

Research Article

A Comparative Study of Metaphor in Arabic and Persian

Yahya Kardgar

Associate Professor, Department of Persian language and literature, Faculty of literature and Humanities, University of Qom, Qom, Iran

Article History

Received: 06.08.2020

Accepted: 22.08.2020

Published: 30.08.2020

Journal homepage:

<https://www.easpublisher.com/easjhcs>

Quick Response Code



Abstract: Metaphor is one of the most important types of trope e that has a special place in every language, but the way it has been viewed in various languages is different. In Arabic and Persian, the similarities of this discussion are more than its distinctions, in that most of the metaphorical topics of Arabic rhetoric books have been repeated in Persian books two or three centuries later. The subject of metaphor in Arabic books has experienced five stages of outset, growth, prosperity, recession, and Modernism, and has undergone three stages of genesis, expansion, and edition in Farsi with fewer developments. Genesis corresponds to the period of outset and growth; the period of expansion corresponds to the period of recession and the period of edition to the period of Arab modernism. Unfortunately, the Persian rhetoric has not benefited much from the prosperity period of the Arabic rhetoric, so its analytical and aesthetic outlook is weak. Today, research in both languages tend to focus on critical topics, the use of metaphorical studies of other languages, and the linguistic outlook, with a greater emphasis on the nature of language and Nativism in Persian metaphor- seekers. Not paying attention to the development of metaphorical culture, disregard for literary types and styles in metaphorical research, and disregard for the evolution of metaphor in literary texts are the weaknesses of metaphorical research in both languages.

Keywords: Rhetoric; Persian language; Arabic language; trope e; metaphor.

Copyright © 2020 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Having been saturated from several sources, the Arabic rhetoric has grown significantly after the Islam, often with the motive of proving the rhetorical miracle of the Qur'an; Greek, Iranian, and Indian people have not forgotten it. Nevertheless, Muslim researchers and scholars have never forgotten the Greek, Iranian, and Indian origins in examining the roots of the Arabic-Islamic rhetoric. In Bayān wa-al-tabyīn, Al- Jahiz speaks of the Persian book *Karvand* and its rhetorical place (Al-Jahiz, 1926, vol.3, 14). In addition, Ibn Nadim mentions the book of the Kasra Testimony of Anushravan Ela Ibn as "the nest of Rhetoric" (Ibn Nadim, 1927, 559), and he also talks about the old translations of his *Rhetorica*, that is Aristotle's Sermon, and "poetics", which is a technique of poetry (Ibn Nadim, 1927, 456), and introduces Farsi, Hindi and Nabatian translators into Arabic. Intellectual centers such as Bayt al-Hikmah, or Khazaneh al-Hikmah or Dar al-Ilm, which have been established in the first years of the third century as ordered by Ma'mun Abbasi (813-817) indicate the scientific transactions of Muslims with other nations, among which Iranians have had a special place (Tafazoli, 1957, 314). It is, therefore, not surprising if the scholar of Arabic rhetoric history emphasizes the role of other nations, especially Iranians, in the flourishing of rhetoric (Atiq, no date, 50). As a result, the Islamic-Arabic rhetoric can be

known as the product of Muslim rhetoric interaction with Greeks, Iranians and Indians. A thorough examination of this issue requires a great deal of time. Therefore, in this article, we will examine the comparative study of metaphors in Arabic and Farsi in order to establish a basis for a comprehensive research on this subject.

RESEARCH BACKGROUND

In recent years, some researches have been published regarding the link between Arabic and Persian rhetoric. These studies have compared the rhetoric of both languages in an overview, among which Ehsan Sadegh Saeed's book named *Rhetorical Science between Arabs and Iranians* can be mentioned; nonetheless, no independent research has ever been published with regard to comparing the rhetoric of two languages, including metaphor. The book *Metaphor in Islamic Rhetoric* by Mohammad Mahdi Moghimizadeh is one of a handful of works that addresses this subject, in which the contribution of the Persian research is very little. Therefore, this article can be one of the earliest research in this field.

Significance, Method, and Research Question

Since the rhetoric of each language must be extracted from the text and the context of the same language, a comparative research can, on the one hand,

provide the rationale for formulating the rhetorical system of any language and, on the other hand, can have an impact on conscious, wise, and useful interaction of languages. This necessity is more prevalent among the Arabic-Persian rhetoric enjoying a long-standing connection. The present article compares the metaphorical view of two languages, descriptively-analytically and seeks to answer the following questions: what are the similarities and differences of the metaphorical research of the two languages? And how has this similarity and difference affected the use of metaphor in these two languages?

DISCUSSION

Abu Ubaidah and his *Majaz al-Qur'an* initiated the metaphorical debate. A discussion that began with the general name of trope e and then experienced several periods: 1- The period of outset: from the second half of the second century to the beginning of the fourth century. 2-The period of growth; the fourth and first half of the fifth century. 3. The period of flourishing - from the fifth to the first half of the seventh century. 4-The period of recession and decline: from the second half of the seventh century to the present day. 5. A period of modernism and a new perspective: that has been formed in the last hundred years in parallel with the period of recession and decline.

The evolution of metaphor-research in Farsi can be studied in three periods: genesis, extension, and edition. Since the discussion of metaphor in Arabic books after Islam is more precedent than Persian rhetoric books, we will adapt the metaphor discussion in these two languages while focusing on the five periods of metaphorical research in Arabic books.

The First Period

In this period, beginning in the second half of the second century and continuing until the end of the third century, the subject of metaphor is associated with Qur'anic and literary discussions and is not yet recognized as an independent rhetorical subject. Abu Ubaidah and Ibn Qatibah refer to it in order to discuss Qur'anic words and meanings, while Jahiz and Mobarrad have considered metaphors while analyzing poems and literary texts. Abu Ubaidah, without mentioning the name of metaphor, refers to trope e in the general sense of the rhetorical sciences, so that while introducing the trope e types, it also provides examples of the metaphor without bringing up its name. Accuracy in the trope e instances provided by Abu Ubaidah shows that he uses trope e to include the whole rhetoric range (Abu Ubaidah, 1981, 18-19), and Ibn Qatibah also speaks of the absolute borrowing of word that metaphor can be a subset of it (Sheikhun, 1994, 7). However, Jahiz refers to the name of the metaphor and its idiomatic definition, albeit while explaining a verse, and writes: "Calling something by a different name,

then replacing it "(Jahiz, 1926, 1/116). Like Ibn Qatibah, Mobarrad speaks of borrowing words in Arabic (Sheikhun, 1994, 9). The form of metaphor is vague in this period; it has no comprehensive definition; it is not recognized as an independent literary discourse; its aesthetic and imaginative aspects are not desired; it is as if this term and its derivatives are used only for the purpose of clarifying and analyzing thought. At the end of this period, metaphor is proposed as a poetic and rhetorical discourse. Thalib in *Qawaeed al-Shir*, discussing the "Heikal al-Shir" (physique of poetry), offers a definition of metaphor: "metaphor is choosing a name or meaning for something other than its own" (Thalib, 1995, 53). In the definition suggested by Thalib, taking another name refers to an explicit metaphor, and taking another meaning refers to an implicit metaphor in the later periods. Finally, it is worth mentioning Ibn Mu'tazz and his book *Al-Baadi*, which studies metaphor under the exquisite name in the general sense of rhetorical science. Until the beginning of the tenth century, this feature was also found in Persian rhetorical books. After quoting the definition of the metaphor, Ibn Mu'tazz gives examples of the Qur'an, hadiths and poems and Arabic references, and finally mentions defective examples of the metaphor (Ibid, 107) without introducing the reason or reasons for being defective. By virtue of the merits of Mahasin al-Kalam of Morghinani, *Al-Baadi*, written by Ibn Mu'tazz, is the foundation of the first Persian rhetorical book that is *Tarjoman Al-Bilaghah*. This means that Morghinani has taken a great advantage of al-Baadi book (Morghani, n.d). In addition, *Tarjoman al-Bilaghah* is also an imitation of *Mahasin al-Kalam* according to its author (Radaviani, 2001, 120). In this way, it can be said that the subject of metaphor in Persian rhetoric books has been influenced by Ibn Mu'tazz, but from this period on, there is no book left discussing metaphor or other rhetorical and literary topics.

