

A Comparative Study of Metaphor in Arabic and Persian

Metaphor as one of the most significant figures of speech has a special place in every language. Regarding the concept of metaphor, there are more commonalities than differences between Arabic and Persian language such that most of metaphorical issues in Arabic rhetorical books have also been restated in Persian ones 2-3 centuries later. Arabic metaphor has experienced 5 stages, namely the beginning, development, flourishing, recession, and modernism, while Persian metaphor has had less transformations with only 3 stages named the emergence, expansion, and revision. The emergence stage in Persian is compatible with the beginning and development stage in Arabic; and the expansion and revision stages in Persian match with the recession and modernism stages in Arabic respectively. Unfortunately, Persian rhetoric has not gained much benefit from the flourishing stage in Arabic so the analytic and aesthetic dimension is less visible in Persian. Current studies in both languages are inclined toward critical arguments, metaphorical studies, as well as linguistic perspectives though Persian researchers have paid more attention to the language essence and nativism in their works. Lack of a metaphorical dictionary, negligence to the variant literary schools and evolution of metaphor in literary texts are among main drawbacks in metaphorical studies in both languages.

Keywords: Rhetoric, Persian Language, Arabic Language, Figure of Speech, Metaphor

Introduction

Arabic rhetoric which has been enriched with various resources flourished significantly after Islam, seeking to confirm the rhetorical miracles of the Qur'an. Nevertheless, Muslim researchers and scholars have never forgotten the Greek, Iranian, and Indian resources contributing to Arabic-Islamic rhetoric. In al-Bayān wa-al-tabyīn, 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 by 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" as a technique of poetry (Ibn Nadim, 1927, 456), and introduces Persian, Hindi and Nabatian into Arabic translators. Intellectual centers such as Bayt al-Hikmah, or Khazaneh al-Hikmah or Dar al-Ilm, having been established established in

the first years of the third century by the order of 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 when the scholars of Arabic rhetoric history emphasize 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 recognized as the outcome 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 focus on the comparative study of metaphor in Arabic and Farsi in order to pave the ground for more comprehensive future research in this field.

Research Background

Some researchers have recently been published regarding the relationship between Arabic and Persian rhetoric. These studies have generally compared rhetorical figures in both languages, among which we can mention Ehsan Sadegh Saeed's book entitled *Rhetorical Science between Arabs and Iranians*; nonetheless, no independent research has yet been published with regard to comparing the rhetorical figures such as metaphor in two languages. The book *Metaphor in Islamic Rhetoric* by Mohammad Mahdi Moghimizadeh is one of few works addressing this subject, yet the portion of Persian research is not much noticeable in that research. Therefore, this article can be considered as one of pioneer studies in this field.

Significance, Method, and Questions of the Study

Since rhetoric of each language must be extracted from its text and the context, comparative researches 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 among languages. This necessity is more prevalent among the Arabic-Persian rhetoric enjoying a long-standing connection. Using descriptive analysis, the present article compares the metaphorical view of two languages and seeks to answer the following questions: what are the similarities and differences of metaphorical researches in the two above languages? and what are the impacts of these similarities and differences on the use of metaphor in the two above languages?

Discussion

Abu Ubaidah by his *Majaz al-Qur'an* initiated the metaphorical discussion which began with the general name of trope and then experienced several periods: 1. The beginning: from the second half of the second century to the beginning of the fourth century; 2. Development: the fourth and first half of the fifth century; 3. Flourishment: from the fifth to the first half of the seventh century; 4. Recession: from the second half of the seventh century to the present day; 5. Modernism and new perspective: formed in the recent century along with the period of recession and decline.

The evolution of metaphor-research in Farsi can be studied in three periods including emergence, expansion, and revision. Since the discussion of metaphor in Arabic books post-Islam preceded rhetoric in Persian books, we compare the metaphor discussion in these two languages 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 up 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, and Jahiz and Mobarrad have considered metaphor while analyzing poems and literary texts. Abu Ubaidah, without mentioning the name of metaphor, refers to trope in the general sense of the rhetorical sciences, such that as he introduces some types of trope, he provides some metaphorical examples without bringing the specific name of metaphor. Contemplation on the trope extensions provided by Abu Ubaidah shows that he uses this figure to include the whole rhetoric sphere (Abu Ubaidah, 1981, 18-19), and Ibn Qatibah also speaks of absolute borrowing of the words, among which metaphor can be a subset (Sheikhun, 1994, 7). However, Jahiz refers to the name of 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

