Conceptual Metaphor in Literary Discourse: A Case Study of Shakespeare's Macbeth and its Three Persian Translations

Saber Khakipour, Fazel Asadi Amjad

Using a cognitive-metaphoric approach, the present study aims to analyze the three Persian translations of Macbeth and the original text in order to determine the translation quality of conceptual metaphors in this drama. This study is exploratory and uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods. The results of this study suggest that the three Persian translations of Macbeth were somewhere between foreignization and domestication. We believe that our results may improve knowledge about the literary translation because we move beyond linguistic limits to consider cognitive aspects across cultures.

Keywords*: cognitive metaphor, Macbeth, literary translation, cognitive translation hypothesis, cultural diversity*

1. Introduction

The concept of cognitive or conceptual metaphor has recently become one of the most interesting issues in the various spheres like literature, cognitive linguistics and applied linguistics. In this growing body of literature, several studies have investigated the translation of conceptual metaphor in genres like short story, autobiography and everyday speech (Burmakovaa and Marugina 2014; Tobias 2015; Shie 2012). To the best of our knowledge, however, there is still insufficient data regarding the translation of conceptual metaphor in the literary genres including drama and poetry.

The application of conceptual metaphor in Legal Discourse, Accounting and Information Technology was also discussed and analyzed (Gražytė and Maskaliūnienė 2009; Amernic and Craig 2009; Lombard 2005). This paper is a preliminary attempt to indicate that translation of conceptual metaphor in genres like drama and poetry could pose a great challenge for translator. This is because translator has to render not only aesthetic and/or surface structures but also the ST author's worldview.

Since cognitive metaphors may represent cultural diversity, the argument could be made that author's worldview and/or cognition can have effect on the translation of cognitive metaphors. The aim of this study is to assess the quality of translation of conceptual metaphors in three Persian translations of *Macbeth* using combination of tests like, descriptive statistics and inter-rater reliability. This investigation takes the form of a case study of Shakespeare's famous tragedy *Macbeth*. This study is exploratory and interpretive in nature because we explore 'why' of the occurrence of the event rather than merely dealing with 'what' of a phenomena. It is interpretive in the sense that we account for the different readers' interpretation as well.

The specific questions which drive the research are:

1. To what extent can a Persian translator of such a text as *Macbeth* mediate between two dissimilar cultures which have different ways of seeing the world?
2. What translation strategies have been used by the three Persian translators of Macbeth?

3. What are other aspects than formal and/or surface features that can have a say in the translation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*?
4. Are the three Persian translations of cognitive metaphors in *Macbeth* source-culture oriented or target-culture oriented?

2. Review of the Literature

2.1. Linguistic Metaphor

Different theories exist in the literature regarding the concept of metaphor. In Newmark's (1988: 104) view there are two main purposes associated with metaphor:

> The purpose of metaphor is basically twofold: its referential purpose is to describe a mental process or state, a concept, a person, an object, a quality or an action more comprehensively and concisely than is possible in literal or physical language; its pragmatic purpose, which is simultaneous, is to appeal to the senses, to interest, to clarify graphically, to please, to delight, to surprise. The first purpose is cognitive, the second aesthetic.

Seeing from cognitive perspective, Lackoff and Johnson (1980: 3) are at odds with the idea that metaphors are only the characteristics of language and they maintain that metaphor is pervasive in our everyday lives and in our thoughts and actions. Mac Cormac (1985) draws a line between analogy and metaphor by stating that the degree of difference between two referents represents the difference between analogy and metaphor (24). Indeed, referents that differ considerably are called metaphors, whereas those that possess more similarities are analogies (ibid.). In his seminal text, *The Rule of Metaphor*, Ricoeur (2004: 28) suggests that the absence of term of comparison such as the particle *like* or *as*, does not mean that metaphor is a shortened simile, rather "simile is a metaphor developed further". Mac Cormac (1985: 50) claims that if a metaphor becomes a dead metaphor in ordinary language, it returns to ordinary language as dictionaries add new lexical meanings to traditional words.

Porat and Shen (2015: 80) propose that the various metaphorical forms can be generally divided into two qualitatively different groups, with respect to the obligatory nature of their related metaphoricity:

> 1. **Standard metaphorical forms**: These forms convey metaphoricity but can also be used to convey literal meanings. The two most prominent examples of this group are the nominal metaphor (*X is Y*) and the simile (*X is like Y*).
> 2. **Metaphoricity-inducing forms (MIF)**: These forms impose metaphorical processing on any two nouns, regardless of semantic factors such as constituent meaning or the context of the expression. This group includes various linguistic constructions that are commonly used to express intensification, such as nominal sentences with adverbial intensifiers (*this X is such a Y, this X is really Y*), appositive genitive constructions (*this is a Y of an X*), and question-like exclamations (*what a Y this X is*).

