

---

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Metaphor in Literary Prose and its Cross-Cultural Transfer: A Case Study of *Jinpingmei* and its Two English Versions

Shuangjin Xiao

School of Languages and Cultures, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Corresponding Author: Shuangjin Xiao, E-mail: [hsiaoschin@gmail.com](mailto:hsiaoschin@gmail.com)

---

| ABSTRACT

The classic novel *Jinpingmei* constitutes a rich source of metaphorical expressions, which poses a challenge to interlingual translation. This paper conducts a descriptive analysis of the translation of metaphor from Chinese to English, taking *Jinpingmei* and its two English versions as the case study. It attempts to examine how and to what extent metaphorical language in the novel is mediated and rendered in the target language, to look at the effect of translative strategies used on the target text and its readers, and to pinpoint factors that motivate translators' choices. Following the paradigm of descriptive translation studies, the paper resorts to a mixed method design which combines qualitative and quantitative data analysis. The results show that translators adopt a wide variety of transferring strategies to handle metaphors identified in the novel, ranging from deletion to paraphrasing and completely retaining metaphors. While metaphors are all preserved in Roy's translation, there are many that suffer from loss or displacement to varying degrees in Egerton's translation. Translators' choice of different strategies exerts an effect on the images, figurative senses, metaphoricity, and cultural implications of individual metaphors in the source text, which exhibits their disparate considerations respecting the literariness of the original work and the target recipients' needs and tastes. Finally, the present study demonstrates that metaphor translation is mainly influenced by individual translators' translatorial skopos as well as their weighing up of prioritizing certain metaphors over others in the text in relation to its intention.

| KEYWORDS

Metaphor; literary discourse; interlingual transfer; translation strategies; *Jinpingmei*

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 16 November 2022

PUBLISHED: 16 November 2022

DOI: 10.32996/ijls.2022.2.2.15

---

### 1. Introduction

As an encyclopedic book written in the Ming dynasty (1368-1644), *Jinpingmei* is generally considered one of the four masterworks of the Ming novel. It contains a masterful display of various forms of Chinese language art, which fulfils a central function in telling the story, foregrounding its meaning, embodying aesthetic values, and enhancing memorability for readers. However, the diversity and beauty of the artistic language, like metaphorical expressions in *Jinpingmei* poses an extra challenge to interlingual translation. Metaphorical language shapes people's conscience, thinking pattern, and cultural psychology and its form is deeply anchored in a specific language and culture. It is used deliberately in literature as a form of linguistic deviation at the semantic level to create defamiliarizing or foregrounding effects (Leech, 2008, p. 21). Thus, research on metaphor in literature and its treatment in translation represents a central aspect of literary translation studies.

According to Newmark, "whilst the central problem of translation is the overall choice of a translation method for a text, the most important particular problem is the translation of metaphor" (1988, p. 104). Different cultures may share some common images and patterns of thinking but there are more linguistic and cultural traits peculiar to a particular discourse, which may pose a major translation problem (van Poucke & Belikova, 2016, p. 347). Metaphor in translation has been viewed as illustrating the limits of translatability and has inspired translation scholars to discuss and develop coping strategies for dealing with this problematic issue

(van den Broeck, 1981). This paper investigates how translators deal with issues of metaphor in the context of Chinese-English literary translation, using the case study of the novel *Jinpingmei*, which has been translated into English several times ever since the twentieth century.

There exist several English versions of *Jinpingmei*, including two complete ones and more than one abridged edition. *The Golden Lotus* (henceforth *Lotus*) by Clement Egerton, published in 1939 in London, is one of the complete English versions. Another complete translation, published in the United States between 1993 and 2013, is titled *The Plum in the Golden Vase* (henceforth *Plum*) by David Roy. The two translations of *Jinpingmei* appearing at different historical moments in the target cultural context showcase different styles in the comprehension of the source work and in English representations. A descriptive approach to metaphor translation is useful to account for the wider scope that individual metaphors may undertake within the network of relations of the entire novel. As such, translators' choices and strategies will be scrutinized to illuminate the way in which metaphorical language is treated in translation.

Given that metaphor translation is less explored in literary discourse than in political, journalistic, and scientific discourses (Monti, 2006), this study responds to the need to show how and to what extent metaphor in literary texts can enhance the text's aesthetic value, its internal coherence, and its cognitive potential. The novel *Jinpingmei* provides a fertile ground for such an exploration due to its rich image-based language and its aesthetic, stylistic, and structural cohesion. To my knowledge, however, no research has yet ventured to carry out a systematic discussion on English translations of metaphors in *Jinpingmei*. Therefore, this paper can address the void in the literature to achieve an understanding of this interesting interlingual and intercultural process. It is hoped that findings of this study can yield useful insights into the translation of literary metaphors in prose fiction from Chinese to English.

## 2. Literature Review

Before proceeding to any detailed analysis of metaphor translation from Chinese to English, some fundamental ideas about metaphor, culture, and cognition need to be clarified first. In addition, theoretical assumptions on the translatability of metaphor and on metaphor translation strategies are also elaborated here in this section.

### 2.1 Theoretical Concepts Explained

Traditionally metaphor is viewed primarily as an exceptional use of language. In *Poetics*, Aristotle defines metaphor as the use of an alien or unfamiliar name by transference from one domain to another, or by analogy (Butcher, 1950, p. 28). Aristotle's broad definition of metaphor has exerted great influence in the domain of metaphor studies. Dagut, for instance, identifies metaphor as "an individual creative flash of imagination fusing disparate categories of experience in a powerfully meaningful semantic anomaly" (1987, p. 77). Richards postulates the meaning of metaphor as derived from the interaction between the connotations of the words applying to each other. He differentiates tenor from vehicle for a given metaphor: tenor is "the idea conveyed by the vehicle"; vehicle is "the idea conveyed by the literal meanings of words used metaphorically" (Richards 1936, 96). Metaphor is often regarded as "a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is used in a non-basic sense, this non-basic sense suggesting a likeness or analogy with another more basic sense of the same word or phrase" (Dickins, 2005, p. 228). As a type of rhetorical device, metaphor renders a text vivid, dramatic, and convincing.

According to Newmark, metaphor is both referential and pragmatic in function: for referential function, metaphor describes "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"; for pragmatic function, metaphor serves "to appeal to the senses, to interest, to clarify graphically, to please, to delight, to surprise" (Newmark, 1988, p. 104). Newmark's treatise on metaphor touches upon the cognitive, mental dimension which is linked to the cognitive theory of metaphor that has gained impetus in recent decades.

