

Full length Research Paper

Translation techniques of figures of speech: A case study of George Orwell's "1984 and Animal Farm"

Elaheh Fadaee

Vakil Abad Blvd. 6 Hashemieh 21 ST., Mashhad, Iran. E-mail: elaheh_fadaee@yahoo.com. Tel: 0098 881 83 44.

Accepted 14 September, 2011

Translating figures of speech deals with finding secondary meaning in the source language (SL), and finding cultural meaning and appropriate equivalence in the target language (TL). Figures of speech and multi-word expressions are some of the most challenging translation difficulties. In this article, translation techniques of figures of speech in George Orwell's 1984 and Animal Farm and their Persian translations are compared on the basis of Newmark's and Larson's theories of translation to answer this question: Do English and Persian translation techniques of figures of speech correspond with each other? Among translation techniques of metaphor, translation techniques for stock and cliché metaphors (TT stock and TT cliché) are used more than other techniques in all six Persian translations; in these six translations, translation techniques of similes have more correspondence with the ST than translation techniques of metaphors. Hence, the study revealed that 1) according to Newmark (1988a: 57), "theories and techniques of translating figures of speech, such as metaphor and simile are so limited which do not cover translating all types of metaphors and similes"; 2) in Persian language, there is no general and fundamental technique for translating these metaphor and simile, and just English techniques are used for translating these two figures of speech; and 3) there are so limited research publications in the field of figures of speech, particularly about metaphor and simile, in both Persian and English Language which must be considered critically.

Key words: Translation, translation techniques, figures of speech, George Orwell.

INTRODUCTION

Figurative language is the one that uses figures of speech. A figure of speech is a way of saying one thing and meaning another. For example, "when Tennyson says that the eagle "clasps the crag with crooked hands", he means that the eagle's claw are anular, bent, and bony- looking- reminding him of mangled human hands" (Rezai, 2004: 1).

Three of the most important figures of speech are simile, metaphor and personification and as the numbers of figures of speech are so numerous, the researcher has selected only two main important figures, metaphor and simile to study their translation techniques in these two novels. In their definition, it must be said that a simile compares one thing to another using like or as and a metaphor compares one thing to another without using like or as. In English rhetoric, Richard (1965) divided the structure of metaphor and simile into 'tenor and vehicle'. Tenor is the subject to which attributes are ascribed.

Vehicle is the subject from which the attributes are

borrowed. They are called source and target in the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphor respectively. The structure of metaphor and simile in English and Persian languages are shown in Table 1. As it is observed, metaphor and simile are common in topic, image and point of similarity, but similarity markers are specific to simile and are not used in metaphor.

Techniques of translation

The process of translation is beyond finding equivalents in the target language (TL) or conveying the general meaning of the source language (SL). For having an acceptable and understandable rendering, some techniques and strategies should be selected as the basis of translating.

Translation techniques are recognized as being universal, and independent of the languages involved in the

Table 1. Structure of metaphor and simile in English and Persian.

Metaphor in Persian	Metaphor in English	Simile in English	Simile in Persian
Mostaaroleh (topic)	Topic	Topic	Moshabah (topic)
Mostaaromeh (image)	Image	Image	Moshabahonbeh (image)
Jame (sense)	Sense	Sense	Vajhe shabah (sense)
.....	Similarity markers	Adate tashbih (similarity markers)

translation process. "A 'strategy' is a generalization about typical courses-of-action exhibited by professional translators" (Neubert and Shreve, 1992: 52); they are the standard tools of the trade, the procedures offering a solution to the various types of problems encountered in the translation task.

Krings (1986: 263) defines translation strategy as "translator's potentially conscious plans for solving concrete translation problems in the framework of a concrete translation task". Moreover, Loescher (1991: 8) defines translation strategy as "a potentially conscious procedure for solving a problem faced in translating a text, or any segment of it". As it is stated in this definition, the notion of consciousness is significant in distinguishing strategies which are used by the learners or translators. In this regard, Cohen (1984: 70) asserts that "the element of consciousness is what distinguishes strategies from these processes that are not strategic".

Furthermore, Bell (1998) differentiates between global and local strategies and confirms that this distinction has been derived from various kinds of translation problems. Global strategies are meant for those dealing with whole texts, whereas local strategies refer to those concerned with translating text segments. Venuti (1998: 240) indicates that translation strategies "involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it". He employs the concepts of domesticating and foreignizing to refer to translation strategies.

