

Rendering Happiness Metaphors: A Cognitive Analysis From Persian Into English

Fatemeh Safarnejad

Safarnejad.a@gmail.com

*School of Language Studies and Linguistics
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*

Imran-Ho-Abdullah

imranho@ukm.my

*School of Language Studies and Linguistics
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*

Norsimah Mat Awal

norsimah@ukm.my

*School of Language Studies and Linguistics
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

Translation of metaphorical expressions is a major challenge in literary translation and has attracted the attention of translation researchers and linguists alike. The aim of this paper is to examine the translation of emotive metaphorical expressions of happiness from Persian to English in the Persian novel “Savushun” written by Simin Daneshvar. To achieve this aim, emotive metaphorical expressions relating to happiness from the source text and two target texts were collected. Subsequently, the conceptual metaphors underlying the metaphorical expressions in the source text and the target texts were investigated based upon the metaphor identification procedures (MIP), proposed by the Pragglejaz group (2007) and general framework of the conceptual metaphor theory (CMT). This paper attempts to identify the strategies used in the translation so that the translational equivalences of these metaphorical expressions were identified in the target texts. The conceptual metaphors of the translation were identified and compared with the conceptual metaphors in the source text. Preliminary results of the study revealed the nature of both similarities and differences in the conceptual metaphors of the source text to the target texts. The similarities are mostly attributed to the universality metaphor, whereas the differences are related to two different concepts and different culture in the translation of metaphors.

Keywords: metaphor; cognitive analysis; metaphor identification procedures (MIP); conceptual metaphor theory (CMT); universality

INTRODUCTION

Translation plays an essential role in transferring message from one culture to another (Badavi, 2008). However, it seems that the difference between source language and target

language and other variations in cultures can sometimes pose challenges in the process of translation. One of the most challenging tasks a translator faces is the difficulty of translating metaphorical expressions. Newmark (1988a, p.105) argues that ‘whilst the central problem of translation is the overall choice of a translation method for a text, the most important particular problem is the translation of metaphor’. Similarly, Dobrzynska (1995) claims that metaphor translation is difficult for translators because metaphors are culture-bound and require in-depth interpretation. Thus, rendering the metaphors of one language into another language requires understanding the background of the culture and conceptual system of both source and target languages which might not necessarily be similar.

Translation and culture are inseparable, and this particularly incorporates the metaphor translation. Values, ideas, assumptions and attitudes make the culture. Even though there might be similarities in cultures in the way of facing general problems and issues, each of them have unique approaches and methods to understand a phenomena, to respond to special situations, to articulate ideas and beliefs, to converse thoughts or messages and to explore problems and solve them. Owing to different backgrounds and experiences, community of different cultures has quite different knowledge of the world. Dissimilar perceptions of reality denote that metaphors incorporate cultural particulars, and cultural conditioning influences how they are interpreted. Thus, it will more or less lead to some inability to translate them that is principally dependent on the extent to which two languages have cultural overlap. Snell-Hornby stated that “the extent to which a text is translatable varies with the degree to which it is embedded in its own specific culture, also with the distance that separates the cultural background of source text and target audience in terms of time and place” (Snell-Hornby, 1988, p. 41). Snell-Hornby also remarked that “the essential problem posed by the metaphor in translation is that different cultures, hence different languages, conceptualise and create symbols in varying ways and formats, and therefore the sense of a metaphor is frequently culture-specific” (Snell-Hornby, 1988, p. 57).

Apart from the linguistics competence which requires the translators to have a good command of the lexis, syntax, style and type of text of the source and target language, the translator must also have metaphorical competence which requires a command of the various cultural elements of the source and target language. Moreover, metaphors can take the form of personalized and compressed use of language or be related to specific cultures. In fact, since there is no one-to-one correspondence between two different languages, translating metaphors is one of the most challenging tasks for translators (Schäffner, 2004). The objective of this paper is to examine the translation of emotive metaphorical expressions from Persian to English. In the present study, emotive metaphorical expressions relating to happiness from the source text and two target texts are identified. Subsequently, the conceptual metaphors underlying the metaphorical expressions in the source text and the target texts are investigated based on the general framework of conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), and metaphor identification procedures (MIP), proposed by the Pragglejaz group (2007). Subsequently, translational equivalences of these metaphorical expressions are examined to determine the translation strategies employed by the translators.