In *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson theorize human being's ordinary conceptual system as "fundamentally metaphorical in nature" (1980, p. 3) and introduce the notion of conceptual metaphor from a cognitive perspective, which broadens the traditional view on metaphor. According to conceptual metaphor theory, metaphor is not simply a rhetorical or stylistic device but is fundamentally a conceptual or cognitive mechanism that is central to people's thinking, reasoning, and imagination (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 159). For Lakoff and Johnson, metaphor is "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (1980, p. 5). Following this line of thought, metaphor can be understood as a means of using "an expression from one domain to structure experience in another domain", which therefore entails metaphorical mapping across two different conceptual domains, namely the target (usually abstract) domain and the source (usually concrete) domain (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 230). Simply put, metaphor works as a cognitive or conceptual tool that enables people to understand abstract concepts based on concrete ones. Thus, a conceptual metaphor can be instantiated by several metaphorical expressions.

To illustrate, the conceptual metaphor – ARGUMENT IS WAR, which can be manifested by at least three metaphorical expressions: He *attacked* every weak point in my argument.

I've never *won* an argument with him.  
I *demolished* his argument.  
(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 4)

In the above sentences, the meanings of the three verbs – “attacked”, “won”, and “demolished” are associated with war; ARGUMENT is the target domain (indicating abstract concepts) and WAR is the source domain (signaling concrete concepts). The target domain is mapped onto the source domain. The correspondence between the two domains is called “cross-domain mapping”, which also points to correspondence in the conceptual system (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 205). This facilitates the understanding of metaphorical expressions such as “I won that argument”. Therefore, metaphor differs from metaphorical expressions from a cognitive perspective. The former refers to cross-domain mappings within the conceptual system whilst the latter indicates concrete linguistic expressions of such mappings. Notably, different cultures often have different types of conceptual mappings or metaphorical concepts (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 181). Gibbs (1999, p. 153) asserts that culture is quite important in the construal of metaphor as it plays a defining role in shaping metaphorical thought. He further avers that metaphorical thinking evinces the workings of a specific cultural model in conceptualizing reality (Gibbs, 1999, p. 155). In the Western culture, for instance, the animal “dragon” is often conceptualized as evil and ferocious, but it is a symbol of auspice in the Chinese culture. It follows naturally that the importance of cultural factors cannot be overemphasized while studying metaphor and metaphor in translation.

Within the cognitive framework, metaphor is not merely a poetic figure of speech of a language, but there exist systems of human conceptualization behind the creation of it. Thus, conceptual metaphor theory allows for a better understanding of metaphor and can be adopted as an approach for the (translational) analysis of metaphorical expressions in the classic novel *Jinpingmei*. This study, however, chooses to focus on metaphor mainly at the linguistic or stylistic level, namely “individual linguistic expressions (words, phrases or sentences) that are the surface realization of cross-domain conceptual mappings” (Lakoff, 1993, p. 203), but it also approaches metaphor from a conceptual or cognitive perspective where necessary.

## **2.2 The Translatability of Metaphor**

Given the multifunctionality and the cognitive mechanism of metaphor, researchers in the sphere of translation studies have shown significant concern on the translatability of metaphor. According to Schänaffer (2016), there are two prominent threads in the literature on metaphor translation: translatability of metaphor and methods of metaphor translation. Scholars such as Kloepfer (1967) argue that metaphor should not be a problem for translation because it is a universal language phenomenon and has an imagination mechanism that is shared by most cultures. Due to its failure to consider the nuanced linguacultural features of metaphorical language, Kloepfer's assertion is disputed by other translation scholars. Nida (1964, p. 220), for instance, contends that metaphor cannot be literally rendered, but it instead needs to undergo different degrees of transformation while translating because of lacking correspondences in the target language.

Given inherent differences between languages and cultures, Dagut illustrates the translatability of metaphor as determined by “the extent to which the cultural experience and semantic associations on which it draws are shared by speakers of the particular TL” (1976, p. 28). Dagut (1987) and Mason (1982) explain that some metaphors can indeed be easily or literally translated while others cannot due to cultural specificity or constraints. In the context of Chinese-English translation, Fagong (2009) stresses cultural implications of metaphor and concedes that image losses in translation arise from cultural hurdles. Ding and Wolf (2010) also confirm the effect of cultural particularities on metaphor translation between Chinese and English. In a similar vein, Snell-Hornby (1995, p. 56) remarks that the essential problem created by metaphor translation is that the meaning of metaphor is frequently culture-specific. Given the specific function of metaphor within the text concerned, Snell-Hornby (1995, p. 58) opines that whether a metaphor can be translatable is closely related to the role it plays in the co-text or context of the artistic structure of the text.

Moreover, several scholars investigate metaphor translation following a cognitive approach. For instance, Mandelblit (1995) argues that the translation of metaphor needs to take cognizance of the importance of each metaphor's conceptual layer or mapping rather than its linguistic level alone. Maalej (2008) demonstrate that the more different cultures conceptualize symbols in the same way, the more translatable metaphor will become. In a systematic study of the transfer of metaphoric expressions in Mo Yan's *Big Breasts and Wide Hips*, Liang finds that the translator misconstrues Chinese metaphors and shows a tendency in conceptual blending based on Western cultural frames, thereby achieving a cognitive effect that is not desired by the original author. However, Schäffner (2004, p. 1267) avers that shifts in metaphor during translation cannot be viewed as mistranslations since the source and target cultures may not always share the same linguistic realizations of a given metaphor. She further adds that translatability of metaphor is linked to the level of conceptual systems of the source and target languages.

Regarding the above reflections on the translatability of metaphor, it is apparent that metaphor translation entails linguistic, cultural, cognitive, and communicative dimensions underlying the creation of source and target texts (Kövecses 2005; Gavins, 2014, p. 504). Consequently, it can be assumed that interlingual transfer of metaphor involves conceptual shifts between different

ontologies rather than linguistic shifts alone (Mandelblit, 1995, p. 486). As Hastürkoğlu (2018, p. 471) indicates, people from different cultures have distinct ways of conceptualizing symbols or entities and of relating abstract things with concrete ones, which gives rise to different conceptual or culture-specific metaphors. To approach such a delicate issue like metaphor translation, different theories regarding metaphor translation strategies have come into being.