The Second Period

This period, which is a period of growth for metaphor and other rhetorical debates, begins from the beginning of the fourth century and continues until the first half of the fifth century. Qadameh Ibn Ja'afar, Ghazi Jarjani, Romani, Abu helal Askari, Ibn Rashiq Qiravani and Ibn Sinan Khafaji are some of the prominent rhetoricians of this period. Each of these rhetoricians arose from different parts of the Islamic world and Iran; therefore, they are able to introduce rhetorical view of Muslim researchers pretty well. The most important features of the metaphor subject in this period are: 1) mentioning the types of metaphor indicating the critical view to this subject. The rhyme adduction (muâzala) (Qadama, 1884, 66), an acceptable and unacceptable metaphor, or rejected that is known in other forms and synonyms, and repeated in the books of this period, shows a ruling critical look at the discussion of metaphor in this period. The basis of these categories

is to pay attention to the clarity or ambiguity of the metaphor, to avoid the riddle and riddle making in it, and to avoid the metaphorical closeness to the truth. 2) Paying attention to the position of truth and trope e (metaphor) in which metaphor will often be superior to truth, if it is used appropriately and is more useful than truth. 3) The metaphor in most of the books of this period is discussed under figures of speech (badi') in the general sense of the rhetorical science. 4) Metaphor is known as an independent rhetorical discussion, and each of the books in this period seeks to provide a definition for it. The theme of all definitions is the use of the word in a meaning other than its own determined meaning. Of course, as explained by the authors of this period, attention to the comparative ratios between the two sides, unlike the preceding one, has reduced the metaphorical scope of the metaphor and clarified its boundaries. 5) Considering the difference between simile and metaphor, there is a common discussion in most of the books of this period, which does not lead to a definitive conclusion. Henceforth, it is a cause for difference in all periods of studies on metaphor. It has provoked controversy and turmoil in Farsi books to which we will refer later. The difference between metaphor and simile in this period is based on the elimination or preservation of the words of comparison and each side being true or trope e. Only Ibn Sanan al-Khafaji shook the distinction by bringing up predestined words of comparison. He does not regard the elimination of the words of comparison as a metaphor "as words of comparison are omitted in the literal sense, and being omitted in the literal sense is like being mentioned" (Sheikhun, 1994, 30). 6) Mentioning criteria for metaphorical criticism: consistency of words and meanings, words and words in metaphor and no tongue twisting between them, avoidance of excesses in the use of metaphor, its formal aesthetics and its enlightening role, and above all, the proportionality and similarity between the metaphorical sides are some of the important criteria of metaphor criticism in the books of this period. 7) Considering the utility and purpose of metaphor is prominent in the books of this period. Summary of the benefits of metaphor can be seen in *al-Sinaatayn* of Abu Helal Askari (Abu Helal Askari, 1993, 262). 8) The concern for the metaphor having an influence on the audience is also one of the interesting topics in the books of this period. 9) The audience's interest in discovering the beauties of metaphor in al-Ummah ibn Rashiq is contemplative. Of course, this requires further research. (Sheikhon, 1994, 27). 10) Another point that is sometimes found in the books of this period is the necessity or unnecessary of metaphor in the language that has been precedent in Aristotle's works and it has been an axis to separate the classics and romantics' view of metaphor. For example, Ibn Rashiq Qiravani's theory can be mentioned in this regard, in which he does not consider metaphor as a necessity in the Arabic language (Ibn Rashiq Qiravani, 2000, 1/344). This is

found in Aristotle's works not only about the Arabic language, but also about all languages (Hawks, 2001, 56). The metaphor-researchers' view of this period is similar to that of Aristotle, which should be sought in translating Aristotle's works into Arabic during this period. What is prominent in the metaphorical view of this period is the analytical-critical view of the rhetorical writers who, without resorting to the excessive subdivisions that became commonplace afterwards, seek to analyze the construction of metaphor, its critique, its appealing and unappealing form and its benefit, the connection of metaphor to truth, and its relation to language and audience.

Although the discussion of metaphor in the Arabic books of this period has achieved remarkable growth and maturity, it is beginning its journey in Persian rhetoric as well. Sometime in between the second and the third period, the study of metaphor in Persian rhetorical books started with the authoring of the *Tarjoman al-Balagheh*, after which formation period commenced. This is why the author of the *Tarjoman al-Balagha* writes: "And that type is a new leaf on the rhetoric garden" (Radaviani, 2001, 148). Since the discussion of metaphor in Persian continued from the fifth century to the first years of the tenth century, while undergoing slight developments, this period is called the "Genesis" period, which is comparable to the first and second periods of metaphorical discussion in Arabic books. Books such as *Tarjoman Al-Balagha*, *Hadaiq-e-Sahar*, *Al-Mu'jam*, *Daghaigh al-Shir*, *Haghaighah al-Hadaighah*, *Me'yar Jamali*, *Badaaye al-Afkar*, and *Badaaye al-Sanaaye* are some of the most important books of this period; but the contents of the first three books are comprehensive reviews of books of this period on metaphor. The most important features of metaphor discussion at this stage are: 1) providing a brief definition of metaphor, that the literal transition from one meaning to another, the metaphor being trope e, and the likeness of similarity between the two meanings are among the most important points in these definitions. 2) In Genesis stage books, like the books in the first two Arabic periods, there is no mention of the metaphorical components and consequently the formation of different types on the basis of the components. Mentioning allegory under the metaphor (Shams Qays, 1994, 320), and the implicit reference to personification in the "debate and conversation of the non-speaking plants and animals" (Ibid, 319) are of the types formed under the metaphor. The reason for considering the debate followed by personification can be traced back to the Iranian pioneering attention to this kind of poetry, the most prominent example being the Asurig Darakht, a poem in Pahlavic era, which is a pre-Islamic poem and has changed the debate of the Palm and the Goat into poetry. 3) The overwhelming evidence of the implicit metaphor under metaphor, as is the case in Arabic books of the first two periods. However, in the Arabic