METAPHOR TRANSLATION

The issues of metaphor translation and translatability of metaphors have occupied translation researchers and theorists for many decades (Catford, 1965; Nida & Taber, 1982; Larson, 1984; Dagut, 1987; Newmark 1980, 1988b; Snell-Hornby, 1988). In general, the literature on translatability of metaphors shows that different scholars have proposed a number of translation procedures to assist the translators whenever they are faced with the problems of adequately transferring metaphors from one language to another and enhancing the readers' comprehension of the translated texts. The procedures could be summed up as follows:

- i. providing a different metaphor in the target text (TT),
- ii. omitting the metaphor in the TT,
- iii. providing the same metaphor in the TT,
- iv. providing a literal paraphrase of the metaphor in the TT or
- v. providing a metaphor with additional information in the TT

In addition to the scholars above, Hiraga (1991), Mandelblit (1995), Schäffner (2004), and Al-Zoubi and Al-Hasnawi (2007) have examined metaphor translation from a cognitive linguistics perspective, mainly influenced by Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) study of conceptual metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) offer a new perspective of metaphor as a basic cognitive function that helps the readers to comprehend the world and to structure abstract concepts, or the conceptual metaphor theory (CMT). In their view, the human conceptual system, "in terms of which humans both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 3). From the viewpoint of a cognitive approach, we can distinguish between the conceptual metaphor and the metaphorical expressions. The metaphorical expressions at the linguistics level are manifestations of conceptual metaphors at the cognitive level, or as Khajeh and Imran (2012, p. 70) argue "the conceptual metaphors are indicated in language and language in turn serves as a basic indicator of these conceptualizations". Hence in terms of metaphor translation, the translation of metaphorical expressions could be distinguished based on whether the translation utilises similar mapping condition (SMC) and/or different mapping condition (DMC). In the case of SMC, the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) use an identical metaphor to conceptualize a particular notion while in the case of both DMC, the SL and TL conceptualize a particular notion using different metaphors. From a cognitive perspective, the study of metaphor translation is largely a descriptive enterprise and focuses on how metaphors and metaphorical expressions are treated in actual translations. Hiraga (1991) through a comparative study focusing on American English and Japanese has established four possible combinations of conceptual metaphors and linguistic metaphors in terms of their similarities and differences. She proposes four patterns with regard to the translation of metaphor:

- i. Similar conceptual metaphors and similar metaphorical expressions;
- ii. Similar conceptual metaphors but different metaphorical expressions;
- iii. Different conceptual metaphors but similar metaphorical expressions; and
- iv. Different conceptual metaphors and different metaphorical expressions.

In contrast to Hiraga (1991), Mandelblit (1995) proposes the Cognitive Translation Hypothesis (CTH) for metaphor translation which favors a cogno-cultural framework.

The basic assumption in CTH is that the translator has to compare the cross-domain mappings that exist in the SL and the TL based on the fact that metaphors are grounded in the conceptual system of the speaker of a particular language. CTH further argues that metaphorical expressions seem to be more difficult (and consume more time) to translate whenever they exploit different cognitive domains compared to the equivalent target language expression. It is hypothesized that the difficulty recorded in the translation of different domains metaphors should be attributed to the search for alternative conceptual mapping, i.e, the cognitive equivalence for SL metaphors in the TL. Schäffner (2004) discusses some of the implications of a cognitive theory of metaphor when translating metaphor. Essentially based on CMT, metaphor translation is not only an issue of translating an individual metaphorical expression in the ST to the TL but also involves the conceptual systems in the source and target culture. Hence an important consideration in metaphor translation from a CMT framework is the procedures adopted in identifying the conceptual metaphors and their transfer from the source language into a target language (Al-Zoubi, Al-Ali & Al-Hasnawi, 2007).

The present study will use the CMT/ CTH framework to analyse the patterns of translation of metaphor in terms of the cognitive equivalence in the translation of metaphorical expressions relating to happiness in the Persian source text and the English target texts. The general framework of conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) is adopted and provides a systematic deducing of conceptual representations and organization from linguistic expressions. The underlying theoretical assumption of CMT allows us to link metaphorical expressions to underlying conceptual metaphors and hence the position of the conceptual mappings between the two conceptual domains.

DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

The data for this study were obtained from the Persian novel ‘Savushun’ written by Simin Daneshvar and the two English translations, one by M. R. Ghanoonparvar (Savushun, A Novel About Modern Iran) and the other by R. Zand (A Persian Requiem). This novel has been chosen as the source of research since it contains highly metaphorical language. This book has been subjected to sixteen printings and sold half a million copies that can be considered a record for a work of literature in modern Iran. The style applied by the author in Savushun is imaginative and sensitive. The story follows basic cultural themes and metaphors, striking special chords of emotion and memory of the recent past. The translation of Savushun into 17 different languages is another reason why the authors of this article choose to investigate the metaphorical expressions in this novel. The translation of the novel into German with the title of Drama der Trauer- Suvashun, and the Spanish version by Joaquin Rodriguez with the title of Suvashun took place in 1997 and 2005, respectively. The same novel has been translated into many other languages including French, Japanese, Russian, Chinese and Turkish. There are two famous English versions of Suvashun which have been translated by Mohammad Reza Ghanoonparvar and Roxane Zand in 1990 and 1992, respectively. Both translators are Iranian and they are obviously familiar with the Persian language. Therefore, they have certainly tried to explain the cultural concepts correctly. Mohammad Reza Ghanoonparvar kept the original name of the novel but Roxane Zand changed its name to “A Persian Requiem”.

Since there are some differences between the translations of metaphorical expressions in the target language, the present study investigated two translated versions

of “Suvashun” with regard to emotive metaphorical expressions. Moreover, far too little attention has been paid to investigate the translation of metaphorical expressions from Persian to English. Therefore, by examining how metaphorical expressions are rendered in translation, it is possible to analyze the patterns adopted for translation of the metaphorical expressions in the target texts, and whether there were similarities or differences in the translations of the metaphorical expressions from the source text to the target texts.

For the purpose of this paper, only emotive metaphorical expressions of happiness in the source text and the target texts were examined. The data employed for the sake of this study consisted of 41 expressions relating to happiness which were extracted from the source text and two target texts. This number included 14 metaphorical expressions extracted from the Persian source text and 27 expressions which have been translated in two target English texts. In this paper, because of the large number of metaphorical expressions, some cases of linguistic expressions were discussed to illustrate the application of the CMT framework in metaphor translation.

In terms of the procedures of data collection, in the first stage, the data was gathered by collecting the Persian metaphorical expressions from the aforementioned novel. In the second stage, the English equivalent expressions in the two English translated texts of the novel were identified. Based on the metaphor identification procedures (MIP) of the Pragglejaz Group (2007), for identification of metaphorical expressions from the source text and two target texts at the linguistic level, the researchers of the study identified metaphorical expressions in these texts using the following steps:

1. Reading the source text, and the translation text rendering carefully.
2. Identifying potentially metaphorical lexical items in the source text and the target texts.
3. (a) Determining the contextual meaning for each lexical unit in the source text.
(b) Searching for a more basic meaning of the each lexical unit in the source text and the target texts.
(c) Comparing the contextual meaning and the basic meaning of the lexical units and determining the extent to which they contrast.
4. Identifying potentially metaphorical lexical units and hence the conceptual metaphors in the expressions.

In addition to the MIP, each Persian metaphorical expression was transliterated and a literal translation was presented. The procedures in step (4) allow us to infer the conceptual metaphor from the lexical units contained in the metaphorical expressions. Similarly, the lexical units in the translational equivalences of these metaphorical expressions allow us to infer the conceptual metaphor in the target text. The conceptual metaphors of the translation are compared with those of conceptual metaphors in the source text. In resolving the semantics of the lexical unit, the researchers relied on the Dekhoda Dictionary (1999) and Aryanpur Bilingual Dictionary (1986), as well as the Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners of American English (MED 2008). In addition to the MIP for identifying conceptual metaphors, the researchers also relied on Steen (1997, 2009) and Semino (2008) five-step procedures to make the ‘jump’ from linguistic metaphor to conceptual metaphor:

- i. identifying the metaphorical focus;
- ii. identifying the metaphorical idea;
- iii. identifying the metaphorical comparison;
- iv. identifying the metaphorical analogy; and
- v. identifying the metaphorical mapping.