Ungerer and Schmid (2006: 118), hold that what is transferred by metaphor is not merely properties inherent in individual concepts, rather it is the structure or internal

relationships of a whole cognitive model. To put it another way, conceptual metaphor involves transferring whole structures from one domain to another rather than individual expressions.

2.2. Conceptual Metaphor

Conceptual metaphor was seen as that kind of metaphor the essence of which is "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 5). Widely varying definitions of the terms ontological, orientational and structural metaphor have emerged (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Barr et al. 2002). 'Structural metaphor' is defined by Lackoff and Johnson (1980: 10) to mean comprehending "one aspect of a concept in terms of another". In the words of Barr, Biddle and Noble (2002: 26), "Ontological metaphors . . . explain concepts in terms of the very basic categories of our existence such as objects and substances." The authors argue that "an orientational metaphor involves *explaining a concept in terms of space*" (ibid.).

In their groundbreaking book *Metaphors we live by*, Lackoff and Johnson (1980) divide ontological metaphors into two types namely 'entity and substance metaphors' and 'container' metaphors. When we see our experiences as objects and substances, we can refer to them, quantify them, identify particular aspect of them, see them as cause and act with respect to it (Lakoff and Johnson: 25-26). The study undertaken by Lapaire (2016: 33) offers the empirical analysis of the concept of ontological metaphor by showing that 'globe gesture' or 'frame configuration' which is mostly observed in formal interviews, allows us to give 'a sense of material existence and physical presence' to an abstract conception thus making the invisible become visible to listeners. As Lapaire (2016: 34) reminds us, "The shapes and movements displayed in front of us are more than visual-kinesthetic *representations* of thoughts: they are *metaphoric enactments* of cognitive processes".

In their book *Metaphors We Live By*, Lackoff and Johnson (1980: 14) note that most of the orientational metaphors are related to spatial orientations like up-down, in-out, front-back, on-off, deep-shallow, central peripheral and they give an abstract concept a spatial orientation, for example, HAPPY IS UP. Although polar oppositions like up-down, in-out are physical n nature, orientational metaphors based on them are grounded in our physical and cultural experience (ibid.).

It appears that conceptual metaphor is not restricted to the language of literature and rhetoric but we can witness it occurrence in various and genres and languages. Lombard (2005: 183) suggests that conceptual metaphor is a naturally occurring phenomenon in the high-tech environment of IT in terms of which people think and talk about abstract concepts comprising their domain of expertise. The conceptual metaphor A COMPUTER IS A HUMAN BEING was found to be the most frequently-manifested metaphor in IT terminology giving rise to a number metaphorical entailments, also referred to as 'specialized' or 'sub-metaphors' in the context of computer networking (Lombard 2005: 179). According to Amernic and Craig (2009: 878), the conceptual metaphor ACCOUNTING IS AN INSTRUMENT infers that 'accounting itself' is an accurate truth telling device of financial performance and an inanimate and adept depicter of financial truth, free from human intervention.

In their paper entitled *What Makes a Metaphor an Embodied Metaphor?* Casasanto and Gijssels (2015) showed that metaphorical source-domain representations are not embodied in modality-specific simulations (327). Casasanto and Gijssels (2015) draw on the work of Aziz-Zadeh et al. (2006) who suggested that in an fMRI experiment, motor areas were active when participants read literal phrases about action verbs (e.g., grasp the pen) but not when they read

non-literal or metaphorical phrases of the same action verbs (e.g., grasp the idea) (333). The use of ontological metaphor in the economic news reports has been investigated recently by Al-Hindawi and Al-Saate (2016). The authors posit that in these kind of texts, ontological metaphors have various manifestations like metonymy, personification and hyperbole. Using statistical analysis, metonymy was found to have the highest percentage of occurrence (166).

In his seminal paper entitled *Extended Metaphors are the Home Runs of Persuasion: Don't Fumble the Phrase*, Thibodeau (2016) has found that extending metaphorical language to the description of policy intervention, strengthens the persuasive power of metaphoric frames for social issues (53). In order to increase the persuasive power of metaphorical frames, there needs to be a conceptual consistency between extended metaphor and responses: "We hypothesize that when an extended metaphor is paired with the conceptually congruent response . . . people will be even more likely to show a metaphor framing effect" (Thibodeau 2016: 55).