books of these two periods, the difference between explicit and implicit metaphors has been mentioned under the metaphor subject, but there is no mention of their names, while in the Persian books, the explanations and definitions refer to the explicit metaphor, but the examples are of implicit metaphor. 4) The fusion of metaphorical evidence with the evidence of metaphorical simile, Implicit simile, and eloquent simile, which is also an evident in the Arabic books of the first two periods. Although this difference enjoys a theoretical support in the Arabic books and the subject of the difference between simile and metaphor has been taken seriously in some of the Arabic books with some evidence, in Persian books, it has either added a confusion to the explanations (Radaviani, 2001, 158), or has determined the implicit simile and metaphor to be the same (Taj al-Halawi, 2004, 47) or even has considered metaphorical simile and metaphor alike (Hosseini Neyshabouri, 2005, 220). The intensity of the simile and metaphor fusion and the frequency of its occurrences is more prominent in Persian studies. 5) The metaphor criticism is less common in the Persian rhetoric than the Arabic rhetoric during the Genesis period. In Arabic books, the terms rhyme adduction (Moa'zalah), accepted and rejected similes come from a critical point of view, while exemplary critiques of Persian rhetorical criticism are restricted to general terms such as conceit and exquisite metaphor (Watwat, 1983, 29). Only in *al- Ma'ajam* of Shams Qais, metaphor criticism has been considered more, some of which is reminiscent of Ibn Mu'tazi's manner of providing subtle and unappealing metaphors (Shams Qais Razi, 1994, 9-318), and in some cases has come close to a critical view of the books in the Arabic second period. (Shams Qays Razi, 1994, 318). The reason for Shams Qais to be highlighted in this feature is more relation with the Arabic rhetorical books. As mentioned by himself, Qais wrote his book in Arabic language at the beginning (ibid, 32). 6) Most of the metaphorical evidence in the Genesis books are Persian evidence except in *Hadā'iq al-sihr* of Rashid al-Din Watwat, in which Arabic evidence is prominent (Ibid, 32). However, it is noteworthy that some Persian rhetoric writers consciously turned to Persianism. This indicates that attention to the nature of the Persian language during this period is highlighted.

In short, the Persian language genesis books were written following the Arabic books of the first and second periods. Of course, paying attention to the Persian evidence, highlighting the discourse of personification due to the longer history of such types of debate in Iranian culture and language and finally attention to the nativism and the nature of the Persian language are among the points that show that the Persian rhetoricians have had a look at the nature of the Persian language and its independence from the Arabic language.

The Third Period

This period covers the first half of the fifth to the first half of the seventh century, and the discussion of metaphorical research, in tandem with other rhetorical discourses, is experiencing remarkable prosperity. Abdul Qahir Jarjani, author of *Asrar al-Balaghah* and *Dalael al-ijaz* and Zamakhshari the author *Al-Kashshaaf*, a rhetoric commentary of Quran is some of the prominent figures of this period, and of course, the flourishing of the metaphorical studies continues to a certain extent in Ibn Khatib Razi. It links this period to the first years of the seventh century.

The metaphor research of Abdul Qahir, which is more reflected in the book of *Asrar al-Balagha* than the *Dalael al-ijaz*, points to his mastery on the topic and his dominance on the subtleties, accuracies, capacity, and status of the metaphor. His view is an analytical one and serves to explain and interpret his theory of poetry. In metaphorical debate, like most rhetorical arguments, Abdul Qahir is reluctant to phrase it, although his analytical arguments are the source of the term- making for the rhetoricians of the later periods. He combines his theory with a lot of analytical evidence, and so there is no twist in his materials except being new. The most important arguments being raised by him in the discussion of metaphor are: 1) Criticism of the ancestors' view; the belief that metaphor is a claim of meaning for an object, not quoting the name from the object (Jerjani, 1989, 532), criticism of placing metaphor under figures of speech category "without being conditioned" (Jorjani, 1995, 256) and finally the criticism of the metaphor definition of the ancestors and their sufficiency in examples (Ibid: 16), are important criticisms of Abdul Qahir of the ancestors' view. 2) Attention to the position of metaphor in rhetoric books; Abdul Qahir believes that truth and trope e, simile, allegory, and then the metaphor, must be discussed, respectively (Jorjani, 1995, 17). But for the sake of remarks that are not, of course, explicitly stated, he "starts his subject by metaphor" (Ibid, 17). It seems that the preface of metaphor and trope e in the Aristotelian tradition has subconsciously directed Abdul Qahir and some of the rhetoricians toward this path. This feature is also found in some Persian metaphorical genesis books such as the *Tarjoman al-Balagheh* and the *Hedayat al-Sahar*. 3) In defining metaphor, he refers to the non-transfer of the word, its meaning and its transmission, and the emphasis on the simile motif of metaphor. Therefore, contrary to the definition of ancestors, his definition is comprehensive, and synecdoche and cited declaration (I'lam Manqulah) do not fall under the metaphor. 4) considering the conditions of metaphor making; unlike Aristotle, he believes that not every metaphor can be constructed from simile and he considers the medium of comparison having near sources, its easy understanding, and the affirmation of the custom as the required conditions for making a metaphor. In short, he says: "the symmetry

and the reason for the present and the custom must express your purpose" (Ibid, 151). 5) Paying attention to the purpose and benefit of metaphor. While praising metaphor a lot, he mentions some benefits for it: "in this worthy manner of expression, a new face of a unique immensity is being hidden" (Ibid, 24)" and It induces many meanings in short words "(Ibid). By the aid of metaphor, plants come to life, talker and non-talker become fluent and eloquent and you find quiet and dumb things to be talkers and preachers. In this magnificent realm, short and inadequate meanings are enlightening and lively "(Ibid). 6) Avoiding term-making, though he speaks of many kinds of metaphors in *Dalail Al-Ajaz* and promises to talk about them elsewhere (Jerjani, 1989, 529); however, his promise never came true. In his discussion of metaphor, it can be said that all the types of metaphor that have been formed in the fourth period of metaphor development have been rooted from his analytical discussions, without him making any terms for them. Rather than pursuing terminology, he thinks about the analysis of the argument and suggests a way to evaluate the types of metaphors. The argument of strong and weak metaphor could be found here as well. The basis of this division is attention to the words of comparison, tenor, and vehicle. (Jorjani, 1995, 31,32 ,35) In the introduction of pure and mere metaphor, he writes: "comparison is taken from rational images like metaphor of light with this reasoning, that it unveils the truth and eliminates doubt and hesitation" (Ibid, 36). There is not a very positive view of such applications in the books of the Persian language (Genesis, 1362, 1362). Types such as the oxymoron and conformative metaphor (Vefaiah) are inspired by these discussions of Abdul Qahir in later periods.

He sometimes criticizes the metaphorical types that preceded him in rhetoric. Among these is the rhyme adduction that Qaddama ibn Ja'far has mentioned for the first time, and Abdul Qahir does not reject it in every context (Jerjani, 1995, 22). 7) Considering discrepancies under metaphor, including those that have a long history in the metaphorical discussion. Eloquent simile and its similarities and differences with metaphor. Abdul Qahir knows simile as the basis for both, except that elimination of the simile components increases hyperbole but does not transform the simile into a metaphor (Ibid, 21-208). He states explicitly: "it is enough to say that our word is like simile; is bounded to hyperbole, is justified in its definition and is not called a metaphor" (Jerjani, 1989, 113). He also uses the syntactic features of the Arabic language to explain the difference between simile and metaphor, which is not possible in Farsi (Jerjani, 1995, 211). He considers metaphor more exaggerated, more concise, and more succinct than simile (Ibid, 149); however, he admits that identifying the exact boundary between simile and metaphor is simply not possible (Ibid, 214). In addition to simile and metaphor, attention to simile, allegory,

