



University of Tehran press

Procedures and methods for translating conceptual metaphors from English to Persian: A case study of the Persian translation of Deathstalker 1



Ali Beikian *ID 0000-0002-7734-2370

English Language Department, Assistant Professor of Translation Studies, Chabahar Maritime University.

Email: a_beikian@yahoo.co.uk



Parisa Roshandel Hormozi **ID 0000-0001-8694-9847

English Language Department, Graduate of Linguistics, Chabahar Maritime University

Email: paris.rshndl@gmail.com



Mehdi Safaie-Qalati ***ID 0000-0002-6952-2646

English Language Department, Assistant Professor of Linguistics, Chabahar Maritime University.

Email: m.safaieqalati@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Conceptual metaphors are among the distinctive features of the Sci-Fi genre. However, understanding conceptual metaphors and translating them correctly is a big challenge, which can be overcome using appropriate translation procedures and methods. The current study investigated the procedures and methods for translating conceptual metaphors in the Sci-Fi novel Deathstalker 1 from English into Persian. To this end, first, a parallel corpus of 150 English sentences containing conceptual metaphors and their Persian translations was built using stratified random sampling. Then the type of each conceptual metaphor and their cross-domain mappings were determined following Lakoff and Johnson (2003). Finally, the translation procedures and methods applied for translating each conceptual metaphor were identified based on Schmidt's (2012) translation procedures and Newmark's (1988) translation methods, respectively. It was found that 'translating a conceptual metaphor to conceptual metaphor,' which preserves the type of conceptual metaphor, cross-domain mapping, and meaning, was the most frequent translation procedure (60%). Similarly, literal translation, adding up to 61%, was the most frequently used translation method. The findings suggest that the relative similarity between Persian and English conceptual systems and the conceptual metaphors' universality result in understanding conceptual metaphors and cross-domain mapping between the two languages despite their linguistic differences.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 24 September 2022

Received in revised form 29 November 2022

Accepted: 11 December 2022

Available online: Summer 2023

Keywords:

cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, translation procedures, translation methods, translation studies

Beikian, A., Roshandel Hormozi, P., & Safaie-Qalati, M. (2023). Procedures and methods for translating conceptual metaphors from English to Persian: A case study of the Persian translation of Deathstalker 1. Journal of Foreign Language Research, 13 (2), 335-349. http://doi.org/ 10.22059/jflr.2023.352312.1001



© The Author(s).

Publisher: The University of Tehran Press.

DOI: http://doi.org/ 10.22059/jflr.2023.352312.1001

* Ali Beikian, Assistant Professor of Translation Studies, Chabahar Maritime University – Corresponding Author

** Parisa Roshandel Hormozi, M.A. Graduate of Linguistics, Chabahar Maritime University

*** Mehdi Safaie-Qalati, Assistant Professor of Linguistics, Chabahar Maritime University

1. Introduction

Sci-Fi novel is one of the most popular genres today. Combining conventional literary metaphors and the numerous uses of conceptual metaphors (CMs) to conceptualize abstract concepts related to scientific and fictional concepts is one of the distinguishing features of this genre. One of the mechanisms the human mind uses to conceptualize abstract concepts is to fall back on CMs. Human communication systems, including natural language, are based on this CM system; therefore, the expressions representing CMs in natural language manifest this universal and inevitable solution of the human mind to create abstract concepts (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 4). Despite the universality of the embodied basis of CMs, there are variations in the representation of CMs in different cultures and languages (Kövecses, 2005, pp. 5-4). This makes the correct understanding of CMs and the correct transfer of their meanings from the source language to the target language challenging. Therefore, correctly translating CMs requires appropriate procedures and methods (Golfam & Nahavandi, 2022). In addition, "a metaphor does not have static and unified meanings and can potentially create multiple meanings" (Snodgrass & Coyne, 1991, as cited in Esfandiari et al., 2022, p. 203).

There is a fundamental difference between a CM and its linguistic manifestation. Among the reasons for this are the cultural and linguistic differences that cause CMs to appear variously from one language to another (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; Kövecses, 2017; Tebbit & Kinder, 2016). According to

Kövecses (2005 & 2010), resorting to CMs to conceptualize abstract concepts through mapping them to embodied experiences is universal; however, the embodied experiences and concrete concepts of the source domain may be manifested in various ways in different cultures, historical periods, and languages. This is the basis for diversity in using CMs in different societies. Thus, in cases where the representation of an abstract concept in a CM differs from one language to another, the correct transfer of the CM concept from the source language to the target language requires accurate translation (Newmark, 1988). Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) believe that the correct transfer of the concept of a metaphor means the similarity of cross-domain mapping in the source and target languages. In other words, mapping and similarity between the source and target languages' CMs should exist.

Now, the problem raised here is, when translating CMs from English to Persian, to what extent the type of the CM and its cross-domain mapping are preserved and which translation procedures and methods are used. The following research questions were formulated to find the answer to the problem: 1. What translation procedures have been used to translate the conceptual metaphors in the Sci-Fi novel *Death Stalker 1* from English to Persian? 2. What translation methods have been used to translate the conceptual metaphors in the Sci-Fi novel *Death Stalker 1* from English to Persian?