Jaaskelainen (2005: 71) considers strategy as, "a series of competencies, a set of steps or processes that favor the acquisition, storage, and utilization of information". He maintains that strategies are "heuristic and flexible in nature, and their adoption implies a decision influenced by amendments in the translator's objectives". Seguinot (1989) believes that there are at least three global strategies employed by translators: "(1) translating without interruption for as long as possible; (2) correcting surface errors immediately; (3) leaving the monitoring for qualitative or stylistic errors in the text to the revision stage" (cited in Ordudari, 2007:10).

Taking into account the process and product of translation, Jaaskelainen (2005) divides strategies into two major categories: some strategies relate to what happens to texts, while other strategies relate to what happens in the process. Product-related strategies, as Jaaskelainen (2005: 16) writes, involve the basic tasks of choosing the SL text and developing a method to translate

it. However, she maintains that process-related strategies "are a set of (loosely formulated) rules or principles which a translator uses to reach the goals determined by the translating situation". Moreover, Jaaskelainen (2005) divides this into two types, namely, global strategies and local strategies. Global strategies refer to general principles and modes of action and local strategies refer to specific activities in relation to the translator's problem-solving and decision-making.

Jaskanen (2001) divides the strategies employed by translators in terms of a SL-TL continuum into three categories: exoticization, naturalization and neutralization. She says exoticization is what Toury (1995) calls 'adherence to source norms,' retaining culturally specific elements in the ST or slightly modifying them whereas naturalization means 'adapting the ST to target culture norms'.

Techniques of translating figures of speech

Figures of speech are imaginative tools in both literature and ordinary communications used for explaining speech beyond its usual usage. The Collins English Dictionary (2006) defines figure of speech as "an expression such as a simile, in which words do not have their literal meaning, but are categorized as multi-word expressions that act in the text as units" (cited in Alhasnawi, 2007:3).

The language that uses figures of speech is called 'figurative language' and "its purpose is to serve three elements of clarity, forth and beauty in the language." (Tajali, 2003: 100) However, as any figure of speech has a figurative meaning, it may cause ambiguity which influences the clarity.

There are numerous classifications of figures of speech, as some rhetoricians have classified them into as many as 250 separate figures. Metaphor and simile important figures of speech in almost all languages.

Richards (1965: 105) says, "the two most common figures of speech are metaphor and simile, but there are many other less common ones".

Broeck (1981) says for a translator to be able to find appropriate equivalents in the target language, he/she must have access to the following: (cited in Miremadi, 2003: 170):

1. A clear-cut definition to differentiate between ordinary expressions and metaphors,

2. Approaches to how a metaphor can be translated and the zigzagging maneuvers to curve around irregularities and discrepancies,

3. An awareness of different types of contexts, in which the use of metaphors is needed to flavor the writing and also the limitations of their use,

4. A correct realization of constraints, which emanate from the nature of translation and are imposed on the rendering of translation.

Morneau (1993) states five techniques for translating metaphors: (cited in Alhasnawi, 2007: 6):

1. Translate the metaphor exactly, word-for-word.
2. Re-phrase the metaphor as a simile. This helps some of the time, but only in languages where metaphor is rarely or never used. So, translating the metaphor in 'the ship plowed through the waves' to the form of a simile 'the ship moved through the waves like a plow' is an example of this kind.
3. Translate the metaphor into an equivalent metaphor in the target language. For example, the metaphor 'the ship ravaged through the waves' rendered into 'the ship pushed through the waves like a battering ram'.
4. Translate the metaphor using literal language. This, of course, gets the point across, but destroys the imagery of the metaphor. 'the ship moved through the waves slowly, powerfully and with difficulty'.
5. Use the metaphor, but provide all the necessary referents so that any listener will understand it. In effect, you must explain the metaphor to those who might not understand it. Like, 'the ship moved through the waves, slowly and powerfully, like a plow being pulled through the hard earth'.

Mollanazar (2005: 46) says that the following steps should be taken in translating a metaphor or simile:

1. The metaphors and similes should be found in the text; the translator should always be alert to the metaphors and similes,
2. Then the translator should determine whether the comparison is a live metaphor /simile or a dead figure; and
3. Different components of the metaphor or simile should be identified.

Larson (1984: 245) suggests the following ways to translate the live metaphors:

1. The metaphor may be kept if the receptor language permits (that is, if it sounds natural and is understood correctly by the readers);
2. A metaphor may be translated as a simile (adding like or as);
3. A metaphor of the receptor language which has the same meaning may be substituted;
4. The metaphor may be kept and the meaning explained (that is, the topic or point of similarity may be added; and
5. The meaning of the metaphor may be translated

without keeping the metaphorical imagery.