### 2.3 Metaphor Translation Strategies

Despite the inherent difficulty in translating metaphor from one language to another, it does not suggest that metaphor in translation is not achievable. Rather, different theories and approaches have been proposed for metaphor translation. For instance, van den Broeck (1981, p. 78) comes up with three different approaches: translation *sensu stricto* (i.e. word-for-word transfer), substitution, and paraphrase. Anyway, these translation procedures are limited in scope since more fundamental approaches fail to be considered. Therefore, an alternate model is proposed by Newmark (1981, p. 88), whose scheme of modes of metaphor translation shows more possibilities as exemplified in the following: reproducing the same metaphorical image in the target language (TL); replacing the metaphor in the source language (SL) with a standard TL metaphor that is culturally compatible in the TL; translation of metaphor by simile while retaining the image; translation of metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense, or occasionally by metaphor plus sense; conversion of metaphor to sense, or paraphrasing; deletion, if the metaphor is redundant; transferring the same metaphor along with its sense (i.e. adding a gloss) to reinforce the image.

Newmark's model seems to involve all the theoretical possibilities, which can be fruitfully applied to analysis of metaphor in translation. More significantly, Newmark emphasizes that the use of certain translation strategies depends on the function (i.e. cognitive, pragmatic or emotive) of metaphor in the text concerned. And yet, Newmark's typology is further developed by Toury, who establishes a different framework for handling metaphor in translation. Toury's framework covers six types of translation procedures: using TL correspondence of ST metaphor; transferring ST metaphor into another metaphor with similar sense; paraphrasing ST metaphor; deletion; turning non-metaphor into metaphor; converting ST non-metaphor into metaphor (Toury, 1995, p. 82). Notably, Toury's typology complements Newmark's by adding the latter two scenarios: introducing a metaphor in the target text (TT) for a non-metaphor in the source text (ST) and using a metaphor to render a monotonous expression in the ST. The two additional scenarios can be considered a translator's conscious attempt to achieve an overall stylistic effect of the TT. The aforesaid typologies of metaphor translation strategies, especially Newmark's, have been used and tested in several studies, and have proved effective for analysis of metaphor translation (e.g., Alvarez, 1993; Hussin & Mansor, 2020). Given the purpose of this study, Newmark's typology is relevant for analyzing the translation of metaphor in *Jinpingmei*. This will be further specified in the next section.

## 3. Methodology

This section outlines the research methods used in this study. It first states the research aims and then elaborates on the research steps followed in the actual analysis.

### 3.1 Objectives

The general objective of this study, as stated earlier, is to analyze the translation of metaphorical language in *Jinpingmei* from Chinese into English. In order to achieve this general objective, the following specific goals are pursued in this paper:

- To compare the original text with its two target texts with a special focus on how and to what extent metaphorical language is mediated and translated into the TL;
- To determine what effect translators' choice of strategies has on the target texts (i.e. the metaphoricity) and on the texts' reception by readers (i.e., intelligibility and readability);
- To examine potential factors that may motivate translators' decision-making while translating metaphorical elements.

### 3.2 Research Design

To achieve the above research aims, this study follows the paradigm of descriptive translation studies, which originates in the case study method and favors the multi-method design to conduct empirical research (Toury, 1995). The current study thus resorts to quantitative and qualitative research methods in carrying out data analysis. The different steps followed in the analytical part of this study are clarified in the following:

- Retrieval of corpus data for analysis;

The corpus for textual analysis derives from the novel *Jinpingmei* and its two English versions, namely *Lotus* and *Plum*. Following other scholars who include under the term metaphor several different figures (van den Broeck, 1981, p. 74; Newmark, 1988, p. 104; Monti 2006), this study also adopts a broad sense of metaphor covering various types of figurative language which *Jinpingmei*

abounds in, namely simile, idiom, and personification. In this stage, therefore, textual fragments containing metaphorical elements in the source text are singled out, along with the corresponding parts of the target texts. It is, of course, beyond the scope of this study to discuss all metaphors in *Jinpingmei*. Thus, several prominent instances are randomly selected for analysis since they well illustrate problems of metaphor translation in terms of variety and complexity.

– Quantitative analysis;

For quantitative analysis, the focus is on counting statistics and calculating the frequency of metaphor translation strategies used by the two translators concerned. The study draws upon Newmark’s typology of metaphor translation strategies as the analytical tool for describing translational shifts. However, the typology is further adapted to the specificity of this study, as is illustrated in Table 1.

**Table 1. Adapted Typology for Analyzing Metaphor Translation Strategies**

Literal translation
Substitution
Simile
Simile plus sense, or occasionally by metaphor plus sense
Paraphrase
Deletion
Combination of strategies

– Qualitative analysis;

For qualitative analysis, the translation strategies identified in the corpus data are further exemplified and analyzed in detail to supplement and consolidate the findings obtained in the quantitative analysis.

– Discussion of the results and drawing of conclusions.

**4. Quantitative Analysis**

This section presents a quantitative analysis of English translations of metaphorical language in *Jinpingmei*. There are altogether 66 samples manually and randomly collected from the source and target texts, which constitutes a small corpus for statistical analysis. Translation procedures used for dealing with metaphor instances in the corpus are categorized according to the proposed typology outlined in Section 3. The relative frequency or percentage of each type of translation strategy used by Egerton and Roy is calculated to produce measurable results. Table 2 presents an overview of the statistical results.

**Table 2. Distribution of Metaphor Translation Strategies in the Corpus**

Type of Strategy	Egerton's version		Roy's version		Two versions combined	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Literal translation	33	50%	52	79%	85	64%
Substitution	1	2%	0	0	1	1%
Simile	10	15%	9	14%	19	14%
Simile+Sense	1	2%	1	2%	2	2%
Paraphrase	5	8%	2	3%	7	5%
Deletion	15	23%	0	0	15	11%
Combination	1	2%	2	3%	3	2%
Total	66	100%	66	100%	132	100%

*Note.* Percentages are rounded off.

The statistical data in Table 2 show that the literal translation strategy (64%) is most frequently used by the two translators while dealing with metaphorical language in the corpus, followed by the strategy of translating metaphor by simile and the strategy of deletion, which represents 14% and 11%, respectively. To be specific, Egerton exploits the literal translation strategy about 33 times, with a percentage as high as 50%. There are 10 metaphorical instances that are translated by simile and 15 ones are deleted in Egerton’s version, but substitution occurs only once. There is also one case that is translated by simile plus sense and one rendered by combing different strategies. By comparison, around 80% of metaphorical instances in the corpus are literally translated and 14% are translated by simile in Roy’s version. Further, two instances are paraphrased and two rendered by combining

differing strategies; only one case is rendered by simile plus sense. Noticeably, instances of substitution and deletion are rare to find in the data regarding Roy's translation.