and metaphor ratio, which is another controversial topic in the rhetorical books, has a special place in Abdul Qahir's works. He argues: "The metaphor- speaker transfers the word from the original meaning but the one who speaks with an example does not do that" (Ibid, 149). He mentions singularity of simile in metaphor and its plurality in allegory as a difference between metaphor and allegory (Ibid, 161). He regards the metaphor and allegory that has reached to the metaphorical level to be of the same nature (Jerjani, 1985, 119), which means the allegorical metaphor of the later periods. 8) Considering the difference between the two main types of metaphor, namely explicit and implicit metaphor, without naming the two. He argues that the first type of metaphor (explicit) is easily traced back to its origin (simile), but that the second type (implicit) reveals its simile origin with the aid of a deep thinking (Jarjani, 1995, 26). When proving that metaphor is not in the word but in its meaning, he uses implicit metaphor evidence (Ibid, 536), and thus implicit metaphor is superior to the explicit one (Ibid, 537). Although, like Aristotle's works and Persian rhetoric books, Abdul Qahir emphasizes the implicit metaphor, his commentary is often concerned with the explicit metaphor. It seemed that proving explicit metaphor is easier than implicit one, and implicit hyperbole and its further avoidance of simile makes it difficult to prove its metaphorical state. 9) Discussing the characteristics and introducing the best kind of metaphor; he knows a reinforcement of the words of comparison as a necessity for metaphor, so that tenor cannot be differentiated from vehicle (Ibid, 527). Abdul Qahir considers the simile and metaphor to be valuable because they are hard to find (Ibid, 214). 10) the comprehensive view of Abdul Qahir to figurative ascription (esnad majazi); at the end of *Asrar al-Bilaghah*, Abdul Qahir discusses rational trope, synecdoche and lexical trope. Although figurative ascription has been discussed in the Arabic books in the previous periods, he discusses it in order not to leave any ambiguity. This subject has attracted attention in the Farsi books of the second period and post- Safavid era as well. He mentions two types of figurative ascription, namely figurative and additive, and knows both to be of the same kind (Ibid, 245). In distinction of the figurative ascription that has a literal aspect with the false speech, he emphasizes the consciousness and belief of the speaker. He believes that in the figurative ascription, the speaker uses consciousness, embedded reasoning, and the possibility of interpretation while speaking in a trope format, whereas in False speech it is unaware, manipulative, and unintelligible and used to deceive the audience. He, therefore, divides the figurative ascription into two ideological and literary categories (Ibid, 250). Abdul Qahir explicitly defines trope and its famous type as metaphor and allegory (Jerjani, 1989, 112). Thus, introducing trope that overlaps with the metaphor, especially the implicit metaphor, is in line with the religious needs of his era

and has religious backgrounds. By this perspective, introducing this subject can be justified (Georgani, 1995, 250). Failure to pay attention to the religious motives of this debate will give rise to the turmoil in the following periods to which we will refer later. The discussion of the figurative ascription, as well as introducing its special and general types, and its benefits are completed in *Dalail al- Ijaz* (Jorjani, 1989, 368). 11) Abdul Qahir's emphasis on the sentence and the context of the word in the subject of trope e and metaphor (Jerjani, 1995, 266), his overview of the languages including Farsi, in the Metaphorical Discussion, and not considering Arabic language superior to other languages in studies on metaphor (Ibid: 20), the discussion about the meaning of meaning regarding trope (Jerjani, 1989, 332), paying attention to some metaphors that constitute components of a compound (Ibid, 121 and 162), emphasis on the relativity of ugliness and the beauty of metaphor (Jerjani, 1995, 161) are some of the prominent points considered by Abdul Qahir in the issues on metaphor. Some of his arguments, such as the discussion of "meaning of meaning," pioneered the theories of contemporary Western scholars (Attic, n.d, 258), and some of his theories, such as the superiority of collective metaphor to the single metaphor supported with evidence and explanations, have not been studied accurately in studies on metaphor (Jorjani, 1989, 121). In short, Abd al-Qahir's view is a collection of the ancestors and contemporaries' view, a ground for future debates and the emergence of new ideas in the field of metaphor-research and other rhetorical topics. Unfortunately, this view has little to do with the first and second periods of Persian metaphor- research, it has lost its way in the Arabic metaphor-research period, and its capacities are underutilized.

Abd al-Qa'ir's views regarding metaphor and other rhetorical topics are loaded and stabilized in *Al-Kashshaaf* written by Zamakhshari (1114). In addition to representing Quran evidences for metaphor and other rhetorical topics, Zamakhshari uses analyses and interpretations of Abdul Qahir to name the types of metaphor which are still repeated under the category of metaphor. Some of the names are explicit, implicit, main, submerged, allegorical, abstract, and stipulated (Morashahah). What highlights Zamakhshari and his Kashshaaf in the metaphorical research is his religious view of the rhetorical discourses, which views the semantics (Ma'ani) and figurative language as the sciences devoted to the Qur'an and regards the mastery of these sciences as the necessity of the commentator's work. With such a view, metaphor research is linked to the text of the Qur'an, and the types of metaphor become meaningful in relation to the verses of the Qur'an, and henceforth receive greater attention. After Zakhakhshari, Ibn Khatib Razi (1209) continued the work of Abdul Qahir, and his book *Nayyah-Al-Ijaz fi Darayatah Al-Ijaz* summarizes the *Dalil al Ijaz* and

Asrar al- Balaghah written by Abdul Qahir. Except the fact that he added to its divisions and explanations (Sheikhun, 1994-39, 39). Ibn Khatib Razi's special view about Hadeq al-Sahir Rashid al-Din Watawat can be considered as a turning point in the link between Arabic and Persian rhetoric. However, in the field of metaphor-research, Ibn Khatib Razi has no prominent place due to presence of works of Abdul Qahir.

The Fourth Period

Beginning in the seventh century and continuing until today, this period is dominated by the views of the Arabic- writing Iranians that are Sakaki, Khatib Qazwini, and Taftazani. Although there are major trends in Egypt and Yemen and the works of Ibn A'thir, Ibn 'Abi al-Nabi, and the Alawi Yemeni, the influence of Sakaki and his commentators on the rhetorical discourse is so much that there is no opportunity left for the original trends. The second period of metaphor- research in Farsi is also linked to the works of Sakaki and his followers, to the extent that many Persian works in this period can be considered as translations of the works of the fourth period. However, works such as Hedayat al-Balagha's studies continue to adhere to Persianism and attention to the books of the first Persian period. The second period of Persian metaphor-l research began in the early years of the tenth century and continues today. Most of the rhetorical books of the Safavid, Zandieh, Afsharieh, Qajarieh, and Pahlavi era are in the second period. Writings such as *Anwar al-Balagha* by Mohammad Hadi bin Mohammad Saleh Mazandarani, *Bayan al-badi's Excerpts* by Mirza Abutaleb Fanderski, *Motale'* by Razi al-Din Mohammad, *Abda al-Badai* by Shams al-Alma'a Garkani, *Mu'allam al-Balagha* by Mohammad Khalil al-Raja'I and *Dorar al-Adab* by hesam al-Alma'a Aagh Ula are some of these works. The rhetoricians of this period are trapped and stagnated on the pretext that the past has left nothing for the future and there is nothing to add to the rhetorical debate.