2.3. Conceptual Metaphor in Literature

In their book *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, Lackoff and Turner (1989: 67) believe that poetic thought is distinguished from every day thought in that the former uses the mechanisms of the latter, but it extends them, elaborates them and combines them in a way that goes beyond the ordinary. Lackoff and Turner (1989) state that there are four reasons why poetic metaphor is harder to process than conventional metaphor. The first reason is that poetic uses are conscious extensions of conventional metaphors. The second one is that authors may call upon our knowledge of basic conceptual metaphors in order to manipulate them in novel ways. The next reason is that it is unusual to find two or more basic metaphors for the same target domain in a single clause and the last one is that there may phonological or syntactical explanations for this (53).

Marugina (2014) studied the conceptual metaphor A MAN IS AN ANIMAL/BEAST in Bulgakov's literary works and found that proliferation of this conceptual metaphor reveals lexical repetition of key metaphorical words and semantically complex links between conceptual metaphors and key textual metaphors (112). As Oswald and Rihs (2014) comment, "Extended metaphors are realized in discourse through the recurring exploitation of the same metaphor at several conceptual levels over a relatively long span of text" (139).

This study aims to unravel some of the mysteries surrounding the Persian translation of extended metaphors in the case of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* with a view to cognitive linguistics. Drawing upon descriptive statistics and qualitative analysis of the original and target texts, this paper attempts to assess the quality of the Persian translation of extended metaphors in *Macbeth*.

3.4. Analytical Framework

Different scholars have proposed various procedures for translating metaphor. Samples in this study were analyzed according to the Cognitive Translation Hypothesis postulated by Mandelblit (1995). As Mandelblit (1995) writes, "translation of conventional metaphor . . . may involve, in addition to *linguistic* shift, a conceptual shift between different conceptual ontologies" (486). He posits two conditions under which conceptual metaphors can be translated: Similar Mapping Conditions (SMC) and Different Mapping Conditions.

1. Similar Mapping Condition (SMC): the source idiomatic expression and the expected translation are based on the same genera metaphorical mapping.
2. Different Mapping Condition (DMC), the expected idiomatic translation is based on a different ontological mapping than that of the source expression.

3. Method

3.1. Design

A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods was used in the analysis of our data. Data for our content analysis does not come from interview since we were unable to conduct an unstructured interview with translators. Rather, we employed contrastive textual analysis in order to recognize whether or not the Persian translations of *Macbeth* could recreate Shakespeare's telescoping or extended metaphors. The research method we employed in our content analysis is based on a deductive approach because we used a priori categories rather than deriving new constructs from data during research. As mentioned before, the unit of analysis in this study is the lines or the sentences of the tragedy. This is because an individual word cannot be said to be cognitively metaphorical on its own unless it is embedded in co-text, i.e., only the surrounding words determine its direct or indirect meaning.

We also used descriptive statistics like relative frequency in order to see what is the most commonly used translation procedure among the three translators of *Macbeth*. This is followed by the comparison of three translators as regards the frequency of translation procedures they employed. In order to ensure the reliability of our findings, we also calculated the intercoder agreement through Kappa coefficient. In so doing, we got another coder to select one of the six categories or codes (here, translation procedures) and insert it by the side of the translation that it matches.

3.2. Corpus

The corpus for our textual analysis is William Shakespeare's world renowned tragedy *Macbeth* which has been translated into Persian by three translators namely, Abdolrahim Ahmadi, Daryoush Ashouri , Farangis Shadman. Out of these available three Persian translations, the translation made by Adbolrahim Ahmadi was published before Islamic Revolution and Daryoush Ashouri and Farangis Shadman produced their translations of *Macbeth* after Islamic Revolution[1]. This is to see if there are any changes in translated product over the passage of time. The sampling technique used in the collection of data is purposive sampling. This is because we selected our case based on its possession of extended conceptual metaphors which is our pre-determined purpose. The original text that we have selected was published by Feedbooks in 1606.

Table 1 lists the imprint or publication details of the three Persian translations of *Macbeth*:

---

[1] Iranian Revolution of 1978–79, also called Islamic Revolution, Persian Enqelāb-e Eslāmī, popular uprising in Iran in 1978–79 that resulted in the toppling of the monarchy on April 1, 1979, and led to the establishment of an Islamic republic.

Target Text	Translator	Publisher	Date of Publication
Macbeth	Abdolrahim Ahmadi	Andisheh Publications	1975
Macbeth	Daryoush Ashouri	Agah Publications	1999
Macbeth	Farangis Shadman	Elmi Farhangi Publishing Company	2002

Table 1 *Publication details of the target texts*

3.3. Participants

For conducting our interrater reliability, we also kindly requested one of the master's students of Translation Studies in Kharazmi University to be the second rater for our content analysis. He was provided with 70 cases of *Macbeth* text and their three Persian translations which were believed to include cognitive metaphor. Each case of extended metaphor was provided with a brief description of its source and target domain so that it can help the rater to grasp Shakespeare's conceits. Then he was asked to match each case of translated conceptual metaphor with the appropriate translation procedure.

