A study of implementing the lexical and discoursal modifications in translation: regarding the translation of "*the Kite Runner*" from English into Persian

Reza Moghaddam Kiya, University of Tehran

Fahimeh Sahraei Nezhad, Payam e nour University

Abstract: This study while acknowledging the need to accommodate certain modifications in translation to establish equilibrium or in some sense equivalence between the source and target text, aims first to examine some of the ways in which these modifications are implemented in real situations and second to illustrate some of the contributions the contemporary theory of metaphor and schema theory can make to the translation of literary works. Our basic claim in this paper is that it can be concluded from the analysis of translated texts that, broadly speaking, most of the modifications in translation are implemented in alignment with the schemata existing in the conceptual system of the translator and the translation addressees. The paper starts by defining the basic concepts used in this study and then these concepts are applied to the analysis of a number of examples extracted from the translation of Khaled Hosseini's novel '*The Kite Runner*' into Persian.

1. Introduction

Before proceeding with the analysis of our corpus, it is necessary to define the aims of the study and some basic concepts on which the analysis of our corpus is based.

1.1. Aims

The aim of this study is to illustrate how modifications are implemented in the actual process of translation and at the same time to indicate how linguistic metaphors and their underlying conceptual structures i.e. '*image schemata*' vary from one language to another and should, therefore, be taken into account in the process of translation, particularly in the translation of literary works.

1.2. Basic concepts

In line with the objectives of this study, some basic concepts such as translation unit, equivalence, modification, image schemata and metaphor are described in the following sections.

1.2.1 Translation unit

Delimiting and defining the unit of translation has been, and still is, one of the main goals of any translation theory. In recent studies there is a broad consensus that the unit of translation is a variable chosen by the translator depending upon certain factors such as the text type and the objective of translation. According to Neubert and Shreve (1992:1), a SL is embedded in a complex linguistic, textual, and cultural context. Its meaning, communicative intent, and interpretive effect draw upon its natural relationships in that environment. In other words, it is only within the context of the text and the wider system of culture that the linguistic items can be properly understood.

Similarly, Snell-Hornby (1988:2) uses the term '*text-in-situation*' to emphasize the role of text, its context, and the importance of text analysis in translation process. A text, she believes, should not be analyzed in parts, but as a whole, from the '*macro-level*' to the '*micro-level*'. The analysis, therefore, begins on the macro level "identifying the text in terms of culture and

situation" (ibid: 69), then it is reduced to the micro level, where the structure of the text is analyzed.

A text, Snell-Hornby believes, is more than just a linguistic phenomenon, it has a communication function reflecting the culture and society in which it is written. This notion of culture is so prominent in her view that she considers translation not just a mere process of trans-coding words from one language to another, but a transfer of culture from one culture to another. According to Genztler (1993: 75)

> Snell Hornby tries to illustrate how translations may need to be altered for the target
>
> culture, depending on the information in question and the audience. She no longer
>
> defines translation as an activity that takes place between two languages, but views it
>
> as an interaction between two cultures.

Taking into account that this study deals with the translation of a novel that mostly reveals social, cultural and communicative aspects of language, the whole text is ,therefore, considered as the unit of translation.

1.2.2 Equivalence

As Neubert and Shreve (1992:22) point out the text-linguistic model of translation maintains that an original text and a translation are different not only because their sentences are different (having been determined by linguistic rules of the two different language systems), but also because of the constraints operating at a level beyond the sentence. Even though achieving exact sameness or complete identity through translation is impossible, the translator can still establish a notion of equivalence between two textual units. Neubert and Shreve (ibid: 349) quote from Ricardo Munoz Martin who defines equivalence as "a correspondence hypothesis established by a translator between two textual units of varying length and nature, always from his/her particular view."

For the purpose of this study, we accept the notion of 'communicative equivalence' as defined by Neubert and Shreve. They suggest that, "though the conception of narrow linguistic equivalence is not justifiable, *'communicative equivalence'* is" (ibid:142). Communicative equivalence is achieved when the target text which stands in the place of the ST "yields similar information to similar readers in essentially similar situations", and "plays the same communicative role as the SL, even though their two textual surfaces do not match (ibid: 143)."