Semino (2008) declares that if the basic meaning and the contextual meaning of a metaphorical expression are understood in terms of an element of a topic domain and an element of vehicle domain, respectively, it can help us to infer the underlying conceptual metaphor in conjunction with what is already known or common knowledge. We can also identify the conceptual metaphor underlying the metaphorical expression according to Steen's (2009) recommendation that if metaphor in discourse can be explained by means of an underlying cross-domain mapping in conceptual structure, then it should be possible to move from the linguistic forms in the text to the conceptual structures that capture their meaning in some ordered fashion. As mentioned earlier, the aim of the present study was to investigate the equivalents for the translation of emotive metaphorical expressions in the target texts (TTs) and discover the translation strategies used by the translators.

After matching the translated English texts to the source text (ST), each pair of ST and the two TTs were dealt with individually. Having located the Persian metaphors in the source text, the researchers examined the target text for the corresponding metaphorical expressions. This was sometimes problematic since the structure of the TT may change in certain cases, thereby displacing the corresponding Persian expressions, or the expressions were often adapted or omitted which create some confusion in locating them. Close reading of both ST and the two TTs was necessary so as not to overlook any translated expressions. Finally, based on the analysis of the metaphorical expressions and the conceptual metaphors in the source text and the target texts, the similarities and differences of both these two levels were explicated.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In order to analyze the data, emotive metaphorical expressions relating to happiness from the source text and two target texts were investigated, and the conceptual metaphor underlining the metaphorical expressions in the source text and the target texts were identified. It is necessary to point out that the purpose of this study was not to evaluate different translations of the source text, and approve or disapprove any of them. This study is only a comparative analysis to find a better solution for transference of metaphorical expressions. The comparative analysis might be difficult to generalize with the limited data; however, this study introduces a kind of data analysis and examines the cultural domain of happiness in the Persian language which was translated into English by two different translators. Although many instances of deficiencies in translation were observed while going over the translation, just three cases of deficiencies in the translation (1-3) are shown as follow:

1. ST (page 143): تمام صورت یوسف با لبخندی روشن شده بود
تمام / لبخندی / روشن / شده / بود / صورت / یوسف / با / تمام
tamam-e/ sorat-e / Yusof / ba / labkhandi/ roshan / shode/ bod

whole -of / face-of / Yusof / with/ smile / **light** / become/ was
“His face **lighted up** with laughter”

1a: Yusof’s whole face had **lit up** with a smile. (TT1 page 155)

1b. Yusof’s face was **radiant** with smiles. (TT2 page 132)

2. ST (page 85): چشم هایش پر از برق بود

چشم / برق / از / پر / یش -ها- چشم
chashm- ha- yash / por / az / **bargh** / bod
eye - s - his / **full** / of / **electricity** / was
“His eyes were filled with electricity”

2a. His eyes sparkled. (TT1 page 97)

2b. His eyes shone. (TT2 page 79)

3. ST (page 36): ما را از خنده روده بر می کند

ما / را / از / خنده / روده بر / می کند
ma / ra / az / khande / **rodebor** / mi-konand
us / DO.marker / from / laugh / **intestine-cut** / do
“Our intestine were cut from laughter”

3a. He makes us laugh so much.(TT1 page 50)

3b. omitted

According to the application of the MIP in the first step, the entire source text and target texts were read to establish a general understanding of the meaning of the texts; then, the source text and the target texts were divided into lexical units. The researchers determined the lexical units which were the sources of metaphors in each of the expressions (these are in bold). The discussion below focuses on each example and its translations.

In (1) *tamam-e sorat-e Yusof ba labkhandi roshan shode bod*, the lexical unit “*roshan*” is identified as a potentially metaphorical item. The contextual meaning of *roshan* refers to a face lighting up to denote happiness. According to Aryanpur Bilingual Dictionary (1986), the basic (non-metaphoric) meaning of “*roshan*” (lit: light) is “an energy that brightens things and makes them visible”. When we compare the contextual meaning and the basic meaning of “*roshan*”, we notice that the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning. We understand that the basic meaning of “*roshan*” in Persian as something that stimulates sight such as lamp. This meaning is in contrast to the meaning of “*roshan*” in (1) where the context is one where the face lights up to denote an emotion, in this case, happiness. Hence, the lexical unit “*roshan*” (Lit: light) is marked as metaphorical item. In terms of human physiology, when a person is happy and smiles, the muscles in the face become more relaxed and the mouth widen giving us a clear picture of the face and a ‘brighter’ complexion. This light metaphor is very common in Persian language and denotes things and emotions that are pleasant.