The most important features of Sakkaki's vision are: 1) he places the discussion of metaphor under the figurative language (Bayan) the initiator of which is Abdul Qahir Jarjani and it is stabilized by Sakkaki. 2) Sakkaki's definition of metaphor is not an invention, but it is interesting in that it is defined in relation to simile. As opposed to the Aristotelian tradition and even against the primacy of the metaphor in Abdul Qahir, the simile is first discussed and then metaphor is defined in such a way that its relation to the simile becomes apparent. The point noted in Sakkaki's definition is the elimination or retention of the two sides of simile. That is, his definition refers to the implicit and explicit metaphor, while the definitions of the past often emphasized the elimination of tenor and the formation of explicit metaphor, though their evidence was often of the implicit type. This characteristic raised questions in the audience's mind. Sakkaki fixed this

defect. He regards metaphor as a rational trope, not a lexical one, and speaks of Abdul Qahir's hesitation between lexical and rational trope (Sakkaki, no date, 157). What is prominent in Sakkaki's explanation is his special attention to symmetry and divides it into two types of single meanings and related meanings, which of course existed in previous eras; however, Sakkaki's emphasis on this subject is more (ibid, 159). The important point is that with the introduction of varieties such as diminishing (Tahkamiah) and Sarcasm (Tamliah) and the long-standing justifications to prove them, Sakaki virtually excludes the discussion of metaphor from vigor. Justifications are also translated and repeated in Persian books (Ibid, 159). In Sakaki's metaphorical discourses, the reduction of analytical and interesting aspects and the addition of the metaphorical types are prominent. He added types such as definite, probabilistic, etc. that do not help much to the metaphorical discussion and some types such as the diminishing and submerged metaphors that are incompatible with the definition of metaphor, and they can be mentioned under the category of metaphor just by using artifice and pretension. In general, Sakaki can be seen as an extremist imitator of Abdul Qahir Jarjani, Zakhkhri and Fakhr razi, and there is a fact that if he had not come up with the metaphorical and other rhetorical arguments, these arguments would have been more effective.

Khatib Qazvini repeated the same content of Sakaki in *Iza'ah* and *Talkhis*. In the preface of *Talkhis*, while praising Sakkaki, he regards his work as interpreting and removing it from the hassle (Ibid.: 37). He has collected the past definitions to prepare a definition for metaphor (Khatib, 2008, 151). The symmetry types in Khatib are divided into three types of single, numerous, and related meanings, summarized by Sakaki in two types (Ibid, 153). In addition, he divides the metaphor into six types based on its triple components (tenor, vehicle, general), which were divided into five types in Sakkaki (Ibid, 156). The "symmetry criteria of metaphor in verb", which was the subject and verb in Abdul Qahir and Sakaki, was increased in Khatib by the addition of the genitive noun (Majrur) (Ibid, 158). He added absolute metaphor to the stipulated and abstract metaphors, which were explained in Sakkaki, but they were not named (Ibid, 158). In the summary, he prefers the stipulated metaphor to the other types because it does not pay attention to simile but increases hyperbole (Ibid, 159). Khatib, despite being a follower of Sakkaki, has criticized some of his views in pages 163-162 of *Talkhis*. In the definition of the lexical trope, he disagrees with Sakkaki that allegory is a part of the explicit metaphor and the abstract trope; and disagrees that submerged metaphor goes back to the implicit metaphor. Taftazani in *Mottawal*, as mentioned in the preface, explains *Talkhis al-Miftah Qazvini* and its errors (Taftazani, 1995, 4). In a comparative study of

the Arabic and Persian rhetoric, Taftazani can be attributed to the association of the Persian books of the second period with the metaphor- research issues of Sakaki and his essays. This point is mentioned in most of the books of the second Persian period (Fanderski, 2002, 15; Saleh Mazandarani, 1997, 20). Therefore, the metaphor research flow in the fourth and second periods of Persian literature is quite adaptive, and there is no remarkable point in the Persian books except in the Persian evidence and sometimes in the summarizing contents. In spite of the imitation in Persian books in the second period, unfortunately the main framework of the metaphor in today's Persian books is a reminder of this period.

To summarize, in the context and content of the fourth Arabic and second Persian studies of metaphor, which goes towards useless recession, stagnation and prolixity, the mainstream of Egyptian and Yemeni metaphor research in Arabic, and Persian trends in the Persian language tend to revive the original studies of metaphor –research. It is a popular trend in Persian and Arabic, and in addition to its origins can be considered as a foundation for a new look at metaphor.

The Fifth Period

This period can be seen as an age of modernism and a new look at the rhetorical issues in general and metaphors in particular. Rhetorical and metaphorical research in Arabic and Persian entered a new era after a long period of stagnation beginning from the first half of the seventh century and the rise of Sakkaki, and continued until the early years of the fourteenth century. The modernist rhetoricians opposed stagnation. Understanding the necessity of changing rhetorical studies, expanding educational and academic centers, and the necessity of developing educational textbooks that were far from complexity to teach rhetorical topics easily led to the creation of critical works on rhetorical topics. Therefore, the educational, research, and critical aspects of the issues on metaphor are prominent in the fifth Arabic and Third Persian language books. A critical look at the rhetorical sciences and, consequently, the discussion of metaphor, is something that is also explicitly found in the Persian books of third period (Forouzanfar, 1997, 3 and Homayi, 1995, 183). The following are the most important features of issues on metaphor in the books of this period.

Reflection on the Definition of Metaphor

Providing a comprehensive definition of metaphor is something that has been addressed in Persian and Arabic books of this period. Referring to the simile base of metaphor, elimination of one of the sides and paying attention to the two main metaphors, namely implicit and explicit while defining the metaphor, emphasizing the simile interest between the

parts, and the need for symmetry in the metaphor are some points that have perfected the definition of metaphor and have prevented it from being confused with other trope s. Finally, with a clear explanation of the limits of metaphors, we come to a succinct definition: "Metaphor is a trope e with simile interest" (Ameli, -2012, 142). The interesting point here is that despite a full definition of metaphor in the books of this period, following the books of the first and second periods, explicit metaphor come to mind, but the evidence are of the implicit metaphor (Hashemi, 2011, 295). This feature is prominent in the Arabic books and can be evidenced. This is because of repetition of the evidence on metaphor that have always been trending toward implicit metaphor.

In the study of the definition of metaphor in the Arabic fifth period and the Persian third period, one cannot speak from a linguistic point of view, which is more prominent in Persian books and does not, of course, contain anything new, but rather proposes the same definition of metaphor in the form of new terms. In addition, it is rooted in Saussure, Jacobson, and Western linguists and critics (Safavi, 2004, 130).

Attention to the Components of Metaphor

Attention to the components of the metaphor has been highlighted in the fourth period of metaphor research and has been the basis for the formation of multiple metaphorical types; however, there is a difference between the Arabic and Persian rhetoricians. This difference is rooted in their visions. That is to say, the Arabic rhetoricians pay attention to the difference between the metaphor and the simile while introducing the components of the metaphor, and therefore, according to the briefness of metaphor, and in comparison with the simile, they spoke of the three components of tenor, vehicle, and metaphor (Hashemi, 2011, 299). However, Persian rhetoricians paid attention to the relation and similarity of simile and metaphor. Therefore, following the simile, they introduced four components of tenor, vehicle, metaphor, and general. As a result, the existential philosophy of metaphor and its difference with simile has been slightly confused in Persian rhetoric.

Paying attention to symmetry in metaphorical structure is a common feature of Arabic and Persian books. The necessity of having symmetry in metaphor and dividing it into lexical and contextual symmetry has been emphasized in Persian and Arabic books. The symmetry role in the formation of the stipulated, abstract, and absolute metaphors is of interest to the metaphor researchers of this period. Among the rhetoricians of this period, Shamisa has a different view of the symmetry role in the stipulation and abstraction of the metaphor, which is contemplative, and illustrates the accuracy of his views (Shamisa, 1999, 160). Some Arabic books, following the earlier rhetorical books,

divide the lexical symmetry into three parts that are in a single meaning or in more than one meaning, or in related and compound meanings, which have not been addressed in Persian books (Maraghi, 1993, 265). Instead, in some Persian rhetorical books, the symmetry scope is expanded (Homayi, 1995, 174; Shamisa, 1999, 166). The Persian rhetorical books are more precise on the role of the connotative symmetry (Sarifah) in the metaphor, and emphasize that it only discards the mind from the true meaning, but it is not sufficient to understand the intended trope meaning. Thus, connotative and homonymic symmetries (Moayanah symmetry) (in common words) are then used metaphorically (Homayi, 1995, 173, and Shamisa, 1999, 205). In general, it can be said that the discussion of symmetry in the books of this period has a considerable scope.