3.4. Procedure

To count up how many conceptual metaphors have been used in *Macbeth*, we read through each line of the tragedy carefully and divided them into two subcategories of 'container' and 'path' metaphors. Then, we read the corresponding Persian translations of the poem to see how STs have been translated in TT. The process of reading the lines was repeated several times in order to avoid the possibility of skipping those lines that may contain conceptual metaphor. Once the reading of the tragedy in two languages were done and we found the lines containing cognitive metaphor, we picked a few cases of cognitive metaphors in *Macbeth* and their corresponding renditions. Following that, we conducted a qualitative and descriptive textual analysis by contrasting cognitive metaphors in source text and their translations into target text.

In order to increase the reliability of our results, we also intended to calculate the frequency of translation strategies which were used by the three Persian translators. We did so by counting the total number of cognitive metaphors in *Macbeth* and then the number of translated cognitive metaphor for each translation strategy as was proposed by Mandelblit (1995). The relative frequency or percentage of each translation strategy was obtained in order to yield measurable results. This was followed by content analysis[2] in which two coders or raters were involved. In order to control for bias, it was decided that the content analysis be carried out by another person as well. In the final stage of the study, after we collected and analyzed those responses and allowing for the intercoder agreement arrived at, we decided whether or not the conceptual metaphors in original poem are equivalent to their corresponding translations in target text.

---

[2] In effect, it simply defines the process of summarizing and reporting written data – the main contents of data and their messages. More strictly speaking, it defines a strict and systematic set of procedures for the rigorous analysis, examination and verification of the contents of written data (Flick 1998: 192; Mayring 2004: 266).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Data Analysis

A combination of qualitative textual analysis and quantitative tests like relative frequency[3] and interrater reliability were used in the analysis of our data. The research method we employed in our content analysis is based on a deductive approach because we used a priori categories rather than deriving new constructs from data during research. As mentioned before, the unit of analysis in this study is the lines or the sentences of the tragedy. In order to provide a more thick description of the data, extra-linguistic factors like the author's worldview were also taken into consideration.

4.1. Qualitative Analysis

For our qualitative analysis of the data, we attempted to categorize the translations done by three Persian translators into two divisions, namely those which appear to manifest Similar Mapping Conditions and those that demonstrate Different Mapping Conditions. Under each category, we arrange the translations according to the translation procedure that has been adopted.

4.1.1. Applied Strategies for Translating Cognitive Metaphor

Similar Mapping Condition: The first translation procedure that we are going to talk about is 'substitution'. After careful reading and analysis of the data, it turns out that some of the three Persian translators used different wording from those in source text to render cognitive metaphors in *Macbeth*. As regards *substitution*, some cases were found as follows:

(1).   ST: O, full of scorpions is my mind, dear wife! (III.ii.36)

Daryoush Ashouri's Translation:
آه، همسر عزیز، سرم کژدم‌زار است.
Back Translation
Oh dear wife, my head is *the land of scorpions*.

In this example, the Macbeth's brain is a container for poisonous stings of anxiety at his still unachieved goals as the words 'full of' indicate. In the target text, this cross-domain mapping is preserved, however, through different expression 'کژدم زار' ['the land of scorpions'].

(2).   ST: I have *supp'd* full with horrors. (V.v.13)

Abdolrahim Ahmadi's Translation
اکنون من از وحشت آکنده‌ام

---

[3] To find relative frequency, we divide the frequency of a specific case by total number of cases and multiply it by 100 to get the percent.

Back Translation
Now, I am *replete with* horrors

In this case, Macbeth sees himself as having a stomach filled with horrors instead of food, but in the target text a more general verbal expression 'آکنده ام' ['I am replete with'] has been adopted while keeping the source ontological mapping.

Transference or *literal translation* is the next translation procedure that we want to discuss. In this procedure, the translator strives to reproduce the cognitive metaphor using the similar or nearly similar wording as the original text. It appears that this is the most frequently used procedure among the three translators. The following are some examples of *Macbeth* in which this procedure has been utilized:

(1).   ST: So from that spring whence comfort seem'd to come
        Discomfort swells. (I.ii.27-28)

        Abdolrahim Ahmadi's Translation
        از منبعی که گفتی آسودگی از آن می رسد، آشفتگی پراکنده می شود

        Back Translation
        From the spring whence comfort seemed to come, discomfort is dispersed

        Farangis Shadman's Translation
        از آن چشمه هم که گویی از او آسایش می تراوید بلا و آفت می جوشد و می افزاید

        Back Translation
        From the spring from which comfort seemed to gush out, disaster and blight comes out

Sweno, King of Norway, is characterized as the container of spring from which liveliness and comfort doesn't come out; rather, it is the source of distress and discomfort. Ahmadi and Shadman attempted to maintain the meaning of original words and so they did not go beyond that. The only difference is that Ahmadi used the Persian equivalent 'منبع' instead of 'چشمه' for the word ['spring'].