The notion of equivalence implies the notion of modification, that is, the ST should be manipulated to produce similar information for a new cultural audience.

1.2.3 Modification

Translation is more than duplication or restructuring of source language sequences. Besides the differences in the linguistic systems of languages, there are also some suprasentential, or textual factors which lead to different discoursal systems. The translator, therefore, should not only be equipped with the knowledge of the two language systems (linguistic knowledge) and the text's subject knowledge, but also with a communicative knowledge, that is, knowledge of the different interaction patterns in the two cultural communities to establish linguistic or cultural equilibrium in translation. To achieve this equilibrium and to produce a more satisfactory and pragmatically adequate translation, the translator has to modify the ST by using a variety of methods, including explicitation, deletion, and modulation. For example, to establish structural equilibrium between two languages, modifications can be in the form of transposition of elements in phrases, clauses, sentences, or paragraphs, changing parts of speech, adding/omitting some linguistic items like propositions, articles, conjunctions, changing the word order etc.

Thus, modification is viewed in this study as a general term implying any kind of change or manipulation, in the form of the ST (at lexical or discoursal level) to convey the maximum

meaning of it into the target language and to establish equilibrium (or equivalence) between the source and the target texts.

Since one type of modifications analyzed in this paper, are those implemented in line with metaphorical projections of the image -schemata existing in our conceptual system, a brief explanation of schema theory, image schemata and metaphor is deemed necessary.

1.2.4 Schema Theory and Image Schemata

The relation between the term '*schema theory*' and '*image schema*' is that of a hyponymy; the first being the super-ordinate and the latter the hyponym. In general, schemata are abstract and organized background knowledge of our social and physical experience which are activated by the relevant elements in discourse. According to this theory, meanings are not contained within the text, but are constructed in the interaction between the text and the interpreter's relevant prior knowledge. According to Johnson (1987:19) a schema is

> a cluster of knowledge representing a particular generic procedure, object, percept,
>
> event, sequence of events, or social situation which provides a skeleton structure for
>
> a concept that can be instantiated, or filled out, with the detailed properties of the
>
> particular instance being represented.

Schemata exist "at a level of generality and abstraction that allows them to serve repeatedly as identifying patterns in an indefinitely large number of experiences, perceptions and image formations for objects or events that are similarly structured in the relevant ways (ibid:28)." Schemata are also believed to be "higher-level, complex (and even conventional or habitual) knowledge structures" (Van Dijk,1981:141) which "function as '*ideational scaffolding*' in the organization and interpretation of experience" (Brown and Yule,1983:247), and which "enable us to mentally structure perceptions and events" (Johnson 1987; Lakoff 1987, 1989).

Image schemata arise from every day bodily and social experiences and build up during the early stages of our development through sensory motor activities i.e. manipulation of objects,

temporal and spatial orientations and perceptual interactions. These abstract structures of knowledge help us understand and reason about our physical experiences and by metaphorical projection of these patterns from the realm of the physical to other more abstract domains, we can understand and reason about abstract and non-physical concepts as well.

Johnson (1987) distinguishes various image schemata, the most salient of which are: CONTAINER, FORCE, PATH, LINKS, CYCLES, SCALES, etc. The first three image schemata will be elaborated on when we examine some examples from our corpus in the last section of the paper.

1.2.5 Metaphor

In the theory of metaphor, proposed by Lakoff (1992), metaphor is not just a device of the poetic imagination and rhetorical linguistic expressions, but it is pervasive in our everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. The essence of metaphor is to understand and experience one thing in terms of another.

Contemporary theory of metaphor suggests that by mapping from a source domain to a target domain in our conceptual system, we actually conceptualize and understand nonphysical and abstract concepts. These metaphorical mappings are conventional, but not arbitrary. They have a basis in our physical and cultural experience.