According to the background of the research, it can be said that the current study has several innovations: simultaneous investigation of translation methods and

procedures used in translating CMs from English to Persian; use of a parallel corpus and a systematic rubric; and use of a Sci-Fi novel, as the corpus of the study, which has distinctive features compared to other genres of the novel.

2. Literature review

2.1 Types of Conceptual Metaphors

All CMs fall into three categories: structural conceptual metaphors (StCMs), ontological conceptual metaphors (OnCMs), and orientational conceptual metaphors (OrCMs) (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Understanding the structure of one experience in the form of another experience by considering several common features between the two concepts allows humans to understand many abstract concepts through experience. Concepts like love, life, idea, understanding, importance, and wealth are conceptualized as structured physical and objective experiences.

Kövecses (2010) believes that StCM originates from the OnCM. To be more precise, an abstract concept is conceptualized in a structural form with multiple requirements in order to be understood in such a way that at the most basic level of conceptual organization, first, it takes a material and physical nature and becomes objectified, and then, the properties of a material object and physical structure are attributed to it.

OrCM has a smaller range of abstract concepts than OnCM. In OrCM, abstract concepts are organized and understood from the perspective of directions such as up, down, front, back, far, near, below, and on. Due to the experience gained through the

body, these directions cause the conceptualization of abstract concepts such as happiness, goodness, rationality, mastery, and health.

2.2 Translation Procedures and Methods Used for Translating Conceptual Metaphors

Translation procedures focus on linguistic changes such as turning a phrase into a word or vice versa, changing parts of speech, modifying sentence structures, etc. (Newmark, 1988). In addition, according to Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), translation procedures are used based on the contextual factors of the source text to translate sentences, phrases, and words. Many translation theorists, including Nida (1964) and Newmark (1988), have studied translation procedures. However, in line with the purpose of the present study, our specific focus here is on the translation procedures used for translating CMs. As Mandelbit (1995) and Schäffner (2004) point out, the cognitive nature of CMs requires specific procedures related to cognitive translation. In other words, the cross-domain mapping of CM has asymmetric aspects. The most superficial layer of CM is the metaphorical expression. This means that CM shows its presence through a metaphorical expression. Therefore, to convey the message of CMs and achieve this conceptual mapping and assimilation, the priority is to translate CMs into metaphorical expressions. Massey (2017) believes:

Two methods of meaning transfer are significant in the translation process (Shuttleworth, 2014): first, the process and the product of cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system of the source language

(Lakoff, 1993), and second, the translation of this mapping into the target language, which according to Massey (2016), is called “remapping” (Massey, 2017, p. 175).

In light of this, some cognitive translation theorists’ classifications of CM translation procedures will be briefly introduced in the following. Tebbit and Kinder (2016, pp. 419-420) consider three procedures for translating CMs: a) preserving all the metaphorical expressions of a CM; b) removing some metaphorical expressions while preserving others; and c) rephrasing the metaphor using the metaphorical expressions of the target language. Mandelbit (1995, as cited in Merakchi, 2017) suggests two procedures, “same mapping conditions” and “different mapping conditions,” and Schäffner (2004), in the discussion of translating CMs in political texts, introduces the following patterns: a) the CM is the same in the source and target languages, but the metaphorical expressions are different; b) the expressions revealing the content of the structural components of the fundamental conceptual schema in the source language replace these components in the target language; c) the metaphor is described in more detail and precision in the target language than in the source language; d) different metaphorical expressions influenced by the same CM are used in the source and target languages; and e) the expressions used in the target language reveal a different aspect of the CM.

Schmidt (2012) proposes the following procedures: 1-a) translating a metaphorical expression into a metaphorical expression having the same CM, meaning, and mapping; 1-b) translating a metaphorical expression

into a metaphorical expression having the same CM and meaning but different mapping; 2) translating a metaphorical expression into a metaphorical expression having a different CM and mapping but the same meaning; 3) translating a metaphorical expression into a non-metaphorical expression with the same meaning; 4) translating a metaphorical expression into a zero-element; 5) translating a non-metaphorical expression into a metaphorical expression with the same meaning; and 6) translating a zero-element into a metaphorical expression.

In the present study, we used Schmidt's (2012) proposed procedures since they consider all possible states and are more complete. In addition, previous similar studies, such as Schmidt (2014), Kajtazović (2018), and Vučković (2020), have used such procedures, which corroborates our choice of theoretical framework.

From Vinay and Darbelnet’s (1995) point of view, choosing a translation method means that the translator creates a general schema of the source text and the author’s message by considering the linguistic features of the source and target languages and the message of the source text. Then, since the message must be accurately conveyed to the target language, they choose a method for accurately transferring it. In line with the purposes of the present study, some translation theorists’ views on translation methods are introduced according to the comprehensiveness of their typology of translation methods. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) put translation methods into two categories: the “direct” method and the

“indirect” method. Crystal (1997, as cited in [Faishol, 2019](#)) divides translation methods into three categories: “word-for-word,” “literal,” and “free.” [Newmark \(1998\)](#) introduces eight translation methods: word-for-word, literal, faithful, semantic, communicative, idiomatic, free, and adaptation. He places these methods in two general categories: source-oriented and target-oriented. All eight methods are placed on a continuum, going from the most affinity with the source language to the most affinity with the target language regarding form, meaning, and culture.