(2).   ST: Yet I do fear thy nature.
        It is too full o' the milk of human kindness
        To catch the nearest way. (I.v.14-16)

        Abdolrahim Ahmadi's Translation
        اما از سرشت تو بیم دارم، زیرا از شیر مهر بشری سرشارتر از آن است که کوتاهترین راه را در پیش گیرد.

        Back Translation
        Yet I fear your nature, because it is too full of the milk of human kindness to go the nearest way

        Daryoush Ashouri's Translation
        اما از نهاد تو بیم دارم که چندان سرشار از شیر مهربانی انسانی است که دور است راه میانبر را در پیش گیرد.

Back Translation
Yet I fear your nature because it is so full of the milk of human kindness that it is too far to take a shortcut.

Farangis Shadman's Translation
با این همه از طبع تو واقعا ترسانم که از شیر محبت انسانی لبریز ترست از آنکه نزدیکترین راه را بدست آورد.

Back Translation
However I really fear your nature because it is too full of the milk of human kindness to catch the shortest way.

Here, Lady Macbeth conceptualizes Macbeth as a container made of nature whose contents are a liquid that is the medium for Macbeth's "human kindness", both the essential quality of his humanity and his goodness. Ahmadi, Ashouri and Shadman used Persian equivalents that are as close as possible to the meaning of the original words. The words ['full of'] are directly transferred into target text as ' لبریز از ', ' سرشار از ' and the phrase ['the milk of human kindness'] as ' شیر مهر بشری ', ' شیر مهربانی انسانی ' and ' شیر محبت انسانی ' with subtle nuances of meaning.

(3).   ST: Come, you spirits
        That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here,
        And fill me from the crown to the toe top-full
        Of direst cruelty! make thick my blood;
        Stop up the access and passage to remorse. (I.v.38-45)

Daryoush Ashouri's Translation
ای ارواح پاسدار اندیشه های مرگبار! هم اینجا مرا از زنانگی‌ام تهی کنید و سراپا پر کنید از هولناکترین سنگدلی. خونم را سنگین مایه کنید و راه و روزن هر نرمدلی را بربندید.

Back Translation
Oh you spirits that guard mortal thoughts! Empty me of my womanhood here, and fill me completely with direst cruelty! Make thick my blood; and stop passage and opening to any remorse.

Lady Macbeth likewise conceives of her own body as a container of her human kindness, and of her sexuality as the liquid that fills that container. Like her husband's, Lady Macbeth's body-container must be emptied so that it can be refilled with a liquid that is not responsive to her "nature", her humanity. Ashouri's translation is nearly similar to the source text image and wording.

Different Mapping Conditions: None of the three translators used particles such as 'like' or 'as' in order make clear the comparison, and so no case of using *simile* was found. When target texts were carefully analyzed, it was found that, sometimes, translators tried to make explicit some components of the image schematic structure of the source image. Here follows some examples of *explicitation* of source domain:

(1). ST: I have supp'd full with horrors. (V.v.13)

Daryoush Ashouri's Translation
من از جامِ وحشت چندان سیر نوشیده ام.

Back Translation
I have drunk full from the *glass* of horrors

Here in the source text, the metaphorical language is implicit (i.e., Macbeth's body is a container). However, Ashouri has made explicit this metaphor by using the word 'جام' ['glass'] which indicates that this conceptual mapping is different across two cultures.

(2). ST: But now I am cabin'd, cribb'd, confined, bound in
To saucy doubts and fears. (III.iv.24-25)

Abdolrahim Ahmadi's Translation
اینک در بندم، در قفسم، در زندانِ بیم ها و دلهره های شوم بزنجیرم.

Back Translation
Now I am locked up, in the cage, bound in the *jail* of saucy doubts and fears.

Here, Macbeth sees himself contained within the larger container of his fears which are themselves contained within the mind that also contains the container of Macbeth's body. Ahmadi reproduced the source images in the target product, however, by making explicit the vehicle or source domain, using 'زندان' ['jail'].

