dark of coal black. a dark on which Mars. Mercury. and Saturn would non lift. ( Davis. p. 306 ) In this ST context. the poet has depicted the scene as though the dark has really covered its face with pitch. Both transcribers have reproduced the same image in their TTs. therefore comparing the dark to a black rock ( ? ? ? ) that has washed its exterior with pitch. ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ( ? . ? ? ? ? – ? ? ? ? ? ? ) Raised such a dust!

But Swift as dust they sped Till day’s cheeks turned to lapis-lazuli. ( Warner & A ; Warner. vol. 7. p. 67 ) They rode rapidly until the twenty-four hours turned violet with twilight. ( Davis. p. 642 ) The definition provided for? ? ? ? ? ? is ‘ a dark bluish stone’ ; its interlingual rendition by Emami is ‘ lapis-lazuli. azure’ . Britannica’s on-line dictionary definition forlapis-lazuli is ‘ a semiprecious rock valued for its deep blue color’ . Therefore. the first transcriber has once more reproduced the same image through the same metaphor. The 2nd transcriber. nevertheless. has converted the metaphor to its sense. i. e. the colour it represents. ? ? ? ? ? ? ?

? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ( ? . ? ? ? ? – ? ? ? ? ? ? ) This he said. And heaved a suspiration. The coloring material of his cheek Turned from pomegranate-bloom to fenugreek ( Warner & A ; Warner. vol. 6. p. 25 ) Having said this he heaved a suspiration from the deepnesss of his being. and the rose-colored Punica granatum petal turned every bit pale as Greek clover. ( Davis. p. 455 ) The mental image of this ST metaphor is mapped onto the king’s face. depicting the alteration of colour in his skin color. The first transcriber has interestingly plenty converted the metaphor to its sense. which seems instead a rare process for a semantic interlingual rendition.

The 2nd transcriber. nevertheless. has reproduced the same image in TT2. 3. 2. Discussion Thirty-three instances of image metaphors of colour were identified in theShahnameh and so located in two English interlingual renditions. i. e. Warner & A ; Warner ( 1925 ) and Davis ( 2007 ) . Afterwards. the processs applied by each transcriber in rendering these 33 points were identified. The model chosen was that of Newmark’s ( 1988a ) . The analysis of the information showed that Warner and Warner applied five of Newmark’s suggested processs in interpreting the specified image metaphors of colour. They besides presented two instances of incorrect interlingual rendition.

In the undermentioned tabular array. the processs applied by Warner & A ; Warner in interpreting the 33 image metaphors of colour identified in this survey and their frequence of happening. along with the corresponding per centums are shown. Table 4. 1. Frequency and per centum of processs applied by Warner & A ; Warner Procedure| Frequency| Percentage| Reproducing the same image in the TL| 23| 69. 69| Replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image| 3| 9. 09| Translation of metaphor by simile. retaining the image| 1| 3. 03| Translation of metaphor by simile plus sense| 0| 0| .

Conversion of metaphor to sense| 3| 9. 09| Deletion| 0| 0| Translation of metaphor by the same metaphor plus sense| 1| 3. 03| Incorrect translation| 2| 6. 06| Total| 33| 100| As evident in this tabular array. Warner & A ; Warner have neither translated any metaphors by simile plus sense. nor deleted any metaphor. The most often applied process in their interlingual renditions was the reproduction of the same image in the TL. The interlingual rendition of the Shahnameh produced by Warner & A ; Warner is a semantic interlingual rendition. which clearly proves the ground as to why their most often applied process is the 1 mentioned above.

“ A semantic interlingual rendition efforts to animate the precise spirit and tone of the original: the words are ‘ sacred’ . non because they are more of import than the content. but because signifier and content are one” ( Newmark. 1988a. p. 47 ) . The analysis of the information besides shows that Davis has applied all seven processs introduced by Newmark in interpreting these points. There was no grounds of any incorrect interlingual rendition. The following table nowadayss the frequence of each process which was applied and besides their per centums. Table 4. 2. Frequency and per centum of processs applied by Davis Procedure| Frequency| Percentage| .

Reproducing the same image in the TL| 12| 36. 36| Replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image| 3| 9. 09| Translation of metaphor by simile. retaining the image| 3| 9. 09| Translation of metaphor by simile plus sense| 2| 6. 06| Conversion of metaphor to sense| 6| 18. 18| Deletion| 2| 6. 06| Translation of metaphor by the same metaphor plus sense| 5| 15. 15| Total| 33| 100| As indicated in the tabular array. the most often used process by Davis is besides the reproduction of the same image in the TL. He has opted for omission of the image metaphor of colour in two instances.

In one of the two instances. his omission seems to function the intent of a more easy-going. reader-friendly text ( where the metaphoric elements seem complex or far-fetched to the mark audience ) . whereas in the other instance. his omission seems someway arbitrary or indefensible. The following tabular array compares the two interlingual renditions in footings of the per centum of processs applied. P1 through P7 are the seven interlingual rendition processs involved in this survey. besides indicated in the old tabular array. and WT stands for incorrect interlingual rendition. Table 4. 3.

Percentage of the processs applied by both transcribers | P1| P2| P3| P4| P5| P6| P7| WT| Total % | W. & A ; W. | 69. 69| 9. 09| 3. 03| 0| 9. 09| 0| 3. 03| 6. 06| 100| Davis| 36. 36| 9. 09| 9. 09| 6. 06| 18. 18| 6. 06| 15. 15| 0| 100| 4. Decision Thirty-three instances of image metaphors of colour were extracted from theShahnameh and relocated in two English interlingual renditions. i. e. Warner & A ; Warner ( 1925 ) and Davis ( 2007 ) . The chief aim of the survey was to find which interlingual rendition processs introduced by Newmark ( 1988a ) for interpreting metaphors in general were applied by the two above mentioned transcribers.

Harmonizing to the collected and analyzed informations. Warner & A ; Warner applied five of Newmark’s suggested processs. The two processs they did non use at all were omission and interlingual rendition of metaphor by simile plus sense. The figures indicated that about 70 % of the 33 instances had undergone Newmark’s first process. i. e. reproducing the same image in the TL. which was besides considered the most often used process by Warner & A ; Warner. This is a confirmation that their interlingual rendition is so a semantic interlingual rendition. as the aim in this type of interlingual rendition is to animate the ST. both its signifier and its content.

This occurs to a great extent through literal/word-for-word interlingual rendition. which is instead similar to the above- mentioned process. Davis. on the other manus. applied all seven of Newmark’s processs in his interlingual rendition of image metaphors of colour. The most often used process was once more. a reproduction of the same image in the TL ( 36 % ) . The 2nd purpose was to find whether any new processs for interpreting image metaphors of colour other than those proposed by Newmark for interpreting metaphors resulted from this survey.