Among the above translation methods, [Newmark’s \(1988\)](#) translation methods were used as the theoretical framework of the present study because they were more complete and comprehensive. In addition, several similar studies, such as [Afifah \(2012\)](#), [Ailan \(2016\)](#), [Ginting et al. \(2018\)](#), [Nugraha et al. \(2017\)](#), [Nurhanifah \(2019\)](#), [Shabitah and Hortono \(2020\)](#), and [Zheng \(2018\)](#) have used [Newmark’s \(1988\)](#) translation methods in their investigations of the translation methods used for translating CMs.

2.3 Previous Studies

[Afrashi and Vadipoor \(2011\)](#) investigated the procedures used for translating CMs in two documentaries based on linguistic features. The results showed that the similarity of cultural features between the two languages significantly impacts translatability and vice versa. In addition, they found that CMs in the source text were often translated into CMs in the target language. [Afrashi et al. \(2012\)](#) studied the translation of OrCMs from Spanish to Persian, based on a comparative approach

and following [Lakoff and Johnson \(1980\)](#). By examining 38 OrCMs in the original and translated versions of a novel at the level of metaphorical manifestation and mapping, they found that the differences between the two languages were derived from cultural factors. However, the users of the two languages have more similarities in understanding direction, which indicates the role of place and direction in determining the CM.

[Sarahi \(2012\)](#) studied the translation of basic sensory CMs and color terms in Persian and English based on [Kövecses’s \(2005\)](#) approach. The study found that the similarity of metaphors between the two languages is due to their universality. At the same time, the differences are derived from the fact that language is dependent on culture. [Amiri Shayesteh \(2014\)](#) investigated the translation of CMs in three odes by Parvin E’tesami from Kövecses’s point of view. The results indicated the high similarity of metaphors and the high frequency of the same source and target domains in the two languages. In the same vein, [Khakipour and Amjad \(2019\)](#) showed that language and culture interdependence causes the difference in metaphorical mapping from one language to another and that the metaphorical mapping of the container and passage of time are not the same in Persian and English due to cultural and meta-linguistic reasons.

[Salemi and Jafarpour \(2020\)](#) concluded that the universality of CMs creates similarities, while the cultural dependence of languages creates differences between the metaphorical expressions of English and Persian. Additionally, [Shadman et al. \(2021\)](#)

studied examples from the book *Sahifa Sajadieh* and its two translations by Mousavi Garmaroodi and Elahi Ghomshei to investigate the relationship between CMs at two primary levels: similar metaphors and particular metaphors. The findings showed that Mousavi Garmaroodi had used creative metaphors, while Elahi Ghomshei had translated abstract concepts into non-metaphorical expressions.

In the same way, [Patrick et al. \(2010\)](#) showed that linguistic, cultural, and authorial factors relatively influence the preservation, omission, and modification of CMs. Also, examining the procedures used in the Chinese translations of English advertisements, [Chen et al. \(2013\)](#) found that out of the 42 StCMs, 32 were translated into StCMs, 2 into OnCMs, and 8 into non-metaphorical expressions (NMEs), while there were no instances of translating StCMs to OrCMs. Out of the 44 OnCMs, 8 were translated into StCMs, 23 into OnCMs, and 13 into NMEs, while there were no instances of translating OnCMs to OrCMs. Finally, out of the 9 OrCMs, 3 were translated into StCMs, 5 into OrCMs, and 1 into NMEs, while there were no instances of translating OrCMs to OnCMs.

[Schmidt \(2014\)](#), by examining the English translation of the CMs used in the subtitles of a Croatian film, proved that the universality of CMs leads to the same translation of metaphorical mapping. However, language's dependence on culture leads to different metaphorical mapping or non-metaphorical translations. In addition, [Nijs \(2015\)](#) found that cultural differences lead to word-for-word or non-metaphorical translation; and

[Liang and Liu \(2015\)](#), upon examining Chinese-to-English translations of news reports, found that three common methods for translating CMs are retention, displacement, and deletion of CMs. [Megantara \(2017\)](#), after examining and comparing the translation methods of CMs used in the English translation of an Indonesian novel, found that out of 102 CMs, 72 were translated into CMs, 26 were translated into NMEs, and 4 were translated into similes. [Ashuja'a et al. \(2019\)](#), who examined the procedures used for translating CMs from English to Arabic, found that the three methods of literal translation, non-metaphorical translation, and descriptive equivalent had the highest frequency, respectively.

3. Research Method

The current study aimed to investigate the procedures and methods used for translating CMs from English to Persian; therefore, the statistical population of the current research is pervasive and includes all the texts translated from English to Persian. Nevertheless, such a corpus is not available. In addition, because for extracting samples containing CMs, the researcher must interpret the expressions in a hermeneutic way, it is evident that mere random sampling was impossible. Given this, a combination of available, purposive, and disproportionately stratified sampling methods was used to extract the sample. Hence, among the translated texts, the text of the translated novels whose English and Persian versions were "available" electronically were considered; then, the Sci-Fi genre, which can represent abstract concepts, was

“purposefully” chosen as the target genre; and finally, to remove the effects of differences in the authors’ styles on the results, only one book and one author were chosen as a sample to conduct a “case study,” that is, the first volume of the Sci-Fi novel *Death Stalker* (Green, 1995).