1 another name refers to an explicit metaphor, and taking another meaning
 2 refers to an implicit metaphor in the later periods. Finally, it is worth
 3 mentioning Ibn Mu'tazz and his book *Al-Baadi*, which studies metaphor under
 4 the exquisite name in the general sense of rhetorical science. Until the
 5 beginning of the tenth century, this feature was also found in Persian
 6 rhetorical books. After quoting the definition of the metaphor, Ibn Mu'tazz
 7 gives some examples of the Qur'an, hadiths and poems and Arabic references,
 8 and finally mentions defective examples of the metaphor (Ibid, 107) without
 9 introducing the reason or reasons for being defective. By virtue of the merits
 10 of Mahasin al-Kalam of Morghinani, *Al-Baadi*, written by Ibn Mu'tazz, is the
 11 foundation of the first Persian rhetorical book, that is *Tarjoman Al-Bilaghah*.
 12 This means that Morghinani has taken a great advantage of al-Baadi book
 13 (Morghani, n.d). In addition, *Tarjoman al-Bilaghah* is also an imitation of
 14 *Mahasin al-Kalam* according to its author (Radaviani, 2001, 120). In this way, it
 15 can be said that the subject of metaphor in Persian rhetoric books has been
 16 influenced by Ibn Mu'tazz, but from this period on, there is no book left
 17 discussing metaphor or other rhetorical and literary topics.

18 19 The Second Period

20
 21 This period which is a developmental stage for metaphor and other
 22 rhetorical debates, began from the beginning of the fourth century and
 23 continued until the first half of the fifth century. Qadameh Ibn Ja'afar, Ghazi
 24 Jarjani, Romani, Abu helal Askari, Ibn Rashiq Qiravani and Ibn Sinan Khafaji
 25 are some of the prominent rhetoricians of this period. Each of them came from
 26 different parts of the Islamic world and Iran; therefore, they were able to
 27 introduce the rhetorical view of Muslim researchers pretty well. The most
 28 important features of the metaphor subject in this period are: 1) Criticism to
 29 the previous views: The rhyme adduction (muâzala) (Qadama, 1884, 66), an
 30 acceptable and unacceptable metaphor, or rejected that is known in other
 31 forms and synonyms, and repeated in the books of this period, shows a ruling
 32 critical look at the discussion of metaphor in this period. The basis of these
 33 categories is to pay attention to the clarity or ambiguity of the metaphor, to
 34 avoid the riddle and riddle making in it, and to avoid the metaphorical
 35 closeness to the truth. 2) Paying attention to the position of truth and trope
 36 (metaphor), in which metaphor will often be superior to truth, if it is used
 37 appropriately and is more useful than truth. 3) The metaphor in most of the
 38 books of this period is discussed under figures of speech (badi') in the general
 39 sense of the rhetorical science. 4) Metaphor is known as an independent
 40 rhetorical discussion, and each of the books in this period seeks to provide a
 41 definition for it. The theme of all definitions is the use of a word in a meaning
 42 other than its own determined meaning. Of course, as explained by the
 43 authors of this period, attention to the comparative ratios between the two