Kövecses (1991) argues that the light metaphor renders numerous properties of the emotion of happiness. First of all, happiness is depicted as the opposites of unpleasant emotional experiences like sadness and anxiety. In addition, such metaphorical employment indicates a sort of shifting in the person’s state from anxiety and sadness to happiness because of hearing some satisfying news or pleasant information about an

issue. Secondly, the shift from the state of sadness or anxiety to happiness goes together with another shift in perspective - happiness implies a positive outlook on the world (as in the expressions bright side, light up and brighten up). Thirdly, a happy person is depicted as an energetic and dynamic person. For this reason, a happy person's external brightness can be considered a reflection of his internal body's heat resulting from his lively activity. Fourthly, thermo-power, as it is known from our understanding of some physical phenomena, spreads from one object to another in three ways: radiation, convection, and conduction.

Hence light as a form of energy is appropriate as a metaphor for emotions, since emotions can exude, display and radiate from the source of the emotion, namely the person (Al-Haq & El-Sharif, 2008). Hence, the conceptual metaphor underlying the expression "*tama-e sorat-e Yusof ba labkhandi roshan shode bod*" (Lit: his face was light up with laugh) is HAPPINESS IS LIGHT.

The translations of the metaphorical expression in (1) are retrieved by aligning the source context and the target contexts and are represented below in (1a) and (1b):

1. tamam-e /sorat-e / Yusof / ba / labkhandi / **roshan**/ shode/ bod
whole-of /face-of / Yusof / with / smile / **light** /become/ was
- 1a. Yusof's whole face had **lit up** with a smile. (TT1 page 155)
- 1b. Yusof's face was **radiant** with smiles. (TT2 page 132)

The analysis of the English translation data follows the analysis of the Persian data and involves a sequence of MIP steps. In the target text (1), the lexical unit *lit up* is considered as a potentially metaphorical item. In this context, the contextual meaning of the lexical unit *lit up* is brightness and radiance. Through choosing the lexical unit *lit up* in the target text (1a), the translator has managed to maintain the meaning of the original lexical unit in the source text. The lexical unit "light up" in English is closely related to lexical unit *roshan shodan* in Persian. In addition, the words light up and face in English are literal equivalents of *sorate roshan* (Lit: light face) in Persian. The use of the expression *face light up* in the translation to express happiness represents a translation using similar metaphorical expressions. In addition, a similar conceptual metaphor namely HAPPINESS IS LIGHT is used in the translation (1a) Yusof's whole face had lit up with a smile. In target text 2, the lexical unit *radiant* is considered as a potentially metaphorical item. In this context, the translator has used a different word (radiant) as the translational equivalent of *roshan* (light) in the source text. The expression "... face was radiant with smiles" is used to describe *happy Yusof's face*. This expression is based on our bodily experience - when someone is happy, his or her face and eyes often become brighter. So the translator is justified in using the word radiant to describe a strong emotion that is reflected in a happy person's face. The basic meaning of radiant according to MacMillan English Dictionary is 'a kind of energy produced by hot objects that cannot be seen such as light'. Consequently, in this context, there is a contrast between the contextual meaning and the basic meaning, rendering the use of radiant metaphorically within the context. In this example, the translator uses different though related metaphorical expressions. The use of the translation equivalents *radiant* in this context provides an image of a happy glowing face much like a face lighting up. Hence,

the conceptual metaphor HAPPINESS IS LIGHT is also instantiated by the linguistic expression “his face was radiant” in the target text (2).