In light of the preceding, the first volume of this novel, translated by Mrs. Arezoo Ahmai and available electronically, was selected as the corpus of the study. However, due to the large volume of the book, which would make the entire book a colossal sample, we used a “stratified disproportionate sampling” method. This way, we considered the number 10 as a random number to select the book’s pages, and the conceptual metaphors contained in the pages whose numbers were multiples of 10 were extracted and entered under Column A of an Excel sheet. However, due to the large number of extracted sentences, which could reduce the study’s accuracy, 150 sentences (out of the total 732 initially extracted sentences) were chosen randomly using the online software *Research Randomizer*. These 150 sentences were inserted under Column A of a new Excel sheet. Then, the sentences whose correct understanding required context were replaced with new sentences randomly selected from the initial 732 sentences. After sampling, the 150 sentences were reviewed and finalized by two experts (an Assistant Professor of Translation Studies and an Assistant Professor of Cognitive Linguistics). Then, the book’s Persian translation was studied, and each English sentence’s translation was extracted and inserted under

Column D of the Excel sheet parallel to its source. In this way, the parallel corpus of the study was prepared.

Then, the three types of CMs used in the sentences under Column A were analyzed using Lakoff and Johnson’s (2003) typology of CMs, i.e., StCMs, OrCMs, and OnCMs, and the obtained information was entered under Column B. Under Column C, the cross-domain mappings of the three types of CMs were included; and under Column E, the types of CMs contained in the Persian sentences were written. In addition, the cross-domain mappings of the three types of CMs used in Column-D sentences were inserted under Column F. Finally, the procedure used for translating each CM was inferred through the comparative analysis of the CM and its cross-domain mapping following Schmidt (2012) and the translation method used for the same was inferred by considering the translation procedure and following Newmark’s (1988) typology of translation methods. The procedures were inserted under Column G, and the methods under Column H.

4. Results

4.1 Conceptual Metaphors

From the source text, 150 sentences containing CMs were extracted and examined according to Lakoff and Johnson’s (2003) typology of CMs. The results of this study showed that 96 sentences contained StCMs, 27 OnCMs, and 27 OrCMs. Out of the 150 CMs in the source text, 117 CMs were translated to CMs, 31 were translated to NMEs, and only 2 CMs were translated to zero-elements (ZEs). Out of 117 target CMs,

86 were StCMs, 25 were OnCMs, and 6 were OrCMs.

In the following, some examples are presented to show how the CMs were identified and classified:

Table 1: Identification of StCMs-a

Source-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping	Target-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping
Partly <u>out of tradition</u> but mainly because the Deathstalkers had always felt it a good idea to have an ace or two hidden up their sleeves.	StCM	Traditions are containers.	طبق حدی نا از بیشتر اما سنت، خاندان که این روی همیشه دثاستاگر بهتر می کردند حس راه دو یکی است مخفی حرکت برای باشند. داشته	StCM	Traditions are the criteria.

The phrase underlined in the English sentence was extracted as a CM since the expression “out of tradition” means “according to tradition,” and its metaphorical meaning has become idiomatic over time. Tradition is introduced as a structure that has

container-like dimensions. In the target language, an StMC with a different cross-domain mapping than the source language has been used to express the intended concept.

Table 2: Identification of StCMs-b

Source-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping	Target-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping
Markee had been relying on the Virimonde run to restock the body banks and <u>repair his fortunes</u> and his ship.	StCM	Fortune is a constructed object.	امیدوار مارکی به سفر با بود مخازن و پریموند، را حسابش و عضو و کند پر نو از به را فضاپیمایش برساند. تعمیرگاه	UNT	NTLM

In the phrase “repair his fortunes”, fortune is an abstract concept conceptualized as an object with a fragile but repairable structure. In fact, due to cross-domain mapping, “fortune is a constructed object”; hence, it is

constructed in the form of some object to be understood and expressed. This phrase has not been translated (UNT) in the target text and has no target language cross-domain mapping (NTLM).

Table 3: Identification of OnCMs-a

Source-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping	Target-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping
The real war will be fought and won <u>in the hearts and minds of people</u> everywhere.	OnCM	The mind is a container for emotions.	در واقعی جنگ مردم قلب و فکر می افته اتفاق.	OnCM	The mind is a container for emotions.

The Phrase “in the minds of people” is an OnCM with the cross-domain mapping “Mind is a container for emotions,” according to the definition by [Lakoff and Johnson \(2003\)](#). This metaphor has given existence to the human mind and introduced

it as a container for beliefs and emotions. In the Persian version of this sentence, the mind has come into existence as a container for beliefs and emotions, and its meaning can be understood in this way.