1 sides, unlike the preceding one, has reduced the metaphorical scope of the
 2 metaphor and clarified its boundaries. 5) Considering the difference between
 3 simile and metaphor, there is a common discussion in most of the books of
 4 this period, which does not lead to a definitive conclusion. Henceforth, it is a
 5 cause for difference in all periods of studies on metaphor. It has provoked
 6 controversy and turmoil in Farsi books to which we will refer later. The
 7 difference between metaphor and simile in this period is based on the
 8 elimination or preservation of the words of comparison and each side being
 9 true or trope. Only Ibn Sanan al-Khafaji shook the distinction by bringing up
 10 predestined words of comparison. He does not regard the elimination of the
 11 words of comparison as a metaphor "as words of comparison are omitted in
 12 the literal sense, and being omitted in the literal sense is like being mentioned"
 13 (Sheikhun, 1994, 30). 6) Mentioning criteria for metaphorical criticism:
 14 consistency of words and meanings, words and words in metaphor and no
 15 tongue twisting between them, avoidance of excesses in the use of metaphor,
 16 its formal aesthetics and its enlightening role, and above all, the
 17 proportionality and similarity between the metaphorical sides are some of the
 18 important criteria of metaphor criticism in the books of this period. 7) The
 19 utility and purpose of metaphor is prominently considered in the books of this
 20 period. Summary of the benefits of metaphor can be seen in *al-Sinaat* of
 21 Abu Helal Askari (Abu Helal Askari, 1993, 262). 8) The concern for the
 22 metaphor having an influence on the audience is also one of the interesting
 23 topics in the books of this period. 9) The audience's interest in discovering the
 24 beauties of metaphor in al-Ummah ibn Rashiqa is contemplative. Of course,
 25 this requires further research. (Sheikhun, 1994, 27). 10) Another point that is
 26 sometimes found in the books of this period is the necessity or unnecessary of
 27 metaphor in the language that has been precedent in Aristotle's works and it
 28 has been an axis to separate the classic and romantic view to metaphor. For
 29 example, Ibn Rashiqa Qiravani's theory can be mentioned in this regard, in
 30 which he does not consider metaphor as a necessity in the Arabic language
 31 (Ibn Rashiqa Qiravani, 2000, 1/344). This is found in Aristotle's works not only
 32 about the Arabic language, but also about all languages (Hawks, 2001, 56). The
 33 metaphor-researchers' view of this period is similar to that of Aristotle, which
 34 should be sought in translating Aristotle's works into Arabic during this
 35 period. What is prominent in the metaphorical view of this period is the
 36 analytical-critical view of the rhetorical writers who, without resorting to the
 37 excessive subdivisions that became commonplace afterwards, seek to analyze
 38 the construction of metaphor, its critique, its appealing and unappealing form
 39 and its benefit, the connection of metaphor to truth, and its relation to
 40 language and audience.

41 Although the discussion of metaphor in the Arabic books of this period had
 42 achieved remarkable growth and maturity, it began its improvement in
 43 Persian rhetoric as well. Between the second and the third period, the study of

metaphor in Persian rhetorical books started by *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, undergoing slight developments, this period is called the "emergence", 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; however, the first three books display a comprehensive review of all the metaphorical books in this period. The most important features of metaphor discussion at this stage are:

- 1) providing a brief definition of metaphor: The literal transition from one meaning to another, the metaphor being trope, and the likeness of similarity between the two meanings are among the most important points in these definitions.
- 2) In emergence 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 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 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

1 the Arabic rhetoric during the emergence period. In Arabic books, the terms
 2 rhyme adduction (Moa'zalah), as well as accepted and rejected similes come
 3 from a critical point of view, while exemplary critiques of Persian rhetorical
 4 criticism are restricted to general terms such as conceit and exquisite
 5 metaphor (Watwat, 1983, 29). Only in *al- Ma'ajam* of Shams Qais, metaphor
 6 criticism has been considered more, some of which is reminiscent of Ibn
 7 Mu'tazi's manner of providing subtle and unappealing metaphors (Shams
 8 Qais Razi, 1994, 9-318), and in some cases has come close to a critical view of
 9 the books in the second Arabic period. (Shams Qays Razi, 1994, 318). The
 10 reason for Shams Qais being highlighted in this feature is more relation with
 11 the Arabic rhetorical books. As mentioned by himself, Qais wrote his book in
 12 Arabic at the beginning (ibid, 32). 6) Most of the metaphorical evidences in the
 13 emergence books are Persian evidences except in *Hadā'iq al-sihr* of Rashid al-
 14 Din Watwat, in which Arabic evidence is prominent (Ibid, 32). However, it is
 15 noteworthy that some Persian rhetoric writers consciously turned to
 16 Persianism. This indicates that attention to the nature of the Persian language
 17 during this period is highlighted.