Based upon the above examples, it can be concluded that both the original context and the translation contexts indicate similar concept of happiness. The universal metaphoric concept makes the translator’s task easier in achieving a higher level of equivalence by finding the similar expression of the source text that already exists in the target texts. In example (1), the translator of TT1 has employed a lexical equivalent for each word from the source text. In fact, the translator has used the exact or equivalent concept from the source text. For example, using the lexical item *light up* to express happiness in the English translation expresses an identical expression and conceptual metaphor in the Persian *sorataash ba labkhandi roshan shode bod*. The translation hence relies on similar metaphorical expression with similar mapping condition. However, in TT2, for the translation of ‘*Yusof’s face was radiant with smiles*’, the translator has utilised an equivalent metaphor in the target language with approximately corresponding lexical unit in the target language lexical item (which is not an exact translational equivalent). In this case, the translation relies on similar mapping condition with different metaphorical expression.

In (2), *chashm- ha- yash por az bargh bod*, the lexical unit *bargh* (Lit: electricity) is considered as a potentially metaphorical item. The lexical unit “*bargh*” in the context of the expression refers to a person’s eye being filled with “*bargh*” (Lit: electricity) to indicate happiness. The most basic meaning of “*bargh*” (Lit: electricity) according to Aryanpur Bilingual English Dictionary (1986) is “a form of energy that can produce light, heat, and a source of power”. So, while comparing these two meanings of “*bargh*”, we observe that there is a contrast between the first discussed contextual meaning and the basic meaning. In the expression, we can consider joy and happiness as a form of energy that is metaphorically reflected in the glitter of one’s eyes. Happiness is internal energy. Hence, the expression “*chashm- ha- yash por az bargh bod*” through the lexical “*bargh*” manifests the conceptual metaphor HAPPINESS IS ENERGY. In Persian, the eyes are conceptually and linguistically highlighted in the face that can be the barometer of emotion. Thus, the body parts “eyes” are such an important feature of the human face that are used very frequently in the conceptualization of emotion in Persian. The expression “*his eyes full of electricity*” reveals a person to be full of joy and it is reflected in his eyes. The eyes serve as a container of the emotion. In this respect, the liquid of happiness is the joy, which is overflowed by the eyes. Then, it is possible to say the expression of “*chashm- ha- yash por az bargh bod*” though the lexical “*por*” (Lit: full) manifests another conceptual metaphor HAPPINESS IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER.

The translations of (2) is provided in (2a) and (2b)

1. *chashm- ha- yash / por/ az/ bargh / bod*
eye - s – his / full / of / electricity / was
- 2a. His eyes **sparkled**. (TT1 page 97)
- 2b. His eyes **shone**. (TT2 page 79)

In TT1, the translator has used the lexical unit *sparkled* to translate the metaphorical expression in the source. Through the translation ‘*His eyes sparkled*’, the same element,

namely the eyes, is utilised to carry the emotions. The basic meaning of the lexical unit *sparkled* in the MED refers to an object or a surface that is shining due to the reflection of a bright light. In the case of (2a), there is a shift in the metaphorical expression as well as the conceptual metaphor. Instead of the source of energy (*bargh* – electricity), the translator has highlighted the effects of that energy – sparkle. The conceptual metaphor in the translation is thus parallel to the one in the first example HAPPINESS IS LIGHT. Similarly in (2b), the translator uses the same conceptual metaphor HAPPINESS IS LIGHT to describe happiness. However, instead of *sparkle*, the translator has used the lexical unit *shone* to translate *bargh*. As with (2a), the use of *shone* in this context conveys the happiness that is reflected in the eyes. Both translators utilise the conceptual metaphor HAPPINESS IS LIGHT in contrast to the source metaphor HAPPINESS IS ENERGY. Arguably, both source and target metaphors are related since light is a form of energy. The example above shows that the translation does not follow the source expression closely. For instance, there is no translation for the original phrase “*por as bargh*” (Lit: full of electricity) in the target text. Moreover, the conceptualization of happiness in the ST to TT is different. It leads us to conclude that both translators have shifted the concept of happiness from the container to light metaphor.

In (3), *ma ra az khande rodebor mi-konand*, the lexical unit *rodebor* provides the metaphorical force in the expression to denote a scene of profuse and uncontrollable laughter. However, the basic meaning of *rodebor* (Lit: cut-intestine) based on the concise *Aryanpur Bilingual Dictionary* (1986) is “having one’s intestine cut”. In Persian, it is common to use a specific body part, such as the intestine to conceptualize abstract entities. This metaphoric expression is also based on the physiological experiences involved in laughing hard which involve the stomach muscle and hence it feels as though our intestine is contracting and expanding when we laugh. If the contractions and expansions get too violent, they may even hurt or damage the affected body parts. Hence, in Persian, when a person is said to have a thorn in some part of the body, it means that this person has laughed so much that his intestine hurts.