Table 4: Identification of OnCMs-b

Source-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping	Target-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping
Silence said harshly, <u>forcing the words out</u> .	OnCM	ideas are substance.	با ساینس و خراشیده صدایی گفت. زحمت به	NME	NTLM

In the source text, the phrase “forcing the words out” has conceptualized words as a substance that pours out of a container. In other words, the word is considered the substance of the container; in this way, the cross-domain mapping “Ideas are substance” is expressed more clearly, and the abstract

concept of the word is conceptualized. However, in the target language, the abstract concept of the word is translated into an NME, and no cross-domain mapping has been used to express the abstract concept of the word (NTLM).

Table 5: Identification of OrCMs-a

Source-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping	Target-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping
Even Owen's <u>head of security</u> didn't know about these tunnels.	OrCM	High status is up.	رئیس حتی از هم او محافظان ها تونل این وجود نداشت. خیر	NME	NTLM

The phrase “head of security” indicates the use of an OrCM. The better the status, the higher the person’s position; therefore, the one with the best status is in the highest position and is placed at the top. The Persian

version of this example does not have any cross-domain mapping (NTLM) and has been translated as an NME.

Table 6: Identification of OrCMs-b

Source-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping	Target-text Sentence	Type of CM	Cross-domain Mapping
Just a few <u>high spirits</u> , that's all.	OrCM	Virtue is up.	آدم نفر چند فقط ..همین پیرانرژیان،	OnCM	Energy is the substance of the container.

Spirit as an abstract concept is conceptualized in an upward direction. In the translation of this example, an OnCM has been used to express the abstract concept and convey the message.

4.2 Procedures Used for Translating Conceptual Metaphors

As mentioned earlier, Schmidt's (2012) translation procedures were used in the present study. These procedures include: 1-a) translating a metaphorical expression into a metaphorical expression having the same CM, meaning, and mapping; 1-b) translating a metaphorical expression into a metaphorical expression having the same CM

and meaning but different mapping; 2) translating a metaphorical expression into a metaphorical expression having a different CM and mapping but the same meaning; 3) translating a metaphorical expression into a non-metaphorical expression with the same meaning; 4) translating a metaphorical expression into a zero-element; 5) translating a non-metaphorical expression into a metaphorical expression with the same meaning; and 6) translating a zero-element into a metaphorical expression. It is worth noting that since the basis of data extraction in the current research is the extraction of CMs from the source text, only the first 4

procedures are relevant for the data analysis. Of all the CMs, 91 CMs were translated using Procedure 1-a, 18 using Procedure 1-b, 31 using Procedure 3, 8 using Procedure 2, and 2 using Procedure 4.

In the following, some examples are presented to show how translation procedures were determined:

Example 1. The real war will be fought and won in the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

جنگ واقعی در فکر و قلب مردم اتفاق می‌افتد.

Procedure 1-a. The OnCM with the cross-domain mapping “The mind is a container for emotions” has been used in the source and target texts to express an abstract concept.

Example 2. Partly out of tradition but mainly because the Deathstalkers had always felt it a good idea to have an ace or two hidden up their sleeves.

تا حدی طبق سنت، اما بیشتر از روی این که خاندان دث‌استاکر همیشه حس می‌کردند بهتر است یکی دو راه برای حرکت مخفی داشته باشند.

Procedure 1-b. In the source text, the StCM with the mapping “Traditions are containers” has been used for the concept of tradition. Although an StCM has been used in the target text to express the desired abstract concept, the mapping conveying its message differs. In the target text, the mapping “Traditions are criteria” has been used to express and understand the abstract concept.

Example 3. Just a few high spirits, that's all.

فقط چند نفر آدم پیرانرژی‌ان، همین.

Procedure 2. In the source text, to express the abstract concept of spirit, an OnCM with the mapping “Virtue is up” has been used;

while in the target text, an OnCM with the mapping “Energy is the substance of the container” has been used.

Example 4. Silence said harshly, forcing the words out.

سایلینس با صدایی خراشیده و بهزحمت گفت.

Procedure 3. In the source text, an OnCM with the mapping “Ideas are substance” has been used; however, in the Persian translation, such a concept has been expressed non-metaphorically.

Example 5. Even Owen's head of security didn't know about these tunnels.

حتی رئیس محافظان او هم از وجود این تونل‌ها خبر نداشت.

Procedure 3. In the source text, an OrCM with the mapping “High status is up” has been used to conceptualize the boss. However, the translator has used the non-metaphorical expression “head of security” in the target text.

Example 6. Markee had been relying on the Virimonde run to restock the body banks and repair his fortunes and his ship.

مارکی امیدوار بود با سفر به ویریموند مخازن عضو و حسابش را از نو پر کند و فضاپیمايش را به تعمیرگاه برساند.

Procedure 4. The phrase “repair his fortunes” has not been translated at all.

According to the presented results, it can be stated that procedure 1-a has the highest frequency, followed by procedures 3, 1-b, 2, and 4, ranking second to fifth in terms of frequency, respectively.