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

28 The Third Period

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

38 The metaphorical research of Abdul Qahir, which is more reflected in the
 39 book of *Asrar al-Balagha* than the *Dalael al-ijaz*, points to his mastery on the
 40 topic and his dominance on the subtleties, accuracies, capacity, and status of
 41 metaphor. His view is an analytical one and serves to explain and interpret his
 42 theory of poetry. In metaphorical debate, like most rhetorical arguments,
 43 Abdul Qahir is reluctant to phrase, although his analytical arguments are the

1 source of term- making for the rhetoricians in the later periods. He combines
 2 his theory with a lot of analytical evidences, and so there is no twist in his
 3 materials except being innovative. The most important arguments being
 4 raised by him in the discussion of metaphor are: 1) Critique of the former
 5 views; the belief that metaphor is a claim of meaning for an object, not quoting
 6 the name from the object (Jerjani, 1989, 532), critique of placing metaphor
 7 under figures of speech category "without being conditioned" (Jorjani, 1995,
 8 256) and finally the critique of former definitions of metaphor and their
 9 sufficiency in examples (Ibid: 16), are important criticisms of Abdul Qahir to
 10 the former views in the past 2) Attention to the position of metaphor in
 11 rhetoric books; Abdul Qahir believes that truth and trope, simile, allegory, and
 12 then metaphor, must be discussed respectively (Jorjani, 1995, 17). But for the
 13 sake of remarks not explicitly stated, he "starts his subject by metaphor" (Ibid,
 14 17). It seems that the preface of metaphor and trope in the Aristotelian
 15 tradition has subconsciously directed Abdul Qahir and some of the
 16 rhetoricians toward this way. This feature is also found in some Persian
 17 metaphorical emergence books such as the *Tarjoman al-Balagheh* and the
 18 *Hedayat al-Sahar*. 3) In defining metaphor, he refers to the non-transfer of the
 19 word, its meaning and its transmission, and the emphasis on the simile motif
 20 of metaphor. Therefore, contrary to the definition of former scholars, his
 21 definition is comprehensive, and synecdoche and cited declarations (I'lam
 22 Manqulah) do not fall under metaphor. 4) considering the conditions of
 23 metaphor making; unlike Aristotle, he believes that not every metaphor can be
 24 constructed from simile and he considers the medium of comparison having
 25 similar sources, its easy understanding, and the affirmation of the custom as
 26 the required conditions for making a metaphor. In short, he says: "The
 27 symmetry and the reason for the present and the custom must express your
 28 purpose" (Ibid, 151). 5) Paying attention to the purpose and benefit of
 29 metaphor: As he excessively praises metaphor, he also mentions some of its
 30 benefits: "In this worthy manner of expression, a new face of a unique
 31 immensity is being hidden" (Ibid, 24)" and it induces many meanings in short
 32 words "(Ibid). By the aid of metaphor, plants come to life, speaking and non-
 33 speaking creatures become fluent and eloquent and you find quiet and dumb
 34 things to be preachers. In this magnificent realm, short and inadequate
 35 meanings are enlightening and lively "(Ibid). 6) Avoiding term-making,
 36 though he speaks of many kinds of metaphors in *Dalail Al-Ajaz* and promises
 37 to talk about them elsewhere (Jerjani, 1989, 529); however, his promise never
 38 came true. In his discussion of metaphor, it can be said that all the types of
 39 metaphor that have been formed in the fourth period of metaphor
 40 development have been originated from his analytical discussions, although
 41 he does not make any terms for them. Rather than pursuing terminology, he
 42 thinks about the analysis of the argument and suggests a way to evaluate the
 43 types of metaphors. The argument of strong and weak metaphor could be

found here as well. The basis of this division is paying attention to the words of comparison, tenor, and vehicle. (Jerjani, 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 unveils the truth and eliminates doubt and hesitation" (Ibid, 36). There is not a very positive view of such applications in the books of Persian language (Genesis, 1362, 1362). Types such as the oxymoron and conformative metaphor (Vefaiah) are inspired by the discussions of Abdul Qahir in later periods.

He sometimes criticizes previous metaphorical types in rhetoric. Among them, there is the rhyme adduction mentioned by Qaddama ibn Ja'far for the first time, and not rejected by Abdul Qahir 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 considers 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 differences between simile and metaphor that 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 not simply possible (Ibid, 214). In addition to simile and metaphor, attention to the ratio of simile, allegory, and metaphor as 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 metaphor and allegory that has reached to the metaphorical level to be of the same nature (Jerjani, 1985, 119). This 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 (Jerjani, 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 the explicit metaphor is easier than the implicit one, and implicit hyperbole and its further avoidance of simile makes