Example (3) in our data is translated as (3a) in TT1 and omitted in TT2.

3. ma/ ra / az /khande/ **rodebor** / mi-konand
us / DO.marker / from /laugh / intestine-cut / do
3a. He makes us laugh so much.(TT1 page 50)
3b. omitted

The English translation (3a) ‘*He makes us laugh so much*’ represents non-metaphorical rendition of original metaphorical expression. In this context, there is not a potentially metaphorical lexical item. The source metaphorical phrase “*as khande rodebor mikone*” is translated into “*laugh so much*” in (3a). The translator merely conveys the literal meaning of the source metaphorical expression to describe happiness. In this case, there is no hidden meaning that needs to be uncovered. Then, the meaning of the source metaphorical expression has been translated without retaining the metaphor. Consequently, the English translation does not involve an original expression.

In the case of (3b), the translator has completely deleted this metaphorical expression from the source text without attempting to find an appropriate equivalent. However, the English translation does not achieve an equivalent metaphorical expression to the Persian

metaphor. Consequently, the two translators applied different strategies in the translation of metaphorical expressions.

CONCLUSION

Translation from one language to another is impossible if there is no adequate knowledge of the two cultures involved. In the case of this study, it was assumed that Persian and English languages are naturally dissimilar since both have different cultural identities. Furthermore, language expressions could be seen as the main difference between Persian and English metaphoric expressions that in turn could be viewed as the factor enriching the societal cultural characteristics. The present study made an attempt to investigate metaphor translation using a cognitive approach to metaphor. From analyzing emotive metaphorical expressions of happiness and their translation from Persian into English, the authors found that they are more cognitive mapping condition oriented rather than similar mapping condition. The findings of this study showed that translating happiness expressions largely depend on source language cognitive domain they come from. On the other hand, the findings of the study also revealed that metaphorical expressions of happiness are not interpreted in Persian and English culture in the same way. It is necessary for a translator to go through different processes of cognitive mapping in the target language. Translators must pay attention to the diversity of cultural conceptualization in their act of translating. Translating metaphorical expressions at both linguistic level and conceptual level in a meaningful sense requires understanding both cultural context of that language, and simultaneously, the patterns that the given culture conceptualize experiences.

Through examining a small sample of the translation of happiness expressions, we are able to observe different patterns of translation utilizing a cognitive approach to metaphor which are:

- i. similar metaphorical concept and similar metaphorical expression;
- ii. similar metaphorical concept but different metaphorical expression;
- iii. different metaphorical concept but similar metaphorical expression; and
- iv. non-translation or omission of the source metaphorical expression.

These patterns show that sometimes the equivalent metaphors have identical linguistic forms and identical conceptual mappings. The translation of this metaphor is easier than the other ones, because both languages have the same metaphorical expressions with the same image, topic and the same point of similarity and the translation of this metaphor would create a similar effect in the target language. Even if the translators do not know the metaphorical meaning of the expression and they translate it only to preserve its structure, they have been successful in their translation. This is the positive transference in translation metaphor. Sometimes they have different linguistic forms and identical conceptual mapping; these metaphors have different images, but they are culturally equivalent. And sometimes they have similar metaphors with different conceptual mapping; the conceptual metaphors underlying these linguistic metaphors are not the same, but these metaphors show the same concepts and metaphorical meaning with different linguistic forms. Therefore, they are similar. These metaphors create some problems for the translator and it takes a long time for the translator to find an equivalent

metaphor. According to Mandelblit (1995), metaphorical expressions take more time and they are more difficult to be translated if they exploit a cognitive domain different from that the target language equivalent expressions. The reason for this difference in the translation process is that it is the search for another conceptual mapping which causes delay, uncertainty and difficulty in the translation of different domain metaphors. In fact, we can conclude when the two languages have identical metaphors, the transference is positive and when they do not have identical metaphors but similar and different ones, the transference is negative. However, translators should observe the metaphorical meaning at first and they should try to find an equivalent metaphor that best expresses the original metaphor. Therefore, the application of cognitive view on translation study can help translators render problematic Persian expressions into English as easy as possible.