4.3 Methods Used for Translating Conceptual Metaphors

Newmark's (1988) eight translation methods include 1. Word for word, 2. Literal, 3. Faithful, 4. Semantic, 5. Communicative, 6. Idiomatic, 7. Free, and 8. Adaptation. It is worth mentioning that due to the nature of the corpus used, Methods 1 and 8 are not relevant to the current research. Also, Method 6 is obtained by studying Procedure 5, which is not used in the present research due to its irrelevance. Examining other methods for translating CMs resulted in the following findings: 91 CMs were translated using the Literal Method, 18 using the Semantic Method, 8 using the Communicative Method, and 33 using the Free Method.

In the following, some examples are presented to show how translation methods were determined:

Example 1. The real war will be fought and won in the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

جنگ واقعی در فکر و قلب مردم اتفاق می افتد.

Method 2. The same type of CM, mapping, and meaning (Procedure 1-a) have caused a literal translation.

Example 2. Partly out of tradition but mainly because the Deathstalkers had always felt it a good idea to have an ace or two hidden up their sleeves.

تا حدی طبق سنت، اما بیشتر از روی این که خاندان دثاستاکر همیشه حس می کردند بهتر است یکی دو راه برای حرکت مخفی داشته باشند.

Method 4. The type of CM has not changed, but the metaphorical mapping used in the source and target languages is different (Procedure 1-b), which has caused a semantic translation.

Example 3. Just a few high spirits, that's all.

فقط چند نفر آدم پیرانرژی‌ان، همین.

Method 5. The metaphoric mapping differs in the source and target languages, but the meaning has been preserved. The OrCM has been changed into an OnCM, but what remains unchanged is the source text author's message (Procedure 2), which has resulted in a communicative translation.

Example 4. Silence said harshly, forcing the words out.

سایلنس با صدایی خراشیده و بهزحمت گفت.

Example 5. Even Owen's head of security didn't know about these tunnels.

حتی رئیس محافظان او هم از وجود این تونل‌ها خبر نداشت.

Example 6. Markee had been relying on the Virimonde run to restock the body banks and repair his fortunes and his ship.

مارکی امیدوار بود با سفر به ویریموند مخازن عضو و حسابش را از نو پر کند و فضاپیمایش را به تعمیرگاه برساند.

Method 7. The metaphorical expressions in sentences 4 and 5 of the source text have been translated into metaphorical expressions; the metaphorical expression in sentence 6 is a zero element. By understanding the subject's content, the translator has transferred the message freely and has not bound themselves to the metaphorical translation (Procedure 3), which has resulted in a free translation.

Because of the presented results, it can be said that literal translation has the highest frequency, followed by free, semantic, and communicative methods ranking second to

fourth in the frequency of use; faithful translation has not been used.

5. Discussion

In response to the first research question, the procedure having the highest usage is Procedure 1-a, adding up to 60%. This shows the universality of CMs because the author's message and meaning have been transferred from the source language to the target language by maintaining cross-domain mapping and the type of metaphor, and the abstract concept used in the CMs between the two languages is conceptualized through cross-domain mapping. Researchers such as Afrashi and Vadipoor (2011), Sarahi (2012), Amiri Shayesteh (2014), Salemi and Jafarpour (2020), Megantara (2017), and Ashuja'a et al. (2019) reached similar results regarding the procedures used for the translation of CMs. It is worth noting that Schmidt's (2014) findings about the universality of CMs are consistent with the results of the present study.

After Procedure 1-a, Procedure 3 has the highest usage (21%). In this procedure, the translator conveys the meaning accurately but does not apply cross-domain mapping in the translation. One of the reasons for this is the dependence of language on culture. The findings of the present study are in line with the studies conducted by Afrashi et al. (2012), Afrashi and Vadipoor (2011), Sarahi (2012), Amiri Shayesteh (2014), Salemi and Jafarpour (2020), Khakipour and Amjad (2019), Liang and Liu (2015), Patrik et al. (2010), and Ashuja'a et al. (2019). Nijs (2015) and Patrick et al. (2010) consider the dependence of language on culture and the different use of CMs and their mappings

affecting the selection of translation procedures. The results of the present study are similar to the said studies regarding the effects of linguistic and cultural factors, the target language context, and intralingual features on the selection of translation procedures.

Procedure 1-b, amounting to 12%, ranked third. In this case, the type of CM that enters the target language from the source text is the same; however, the mapping responsible for conceptualizing the abstract concept differs in the two languages. This procedure relies on the conceptual metaphor's universality and language's cultural dependence. Khakipour and Amjad (2019), Schmidt (2014), and Liang and Liu (2015) achieved results similar to those of the present study.

Procedure 2, with 5% usage, ranked fourth. In this procedure, the type of the CM changes during translation, and only the meaning is preserved. The CM in this procedure is more influenced by the culture of the two languages than in Procedure 1-b, and the type of the CM changes during the translation process. Liang and Liu (2015) and Patrick et al. (2010) also found that the type of CM changes during the translation process.

Procedure 4, whose usage amounted to only 2%, was the last procedure used to translate CMs. In this procedure, the CM is not translated, and its message is not reflected in the target text. None of the previous studies discussed in the literature review reported such a procedure; however, it has been used to translate two CMs in the present research. Among the reasons for this, we can mention the data type and research methods used in

the said studies and the translator's accuracy and meticulousness.