1 it difficult to prove its metaphorical state. 9) Discussing the characteristics and
 2 introducing the best kind of metaphor; he knows a reinforcement of the words
 3 of comparison as a necessity for metaphor, so that tenor cannot be
 4 differentiated from vehicle (Ibid, 527). Abdul Qahir considers the simile and
 5 metaphor to be valuable because they are hard to find (Ibid, 214). 10) the
 6 comprehensive view of Abdul Qahir to figurative ascription (Esnad Majazi); at
 7 the end of *Asrar al-Bilaghah*, Abdul Qahir discusses rational trope, synecdoche
 8 and lexical trope. Although figurative ascription has been discussed in the
 9 Arabic books in the previous periods, he discusses it in order not to leave any
 10 ambiguity. This subject has attracted attention in the Farsi books of the second
 11 period and post- Safavid era as well. He mentions two types of figurative
 12 ascription, namely figurative and additive, and knows both to be of the same
 13 kind (Ibid, 245). In distinction of the figurative ascription that has a literal
 14 aspect with false speech, he emphasizes the consciousness and belief of the
 15 speaker. He believes that in the figurative ascription, the speaker uses
 16 consciousness, embedded reasoning, and the possibility of interpretation
 17 while speaking in a trope format, whereas in False speech it is unaware,
 18 manipulative, and unintelligible and used to deceive the audience. He,
 19 therefore, divides the figurative ascription into two ideological and literary
 20 categories (Ibid, 250). Abdul Qahir explicitly defines trope and its famous type
 21 as metaphor and allegory (Jorjani, 1989, 112). Thus, introducing trope that
 22 overlaps with the metaphor, especially the implicit metaphor, is in line with
 23 the religious needs of his era and has religious backgrounds. By this
 24 perspective, introducing this subject can be justified (Georgani, 1995, 250).
 25 Failure to pay attention to the religious motives of this debate will give rise to
 26 the turmoil in the following periods to which we will refer later. The
 27 discussion of the figurative ascription, as well as introducing its special and
 28 general types, and its benefits are completed in *Dalail al- Ijaz* (Jorjani, 1989,
 29 368). 11) Abdul Qahir's emphasis on the sentence and the context of the word
 30 in the subject of trope and metaphor (Jerjani, 1995, 266), his overview of the
 31 languages including Farsi, in the Metaphorical Discussion, and not
 32 considering Arabic language superior to other languages in studies on
 33 metaphor (Ibid: 20), the discussion about the meaning of meaning regarding
 34 trope (Jerjani, 1989, 332), paying attention to some metaphors that constitute
 35 components of a compound (Ibid, 121 and 162), emphasis on the relativity of
 36 ugliness and the beauty of metaphor (Jerjani, 1995, 161) are some of the
 37 prominent points considered by Abdul Qahir in the issues on metaphor. Some
 38 of his arguments, such as the discussion of "meaning of meaning," pioneered
 39 the theories of contemporary Western scholars (Attic, n.d, 258), and some of
 40 his theories, such as the superiority of collective metaphor to the single
 41 metaphor supported with evidence and explanations, have not been studied
 42 accurately in studies on metaphor (Jorjani, 1989, 121). In short, Abd al-Qahir's
 43 view is a collection of the old and contemporary views, 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 Qur'anic evidences for metaphor and other rhetorical topics, Zamakhshari uses the analyses and interpretations of Abdul Qahir to name the types 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 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 the presence of Abdul Qahir's works.

The Fourth Period

Beginning in the seventh century and continuing until today, this period is dominated by the views of the Arabic-writing Iranians such as 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 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 still continues. Most of the rhetorical books of the Safavid, Zandieh, Afsharieh, Qajarieh, and Pahlavi era are in the second period. For instance, we can refer to writings such as *Anwar al-Balagha* by Mohammad Hadi bin Mohammad Saleh

1 Mazandarani, *Bayan al-badi's Excerpts* by Mirza Abutaleb Fanderski, *Motale'* by
 2 Razi al-Din Mohammad, *Abda al-Badai* by Shams al-Alma'a Garkani, *Mu'allam*
 3 *al-Balagha* by Mohammad Khalil al-Raja'I and *Dorar al-Adab* by hesam al-
 4 Alma'a Aagh Ula. The rhetoricians of this period are trapped and stagnated on
 5 the pretext that the past has left nothing for the future and there is nothing to
 6 add to the rhetorical debate.