Newmark (1988b: 81) mentions the difference between translation methods and translation procedures and writes that, "while translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language". He offers five types of metaphors with particular translation techniques for each one:

- i. Dead metaphor: this kind of metaphor is typically easy to translate, but they often defy literal translation and the translator needs to find their culturally dependent counterparts in the TL. "When dead metaphors combine with other words and find figurative meaning, their translation becomes difficult" (Delkhah, 1996: 18). For example: the foot of the table: (the same Persian equivalent)
- ii. Cliché metaphor: in this kind of metaphor, a translator is entitled to get rid of cliché in any informative text where only facts are sacred, and in a socially operative or vocative text such as propaganda or publicity, where the translator might be considered to be justified in helping the author obtain the optimum reaction from the reader. On the other hand, a translator is not entitled to touch cliché in expressive texts, authoritative statements, laws, regulations, notices, etc. "Sometimes, when there is no appropriate equivalence in the TT, the translator can bring simile or dead metaphor in the TT" (Delkhah, 1996: 17). For instance: she hasn't an ounce of common sense: her wisdom is like the wisdom of a baby/ she hasn't an ounce of wisdom (Persian equivalent)
- iii. Stock metaphor: Newmark (1988a) proposes six procedures for the translation of stock metaphors from one language into the other. They are as follows in order of preference. Examples are cited from Tajalli (2003: 107):

- a. Reproducing the same image in the TL provided the image has comparable frequency and currency in the appropriate register. Example: play with someone's feelings (the same Persian equivalent)
- b. Replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture, but which, like most stock metaphors are presumably coined by one person and diffused through popular speech, writing and later the media. Example: I got it off my chest: I got it off my heart (Persian equivalent)
- c. Translation of metaphor by simile, retaining the image: this is the obvious way of modifying the stock of a metaphor, particularly if the TL text is not emotive in character. Example: the coast was only a green line: the coast was seen like a green line (Persian equivalent)
- d. Translation of metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense (occasionally a metaphor plus sense): this procedure has the advantage of combining communicative and semantic translation in addressing itself both to the layman and the expert if there is a risk that the simple transfer of the metaphor will not be understood by most

readers. Example: he is an owl: he is as clever as an owl (Persian equivalent)

e. Conversion of metaphor to sense: depending on the type of text, this procedure is common, and is to be preferred to any replacement of an SL by a TL image which is too wide of the sense or the register. Example: to keep the pot boiling: to earn one's livelihood (Persian equivalent)

f. Translation of metaphor by the same metaphor combined with sense: the addition of a gloss or an explanation by the translator is to ensure that the metaphor will be understood. Example: the tongue is fire: the tongue is fire, the fire is destructive, what we say is destructive (Persian equivalent)

iv. Recent metaphor: this culture specific metaphor can be conveyed from the ST to the TT by exploring the connotations of the source culture and searching for the closest equivalent in the target culture. Example: green back (of banknote): red back (Persian equivalent)

v. Original metaphor: in principle, this metaphor must be translated literally in authoritative and expressive texts, whether they are universal, cultural or obscurely subjective. Original metaphors in most informative texts are open to a variety of translation procedures; depending on whether the translator wants to emphasize the sense or the image. The choice of procedures in expressive or authoritative texts is much narrower, as is usual in semantic translation. However, if an original cultural metaphor appears to the reader to be a little obscure and not very important, the translator can sometimes replace it with a descriptive metaphor or reduce it to sense. For example: the past was dead: (the same Persian equivalent)

Some believe that Newmark's suggestions for translating metaphors do not serve well in translating the meaning of the text and they are so problematic, because they are based on separate text elements, not on the whole text. For example, word-for-word translation of original metaphor. Metaphors is not always possible, as it can describe a character or writer's thought and there is no reason to render this kind differently from other metaphors. Also, dead metaphors may carry some connotative meanings in both ST and TT, while being dead or has referential meanings in other texts. Sapir (1921) believes that "translation of metaphor is a relative process. As metaphor deals with culture, it does not have the fixed equivalence in different languages" (cited in Sharififar, 2001: 49). Based on this statement, it can be said that cliché and recent metaphors have relative translation, because in their translation, cultural elements must be considered, too. But original metaphors are not relative at all, as they must be translated literally. Kloepfer (1967) argues that the more original the metaphor is, the easier it is to translate.