Overall, the results show that Egerton has more options for dealing with the transfer of metaphorical expressions in the corpus and his translation style is also more flexible, varied, and dynamic; however, Roy resorts to relatively fewer solutions and his primary choice is to preserve all metaphors in translation. This finding contradicts Davies' (2003) observation that individual translators are not consistent in prioritizing some strategy among different possibilities. In the case of Roy, he applies literal translation strategy in preference to other options while translating the SL metaphor. In the next section, metaphor translation strategies used by the two translators will be exemplified and analyzed qualitatively.

## 5. Qualitative Analysis

For qualitative analysis of the data, this section attempts to categorize the translations done by Egerton and Roy into seven groups, based on the typology of metaphor translation strategies adapted from Newmark's framework. Under each group, the translations of metaphorical language are arranged according to the translation strategy used by translators. It should be noted, however, that English renderings by the two translators may be discussed separately on some occasions, considering the different strategies employed. All the examples under discussion are taken from the corpus data stated in the preceding section. To facilitate the ensuing analysis, all metaphorical expressions and their translated counterparts appear in bold. The capital letter *E* stands for Egerton's translation while *R* refers to Roy's version.

### 5.1 Literal Translation

The first translation strategy that is discussed is literal translation. By literal translation, it means reproducing the same metaphorical image in the TL (Newmark, 1981, p. 88). According to Zitawi (2003, p. 249), if an SL metaphor is literally translated, it suggests that pairings of form and meaning of the original are knowingly retained as much as possible. This is favored by Kloepfer (1967) and Mason (1982) who advocate a word-for-word transfer of the SL metaphor. However, several studies show that literal translation strategy should be used cautiously since it is a constant source of erroneous and unnatural translations (Abu-Ssaydeh, 2004). As the corpus data indicate, literal translation emerges as the most common strategy used by translators. This might sound somewhat surprising because the cultural background and value systems between the SL and TL are so vastly different.

There are several reasons for the high frequency of literal translation that is found in the data. First is that metaphorical language, which has a greater figurative or stylistic function for the text than the plain, literal language, may be considered too important to be abandoned or reduced to simple, unadorned expressions. Second, translators' translational philosophies while rendering the source text play a significant role. Both Egerton and Roy highly esteem the artistic charisma and aesthetic value of *Jinpingmei* as a canonical work in the source culture, as is suggested in their prefatory statements (Egerton, 1939, vii; Roy, 1993, xlvii). Finally, since metaphor is also a conceptualizing process, there exist shared cognitive constructs between the SL and TL in terms of conceptualizing and experiencing reality.

After careful reading and analysis of instances of metaphor in *Jinpingmei*, it turns out that Egerton and Roy show certain similarity in retaining the SL metaphor (including simile) as possible as they could in order to reproduce the metaphorical force of the text. As with simile, it is characterized by indicators such as 如, 似, 像, 若 in Chinese or *like, as* in English. In the case of metaphor, there are no such indicators between tenor and vehicle. In the following examples, the two translators are shown to use a literal translation strategy for dealing with SL metaphors.

(1) 生得貌若梨花，腰如楊柳，長挑身材，瓜子臉兒。

E: Her face was **like the pear blossom**, and her waist was **as slender as the willow**.

R: **A pear-blossom complexion; A willow waist; A tall stature; And a melon-seed face ...**

(2) 又見婦人脫的光赤條條，花朵兒般身子，嬌啼嫩語。

E: Ximen looked again at the woman. Her **flower-like body**, unclothed, was kneeling as she uttered these softening words and wept so touchingly.

R: Moreover, when Hsi-men Ch'ing saw the woman's **flowerlike body**, which had been stripped stark naked, kneeling before him as she uttered her: Winsome sobs and melting words.

(3) 西門慶把眼觀看簾前那雪，如搥綿扯絮亂舞梨花，下的大了。

E: Through the window Ximen Qing looked out upon the snow. It was **as white as cotton wool** and the falling flakes seemed **like the whirling petals of the pear blossom**.

R: It looked just like: **Shredded cotton wadding, or Wildly dancing pear blossoms.**

(4) 往後日子多如柳葉呢。

E: There are still **as many days before us as there are leaves upon a willow tree.**

R: There are **as many days ahead of us as there are leaves on the willow tree.**

(5) 正是有眼不識荆山玉，拿著頑石一樣看。

E: I have been like those who did not recognize **the jade of the Jing Mountain** and thought it but **a piece of common stone.**

R: Though I have eyes I have failed to identify the **'Jade of the Ch'u Mountains'**; And have treated it as though it were no more than **an ordinary stone.**

(6) 西門慶就在婦人房中宿歇，如魚得水，美愛無加。

E: Ximen spent every night with her. They played together **as merrily as fishes in water**, and nothing could have surpassed their pleasure in each other.

R: That evening Hsi-men Ch'ing slept in Chin-lien's chambers. **Like fish sporting in the water**; Their pleasure could not be exceeded.

(7) 若是饒了這個淫婦，除非饒了蠍子。

E: If he can forgive a whore like this, he can forgive **a scorpion.**

R: You'd do as well to forgive a whore like that as you would to forgive **a scorpion!**

Examples (1) to (7) show that the SL metaphorical expressions, along with tenors and vehicles, are literally rendered into the TL, which ensures the "adequacy" of the target texts (Toury, 1995, p. 70). Despite the adherence to the ST in both form and content, the English expressions for the SL counterparts exhibit a certain degree of semantic exoticism for an appropriate interpretation on the part of the target audience. Anyway, interpretation of metaphor is always culturally conditioned as metaphorical sense springs from the use of an expression in a specific linguistic and situational context (Dobrzyńska, 1995, p. 596). It can be seen in example (5) that the expression "the jade of the Jing Mountain" given for "荆山玉" is exoticized or foreignized, which "registers the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text", in Venuti's (1995, p. 20) parlance. The expression "有眼不識荆山玉" is a metaphorical idiom suggesting someone who is undiscerning and cannot tell good from bad. In this light, an average reader may require more cognitive efforts to decipher the intended meaning of this culture-bound metaphor.