7 The most important features of Sakkaki's vision are that: 1) he places the
 8 discussion of metaphor under the figurative language (Bayan) the initiator of
 9 which is Abdul Qahir Jarjani and it is stabilized by Sakkaki. 2) Sakkaki's
 10 definition of metaphor is not an invention, but it is interesting in that it is
 11 defined in relation to simile. As opposed to the Aristotelian tradition and even
 12 against the primacy of the metaphor in Abdul Qahir, the simile is first
 13 discussed and then metaphor is defined in such a way that its relation to the
 14 simile becomes apparent. The point noted in Sakkaki's definition is the
 15 elimination or retention of the two sides of simile. That is, his definition refers
 16 to the implicit and explicit metaphor, while the definitions of the past often
 17 emphasized the elimination of tenor and the formation of explicit metaphor,
 18 though their evidence was often of the implicit type. This characteristic raised
 19 questions in the audience's mind. Sakkaki fixed this defect. He regards
 20 metaphor as a rational trope, not a lexical one, and speaks of Abdul Qahir's
 21 hesitation between lexical and rational trope (Sakkaki, no date, 157). What is
 22 prominent in Sakkaki's explanation is his special attention to symmetry and
 23 divides it into two types of single meanings and related meanings, which of
 24 course existed in previous eras; however, Sakkaki's has more emphasis on this
 25 subject (ibid, 159). The important point is that with the introduction of
 26 variants such as diminishing (Tahkamiah) and Sarcasm (Tamliah) and the
 27 long-standing justifications for them, Sakaki virtually excludes the discussion
 28 of metaphor from vigor. Justifications are also translated and repeated in
 29 Persian books (Ibid, 159). In Sakaki's metaphorical discourses, the reduction of
 30 analytical and interesting aspects and the addition of the metaphorical types
 31 are prominent. He added types such as definite and probabilistic that do not
 32 help much to the metaphorical discussion and some types such as the
 33 diminishing and submerged metaphors that are incompatible with the
 34 definition of metaphor, and they can be mentioned under the category of
 35 metaphor just by using artifice and pretension. In general, Sakkaki can be
 36 seen as an extremist imitator of Abdul Qahir Jarjani, Zakhakhri and Fakhr
 37 razi, and there is a fact that if he had not come up with the metaphorical and
 38 other rhetorical arguments, these arguments would have been more effective.

39 Khatib Qazvini repeated similar content to what Sakaki stated in *Iza'ah* and
 40 *Talkhis*. In the preface of *Talkhis*, Qazvini praises Sakkaki and regards his work
 41 as interpreting and removes that from the hassle (Ibid.: 37). He has collected
 42 the previous definitions to prepare a definition for metaphor (Khatib, 2008,
 43 151). The symmetry types in Khatib are divided into three types of single,

1 numerous, and related meanings, summarized by Sakaki in two types (Ibid,
 2 153). In addition, he divides the metaphor into six types based on its triple
 3 components (tenor, vehicle, general), which were divided into five types in
 4 Sakkaki (Ibid, 156). The "symmetry criteria of metaphor in verb", which was
 5 the subject and verb in Abdul Qahir and Sakaki, was increased in Khatib by
 6 the addition of the genitive noun (Majrur) (Ibid, 158). He added absolute
 7 metaphor to the stipulated and abstract metaphors explained in Sakkaki,
 8 although they were not named (Ibid, 158). In the summary, he prefers the
 9 stipulated metaphor to the other types because it does not pay attention to
 10 simile but increases hyperbole (Ibid, 159). Khatib, despite being a follower of
 11 Sakkaki, has criticized some of his views in pages 163-162 of *Talkhis*. In the
 12 definition of the lexical trope, he disagrees with Sakkaki in that allegory is a
 13 part of the explicit metaphor and the abstract trope; and disagrees that
 14 submerged metaphor goes back to the implicit metaphor. Taftazani in
 15 *Mottawal*, as mentioned in the preface, explains *Talkhis al-Miftah Qazvini* and
 16 its errors (Taftazani, 1995, 4). In a comparative study of the Arabic and Persian
 17 rhetoric, Taftazani can be attributed to the association of the Persian books of
 18 the second period with the metaphor-research issues of Sakaki and his essays.
 19 This point is mentioned in most of the books of the second Persian period
 20 (Fanderski, 2002, 15; Saleh Mazandarani, 1997, 20). Therefore, the metaphor
 21 research flow in the fourth and second periods of Persian literature is quite
 22 adaptive, and there is no remarkable point in the Persian books except in the
 23 Persian evidence and sometimes in summarizing contents. In spite of the
 24 imitation in Persian books in the second period, unfortunately the main
 25 framework of the metaphor in today's Persian books is a reminder of this
 26 period.