It is worth mentioning that no scholar in the field of contrastive analysis or translation theory has prescribed

definite translation procedures for metaphors in general. Newmark (1988b: 113) admits that:

"The translation of any metaphor is the epitome of all translation, in that it always offers choices in the direction either of sense or of an image, or a modification of one, or a combination of both, and depending on the contextual factors, not least on the importance of the metaphor within text".

All of the mentioned techniques have some common points, as all include substitution (metaphor into different metaphor), paraphrase (metaphor into sense), conversion (metaphor into simile) or deletion which helps the translator to have knowledge of how to translate metaphors and also how metaphors are dealt with in translation. Some translation techniques of simile are presented thus:

T1: Literal translation (retention of the same vehicle).

T2: Replacement of the vehicle with a different vehicle.

T3: Reduction of the simile, if idiomatic, to its sense.

T4: Retention of the same vehicle plus explicitation of similarity feature(s).

T5: Replacement of the vehicle with a gloss.

T6: Omission of the simile.

Since target readers may not have the knowledge needed to interpret the simile, the translator will first assess their background knowledge. If he believes that the target readership has the knowledge required, he will leave the simile unchanged; if the target readership does not, some modification to the source simile may be required, for example, he can add some explanatory information. Larson (1984: 246) mentions these techniques for translating simile:

1. Keep the same simile: As bright as day: (the same Persian equivalent); As white as snow: (the same Persian equivalent)

2. Replace another simile, but keep the original meaning: As harmless as a dove: as harmless as an ant (Persian equivalent); As black as coal: as black/dark as night (Persian equivalent)

3. Keep the same simile, but spread it (bring its topic or point of similarity): Life is like the hound equivocal: life is like the hound equivocal, comes at a bound, either to rend me or to befriend me (Persian equivalent)

In some cases, because of different cultural features, a combination of more than one strategy is needed to convey the meaning. If the translator used two or three methods as explanation, paraphrasing or adaptation, translating would be simpler and the message rendered in a better way.

Among these techniques, translation techniques of metaphor stated by Newmark and translation techniques of simile stated by Larson are selected, because they are more comprehensive and have more correspondence with Persian metaphors.

Table 2. "1984"s examples.

English simile	Type	Hosseini	Tech.	Bahremand	Tech.	Balooch	Tech.
He had tasted chocolate like the piece she had given him	Implicit simile	He tasted chocolate like the one she has given him	T1	He had tasted chocolate like Julia's one	Expression	But he had tasted other chocolates before	Expression
The rasping red skin bore the same relation to the body of a girl as the rose hip to the rose	Explicit simile	The rasping red skin bore the same relation to the body of a girl as the rose hip to the rose	T1	The rasping red skin bore the same relation to the body of a girl as the apple hip to the apple	T2	The rasping red skin bore the same relation to the body of a girl as the rose hip to the rose	T1
English metaphor							
Swum into his mind	Stock	Swum into the sea of his mind	T1	Made its understanding difficult	Expression	It has flown in his eyes	Expression
His eyes were anchored by the freckled face with its faint, bold smile	Stock	The ship of his eyes anchored on her face	T1	He couldn't attract his look toward himself	Expression	The boat of his eyes anchored on her face	T1

PRACTICAL SIGHT

Here, two novels of George Orwell, 1984 and *Animal Farm* and their six Persian translations are the subject of analysis. The selected Persian translations of 1984 are by Hosseini, Balooch and Bahremand and Persian translations of *Animal Farm* are by Hosseini, Amirshahi and Kooshesh. First, the two English novels of George Orwell with their six Persian translated books were studied and their metaphors and similes with their Persian equivalences were found and collected into two separate tables; then their types, five types of metaphor and two types of simile mentioned were determined. After this, translation techniques of metaphor and simile mentioned by "Newmark" and "Larson" respectively were put into the tables. To collect data, the number of translation techniques used in each Persian translation was calculated.

Some metaphors and similes of these two novels are compared with their six Persian translations on the basis of Newmark's translation techniques of metaphor and Larson translation techniques of simile to show types of translation techniques used in each sentence (Tables 2 and 3).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Here, in order to find out the extent of using translation techniques in George Orwell's two novels, the data were gathered and settled into 12 tables. For each translated

books, 2 tables were drawn, 1 for similes and 1 for metaphors. In these tables, the above row labeled with the frequency, relative frequency and percentage of relative frequency and the left column labeled with types of metaphor and simile.