Of the above metaphor instances rendered by literal translation, the images, or vehicles of each ST metaphor are all maintained in the TL, which aptly conveys the metaphorical force of the original while at the same time assuming the communicative function. However, as mentioned previously, the literal translation strategy does not always work for dealing with the SL metaphor. In some cases, this type of strategy may lead to semantic ambiguity as well as textual incoherence, which may cause confusion for target readers. This is primarily because the original writer and the translator come from different epochs and have different physical and cultural experiences. Problems may thus arise in terms of recreating in the TL certain metaphors that belong to "fixed language specific expressions and regional and time-specific variants" in the ST (Trim, 2007, p. 67). The following examples may well illustrate this point.

(8) 娘，你看他嘴似淮洪也一般，隨問誰也辯他不過。

E: "Mother," Xue'e cried, "you must realize that **her mouth is as the Huai River.** There is not a person living who could get on with her..."

R: "Just look at her, Mother," protested Hsueh-o: "**Her mouth is like the Huai River in spate...**"

(9) 家雞打的團團轉，野雞打的貼天飛

E: When **a farmyard chicken** is beaten, it turns round and round; **a wild one** flies a way

R: If you beat **domestic fowl**, they'll hop around in circles; If you beat **wildfowl**, they'll fly high into the sky.

(10) 學生生一豚犬，不足為賀，倒不必老太監費心。

E: This ignorant fellow has but **a little dog**. The occasion is not worthy of such an honor, and I beg you not to trouble yourselves.

R: The fact that your pupil has been able to sire **a shoat or a whelp**: Is not worthy of congratulation. There is really no need for the senior eunuch directors to go to so much trouble.

(11) 美冤家，一心愛折後庭花。

R: My handsome lover particularly loves to pluck the **flower in the rear courtyard.**

(12) 你在誰人跟前試了新，這回剩了些殘軍敗將，才來我這屋裡來了。

E: I have to content myself with the **defeated champion.**

R: Whoever it is that you've tried it on first has reduced you to no more than: The **bested general of a defeated army**, by the time you bother to show up in my room here.

As can be seen from the above examples, the metaphorical expressions in the ST are all rendered by their literal equivalents in the TL, with no intent of adapting them to the target cultural consciousness. We could even observe word-for-word renderings by comparing the source and target texts. Nevertheless, the implied meaning of the original is not captured or distorted. As Hussin and Mansor (2020) comment, there exists the possibility that literal interpretations which disregard the implied meaning would give rise to obscure translations. The above target texts do not seem to reproduce plausible metaphorical counterparts when the denotative meaning of the ST metaphors is given.

In effect, the ST metaphors are highly culture-specific, producing associations that transcend the target cultural consciousness. There are no one-to-one linguistic or semantic equivalents in the TL since the cultural experience and semantic associations on which the ST metaphors draw are not shared by the TL readers. Thus, an interpretation of such metaphors does not consist of mere deciphering of linguistic signs, or the surface meaning of metaphorical utterances (Dobrzyńska, 1995, p. 598). Rather, transfer of such complex metaphors depends on the co-text, or textual context and thus modulation becomes necessary. To illustrate, the metaphorical images “豚犬”, “後庭花”, and “殘軍敗將” in examples (10), (11) and (12) suggest meanings that are quite different from their denotations. The same is true of the other two examples. Precisely, the lexeme “豚犬” is used metaphorically to indicate someone's own son in the source culture, the image “後庭花” insinuates sexuality, and the figurative sense of “殘軍敗將” is contextually determined, implying aphrodisiacs enjoyed by the male protagonist. These figurative expressions are, however, not modulated but rendered in a word-for-word way in the TL, which leads to interpretations that are incompatible with those intended in the original. In a word, the English renderings carry vague, unnatural meanings that strike readers as jarring and estranging, allowing for diverse interpretations.

### 5.2 Substitution

As demonstrated in the data analyzed in Section 4, substitution is not the strategy that is favored by translators while handling metaphors. By substitution, it means translators' choice of replacing the metaphorical image from the SL with a standard image in the TL provided that the image is culturally compatible in the TL (Newmark, 1981, p. 88). Of all the strategies used by Egerton and Roy, the substitution procedure is merely used less than twice. What follows is a telling example that is linked to the choice of substitution.

(13) 你看看孟家的和潘家的，兩個**就是狐狸一般**，你怎鬥的他過！

E: Meng Yulou and Pan Jinlian are like a couple of wolves. You can never you're your own against them.

In this example, the two female characters, Yulou and Jinlian, are compared to animals, which reflects the tension and conflict between different characters depicted in the novel. The animal image “狐狸” is used metaphorically to refer to wicked, unchaste, and wanton women in the source culture. The metaphorical meaning is built from the stereotyped association of the animal image obvious to readers of the SL. However, the image, or the vehicle of this original metaphor is modified and substituted with a different animal image, namely “wolves”, in the TL, which alters the original iconicity but reinforces the satirical tone. The replacement of the original image has similar implications (i.e. submitting female characters to animals) and fulfils the communicative function as well, in so far as the “conceptual mapping” (women are animals), in Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) terms, remains unchanged. Hence, it seems that substitution can achieve conceptual or cognitive equivalence for metaphor translation despite the difference in lexical form and cultural dimensions.

### 5.3 Translating Metaphor by Simile

According to Newmark (1981), simile is a more cautious form of metaphor. In *The Rule of Metaphor*, Ricoeur makes the point that “simile is a metaphor developed further” (2004, p. 28). Translation of metaphor by simile represents a conscious strategy that can make the ST metaphor more accessible to target recipients. The following examples show how the original metaphorical utterances are translated respectively by similes while at the same time retaining the original imagery in the target texts.

(14) 打扮的**就是活觀音**

E: She looked **as beautiful as the living Guanyin**.

(15) 俺每是買了個**母雞**不下蛋，莫不吃了我吃不成！

R: Even if my case should be **like that of: The purchased hen who doesn't lay eggs**; do you mean to say he'll simply kill me?"

(16) 與王六兒打的**火炭般熱**

E: ...their passion for each other was **as fiery as burning charcoal**



R: ...he and Wang Liu-erh were: **As hot for each other as burning charcoal**

(17) 打的經濟鯽魚般跳

E: Jingji jumped **like a fish**.

R: Ching-chi wriggled **like a carp**.

(18) 你本蝦鱧

Roy: You're just **like a shrimp or an eel**.