Image schemata as mental patterns, are available as source domains in a variety of metaphorical mappings. For example, Lakoff and his students have indicated that various aspects of event structures, like *states, changes, processes, actions*, *causes, purposes, and means*, and the most common abstract concepts like, *time* are characterized cognitively via metaphor in terms of *space, motion*, and *force* (container, path and force schemata respectively). We speak of being in or out of a state, of going into or out of it, of entering or leaving it, etc. as metaphorical expressions with underlying container image schema.

Lakoff and Johnson (2003:57) maintain that most of our conceptual system is metaphorically structured; that is, most concepts are partially understood in terms of other concepts. For example in both English and Persian, argument is viewed as a war. So we talk about argument in terms of war. We can actually win or lose arguments. We see the person we are arguing with as an opponent. We attack his positions and defend our own, and so on. Another metaphorical concept in both languages is TIME IS MONEY metaphor. Having this concept in our cognitive system, we use and understand the following metaphorical expressions:

You are *wasting* your time. I don't *have* the time to *give* you. I *spent* a lot of time here. You're *running out of* time. Do you *have* much time *left*? …

These conventional metaphors are grounded in constant interaction with our physical and cultural environments and "takes place within a vast background of cultural presuppositions" (ibid :58).

A distinction can be made between experiences that are more physical, and those that are more cultural. Some metaphorical mappings are based on our direct physical experience, while others are grounded in our general knowledge schema, that is, the overall knowledge about everything in our environment that can serve as a basis for metaphorical projections in language (e.g in the case of proverbs). This overall knowledge is referred to as '*generic-level schema*' and is considered a "variable template that can be filled in in many ways"(Lakoff, 1992:29).

Another distinction Fundamental to the contemporary theory of metaphor is that between conceptual metaphors and linguistic metaphors. A conceptual metaphor is a cognitive mapping between two different domains, whereas a linguistic metaphor (also called metaphorical expression) is an expression of such a mapping through language. In other words, linguistic metaphors are surface realizations of the conceptual metaphors existing in our mind. Lakoff and Johnson use big cases (block letters) for conceptual metaphors (TIME IS MONEY, ARGUMENT IS WAR, LOVE IS A JOURNEY, …) to mark this distinction.

2. Corpus

To examine how modifications are implemented in translation, we chose Khaled Hosseini's novel, *The Kite Runner*, as the corpus for our analysis. *The Kite Runner* was first translated into Persian in 2004, but one year later another translation of the text was published. The former is used as the corpus in this study. Using systematic Sampling Model we came up with one eighth of the whole novel (i.e. 25 pages) to be studied.

Having compared these sample pages with the translated text, we came up with different types of modifications which will be described in the following sections.

3. Analyzing the data

We now proceed to the analysis of some examples of modifications from our corpus to illustrate the ways in which these modifications are implemented in the target text and at the same time to indicate how schema theory and the current theory of metaphor can help the translator to establish equilibrium between the source and the target text. Modifications are dealt with under two categories of 'Lexical modifications'and 'Discoursal modifications.'

3.1 Lexical modifications

In this type of modification, a word in the ST is replaced by a word from the TL which is not just its formal equivalence, but also its communicative equivalence in the target culture. As is illustrated in the following examples, these modifications are implemented in line with the readers' general background knowledge of the world they live in and, therefore, play an important role in making the translation intelligible to the readers. Image schemata are also important in this type of modification because some of the conceptualizations made in this process are based on underlying image schemata. Here are some examples.

ST	**p.1** … slanting, *narrow* eyes like *bamboo leaves*.
TT	ص. ٦ چشم هاي ريز بادامي *tiny almond-shaped* eyes
Modification	*Bamboo leaves* is replaced by *almond-shaped* and *narrow* is replaced by *tiny* to describe the eyes in Persian.

ST	**P. 26** The snow (is) so white my eyes *burn*
TT	ص.۵۶ برف آنقدر سفيد است که چشم را ميزند The snow is so white that it *hits eyes*.
Modification	The whiteness of snow *burns* eyes in English, but it *hits* eyes in Persian.