(3). ST: Most sacrilegious murder hath broke ope
The Lord's anointed temple, and stole thence
The life o' the building! (II.iii.62-64)

Daryoush Ashouri's Translation
کافرانه ترین جنایت دست به آستان مبارک خداوندگار برده و گوهرِ جانِ آستان را از آن ربوده است.

Back Translation
The most divine crime has broken into the Lord's anointed temple, and stole thence the *precious stone* of the life of the temple.

Macduff understands murder as a burglar who has violated the outer boundary, the precincts of a sacred building, the body of a king. The loot the burglar has removed from that container's interior is the spirit that gives life to Duncan and in turn to his kingdom. In the translation done by Ashouri, the word 'گوهر' ['precious stone'] has been used to explain or make explicit part of the image schema of the source domain.

The next translation procedure that we are going to delve into is *omission*. This is one of the most frequently used procedures. Here follows some cases of omission:

(1). ST: *Come to* my woman's breasts,

<u>And take my milk for gall</u>, you murdering ministers. (I.v.45-46)

Abdolrahim Ahmadi's Translation

ای خداوندان مرگ، پستان های زنانه ی مرا *بازگیرید* و شیرم را بزهر بدل کنید!

Back Translation
Oh you gods of death! *Take back* my woman's breasts and change my milk to gall

In the source text, the word 'come' indicates that Lady Macbeth's body is characterized as a container and therefore is part of the image schematic structure of source domain CONTAINER. In target text, however, the use of the word 'باز گیرید' ['take back'] hardly recreates this image.

(2).   ST: Scotland hath foisons to *fill up* your will
         Of your mere own. (IV.iii.87-89)

Daryoush Ashouri's Translation

اسکاتلند چنان سرشار از ثروت است که خواسته ی شما را با آنچه از آن شماست *بر می آورد*.

Back Translation
Scotland is so full of wealth that it *meets* your desire with what is your own

Macduff reformulates Malcolm's avarice as a container that the royal treasuries can fill up; that is, we have SCOTLAND AS CONTAINER cognitive metaphor. Using 'بر می آورد' ['meets'], Ashouri only translated the sense of the original text without paying attention to the 'container' metaphor.

The last translation procedure that we want to look into is *paraphrase*. There are a very few cases where the translator changed the word order or part of speech of the source text:

(1).   Come what come may,
         Time and the hour *runs through* the roughest day. (I.iii.146-147)

Daryoush Ashouri's Translation

هرچه بادا باد! *گذار* زمان بر سخت ترین روز است.

Back Translation
Come what may! *The passing* of time is in the roughest day.

In this example, there is time-moving metaphor where 'time' and 'hour' are conceptualized as moving objects. Ashouri converted the original verb 'runs through' into noun 'گذار' ['passing'].

4.2. Quantitative Analysis
In order to yield more satisfactory results and increase the reliability of our findings, statistical data was also taken into consideration. Descriptive statistics like relative

frequency and percentage was employed in which we arrived at the frequency of translation procedures employed by three translators. Having found the relative frequency and percentage of transition procedure for each translator, we compared the three Persian translators regarding the percentage of translation procedures they adopted in a separate table. The original and target texts were also rated by another coder to reduce the author's bias. Interrater reliability was calculated in order to lower the subjectivity of this textual analysis. There are 46 cases of container metaphors and 24 cases of path metaphors in *Macbeth*.

4.2.1. Descriptive Statistics

In order to find the relative frequency of translation procedures used, we counted the number of translation procedures for each translator and then divided them by total number of cases which is 70. Then the relative frequency was multiplied by 100 in order to arrive at the percentage of each translation procedure.

Looking at Table 2, it is apparent that Ahmadi's preferred translation procedure is transference followed by omission, substitution and explicitation, respectively. He did not use simile or paraphrase as translation procedures. From the table, it can also be seen that transference is Ashouri's most frequently used strategy. Following transference, omission, explicitation, substitution and paraphrase are in order of preference. As Table 2 shows, transference is preferred translation procedure employed by Shadamn which is followed by omission and explicitation. She did not translate cognitive metaphors as simile, and did not substitute a different wording for the source text and did not change the word order or word class of the source text.