In response to the second research question, Literal Translation, with 61% usage, was the most used method for translating CMs. This method, obtained from the study of Procedure 1-a, causes the transfer of the message of the source text to the target text while maintaining the structure of the source language, cross-domain mapping, and the type of CM. Afrashi et al. (2012), Khakipour and Amjad (2019), Salemi and Jafarpour (2020), Ashuja'a et al. (2019), Liang and Liu (2015), Chen et al. (2013), Schmidt (2014), Nijs (2015), Patrick et al. (2010), and Megantara (2017) obtained results similar to those of the present study regarding the use of Literal Translation.

Free Translation, adding up to 22%, ranked second. Using this method, the translator has used a non-metaphorical expression in the target language to convey the message of the source text CM. Khakipour and Amjad (2019), Shadman et al. (2021), Ashuja'a et al. (2019), Liang and Liu (2015), Chen et al. (2013), Patrick et al. (2010), and Megantara (2017) in their investigations obtained results that indicated the translation of CMs into NMEs, i.e., the use of Free Translation.

Semantic Translation, accounting for 12% of the methods used, ranked third, which shows that the CM is preserved during translation, but its cross-domain mapping changes to convey the message and meaning. Therefore, it can be argued that Semantic Translation affects metaphorical mapping. Such a finding is compatible with the findings of the studies conducted by

Khakipour and Amjad (2019), Chen et al. (2013), Megantara (2017), Liang and Liu (2015), and Schmidt (2014) regarding the type of translation method and translation product.

Communicative Translation, whose usage amounted to 5%, ranked fourth. In this method, the CM of the source text is transformed into another metaphor during translation. This translation method affects the three types of CM contained in Lakoff and Johnson's (2003) typology of CMs. Schmidt (2014), Chen et al. (2013), Megantara (2017), Liang and Liu (2015), and Patrick et al. (2010) also found that the type of CM changes during translation.

6. Conclusion

The current research is a case study, and it is evident that the generalizability of its findings is very limited. At the same time, comparing the results and findings of the current research with previous research shows that the implications of the current research can be used as a material for designing and implementing qualitative and quantitative research with higher generalization power. Among the implications of the current research, the following can be mentioned: First, the findings showed that in the current case study, StCM is used more in metaphor remapping than the other two types of CM in the Persian translation text. This indicates the maximal use of StCM to express the abstract concepts of event structure in Persian. Second, based on the results of the present case study, it can be expected that OrCM mapping is less useful in Persian than in English because this type of metaphor is

translated non-metaphorically in most instances. This issue, besides not changing StCM or OnCM to OrCM, shows the little use of orientational schema in the Persian language. Perhaps, Persian speakers use an orientational schema in relatively fewer cases to understand abstract concepts through understanding experience. Third, the current case study found that translation procedures are a prerequisite and requirement for studying translation methods. More precisely, the linguistic characteristics of the source and target languages and the type of message make the translator create a general schema of the source text and choose a specific method to translate the whole text (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995). However, the contextual factors, which can be recognized in the sentences, phrases, and words used in the text, require attention to details and intricacies. The correct and appropriate transfer of the message, along with the details and contextual factors, requires selecting the appropriate translation procedure. One of the practical implications, based on the alignment of the findings of the present case study with considerable previous research, is to consider the use of a cognitive approach in teaching translation. Teaching appropriate procedures and methods for transferring the concepts of CMs and cross-domain mappings is suitable for training professional translators and increasing their knowledge, skills, and awareness. Also, it seems that using the theories and findings of cognitive linguistics, including the CM theory, can help analyze and criticize translation in such a way that applying the appropriate procedure and method in the translation of CMs is

considered a criterion for evaluating translations.

The present study only investigated the procedures and methods used for the English-to-Persian translation of CMs in one volume of a Sci-Fi novel translated only once by one translator. Replicating the study with more Sci-Fi novels and their translations by several translators will yield more generalizable results. In addition, in the present study, the CMs were examined only from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, while cognitive poetics describes conceptual metaphors differently. It is hoped that the findings of the current research, despite the limitations and deficiencies, will lead to future research in the field of cognitive linguistics and translation research and will be fruitful in progress toward solving linguistic problems.

References

- Afifah, W. (2012). Translation methods and procedures preference of English department students Universitas Airlangga on translating Aesop Fables. *Anglicist*, 1(2), 36-42.
- Afrashi A, Hesami T, Salas B. (2012). A comparative survey of orientational conceptual metaphors in Spanish and Persian. *Language Related Research*, 3(4), 1-23.
- Afrashi, A., & Vadipoor, G. (2011). A cognitive approach to the translation of conceptual metaphors in documentary films. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies*, 9(34), 39–54.
- Ailan, D. (2016). A study of film title translation from the perspective of Peter Newmark's