ST	**p.58** ….his voice was *breaking*.
TT	ص.۱۲۳ صدايش مي‌لرزيد. His voice was *trembling*.
Modification	In the ST, voice is *breaking* is a projection of the generic schema BREAK, but *trembling* in TT, is a projection of TREMBLE schema.

ST	**p.58** a *sheen* of grief
TT	ص. ۱۲۲ موجي از غم A *wave* of grief
Modification	*Grief* as an abstract concept is conventionally conceptualized In the ST by mapping the knowledge about *sheen* onto the knowledge about *grief*, but in TT, to conceptualize the bigness of grief, the concrete domain of **wave** is chosen for metaphorical mapping.

ST	**p.66** I kept my eyes *glued* to those florescent green hands.
TT	ص.۱۳۹ چشم‌هايم را به آن عقربه‌هاي فلورسنتي سبز دوختم. I *sewed my eyes on* to those florescent green hands.
Modification	In English people *glue* their eyes to something, but in Persian people *sew* their eyes on something.

ST	**p.82** the color *dropped* from her face.
TT	ص.۱۷۴ رنگ از صورتش‌پريد. The color *flew* from her face.
Modification	In English dropping color from one's face is a projection of DROPPING schema, But in Persian, color flies from one's face.

ST	**p.130** He is muttering something *under his breath.*
TT	ص.۲۷۱ زیر لب چیزی زمزمه می کند. He is muttering something *under his lips*.
Modification	In English people mutter under their breath, but in Persian they do this under their lips.

ST	**p.58** We have *made* our decision.
TT	ص.۱۲۲ تصمیم مان را گرفته ایم. We have *got* our decisions.
Modification	In English, they make their decision, while in Persian, they get it.

3.2 Discoursal Modifications

Discoursal modifications refer to those modifications which go beyond the single word and are implemented by applying various strategies. The aim of this type of modification is to achieve certain goals like grammatical adjustment, establishing linguistic or cultural equivalence, and finding equivalences for linguistic metaphors with regard to their underlying conceptual metaphors. Accordingly, this type of modification is presented here in four sub-groups.

3.2.1 Structural Modifications

These are modifications implemented in line with the structure of TL and are carried out in several ways including transposition of elements in phrases, clause, sentences, or paragraphs,

changing parts of speech, adding/omitting some linguistic items like propositions, articles, conjunctions, etc. as can be seen in the following examples.

ST	**p.10** Baba heaved *a sigh of impatience*.
TT	ص.۲۳ بابا *با بي حوصلگي* آهي كشيد. He sighed *impatiently*.
Modification	A noun phrase is changed into an adverb of manner.

ST	**P. 29** Except now, he was the ant and *I was holding the magnifying glass*.
TT	ص.۶۳ هميشه او مورچه بود و *من آن آدم ذره‌بين بدست* I was *the magnifier-holder man*.
Modification	A complete sentence is rendered into a phrase.

ST	**p.106** *sweaty* little man
TT	ص. ۲۲۱ مرد ريزه اي*كه بوي عرق مي‌داد* A little man *who smelt of sweat*.
Modification	An adjective is rendered into a noun phrase.

ST	**p.106** *Muslims* have to help *Muslims***.**
TT	ص. ۲۲۱ مسلمان باید به داد مسلمان برسد. *Muslim* has to help *Muslim*.
Modification	Singular form in TT for the plural in ST

ST	**p.138** It *may be very dangerous***.**
TT	ص.۲۸۷ ... خالي از خطر هم‌نيست. … It is not void of danger.
Modification	negative form of verb in TT for positive in ST

3.2.2 Linguistic Equation

The number of lexical items conveying a given concept varies across languages. For example a one-word verb like '*remember*' is conveyed in Persian by three words (به خاطر آوردن = bring to memory). Linguistic equation in translation is, therefore, inevitable. Examples:

ST	**p.7.** *Skeptics* had urged him …
TT	ص.۱۷ آنهايي كه به كارش شك داشتند اصرار مي‌كردند .. *Those who were doubtful about his work* …
Modification	There is a one-word noun in English which is translated into a six- word sentence in Persian.