(19) 你兩個銅盆撞了鐵掃帚。

E: You two are like **a brass bowl** and somebody banging it with **an iron broom handle**.

R: The two of you are like: **A brass basin** meeting up with **a steel brush**....

From examples (14) to (19) we could observe an extensive use of metaphorical expressions in the ST, which renders the text vivid, colloquial, and imaginative. The metaphorical usage is aimed at delineating various characters in the story. As can be seen, characters are described or even visualized using various concrete images, which exerts a profound visual effect on the reader's mind. Remarkably, all these ST metaphors are translated by similes in the TL, which manages to represent the figurative sense exactly. Not only do the English renderings keep the aesthetic effect in play, but they fulfil the communicative function for the target audience. The choice of this translational tactic brings into prominence the verbal playfulness of the original while recreating at the same time the metaphoricity in the target texts.

#### **5.4 Translating Metaphor by Simile plus Sense**

Translation by simile plus sense suggests that the ST metaphor can be translated by simile while at the same time providing additional explanations. Newmark (1981, p. 88) contends that this type of strategy involves a compromise during translation as it can avoid a risk that the simple transfer of certain complex metaphors will not be understood by general readers. There are only a few cases in the data where the ST metaphors are dealt with using this approach:

(20) 俺們是沒時運的，行動**就是烏眼雞一般**。

E: But the rest of us are out of luck. He treats us like black-eyed chickens.

R: While the rest of us are so out of favor that, no matter what we do, he treats us **like an angry fighting cock**.

(21) 打扮的**就是活觀音**

R: In fact she was so made up as to look **like an avatar of the Goddess Kuan-yin**.

(22) 日月**如梭**。

E: The sun and moon crossed and recrossed **like the shuttles of a weaver**.

The above metaphorically used words and expressions in the SL are translated by similes along with their senses, facilitating the understanding of the target texts. Precisely, in example (20), the animal image “烏眼雞” is used metaphorically to suggest people who are living in malice and envy and hating one another. The expression “like an angry fighting cock” in the target text reproduces the implied meaning of the original, which makes the text intelligible and communicative. In example (21), the intended meaning of the ST metaphor “就是活觀音” is made fairly explicit in the target text. The same is true of example (22) in which the cultural image “梭” is clarified as “the shuttles of a weaver” in the target text. Thus, the strategy of translating metaphor by simile plus sense can help retain metaphorical images as well as guarantee intelligibility, enabling the reader to experience a metaphorical effect similar to the original.

#### **5.5 Paraphrasing**

As indicated in the corpus data, this procedure is used seven times by Egerton and Roy for dealing with SL metaphors. It means converting metaphor to its sense only, without retaining the original image in the TL. In other words, metaphorical language present in the ST is converted to literal language that is simple, bland, and unadorned. As indicated by Dobrzyńska, the disparity of “lexical connotations and stereotyped associations often prevents direct metaphorical rendering of many common expressions referring to generally known things and concepts” (1995, p. 599). According to Newmark (1981, p. 90), when metaphor transfer from the SL to the TL is unachievable in terms of imagery or register, converting metaphor with its sense should be an ideal choice. The drawback of paraphrase, however, is that the rhetorical features (e.g., brevity and expressivity) of the original are dismissed, which certainly does an injustice to the source writer. Since every coin has two sides, there also exists the merit which suggests that paraphrasing can enhance fluency and readability for the translated text. The following examples engage in the adaptation of the SL metaphors using paraphrasing.

(23) 都是露水夫妻，再醮貨兒。

E: They are **all just stale married women**, nothing more.

(24) 饒你奸似鬼，也吃洗腳水。

E: Though he **had all the cunning of a ghost**, he was compelled to drink the water in which she washed her feet.

(25) 合歡核桃真堪愛，裡面原來別有仁。

R: The coupled halves of the peach stone serve to evoke a chuckle; Because inside, it will be found lie yet **another couple**.

(26) 光陰似箭

E: **The time passed very quickly**.

(27) 誰知道這小夥兒綿裡之針，肉裡之刺。

E: Nobody could have suspected **the treacherous villainy of this young man**.

(28) 任他錦帳鳳鸞交，不似蘭湯魚水戰。

R: In ancient times and modern, such contests have been countless; But none of them was the equal of this battle in the bathtub.

(29) 李嬌兒說：“我燈草拐杖一做不得主。你還請問你爹去。”

E: “I have no say in the matter,” Li Jiao'er said. “I can do nothing; you must go and see what your master thinks about it.”

As the examples above clearly show, the Chinese sentences are marked as metaphorical in nature. They are terse, vivid, and expressive in describing characters and events, reflecting values and beliefs peculiar to the SL culture. To illustrate, the expression “露水夫妻” in example (23), suggests illicit marriage in the source culture; “奸似鬼” in example (24) is used to describe evil, cunning guys; “別有仁” in example (25) indicates someone who is a two-timer; “光陰似箭” in example (26) suggests the swift passage of time; “綿裡之針，肉裡之刺” in example (27) refers to wicked, hypocritical, and treacherous people; “鳳鸞交” and “魚水戰” in example (28) insinuate sexual activity; “燈草拐杖” in example (29) suggests someone who has no say in the final decision. All these metaphorical expressions have specific connotations and stereotyped associations that do not exist outside the SL. In the case of the English renderings, however, the ST metaphors are not literally rendered but are paraphrased using non-metaphorical alternatives in the TL. As a result, the symbolic associations of SL metaphorical images are lost. So are the vividness of expression and cultural implications. However, converting metaphor to its sense has great relevance for making the target text more intelligible and accessible to the reader.

### 5.6 Deletion

Deletion, or abandoning metaphor along with its sense in the target text, may arise from various causes. As Newmark (1981, p. 90) postulates, if the ST metaphor is considered redundant, it can be deleted alongside its sense. However, deletion can also be due to the pressure of poetic norms operating in the target culture or to the complex communicative mechanism of the SL metaphor. Whatever the reason, the decision made by the translator must have resulted from his or her weighing up the priorities within the text in relation to its intention. As is the case in this study, the primary justification for Egerton's removal of certain metaphors in translation should be to avoid litany and sensitivity. According to the statistics, there are about 15 deletion instances in Egerton's translation. Notably, none of the instances is eliminated in Roy's translation. Below are prime examples that are omitted altogether in Egerton's version.