	Abdolrahim Ahmadi		Daryoush Ashouri		Farangis Shadman	
	Relative Frequency	Percentage	Relative Frequency	Percentage	Relative Frequency	Percentage
Simile	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Substitution	0.057	5.7%	0.071	7.1%	0	0%
Transference	0.585	58.5%	0.5	50%	0.614	61.4%
Explicitation	0.042	4.2%	0.1	10%	0.1	10%
Omission	0.314	31.4%	0.271	27.1%	0.285	28.5%
Paraphrase	0	0%	0.057	5.7%	0	0%

Table 2 *Comparison of Applied Translation Procedures by Three Translators*

What stands out in this table is the dominance of transference as the translation procedure used by three translators. Around 60% of *Macbeth* cognitive metaphor translations stayed as close as possible to source text wording and conceptual mapping. Following transference, omission is the next most commonly used translation procedure. We can see from the table that none of the three translators adopted simile when dealing with *Macbeth* conceptual metaphors. It was also found that of 70 cases of *Macbeth* conceptual metaphors, 10% were translated using explicitation by Ashouri and Shadman and 4.2% by Ahmadi. Fewer than 10% of translations of cognitive metaphors were done using substitution and paraphrase. Ashuori's translation includes more cases of substitution than Ahmadi, while Shadman did not use it. Finally, the only translator that appears to have used paraphrase is Ashouri.

4.2.2. Interrater Reliability

So far, we have done a subjective contrastive analysis of certain *Macbeth* cognitive metaphors and their translations along with quantitative analysis of the translation procedures used by the three Persian translators. The quantitative part of the analysis was done through counting the number of translation procedures for each translator and then arriving at the relative frequency and percentage. Up to now, only one rater, the author, analyzed the textual data. However, a second rater was also used in order to produce more reliable results and to reduce the intuitive side of this content analysis. Interrater reliability was used to determine whether two raters agree on the match between a translation procedure and the Persian translation.

The total number of cases is the number 3 (three translations) multiplied by 70 (cases of cognitive metaphor) which makes 210. The level of agreement between the two raters for each case was analyzed using Cohen's kappa coefficient. The second rater is one of the master's students of Translation Studies from Kharazmi University and so we have two raters for our interrater reliability. The categories according to which the textual data is to be analyzed are the six translation procedures namely simile, substitution, transference, explicitation, omission and paraphrase. Hence, there are six categories of nominal variable. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software (version 21). The following is the crosstabulation between two raters and the Kappa coefficient yielded.

Count

		Coder2					Total
		Explanation	Omission	Paraphrase	Substitution	Transference	
Coder1	Explanation	11	2	1	1	2	17
	Omission	2	51	0	2	6	61
	Paraphrase	0	0	4	0	0	4
	Substitution	0	0	0	5	2	7
	Transference	3	0	0	3	115	121
Total		16	53	5	11	125	210

Table 3 *Coder1 * Coder2 Crosstabulation*

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Measure of Agreement Kappa	.801	.037	16.586	.000
N of Valid Cases	210			

Table 4 *Symmetric Measures*

The value of kappa for this data is .80, which indicates that inter-coder reliability is substantial or there is substantial agreement between coders in analyzing the data. The results gained from the above analysis suggests that both raters remarkably agree on the match between the translation procedure and the Persian translation. There was some negligible differences between two raters which did not affect the overall results. Both raters found that 115 cases were translated using transference.

4.3. Discussion and Interpretation

This study set out with the aim of assessing the three Persian translations of the *Macbeth* cognitive metaphors from cognitive-metaphorical perceptive. One of the three Persian translations of *Macbeth*, Ahmadi's translation, was brought out a few years before Islamic Revolution of Iran and is mainly characterized by archaic and literary style. The other two translators namely Daryoush Ashouri and Farangis Shadman published their translations after Islamic Revolution.

The first question in this study sought to determine to what extent a Persian translator of *Macbeth* can mediate between two cultures that have different worldviews and conceptualizations of the phenomena. From the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the original and target texts, it was found that all the three Persian translators attempted to produce a target text that appears to be resistant to the target culture and also conflicts the target readers' thought processes and conceptual system. In other words, they tried to move closer to the Shakespearean literary discourse and cognition by transferring the form and meaning of the ST. But, there are also cases where none of the three translators could reconceptualize the same *Macbeth* cognitive metaphors in target text and so omitted the conceptual mapping of the ST.

With respect to the second research question, both raters found that transference is the most commonly used translation strategy as illustrated above. This is an indication of the fact that the three translators tried to reproduce the same image as the original *Macbeth* text. This was followed by omission, explicitation, substitution and paraphrase, respectively. None of the cognitive metaphors were found to be translated as simile in the target texts.

The third question in this research was whether or not there are other aspects than formal and/or surface features that can have a say in the translation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. The container metaphor WORDS ARE CONTAINERS, for instance, is barely accessible in Persian culture if translated literally. So here, Shakespeare's worldview and/or his way of thinking is a very determining factor. Due to the fact that there is cultural diversity in such container metaphors, translating the form or surface structure of the source text will result in a target product that is faithful to the ST. However, Persian readers will consider such a translation to be strange because it is consciously activated by them.