ST	**p.10** but he just *nodded, muttered*, 'Good'.
TT	ص.٢۴ اما او فقط‌سري جنباند و زير لب گفت: 'خوبه'. But he only *moved his head* and *said under his lip*: 'Good'
Modification	Two one-word verbs in the ST are rendered into three-word and four-word verb phrases respectively.

ST	**p.90.** He *showed up* at the door.
TT	ص.١٨٨ يكدفعه سر و كله‌اش دم در خانه پيدا شد. *Suddenly* his *head appeared* at the door .
Modification	An English two-word verb is rendered into five words in Persian

3.2.3 Cultural Equation

expressions with cultural load in ST are replaced by expressions conveying the same meaning in the TT. Here the entire discourse is changed as can be seen in the following examples.

ST	**p.12** A boy who won't *stand up for himself* becomes a man who can't stand up to anything.
TT	ص. ٢٩ پسري كه نتواند گليم خودش را از آب بكشد، مرد هم كه بشود نمي تواند از پس كاري بر آيد. A boy who is not *able to pull his rug out of water* '
Modification	The phrase *stand up for himself* is rendered into a proverb in Persian.

ST	**p.122** How had Ali lived in that house, day in and day out, knowing he had been *dishonored* by his master…
TT	ص.۲۵۵ علي چطور توانست روزها را يكي پس از ديگري در آن خانه سپري كند با اينكه مي دانست اربابش حيثيتش را *لكه دار كرده*... …knowing that his master has *stained his reputation*.
Modification	*Dishonored* is replaced with its cultural equivalent in Persian

ST	**p.18** *he was beaming*
TT	ص. ۴۰ داشت بال در مي آورد. *He was growing wings*.
Modification	This is a case of two different ways of conceptualizing the abstract concept of happiness based on two different general knowledge schemata.

ST	**p.162** My heart *gave a sick lurch*
TT	ص. ۳۵۱ بند دلم پاره شد. My heart's *band was torn*.
Modification	The phrase *give a sick lurch* is rendered into an idiom in Persian.

3.2.4 Modification of linguistic metaphors

In this part we examine those modifications which when implemented in translation bring about a change in the linguistic metaphors of the ST and their corresponding schemata. Only changes in three underlying schemata are dealt with here i.e. CONTAINER, FORCE, and PATH. These schemata are selected because of "their prominent role in the construction of metaphors" (Pena 1999). First the structural elements of these schemata are examined.

A. CONTAINER or CONTAINMENT schema

This schema structures our regular recurring experiences of seeing bounded areas, like caves, rooms, going into and getting out of them, putting objects into and taking them out of containers. As a result of projecting this pattern into the domain of abstract concepts, metaphorical expressions emerge.

B. FORCE schema

We encounter with the physical forces in our environment, external forces like gravity, wind, light, heat, etc. At the same time, we can forcefully interact with our surroundings. These physical patterns are internalized in our mind as an abstract structure that can be projected into the domain of non-physical and abstract things.

C. PATH schema

The structural elements of the PATH schema are a starting point or a source, an end point or a destination and a direction. If you go from a source to a destination along a path, you must pass through each intermediate point on the path and that the further along the path you move, the more time is gone since the starting point (Lakoff 1989: 119). Again these patterns can be projected into the domain of non-physical and abstract things.

3.2.4.1 Modifications in alignment with the image schemata

A. CONTAINER → PATH

ST	**p. 10**. but I hadn't *turned out* like him.
TT	ص. ۲۴ ولي من اصلاً به او نرفته بودم. but *I hadn't resembled him*
Modification	*Turn out* is based on OUT schema, one of the CONTAINER's entailments. But it's Persian equivalent is based on the PATH schema

ST	**p.114** she *looked like* she had not eaten for days.
TT	ص.۲۳۸ به نظر مي رسيد چندين روز چيزي نخورده بود. *It seemed that* she had not eaten …
Modification	*Looked like* is based on CONTAINER schema, but its Persian equivalent is based on PATH schema.