(30) 美冤家，一心愛折後庭花。

E: [Deletion]

(31) 若教此輩成佛道，天下僧尼似水流。

E: [Deletion]

(32) 各人自掃簷前雪，莫管他人屋上霜。

E: [Deletion]

(33) 忙忙如喪家之犬，急急似漏網之魚。

E: [Deletion]

(34) 風流茶說合，酒是色媒人。

E: [Deletion]

As a matter of fact, the above examples belong to the narrator’s language which serves to portray and comment on characters in the novel. This type of language evinces the narrator’s worldview and cognitive attitudes toward the characters commented on. Since these metaphorical expressions are left out in the target text, the relevant aesthetic or stylistic value of the narrator’s commentary is lost, which undoubtedly prevents readers from perceiving the narrator’s worldview. Nonetheless, deletion of certain metaphors can be justified since the loss incurred by this strategy can be compensated for by those that are retained elsewhere in the text. The function of the omitted metaphors, as Newmark (1981, p. 91) states, can also be fulfilled elsewhere in the text provided that not all SL metaphors are omitted in the translation.

**5.7 Combined Use of Strategies**

As shown in the quantitative analysis, there exists the situation in which a single metaphorical utterance is translated using different strategies. The concurrent use of strategies is also considered a compromise procedure for tackling certain complicated metaphors (Newmark, 1981, p. 88). In the following examples, the Chinese expressions are at once culture-bound, metaphorical, and idiomatic. Close reading of their English renderings reveals that at least two different translation strategies are deployed by Egerton and Roy while dealing with each metaphor.

(35) 恍似姮娥離月殿，猶如神女到筵前。

R: It is just as though Ch’ang-o has come down from her palace in the moon; She is exactly like the Goddess of Witches, Mountain deigning to grace the feast.

(36) 皆鷹犬之徒，狐假虎威之輩。

E: These are all men of utter unworthiness, scoundrelly fellows who, like foxes, invest themselves with the dignity of a tiger.

R: All of the above-named persons: Fall into the category of mere falcons and hounds; Are of the same ilk as the fox who flaunted the tiger’s might.

In example (35), we could identify a concurrent use of two strategies: literal translation strategy and substitution. The cultural image “姮娥” is transliterated or rendered verbatim as “Chang’o” while “神女” is replaced with “Goddess of Witches”, a familiar image in the TL, which has different stereotyped associations from the SL counterpart. In example (36), “皆鷹犬之徒” is paraphrased as “men of utter unworthiness, scoundrelly fellows” in Egerton’s version, while “狐假虎威之輩” is translated by simile plus sense. Roy, however, translates “皆鷹犬之徒” literally as “the category of mere falcons and hounds”. As with “狐假虎威之輩”, it is also rendered by a simile plus its sense in the TL. The combination of differing translation procedures proves effective since the original metaphorical effect is replicated in the target texts whose meaning is readily accessible to the reader.

**6. Discussion and Conclusion**

In light of the above quantitative and qualitative analysis, it can be concluded that in dealing with the transfer of metaphorical language in *Jinpingmei*, the translators, Egerton and Roy, have employed diverse strategies and produced different renditions. Whatever strategies they have adopted, there are two fundamental results: preserving the ST metaphor in the target texts as far as possible and adapting or modulating the ST metaphor to produce an intelligible, accessible, and acceptable translation. Therefore, translators’ choice of strategies can have distinct functions (i.e. loss and gain) in terms of representing the original image, sense, metaphoricity, and cultural implications. Table 3 presents an overall picture of the range of strategies used for metaphor translation with reference to their multiple functions.

**Table 3. Functions of Metaphor Translation Strategies**

Strategies	Image	Sense	Metaphoricity	Cultural implications
Literal translation	✓	?	✓	✓
Substitution	→	?	✓	—
Simile	✓	✓	✓	✓
Simile+Sense	✓	✓	✓	✓
Paraphrase	—	✓	—	—
Deletion	—	—	—	—
Combination	✓	✓	✓	✓

\* ✓ stands for preservation while — for loss; → indicates replacement; ? means that misinterpretation happens.

Table 3 shows that each type of strategy fulfils different functions in terms of metaphor translation. However, there are few perfect solutions since most translation strategies can result in either positive or negative effects. As Toury (1995, p. 70) puts it, no

translation can be totally adequate or totally acceptable. Take, for example, the case of literal translation, it is the strategy most favored by Roy, but it can, on some occasions, lead to obscurity regarding the meaning of certain translated metaphors, as is revealed in the qualitative analysis. In terms of paraphrase and deletion strategies, they attest to the difficulty and complexity involved in translating metaphor from Chinese to English since the language pairs share few overlaps of cultural experience and values attached to metaphorical concepts. After all, the translatability of metaphor is concerned “with the distance that separates the cultural background of the source text and the target audience in terms of time and space” (Snell-Hornby, 1995, p. 41). Thus, it is hardly surprising that several metaphors are omitted or abandoned in translation. Other strategies play a central part in reproducing metaphor along with its sense in translations while at the same time manifesting its cultural implications.

The study demonstrates that the diverse strategies used by Egerton and Roy in terms of metaphor translation can serve as an important characteristic for distinguishing the two English translations of *Jinpingmei*. Based on the foregoing discussion, it is noticeable that Egerton’s translation is more reader-friendly since he resorts to a wider range of solutions for handling metaphor. The lower frequency of use of literal translation strategy and the higher proportion of paraphrase and omission reflect Egerton’s consciousness to make the text fluent and intelligible, thereby reducing reading difficulty for the target audience. On the other hand, the higher frequency of use of the literal translation method and no use of omission manifest Roy’s overall preference for preserving each and every SL metaphor in his translation.

The translators’ respective preference for deploying strategies should be concerned with their different weighing up of individual metaphors’ function in the text, such as their involvement in the structure of text and their specific communicative character. Egerton’s translation tends to highlight the communicative function whilst Roy’s emphasizes the semantic content as well as the aesthetic, stylistic form of the SL metaphor. For this reason, the two translators can choose among several possibilities. As the study reveals, an SL metaphor can be rendered into a TL one or a simile, converted by its sense, paraphrased, or simply deleted. In any case, metaphor translation is always a process of negotiation due to language and cultural difference and entails loss and gain in different circumstances.