- communicative translation theory. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 13(3), 32–37.
- Amiri Shayesteh, L. (2014). *Translation of conceptual metaphors in Parvin E'tesami's poems* (Unpublished master's thesis). Allameh Tabatabaie University, Tehran.
- Ashuja'a A. A., Almatari S. M., & Alward A. S. (2019). Exploring strategies for translating metaphors of English into Arabic with reference to scientific texts. *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*, 7(3), 26-38.
- Chen, H., Qiu, R. & Wang, Y. (2013). The translation strategy of advertisement based on nonequivalence between Chinese and English conceptual metaphors. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(5), 29-37.
- Esfandiari, R., Vadipoor, G., & Shabani, M. B. (2022). Conceptual metaphor as a cognitive solution to English writing problems: The effect of instruction on writing attitude and self-efficacy of EFL learners. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 12(3), 195-213.
- Faishol, S. A. (2019). *Translation techniques used in translating the main character's dialogues in Lore's Lorien Legacies: I'm number four into Indonesian*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Ginting, D. F., Nainggolan, R. M., & Mono, U. (2018). Translation methods in Reader's Digest Magazine by students of the English department at HKBP Nommensen University. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 6, 195-198.
- Golfam, A., Nahavandi, M. (2022). The effect of using multimodal conceptual metaphors to improve English reading and writing skills. *Foreign Language Research Journal*, 12(2), 131–153.
- Green, S. R. (1995). *Deathstalker 01*. UK: Gollancz.
- Green, S. R. (2013). *Deathstalker 01* (A. Ahmai, Trans.). Tehran: Viad Publications. (Original work published 1995)
- Kajtazović, E. (2018). Conceptual metaphor in short stories of Alexandar Hemon. *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu*, 21(1), 90-114.
- Khakipour, S. & Amjad, F. A. (2019). Conceptual metaphor in literary discourse: A case study of Shakespeare's Macbeth and its three Persian translations. *Journal of Translation and Interpretation [online]*, 12(2), 50-65.
- Koulchitskaya, L. V. (2012). Conceptual metaphorization of translation in the English and Russian languages of translation studies. *Вестник МГЛУ. Выпуск*, 9(642), 150-159.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2017). Conceptual metaphor theory. In Semino, E. Demjén, Z. (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Metaphor and Language*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., & Schwartz, A. (1991). *Second draft copy: Master metaphor list*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Liang, M. & Liu, J. (2015). Translating conceptual metaphor in Chinese stock news report: A web-based study. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 5(3), 118-124.
- Massey, G. & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2017). Translating of conceptual metaphor: The process of managing interlingual asymmetry. *Research in Language*, 15(2), 173-189.
- Megantara, I. G. (2017). The translation of Indonesian conceptual metaphor found in the novel *Tarian Bumi* into English. *Lingua scientia*, 24(2), 71-78.
- Merakchi, Kh. (2017). *The translation of metaphor in popular science from English into Arabic in the domain of astronomy and astrophysics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Surrey.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall International vUIO Ltd. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nijs, M. (2015). *Translation metaphors we live by Conceptual metaphor in a cross-cultural setting*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Leiden University.
- Nugraha, A. & Nugroho, M. A. B. & Rahman, Y. (2017). English-Indonesian translation methods in the short story "A Blunder" by Anthon Chekhov. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 3(1), 79-86.
- Nurhanifah, N. D. (2019). *An analysis of English-Indonesian translation methods in products label*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, Indonesia.
- Patrick, G. K., Ruiz, M. N. & Mercedes, S. D. L. T. M. (2010). Translation and cognition: metaphor in specialized texts. *Ánfora*, 17(28), 13-34.
- Salemi, R. & Jafarpour, A. (2020). A cognitive study of conceptual metaphors in English and Persian: Universal or culture-specific? *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature; Dynamic and Advances*, 8(1), 9-31.
- Sarahi, A. (2012). *A comparative analysis of metaphors in Persian and English based on the conceptual metaphor theory*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Isfahan, Isfahan.
- Schäfnner, C. (2004). Metaphor and Translation: Some implication of cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(7), 1253- 1269.
- Schmidt, G. (2012). *A cognitive-linguistic approach to the translation of metaphor from English into Croatian*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia.
- Schmidt, G. (2014). Metaphor translation in subtitling. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 831, 95–104.
- Shabitah, W. & Hortono, R. (2020). The use of Newmark's translation method in translating Forman's novel "I was here" From English into Indonesian. *Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies*, 9(1), 63-75.
- Shadman, Y., Ahmadi, M. N., Malekian, S. (2021). The role of conceptual metaphors in the translation of *Sahifa Sajadieh* from the linguistics perspective and the model of

Lakoff and Johnson. *Translation Research in the Arabic Language & Literature*, 11(24), 121-144.

Tebbit, S. & Kinder, J. J. (2016). Translation developed metaphors. *Fédération des Traducteurs (FIT) Revue Babel*, 62(3), 402-422.

Vinay, J.P. & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. Translated and edited by Joan C. Sagar & M. J. Hamel. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Vučković, M. (2020). *A cognitive approach to translating metaphor in self-help discourse: An analysis of Buddha's brain by Rick Hanson and Richard Mendius and its translation into Croatian*. (Unpublished master's Thesis). University of Zagreb, Croatia.

Zheng, W. (2018). Exploring Newmark's communicative translation and text topology. *Advances in social sciences, education, and humanities research*, p. 185. 6th International Conference on Social Sciences, Education, and Humanities (SSEHR 2017) (pp. 628–630). Atlantic.