PATH → CONTAINER

ST	**P.122** The questions *kept coming* at me.
TT	ص.۲۵۵ سؤال بود که پشت سؤال به ذهنم مي رسيد. The questions *reached to my mind* one after another.
Modification	Underlying PATH schema of *kept coming* is changed into CONTAINER schema of *reached to my mind*.

ST	**p. 154** I *ended up* there one night…
TT	ص. ۳۱۸ زمانی سر از آنجا درآوردم که ... One day *my head emerged out of that place....*
Modification	*to end up* is a metaphor based on the PATH schema, but its equivalent in Persian is based on the CONTAINER schema.

PATH → FORCE

ST	**p.58** a sheen of grief *across his face*
TT	ص. ۱۲۲ بابا پا شد، موجي از غم چهره اش را گرفت. A wave of sorrow *took his face*.
Modification	*Across* is based on PATH, whereas *took away* is based on FORCE schema.

ST	**P.114** I sat with Sanaubar all day as the sky *went from* bright blue *to* purple.
TT	ص.۲۳۹ تمام روز کنار صنوبر نشستم تا اینکه رنگ آسمان از آبي به ارغواني گرایید. All day long I sat beside Sanaubar until the color of the sky *grew from blue to purple*.
Modification	PATH schema in English, but FORCE schema in Persian

ST	**p. 114** one of the cuts *went from* cheekbone to hairline and it had not spared her left eye *on the way*.
TT	ص. ۲۳۸ يكي از بريدگي ها از گونه تا رستنگاه موها *كشيده شده بود* و در مسيرش از چشم چپ او هم گذشته بود. One of the cuts was <u>*pulled*</u> from cheekbone to hairline and passed through his left eye on its way.
Modification	PATH schema in English, but FORCE schema in Persian

CONTAINER → FORCE

ST	**p. 42** It is a look that will *haunt* my dreams for weeks.
TT	ص.۹۰ نگاهي كه بعد از آن تا هفته ها خواب را از من *مي گيرد*. A look that will *take sleep from* my eyes.
Modification	The underlying schema is changed from CONTAINER to FORCE

ST	**P. 194** *I fall asleep* almost immediately.
TT	تقريباً بالافاصله خوابم مي برد. Almost immediately *sleep took me away*.
Modification	Underlying image schema is changed from CONTAINER to FORCE.

FORCE → PATH

ST	**p. 50** And for a while, it *took my mind off* what had happened that winter, what I had let happen.
TT	ص.۱۰۵ و همین موضوع برای مدتی اتفاقی را که زمستان آن سال افتاده بود، اتفاقی را که من گذاشته بودم *بیفتد*، از یادم برد.
Modification	*to take one's mind off* in English is based on both path and force schema , but it's Persian equivalent is based on containment and path schemata.

ST	**p.106** *I drifted* to sleep
TT	ص. ۲۲۱ *خوابم برد* Sleep *took me away*
Modification	*Drift* is based on FORCE schema, but its equivalent in Persian is based on PATH schema.

3.2.4.2 Modifications in alignment with generic-level Schemata

Lakoff and Turner (1989) hypothesized the existence of what they called '*generic-level metaphor*' to deal with the problems they faced with personification and proverbs. Lakoff (1992:29) refers to "the schema underlying such metaphors as '*generic-level schema*' … which is a very general schema characterizing an open-ended category of situations. We can think of it as variable template that can be filled in in many ways."

The examples below illustrate how generic-level metaphors and thus their corresponding schemata in the ST vary from those of the TT. This fact again indicates the significance of using functional equivalents in translation.