Other factors such as those relating to specific translational skopos, also come into play here. It is noticeable that the skopos or purpose for the two translators differs significantly while translating *Jinpingmei*, which can certainly influence how they deal with metaphors in the novel. Roy is a scholarly translator and his translation of *Jinpingmei* is in fact a scholarly work that is highly source-text-oriented. Roy’s translational philosophy is translating everything in the source text to reveal for the envisaged reader all the subtleties of the original work (Roy, 1993, xlvi). Thus, it is not surprising that Roy’s translation preserves all the SL metaphors as shown in the above analysis.

Unlike Roy, the actual translational situation for Egerton is quite different. Rather than producing a scholarly translation, Egerton intends to make a smooth English version of *Jinpingmei* for his contemporary audiences, and, at the same time, to preserve the spirit of the original work (Egerton, 1939, vii). To find the right balance between the two goals, Egerton often makes an ad hoc compromise while translating individual metaphors in *Jinpingmei* to accommodate his text to the taste and experience of the assumed readership. All in all, then, translators’ decisions for designing appropriate strategies to handle metaphor can be influenced by any number of factors, but it is nevertheless translators’ interpretive efforts, or power of re-creation and their individual skopos that are considered most relevant.

Metaphorical language in literature constitutes a challenge to interlingual translation, as is the case with the novel *Jinpingmei*. This study represents a preliminary attempt to unveil the intricacies inherent in the translation of metaphor from Chinese to English. However limited the contribution of this study might be, it allows for an understanding of the effect of translators’ solution-types on individual metaphors identified in *Jinpingmei* and of potential factors that give rise to such effect. Future research can be conducted by considering other aspects of the novel, such as poetry and songs, to examine how they are treated by translators and whether their solutions share similarity with or simply contradict those utilized for translating metaphor as shown in this particular case study.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author has no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

**Acknowledgments:** The author wishes to thank the anonymous peer reviewers and editors for their comments.

**Publisher’s Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

## References

- [1] Alvarez, A. (1993). On translating metaphor. *Meta*, 38(3), 479-490.
- [2] Abu-Ssaydeh, A. (2004). Translation of English idioms into Arabic. *Babel*, 50(2), 114-131.
- [3] Butcher, S. H. (1950). *Aristotle on the art of poetry*. Liberal Arts Press.
- [4] Dagut, M. (1976). Can 'metaphor' be translated?. *Babel*, 22(1), 21-33.
- [5] Dagut, M. (1987). More about the translatability of metaphor. *Babel*, 33(2), 77-83.
- [6] Dobrzynska, T. (1995). Translating metaphor: Problems of meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24, 595-604.
- [7] Ding, Y., Noël, D., & Wolf, H. H. (2010). Patterns in metaphor translation: A corpus-based case study of the translation of FEAR metaphors between English and Chinese. In R. Xiao (Ed), *Using corpora in contrastive and translation studies* (pp. 40-61). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- [8] Davies, E. E. (2003). A goblin or a dirty nose?. *The Translator*, 9(1), 65-100.
- [9] Dickins, J. (2005). Two models for metaphor translation. *Target*, 17(2), 227-273.
- [10] Egerton, C. (1939). *The golden lotus*. George Routledge & Sons Ltd.
- [11] Fagong, L. (2009). Making up for image losses in Chinese-English translation of metaphors. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 6, 52-56.
- [12] Gibbs, R.W. & G. Steen (eds) 1999 *Metaphors in Cognitive Linguistics* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [13] Gibbs, R. W. (1999). Taking metaphor out of our heads and putting it into the cultural world. In Gibbs, R. W., & Steen, G. (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics: Selected papers from the fifth international cognitive linguistics conference* (pp. 145-166). John Benjamins.
- [14] Gavins, J. (2014). Metaphor studies in retrospect and prospect. An interview with Gerard Steen. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 12(2), 493-510.
- [15] Hastürkoğlu, G. (2018) Incorporation of conceptual metaphor theory in translation pedagogy: A case study on translating simile-based idioms. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 38(4), 467-483.
- [16] Hussin, M., & Mansor, I. (2020). Metaphor translation procedures and their application in translating Amthāl al-Hadith into Malay with reference to Newmark's theory. *Al-Bayan: Journal of Qur'an and Hadith Studies*, 18(1), 29-55.
- [17] Kloefer, R. (1967). *Die theorie der literarischen übersetzung* [The theory of literary translation]. Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- [18] Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge University Press.
- [19] Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- [20] Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 202-251). Cambridge University Press.
- [21] Leech, G. (2008). *Language in literature: Style and foregrounding*. Longman.
- [22] Liang, X. (2017). Different conceptual blending with different cultural frames: Goldblatt's (mis-)construal of Mo Yan's metaphor in *Big Breasts and Wide Hips*. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 54(4), 771-794.
- [23] Mason, K. (1982). Metaphor and translation. *Babel*, 28 (3), 140-149.
- [24] Mandelblit, N. (1995). The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory. In T, Marcel, & B. L. Tomaszczyk (Eds.), *Translation and meaning, part 3* (pp. 483-495). Universitaire Press Maastricht.
- [25] Monti E. (2006). Dwelling upon metaphors: The translation of William Gass's novellas. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(1), 117-132.
- [26] Maalej, Z. (2008). Translating metaphor between unrelated cultures: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective. *Sayyab Translation Journal*, 1, 60-81.
- [27] Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill Archive.
- [28] Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Pergamon Press.
- [29] Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of translation*. Tice Hall Press.
- [30] Richards, I. A. (1936). *Philosophy of rhetoric*. Oxford University Press.
- [31] Roy, D. T. (1993-2013). *The plum in the golden vase* (5 vols.). Princeton University Press.
- [32] Snell-Hornby, M. (1995). *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. John Benjamins.
- [33] Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1253-1269.
- [34] Schäffner, C. (2017). Metaphor in translation. In E. Semino, & Z. Demj'en (Eds.), *The routledge handbook of metaphor and language* (pp. 247-262). Routledge.
- [35] Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins.
- [36] Trim, R. (2007). *Metaphor networks. The comparative evolution of figurative language*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [37] Van den Broeck, R. (1981). The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation author. *Poetics Today*, 2(4), 73-87.
- [38] Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- [39] Van Poucke, P., & Belikova, A. (2016). Foreignization in news translation: Metaphors in Russian translation on the news translation website InoSMI. *Meta: journal des traducteurs*, 61(2), 346-368.
- [40] Xiao, X. S. (2012). *Jinpingmei* [Gold Vase Plum]. South Ocean Publishing House.
- [41] Zitawi, J. (2003). English-Arabic dubbed children's cartoons: Strategies of translating idioms. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 4(2), 237-251