Attention to the Relation of Metaphor with the Similar Terms

The comparison between the simile and metaphor and the difference between the two was more evident in the fifth period books and the Arabic books often influenced by the views of Abdul Qahir Jarjani and other second and third period metaphor researchers. In most of the books of this period, the simile base of metaphor attracted attention; but they are not unaware of the difference between the two. Maraghi considers metaphor as a simile with the elimination of one of the sides, the words of comparison and the medium of comparison. Regarding the difference between simile and metaphor, he writes that unity does not occur in the simile mentioning the sides as well, while in metaphor, unity and synthesis are claimed, to the extent that one party may be named after another (Maraghi, 1993, 260). Another point that has been noted in the relation of simile and metaphor in the books of this period is that the move from simile to metaphor is seen as a move from "beautiful to more beautiful" (Zubai, Halawi, 1996, 95) and such a hierarchy is considered between these imaginary elements: Simile-Simile with the deletion of words of comparison- simile with the deletion of words and medium of comparison – metaphor. They know in short, the rhetoric of simile in its hyperbole, and this hyperbole is increased by eliminating words and the medium of comparison and one of the sides (Agent, 2012, 142).

In the hierarchy of transition from simile to metaphor, the eloquent simile is in the middle of the road. Therefore, an accurate identification of the boundary of eloquent simile and metaphor has been one of the concerns of rhetorical books. Entering this discussion, the fifth period books have attempted to illustrate the way to differentiate eloquent simile from metaphor. In their view, the sides are present in the eloquent simile nonetheless, but in metaphor, the simile is forgotten (Jarm, Amin, 2012, 95). The possibility or the impossibility of removing words of comparison is

another way of identifying implicit simile and metaphors (Zubeyi, Halawi, 1996, 95).

Attention to the relation of the allegorical metaphor and allegory is also found in the fifth period books. The relationship between the two has always been the subject of controversy in the Persian and Arabic books. Homayi has elaborated on these issues and has described terms such as Compound Synecdoche, compound trope to metaphor, and has resolved disagreements by expressing the distinction between simile, allegory, and making "metaphorical exemplum" (Homayi, 1995, 190-200). In the relation of the two, Hashemi speaks of the allegorical metaphor source of exemplum, prevalence of proverb among the people, its constant form in every morphological and syntactical state, its superiority over other trope types because of its allegorical simile root and its compound medium of comparison (Hashemi, 2011, 316). Most of the Arabic books of this period have focused on this subject, but less attention has been given to it in the Persian books.

The Types of Metaphor Criticism

What is disturbing the metaphorical subject is the formation of different terms and variation. Sometimes the philosophy of the type formation is unclear and sometimes the formed terms overlap, and sometimes the changes in the perspective forms a specific type. Finally, interest in making terms and looking at details sometimes shape some types that are inconsistent with the definition of metaphor. Hence, the books of this period criticized and analyzed the types of metaphors. Although both the Persian and Arabic rhetoricians disapproved the turmoil in this area, they took two different approaches to face it. The Arabic rhetoricians often criticized Sakkaki and his commentators and knew the divisions and terminology as the cause for the loss of the value and validity of the rhetorical issues, and in turn, they liked and praised the views of Abdul Qahir Jarjani, Abul Hilal Askari, and generally the second and third period rhetoricians who favored briefness and analyzed aesthetics of metaphor (Maraghi, 1993, 8 and 10; Sheikun, 1994, 60 and 68; Zubai, Halawi, 1996, 5, 93, 96). As a result, they liked briefness in introducing the types of metaphor. For instance, there is nothing about the types that cause the disturbance of the metaphor in Balaghah al-Wahdah. This group of rhetoricians only explains and provides evidence for the explicit, implicit, and allegorical metaphor. They know explicit and implicit metaphors as the most important types of metaphor and they avoid the types that "distract the mind of the rhetoric and aesthetic implications of the metaphor" (Zubai, Halawi, 1996, 101). However, the Persian rhetoricians still recognize Sakkaki and his followers as excelling in this field and attempt to highlight the similarities and differences of types by discussing various types. Perhaps the Arabic origin of these types gives the Arab

rhetoricians more daring and boldness to modify the term, and urges them to eliminate unnecessary items. However, the fifth period's early books such as *Jawahar-e-Balagheh*, *Balagheh al-Wahdah*, and the *Ulum Balagheh* are still bound by the relations and differences of the implicit, submerged, and imaginary metaphors (Hashemi, 2011, 304; Jarm, Amin, 2012, 74; Maraghi, 1993, 272). They also try to reduce the severity of the differences by specifying the appellation and the philosophy of naming the types under discussion and thus defend these divisions (Hashemi, 2011, 303, 306, 307). But the process of metaphorical transformation towards eliminating disparate types is unnecessary.

A Critique of the Logical, Theological, and Philosophical Views

The fusion of rhetorical debates with other scholars culminated in al-Sakati's *Miftah al-'Ulum* and continued in his followers and commentators (Sheikun, 1994 AD, 67); while before him, getting away from non-rhetorical debates in the works of some of the rhetoricians was praised. As it is written about Abu Hulal Askari: "He explicitly says that he did not compose his work in the manner of theologians, but that it was written in the style of poets and writers who are cultivators of speech" (Atiq, Beta, 198). The result of the excesses in non-rhetorical tendencies is the formation of critical sentences like this: "Rhetoric has changed to barren arduous rules which are laid down in a rational dry form" (Ibid: 268). So, in the preface to the rhetorical books of this period, "the book being empty of margins" (Ameli, 2012, 13) and the rhetorical discussion in a "scientific-literary" manner (Ibid, 14) are emphasized. This moderate approach liberated the metaphor discussion from unnecessary divisions, simplified its teaching by its simple and brief introduction, and freed it from complex and arduous arguments.

In the third period of metaphor research, Foruzanfar is the beginner of this view (Foruzanfar, 1997, 5) Shafi'i Kadkani also criticizes the verbal view in the relational trope and denounces it in all the rhetoric fields (Shafi'i Kadkani, 1993, 104).

Comparing and Contrasting Arabic and Persian Metaphor with the Western Studies

The rhetoric of Western rhetorical research in the Islamic world can be traced back to the first periods of metaphorical research, and even Sakkaky has been criticized in later periods for his attention to Greek practices (Maraghi, 1993, 9). Although such a look at the works of Sakaki is a new one, the relation of the works by Khawaja Nasir al-Din Tusi with Aristotle's works in the seventh century also imposes a link between Sakaki and the Greek viewpoint.

The precedent of metaphor over the simile, the importance of the implicit metaphor and the personification and abundance of their evidence, the prominence of the analytical and aesthetic point of view in some rhetorical books, the tendency to eliminate unnecessary terms, the attention to new Western schools and perspectives in the research on metaphor all point to the link between the research on metaphor in the Islamic and the Western worlds. Dozens of books translated from Western languages into Persian and Arabic in the last period of research on metaphor and the modern era show that the adaptation of the rhetoric of Islam with the rhetoric of the West in this period influenced the course of the research on metaphor. Of course, if this path is not examined seriously, the prospect will not be promising.