ST	**p.146** He gets caught, they'll give him a flogging *that will waken his father in the grave.*
TT	ص.۳۰۲ اگر بگیرندش چنان شلاقی بهش بزنندکه مرغهاي آسمان به حالش گریه کنند. If they get him, they'll give him such a flogging that *the birds in the sky will cry for him.*
Modification	A proverb in the ST is replaced by a proverb in TT.

ST	**p.186** *'you're preaching to the choir*, Amir,' he said. "But the fact is, take current immigration laws, adoption agency policies, and the political situation in Afghanistan, and *the deck is stacked against you."*
TT	ص.۳۸۰ گفت ''آنهاگوششان به این حرفها بدهکار نیست امیر. واقعیت این است که با توجه به قوانین جاري مهاجرت، راه کارهاي مؤسسـات امـور فرزندخواندگي و شرایط سیاسي افغانستان، هیچ برگ برنده اي نداري.''
Modification	*you're preaching to the choir* is rendered into what literary means *their ears do not owe anything to what is said* and *the deck is stacked against you* is rendered into *you don't have any winning card.*

4. Conclusion

This paper aimed to indicate how '*schema theory*' and the current theory of metaphor can contribute to the theory and practice of translation. It is, therefore, difficult to draw as exact and concrete conclusions as can be derived from a quantitative analysis. We try, however, to draw some general conclusions based on the data we analyzed above.

The analysis of the corpus revealed that modification, in general, is an indispensable element of every translation. As it was noted earlier in this paper, modification refers to any type of changes in the form of the source text which result in achieving a better and more readable text in the target language. According to Popovic (1975)

> because of the communicative differences between SL and TL that almost always
>
> exist, the translator should modify any cultural specificities in the ST to conform
>
> to target culture norms. These modifications should not affect the core of meaning
>
> but influence only the expressive form (quoted from Taylor, 2009:39)

On the other hand, the contemporary theory of metaphor has taught us that most basic concepts like time, quantity, states, changes, processes, actions, causes, purposes, etc. and even emotional concepts are comprehended through metaphor, i.e. via conventional correspondences between source and target domains. As Lakoff and Johnson (2003:4) state, "metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action."Also, as it was said before, 'image schemata' as knowledge structures in our minds provide source domains for metaphorical projections, we can, therefore, conclude that metaphors and their underlying image schemata, are inevitable components of any kind of study related to language. As the modifications we examined from our corpus indicated almost all types of these modifications, at a more general level, are implemented in line with the schemata existing a priori in the conceptual system of translation addressees and thus play an important role not only in achieving balance in translation, but also in the

enhancement of the readability of the translation text. It is, therefore recommended that the schemata theory and the theory of metaphor , in general, and image schemata, in particular, be incorporated in the theory and practice of translation.

References

- Brown, G. and G. Yule (1983). *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ganji, Z. and P. Soleymanzadeh (2004) *Badbadak Baz* (Persian translation of *The Kite Runner*) Tehran: Morvarid

- Genztler, E. (1993). *Contemporary Translation Theories.* Routledge, New York.

- Hosseini, Kh. (2003). *The Kite Runner*. New York: Riverhead books.

- Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind: the Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, G. (1992). *"The contemporary Theory of Metaphor"*. In A. Ortony (Ed.),*Metaphor and Thought* 2nd. Ed. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 202 - 251.

- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things : what categories reveal about the mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (2003). *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, G. and M. Turner (1989). *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Neubert, A. And G. M. Shreve (1992). *Translation as Text.* Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press.

- Newmark, P. (1988). *A text Book of Translation*. UK: Prentice Hall International.

- Pena, S. (1999). "*Subsidiary relationships between image-schemas: an approach to the force schema". Journal of English studies* I, 187-207.

- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach.* Revised Eddition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Taylor, J. L. (2009). *The Specificity of Simenon: On Translating Maigret.* A Thesis Submitted for the degree of PHD at the University of St. Andrews. https://research-repositing.st-andrews.ac.uk/

- Van Dijk, T. A. (1981). *Studies in the pragmatics of discourse.* The Hague: Mouton.