REFERENCES

- Al-Zoubi, M. Q., Al-Ali, M. N. & Al-Hasnawi, A. R. (2007). Cogno-Cultural Issues in Translating Metaphors. *Perspectives*. Vol 14(3), 230-239.
- Al-Haq, F. & El-Sharif, A. (2008). A Comparative Study for the Metaphor Use in Happiness and Anger in English and Arabic. *Journal of US-China Foreign Language*. Vol 6(11), 5-23.
- Aryanpur, K. A. & Aryanpur, K. M. (1986). *Aryanpur Persian-English Dictionary*. Tehran: Amir-Kabir Publications.
- Badavi, M. F. (2008). Investigating EFL Prospective Teacher's Ability to Translate Culture-Bound Expressions. Retrieved October 25, 2012 from <http://www.bel.edu.ar/spis/IMG/pdf/d0.pdf>
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Dobrzynska, T. (1995). Translating Metaphor: Problems of Meaning, *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol 24(6), 595-604.
- Dagut, M. (1987). More about the Translatability of Metaphor. *Babel*. Vol 33(2), 77-83.
- Daneshvar, S. (1969). *Savushun*. Tehran: Kharazmi.
- Dehkhoda, M.A. (1999). *Amsal-O-Hekam-E-Dehkhoda*. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.
- Ghanoonparvar, M. R. (1991). *Savushun: A Novel about Modern Iran*. Washington, D. C.
- Hiraga, M. (1991). Metaphor and Comparative Cultures. In P.G.J. Fendos (Ed.). *Crosscultural Communication: East and West, Volume 3* (pp. 149-166). Taiwan: Tai Cheng Publishing.
- Kövecses, Z. (1991). Happiness: A Definitional Effort. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*. Vol 6, 29-46.
- Khajeh, Z. & Imran Ho-Abdullah. (2012). Persian Culinary Metaphors: A Cross-cultural Conceptualization. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*. Vol 12(1), 69-87.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Larson, M.L. (1984). *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence*. Lanham, New York & London: University Press of America.

- Macmillan English Dictionary. (2008). *For Advanced Learners of American English*. Macmillan English Dictionary.
- Mandelbilt, N. (1995). The Cognitive View of Metaphor and its Implications for Translation Theory. In M. Thelen & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (Eds.). *Translation and Meaning* (pp. 95-483). Maastricht, Netherlands: Universitaire Pars Maastricht.
- Newmark, P. (1980). The Translation of Metaphor. *Babel*. Vol 26(2), 93-100.
- Newmark, P. (1988a). *Approaches to Translation*, Prentice Hall International, (UK)
- Newmark, P. (1988b). *A Textbook of Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Nida, E. A & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Help for Translators), Leiden: United Bible Societies.
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*. Vol 22(1), 1-39.
- Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and Translation. Some Implications of a Cognitive Approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol 36(7), 1253-1269.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies*. 2nd Edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steen, G. (1997). From Linguistic to Conceptual Metaphor in Five Steps. In Gibbs Jr., R.W. & G. Steen (Eds.). *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 57-77). Selected papers from the fifth international cognitive linguistics conference, Amsterdam, July 1997, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Steen, G. (2009). From Linguistic Form to Conceptual Structure in Five Steps: Analyzing Metaphor in Poetry. In: F. Brône & J. Vandaele (Eds.). *Cognitive Poetics, Goals, Gains and Gaps* (pp. 197-226). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zand, R. (1992). *A Persian Requiem*. New York: G. Braziller.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Fatemeh Safarnejad is a Ph.D candidate at the School of Language Studies & Linguistics, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. Her special interests include cognitive linguistic and translation study.

Imran Ho Bin Abdullah @ Ho Yee Beng (Ph. D) is professor of linguistics at Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. He has been dean of the Faculty of Language Studies (now the School of Language Studies & Linguistics) and is currently the Director of the International Relations at UKM.

Norsimah Mat Awal is an Associate Professor in the School of Language Studies and Linguistics, Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities, UKM. Her special interests include semantics and pragmatics and translation.