The results were analysed on the basis of Newmark's translation techniques for metaphor and Larson's translation techniques for simile. Newmark proposes five translation techniques for dead, cliché, stock, recent and original metaphors and Larson mentions three translation techniques, TT1, TT2 and TT3 for similes which are given below:

According to Tables 4 to 9, the amount of using TT1 for similes in 1984's translations is more in Hosseini's (96%), and in *Animal Farm's* translation (Tables 10 to 15), it is more in Amirshahi's and Kooshesh's (90%). The amount of using TTs for stock metaphors in 1984's translations is more in Balooch's, (51%), and in *Animal Farm's* translations is more in Hosseini's, (95%). The results show that translation techniques of figures of speech in both English and Persian texts correspond with each other; figures of speech in both English and Persian texts correspond with each other, too; translators did not use all of these techniques and tried to be more faithful to technique 1 of simile and technique of stock metaphor; translator's style and interest in using translation techniques is important. For instance, Hosseini's translations and works are so metaphoric and imaginative, so in these two novels he has used the high amount of translation techniques, even more than the source texts.

Table 3. "Animal Farm's" examples.

English simile	Type	Hosseini	Tech.	Amirshahi	Tech.	Kooshesh	Tech.
He seemed more like three horses than one	Implicit simile	Now he was like three horses in the appearance of one horse	T1	Now he worked like three horses	Expression	Now he appeared more like three horses	Expression
The cruel pellets swept over them like hail	Implicit simile	The cruel pellets swept over them like hail	T1	The cruel pellets swept over them	Expression	The cruel pellets swept over them	Expression
English metaphor							
The entire work of the farm seemed to rest on his mighty shoulders	Stock	The entire work of the farm rested on his mighty shoulders	T1	The entire work of the farm rested on his mighty shoulders	T1	The entire work of the farm rested on his mighty shoulders	T1
The weather had broken	Stock	The weather had broken	T1	The weather had broken	T1	The coldness of the weather had reduced	Expression

Table 4. Book 1, Hosseini's TTs of metaphor (total techniques: 222).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT Dead	9	0.0405	4.05
TT Cliché	80	0.3603	36.03
TT Stock	109	0.4909	49.09
TT Recent	6	0.027	2.70
TT Original	18	0.081	8.10

Table 5. Book 1, Hosseini's TTs of simile (total techniques: 202).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT1	195	0.9653	96.53
TT2	7	0.0346	3.46
TT3	--	--	--

Table 6. Book 2, Balooch's TTs of metaphor (total techniques: 111).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT Dead	2	0.0180	1.8
TT Cliché	42	0.3783	37.83
TT Stock	57	0.5135	51.35
TT Recent	3	0.0270	2.7
TT Original	7	0.0630	6.3

Table 7. Book 2, Balooch's TTs of simile (total techniques: 179)

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT1	169	0.9441	94.41
TT2	8	0.0430	4.3
TT3	2	0.0107	1.07

Table 8. Book 3, Bahremand's TTs of metaphor (total techniques: 120).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT Dead	6	0.05	5
TT Cliché	41	0.3416	34.16
TT Stock	57	0.475	47.5
TT Recent	12	0.1	10
TT Original	4	0.0333	3.33

Table 9. Book 3, Bahremand's TTs of simile (total techniques: 186).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT1	170	0.9139	91.39
TT2	13	0.0726	7.26
TT3	3	0.0167	1.67

Table 10. Book 1, Hosseini's TTs of metaphor (total techniques: 36).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT Dead	1	0.0277	2.77
TT Cliché	16	0.4444	44.44
TT Stock	17	0.4722	47.22
TT Recent	--	--	--
TT Original	2	0.0555	5.55

Table 11. Book 1, Hosseini's TTs of simile (total techniques: 24).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT1	23	0.9583	95.8
TT2	--	--	--
TT3	1	0.0416	4.16

Table 12. Book 2, Amirshahi's TTs for metaphor (total techniques: 22).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT Dead	--	--	--
TT Cliché	9	0.4090	40.9
TT Stock	11	0.5	50
TT Recent	--	--	--
TT Original	2	0.0909	9.09

Table 13. Book 2, Amirshahi's TTs of simile (total techniques: 22).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT1	20	0.9090	90.9
TT2	1	0.0454	4.54
TT3	1	0.0454	4.54

Table 14. Book 3, Kooshesh's TTs of metaphor (total techniques: 15).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT Dead	--	--	--
TT Cliché	3	0.2	20
TT Stock	9	0.6	60
TT Recent	--	--	--
TT Original	3	0.2	20

CONCLUSION

Having analysed Orwell's two novels, *1984* and *Animal*

Table 15. Book 3, kooshesh's TTs of simile (total techniques: 22).