When it comes to the last research question, the results of this study indicates that the *Macbeth*'s cognitive metaphors were directly transferred or unconsciously translated into target text by three Persian translators as long as there was not cultural diversity or clash. However, if there was any cultural clash present, the translator became aware of what could be done to the text and adopted particular approaches and consciously utilized particular combinations of procedures the end product of which is usually geared towards the target culture. In such cases, the translators switched between two conceptual systems by communicating 'intentions' rather than transferring linguistic forms (words, phrases or syntactic structures). These decision-makings were directed at achieving 'dynamic equivalence' or 'optimal relevance'.

5. Conclusions

This study has examined the effect of culture on the cognitive metaphors in *Macbeth* and found out that it is not possible for all cognitive metaphors in source culture to be accessible in target culture. This is the case in ontological metaphors not least 'container metaphors'. However, there were also some cases of 'time-moving metaphors' where cross-cultural difference was witnessed.

We are aware that our research may have four limitations. The first is that the only English work of literature that is both related to the focus of our research and has sufficient number of Persian translator, is Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. The second limitation is that we will have to analyze only two subtypes of cognitive metaphors namely 'container' and 'path' metaphors as these are the only conceptual metaphors that occur in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. The third limitation for our study is that we were unable to conduct an unstructured interview with two of the three translators since we could not contact with them. The last limitation is that the substantial agreement between two raters has nothing to do with the accuracy of the data.

References

AL-HINDAWI, Fareed Hameed, AL-SAATE, Wafaa S. 2016. Ontological Metaphor in Economic News Reports: A Pragmatic Approach. In *Arab World English Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 155-174.

AMERNIC, Joel, CRAIG, Russel. 2009. Understanding accounting through conceptual metaphor: accounting is an instrument?. In *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, vol. 20, no. 8, pp. 875-883.

BARR, Pippin, BIDDLE, Robert, NOBLE, James. 2002. A taxonomy of user-interface metaphors. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI-NZ Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction, pp. 25-30. ACM.

BURMAKOVAA, Elena A., MARUGINA, Nadezda I. 2014. Cognitive Approach to Metaphor Translation in Literary Discourse. In *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 154, pp. 527-533.

CASASANTO, Daniel, GIJSSELS, Tom. 2015. What makes a metaphor an embodied metaphor? In *Linguistics Vanguard*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp: 327-337.

FLICK, Uwe. 1998. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

GRAZYTE, Rasa, MASKALIUNIENE, Nijolė. 2009. Translation of conceptual metaphor in the legal discourse of eu white papers. In *Vertimo Studijos*, pp. 71-87.

LAKOFF, George, JOHNSON, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors we live by.* London: The university of Chicago press, 1980.

LAKOFF, George, TURNER, Mark. 1989. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

LAPAIRE, Jean Remi. 2016. From ontological metaphor to semiotic make-believe: giving shape and substance to fictive objects of conception with the "globe gesture". In *Signo*, vol. 4, no. 70, pp. 29-44.

LOMBARD, Carol G. 2005. Conceptual metaphors in computer networking terminology. In *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 177-185.

MAC CORMAC, Earl. R. 1985. *A Cognitive Theory of Metaphor.* Cambridge and Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1985.

MANDELBLIT, Nili. 1995. The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory. In *Translation and meaning*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 483-495.

MAYRING, Philipp. 2004. Qualitative content analysis. In FLICK, Uwe, von KARDOFF, Ernst, STEINKE, Ines, eds. *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

OSWALD, Steve, RIHS, Alain. 2014. Metaphor as argument: Rhetorical and epistemic advantages of extended metaphors. In *Argumentation*, vol. *28*, no. 2, pp. 133-159

PORAT, Roy, SHEN, Yeshayahu. 2015. Imposed Metaphoricity. In *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 77-94.

RICOEUR, Paul. 2004. *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language.* Psychology Press, 2004.

SHIE, Jian-Shiung. 2012. Conceptual metaphor as a news-story promoter: The cases of ENL and EIL headlines. In *Intercultural Pragmatics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1-21.

THIBODEAU, Paul H. 2016. Extended metaphors are the home runs of persuasion: Don't fumble the phrase. In *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 53-72

TOBIAS, Shani. 2015. Traversing Textual Terrains: The Translation of Metaphor in "Rashōmon. In *Translation Review*, vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 8-22.

UNGERER, Friedrich, SCHMID, Hans Jorg. 2006. *An introduction to cognitive linguistics.* Routledge, 2006.

Saber Khakipour
MA student of Translation Studies
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Kharazmi University, Iran
Email: saberkhakipour@gmail.com

Fazel Asadi Amjad
Full Professor of English Language and Literature
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Kharazmi University, Iran
Email: Fazel4313@yahoo.com