Alongside the aforementioned common features between the metaphors of the fifth Arabic period and the third Persian period, there are some differences between the two as well.

Analytical look at the metaphor

The aesthetic aspects of metaphor and its analytical look are more evident in the Arabic books of the fifth period. This view is often influenced by the second and third periods of Arabic metaphor- research, but the Persian books had no serious regard for these two periods. The natural tendency of man to trope, the power of its imagination, the amplification of the word, the multiplication of meanings and the accuracy of expression, the creation of happiness in man (Hashemi, 2011, 281), bringing meaning to the mind, arousing the imagination, the power of persuasion (Maraghi, 1993, 281), good Imagary, Enlightenment (Sheikhun, 1994, 80), a new interpretation, along with illusions, contemplation, and the conversion of spiritual affairs to sensual ones (Zubai, Halawi, 1996, 92) are all among the most important benefits of metaphor. Sheikhon points to the benefits of Qur'anic metaphors, which can, of course, be expanded to a lower level to literary texts and their metaphors as well (Sheikhun, 1994, 83).

The rhetorical position of metaphor in most of the fifth period books has gained an independent place (Jarm, Amin, 2012, 94; Maraghi, 1993, 281; Sheikhun, 1994, 93). Ways and means of identifying rhetoric of metaphor (Zubai, Halawi, 1996, 103), paying attention to the metaphor evaluation, providing the criteria for good metaphors, and paying attention to the eccentricity of metaphor and its factors are among the other points that are originated from the analytical view of the metaphor researchers of the fifth period. The superiority of the allegorical metaphor due to its basis of allegorical simile, and its medium of comparison is abstracted from different issues, and it is difficult and contemplative (Maraghi, 1993, 288; Hashemi, 2011, 316). A hierarchical expression of metaphor types, namely, the metaphorical metaphor, implicit metaphor, and explicit

metaphor (Sheikhun, 1994, 80), the superiority of stipulation over abstraction because of ignoring simile and enforcing hyperbole (Ameli, 2012, 146) are some of the points in the books of this period. The books of this period regard the moderation in eccentricity and proximity to the mind as the criterion of good metaphor (Ibid, 147). Finally, in line with the analytic view of metaphor, the eccentricity of metaphor and its causes are discussed in the fifth period books, which have received little attention in the earlier periods (Maraghi, 1993, 268). In the books of third period of Farsi metaphor- research, there is not much analytical view except in *Sovar e-Khial* by Shafi'i Kadkani, and somehow in Balaghah *Taswir* written by Fotuhi being influenced by the Western rhetoric and *Bayan* written by Kazazi and *Bayan* written by Shamisa. Referring to the terms and conditions of applying the meaning of trope in the forms of Shafi'i's *Sovar e-Khial* (Shafi'i Kadkani, 1993, 120), which is influenced by the rhetoric books of the second and third Arabic periods, indicating the reasons for superiority stipulation over abstraction in *Bayan* written by Kazazi, mentioning some points regarding the value of metaphor in this book, and finally, the dispersed analytical and aesthetic look at Shamisa's *Bayan* are some of the most important points in line with the analytical approach to metaphor reflected in Persian books, which are weak in comparison to the Arabic books.

A Criticism of Disregarding the Nature of the Persian Language

This nature is characteristic of the Persian books. It should be indicated that Arabic language has long been the source of its rhetorical debates, and with the exception of the sporadic sentences that have criticized Greekism of the Arabic rhetoricians, there is no mention of disregarding the nature of the Arabic language.

Such criticisms are found in the books of the third Persian period, especially in introducing the different types of trope (Homayi, 1995, 205) and submerged metaphor in letters (Ibid, footnote 186), Forouzanfar (Forouzanfar, 1997, 6) and Shafiei Kadkani (Shafi'i Kadkani, 1993, 102) have spoken about this more than others. In current research, of course, Arabic and Persian languages, and the characteristics of the two, are lost and threatened in the face of the Western research that dominates them; however, they require serious attention.

Nativism in the rhetorical and metaphorical discourses of Farsi has just started, and has only led to Farsiism in sub-terms of metaphor. This feature is evident in *Bayan* written by Kazazi, and the book of *Bayan* in Persian poetry by Behrouz Tharvatian, which does not seem to be helping the problems of rhetoric and metaphor.

CONCLUSION

The ups and downs of metaphorical discussion in Arabic books have been more than the Persian books. In the first, second, and early years of the third periods, a book on the subject of metaphor in Persian has not yet been compiled, and it is not possible to study metaphor in Arabic and Persian at the same time. This possibility begins with the third period of the Arabic metaphor research. The first period of Persian metaphor research is comparable to the first and to some extent the second periods, its second period is matched with the fourth Arabic period, and its third period is compatible to the fifth Arabic period. The Persian metaphor researchers have not received much benefit of the third period of the Arabic metaphor research, which is the period of its glory. Generally speaking, metaphor research in Farsi began with translating the Arabic subjects. Then, it moved toward translation and mere imitation. Finally, over the last hundred years, Persian metaphor research tried to criticize, modify, and accommodate the Arabic metaphor research with the nature of Persian language using a critical view. Of course, in the latter period of the Arabic and Persian metaphor research, both currents were influenced by Western research, and if this ignorance of the native researches of the two languages continues, there will not be a good perspective for the subject of metaphor and other rhetorical issues. The necessity of formulating metaphorical culture, examining the evolution of metaphor in literary texts, styles and types of literature, reinforcing the analytical and aesthetic aspects of metaphorical debate, the need to pay attention to the nature of languages in the use of other nations' research, and finally, preserving the interesting and imaginary aspects of the metaphor subject in contrast to schools and theories that examine metaphor with a scientific perspective, should be taken into account in future Arabic and Persian research.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, M. (2008). Abdul Qahir Jarjani and New Perspectives on Literary Criticism, Translated by Maryam Musharraf. Tehran: Nashcheshmeh.
2. Abdul Qahir, J. (1989). *Dalail Al-Ijaz Fi al- Quran*, translated by Seyyed Mohammad Radmanesh. Mashhad: Astan Quds Razavi.
3. Abdul Qahir, J. (1995). *Asrar Balagheh*, Translated by Jalil Tajliz, Fourth Edition. Tehran: University of Tehran.
4. Agh Ula., & Hussein, A. (1994). *In Dorar al-Adab*. Qom: Hijra.
5. Al-Ameli, al-Sheikh Moien Daghigh. (2012). *Dorous Fi al- Balagheh*. Beirut: Dar Jawad al-A'mah.
6. Aljarm, A., & Mustafa, A. (2012). *Al-Balagheh al-Wahdah*. Qom: Zawi-al-Qirbi.
7. Al-Maraghi, al-Mustafa. (1993). *Ulum al Balagheh*. Lebanon, Beirut: Dar al-Kutab al-Umayyah.
8. Al-Maraghi, al-Mustafa. No-date. *Mahasen al-Kalam*, by the efforts of Mohammad Fesharaki. Isfahan: Isfahan Cultural Center.
9. Al-Mobarad, Abi al-Abbas Mohammed bin Yazid. (2010). *Al-Kamel, Al-Jazeera Al-Awl*, by the efforts of Mohammed Abolfazl Ibrahim. Beirut: Al-Maktaba Al-Assariyah.
10. Al-Sakkaki. No-date. *Miftah Al-Alum*. Qom: Urmia Library Publications.
11. Al-Sayyed Sheikhun, Muhammad. (1994). *Metaphor, Its Genesis and Evolution*. Dar al-Hidayah, Second Edition.
12. Althimi al-Timi, Abi Abideh Moammar. (1981). *Majaz al Quran, Al-Jazeera Al-Aul*, by the efforts of Mohammad Fad Sezkin. Beirut: al-Rasala Institute.
13. Al-Zuba'i, Talib Mohammed and Halawi, Nasser. (1996). *Al-Bayyan and al-Badieh*. Beirut: Dar al-Nazeja al-Arabiya and Al-Jawrah.
14. Amarati Moqaddam, David. (2016). *Rhetoric from Athens to Medina*. Tehran: Hermes.
15. Askari, A., Hassan bin Abdullah bin Soheil. (1993). *Me'yar al Balagheh*. Translation of the Book of Sana'atain translated by Mohammad Javad Nasiri. Tehran: University of Tehran.
16. Atftazani. (1995). *Al-Matool*. Qom: Dawari School.
17. Attiq, Abdulaziz. No-date. *The history of the Arabic rhetoric*. Beirut: Dar al-Nahda al-Arabia.
18. Fouruzanfar, B. A. (1997). *Ma'a:ni and Bayan*, by the efforts of Seyyed Mohammad dahir Siaghi. Tehran: Academy of Persian Language and Literature, Letter of the Academy, Annex 3.
19. Fundersky, M. A. (2002). *Excerpts of the exquisite Bayan*, Corrected by Seyedeh Maryam Ravatian, First Edition. Isfahan: Islamic Propaganda Office of Isfahan Branch.
20. Haghshenas, A. M. (1991). *Literary, Linguistic Papers, "The Classification of Jarjani Metaphor, Special Reference to the Classification of Aristotle's Metaphor"*, First Edition. Tehran: Niloufar.
21. Hashimi, A. (2011). *Jawahir al-Balagheh*, correction, translation and Diacritic transcribed by Mahmoud Khorsandi, Hamid Masjidarai. Tehran: Payam Noavar Publications (Former Islamic Law).
22. Hawks, T. (2001). *Metaphor*, translation by Farzaneh Taheri, Second Edition. Tehran: Center Publishing.
23. Hedayat, R. G. K. (2004). *Madarij al-Balagheh*, edited by Hamid Hassani, Contribution by Behrouz Safarzadeh, First Edition. Tehran: Academy of Persian Language and Literature.
24. Ibn Mu'tazid, Abdullah bin Mohammed. (2016). *Al-Badi book*. translation and research by Yahya Kardgar, Bahauddin Eskandari. Qom: Bustan e Ketab Institute.
25. Ibn Nadim, & Muhammad bin Isaac. (1967). *Al Fihrist*. Translated by M. Reza Tajadod, Tehran:

- Iran Commercial Bank Printing House, Second Edition.
26. Ibn Rashiq al-Qirwani, Abi Ali al-Hasan. (2000). *Al-Umda* (vol 1), by Salah al-Din al-Hawari, A. Hoda Oudah. Beirut: Dar al-Hilal.
 27. Jahiz. (1926). *Albian and al-Tabin*, by the efforts of Hasan al-Sandoubi. Qom: Urmia Library Publications.
 28. Jalaluddin, H. (1995). *Meanings and figurative language*, Third Edition. Tehran: Homa Publishing,
 29. Khattib al-Qawzwini. (2008). *Talkhis al-Miftah*, by the efforts of Yassin Al-Aubi. Beirut: Al-Maktabah al-Assariyah.
 30. Mir Jalaluddin, K. (1991). *Bayan*, Second Edition. Tehran: Center Publishing.
 31. Moqimizadeh, M. M. (2015). *Metaphor in Islamic Rhetoric*. Tehran: Tahora.
 32. Nishaburi, H., Burhanuddin A. M. (2005). *Badi-al-Sanayah*, Correction of Rahim Muslim Ghobadiani, First Edition. Tehran: Mahmoud Afshar Endowment Foundation.
 33. Qodamah ibn Ja'afar. (1884). *Naqd al- Shi'r*, first edition. Constantinople: Javanib Pub.
 34. Radavian, Mohammad bin Omar. (2001). *Tarjoman al-Balagha*, edited by Ahmad Atash, with the effort and translation of the introduction by Tofigh. H. Sobhani - Esmail Hakami, First Edition. Tehran: Association of Cultural Works.
 35. Rajaie, Mohammad Khalil. (1993). *Ma'alim al-Balagheh*, Third Edition, Shiraz: Shiraz University.
 36. Rami Tabrizi, Sharafuddin Hassan bin Mohammed. (1962). *Haqqaiq al-Hadeq*, edited by Seyyed Mohammad Kazem Imam, first edition. Tehran: University of Tehran.
 37. Sadeq Saeed, Ehsan. (2000). *Rhetorical Sciences in Arabic and Persian*. Damascus: Islamic Republic of Iran Cultural Consultation, Iranian-Arabic Cultural Research Unit.
 38. Safavi, Kuroush. (2004). *From Linguistics to Literature*, Volume Two: Poetry, First Edition. Tehran: Surah Mehr.
 39. Safavi, Kuroush. (2017). *Metaphor*, first edition. Tehran: Scientific Publication.
 40. Saleh Mazandarani, Mohammad Hadi bin Mohammad. (1997). *Anwar al-Balagheh*, edited by Mohammad Ali Gholaminejad, first edition. Tehran: Qibla Cultural Center, and Heritage Publishing Office.
 41. Shafie Kadkani, & Mohammad Reza. (1993). *Sowarr e- khiyal*, in Persian Poetry, Fifth Edition. Tehran: Agah.
 42. Shafie Mostofi, Raziyyeddin Mohammad bin Mohammad. (2010). *Mat'lah*, MSc Thesis. Qom: Qom University.
 43. Shams al-Alma'i Garkani, Haj Mohammad Hussein. (1998). *Abda' al Badayah*, by Hossein Jafari, with introduction of Jalil Tajliz, first edition. Tabriz: Aharar.
 44. Shams Fakhri Isfahani. (2010). *Me'yar Jamali*, Correction by Yahya Kardgar, First Edition. Tehran: Library, Museum and Document Center of the Majlis.
 45. Shams Razi, R. (1994). *Al-Mujamm fi Ma'ayar Asha'r al-Ajam*, by the efforts of Sirius Shamisa, First Edition. Tehran: Ferdows.
 46. Shemisa, S. (1999). *Bayan*, Seventh Edition. Tehran: Ferdows.
 47. Shoughi, Z. (2004). *History and notation of rhetorical science*, translation by Mohammad Reza Torqi. Tehran: Side.
 48. Taftazani, Sa'daldin. (2003). *Mokhtasar al Ma'ani*. Qom: Dar al-Fakr Publications.
 49. Taj al-Halawi, Ali bin Mohammed. (2004). *Daghaigh al Shi'r*, by the efforts of Mohammad Kazem Imam. Tehran: University of Tehran.
 50. Thaqlab. (1995). *Qawaid al Shi'r*, by Ramadan Abdul Tawab. Cairo: Maktabah al-Khanji.
 51. Tharwatian, Behrouz. (1999). *Bayan in Persian Poetry*. Tehran: Barg Publishing.
 52. Waiz Kashefi Sabzevari, Kamaluddin Hussein. (1990). *Badayah al- Afkar fi Sanayah al-Asha'r*, edited by Mir Jalaeddin Kazazi, First Edition. Tehran: Center Publishing.
 53. Watwat. (1983). *Hedayegh al-Sahar fi Daqayaq al-Sha'ir*, correction by Abbas Iqbal Ashtiani, first edition. Tehran: Taheri & Sanai Library.