Trans. tech.	F	Rf	P.Rf (%)
TT1	20	0.9090	90.9
TT2	--	--	--
TT3	2	0.0909	9.09

Farm with their six Persian translations and evaluating the acquired data to find out the extent of using translation techniques, it is time to answer the research question.

The question was about the correspondence between English translation techniques of metaphor and simile and their Persian equivalences in the translated texts. Among three translation techniques of simile, translation techniques 1 (TT1) is used more than other two translation techniques (TT2 and TT3) in all six Persian translations.

Among translation techniques of metaphor, translation techniques for stock and cliché metaphors (TT stock and TT cliché) are used more than other techniques in all six Persian translations. As it is stated before, technique 1 of simile focused on replacing the same simile of the ST in the TT. Also, technique for cliché metaphor is focused on keeping the ST cliché in the TT, too. Moreover, technique 1 of stock metaphor focused on replacing the same image of the ST in the TT. Therefore, the high rate of using these techniques in Persian translations shows a high rate of correspondence between English and Persian translation techniques of figures of speech.

However, it must be considered that the amount of using metaphors and similes in the target text, first depends on the faithfulness to the source text, and then on the translator's style and interest in using more or fewer figures of speech than the source text. For instance, among translations of *1984* and *Animal Farm*, it is seen that Hosseini's translation has more correspondence with translation techniques of both metaphors and similes which means that he is so faithful to the writer of the source text. In addition, in these six translations, translation techniques of similes have more correspondence with the ST than translation techniques of metaphors.

IMPLICATIONS

Here, some implications of this study are stated thus:

- i. According to Newmark (1988a: 57), "theories and techniques of translating figures of speech, such as metaphor and simile are so limited which do not cover translating all types of metaphors and similes".
- ii. In Persian language, there is no general and fundamental technique for translating these metaphor and

simile, and just English techniques are used for translating these two figures of speech.

iii. There are so limited research publications in the field of figures of speech, particularly about metaphor and simile, in both Persian and English language which must be considered critically.

REFERENCES

- Alhasnawi A (2007). "A Cognitive Approach to Translating Metaphors". *Translation J.*, 11 (3).
- Bell RT (1998). "Psychological/Cognitive Approaches". In: M. Baker (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge Publication.
- Cohen AD (1984). "On Taking Tests: What the Students Report". *Language Testing*. 11 (1).
- Delkhah, M. (1996). "Metaphor". *Motarjem J.*, 2 (20).
- Jaaskelainen R (2005). *Translation Studies: What Are They?*. <http://www.hum.expertise.workshop>.
- Jaskanen S (2001). *Fine Kettle of Fish*. [http:// Eng. Helsinki-fi](http://Eng.Helsinki.fi). 3 (10).
- Kleopfer W (1967). *Die Theorie der Literarischen Uebersetzung*. Fink, Munich.
- Krings HP (1986). "Translation Problems and Translation Strategies of Advanced Learners of French". In J. House, and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Larson ML (1984). *Meaning- Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalences*. United States of America: University Press of America, In.
- Loescher W (1991). *Translation Performance, Translation Process and Translation Strategies*. Tübingen: Guten Narr.
- Miremadi A (2003). *Theories of Translation and Interpretation (3rd ed.)*. Tehran: Samt.
- Mollanazar H (2005). *Principles and Methodology of Translation*. Tehran: Samt.
- Neubert A, Shreve GM (1992). *Translation as Text*. Kent/London: The Kent State University Press.
- Newmark P (1988a). *Approaches to Translation*. London: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Newmark P (1988b). *A Text Book of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Ordudari M (2007). "Translation procedures, Strategies and Methods". *Translation J.*, 11(3).
- Rezai A (2004). *Poetry in Translation*. Tehran: Samt Publication.
- Richards IA (1965). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York: OUP.
- Shariffar M (2001). "Metaphor, Life and Translation". *Kerman University J.*, 2 (7).
- Tajalli G (2003). *Idioms and Metaphorical Expressions in Translation*. Tehran: Samt.
- Toury G (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Venuti L (1998). *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York and London: Routledge