27 In sum, in the context and content of the fourth Arabic and second Persian
 28 studies of metaphor that goes towards useless recession, stagnation and
 29 prolixity, the mainstream of Egyptian and Yemeni metaphor research in
 30 Arabic and Persian trends in the Persian tend to revive the original studies of
 31 metaphor-research. It is a popular trend in Persian and Arabic, and in addition
 32 to its origins, it can be considered as a foundation for a new perception to
 33 metaphor.

34 The Fifth Period

35
 36
 37 This period can be seen as an age of modernism and a new perspective at
 38 the rhetorical issues in general, and metaphor in particular. Rhetorical and
 39 metaphorical research in Arabic and Persian entered a new era after a long
 40 period of stagnation beginning from the first half of the seventh century and
 41 the rise of Sakkaki, and continued until the early years of the fourteenth
 42 century. The modernist rhetoricians opposed stagnation. Understanding the
 43 necessity of changing rhetorical studies, expanding educational and academic

centers, and the necessity of developing educational and comprehensible textbooks to teach rhetorical topics led to the creation of critical works on rhetorical topics. Therefore, the educational, research, and critical aspects of 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 explicitly found in the Persian books of the third period (Forouzanfar, 1997, 3 and Homayi, 1995, 183). The following are some of the most important features of metaphorical issues 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. Reference to the simile base of metaphor, elimination of one of the sides and attention to the two main metaphors, namely implicit and explicit while defining the metaphor, emphasis on the simile interest between the parts, and the need for symmetry in the metaphor are among points that have perfected the definition of metaphor and have prevented it from being confused with other tropes. Finally, with a clear explanation of the limits of metaphors, we come to a succinct definition: "Metaphor is a trope with simile interest" (Ameli, -2012, 142). The interesting point here is that despite the complete definition of metaphor in the books of this period, following the books of the first and second periods, explicit metaphor comes to mind, but the evidence shows 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 ideas of Arabic and Persian rhetoricians which originates from their visions. That is to say, the Arabic rhetoricians have paid 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 have 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 role of symmetry in the formation of the stipulated, abstract, and absolute metaphor is appealing to the metaphor researchers in this period. Among the rhetoricians of this period, Shamisa has a different view of the symmetry role in the stipulation and abstraction of metaphor, which is contemplative, and illustrates the accuracy of his views (Shamisa, 1999, 160). Following the earlier rhetorical books, some Arabic books divided 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, & 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 were 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 attracts 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 on the relation between 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 metaphor (Zubeyi, Halawi, 1996, 95).

Attention to the relation between 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 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 this regard, 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 Arabic books of this period have focused on this subject although it has not received much attention in the Persian books.

The Types of Metaphor Criticism

What is disturbing the metaphorical subject is the formation of different terms and variations. sometimes the philosophy of the type formation is unclear and 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. 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 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. These rhetoricians only explain and provide evidence for the explicit, implicit, and allegorical metaphor. They know explicit and implicit metaphors as the most important types of metaphor and 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 by discussing various types. Perhaps the Arabic origin of these types persuades the Arab rhetoricians 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 *Uloom 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 attempt 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-'Uloom* and continued by his followers and commentators (Sheikun, 1994 AD, 67); while some of the former rhetoricians were reluctant to get into non-rhetorical debates. As it is written about Abu Hulal Askari: "He explicitly says that he did not compose his work in the manner of theologians, but rather it was written in the style of poets and writers who are cultivators of speech" (Atiq, Beta, 198). The result of abundant 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 (Forouzanfar, 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 between the works by Khawaja Nasir al-Din Tusi and Aristotle's works in the seventh century also imposes a link between Sakaki's and the Greek's viewpoints.

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 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 research on metaphor. Of course, if this path is not investigated seriously, the prospect will not be promising.

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

An Analytical look at metaphor

The aesthetic aspects of metaphor and its analytical perspectives 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 to trope, the power of its imagination, the amplification of the word, the multiplication of meanings and the accuracy of expression, creating happiness (Hashemi, 2011, 281), bringing meaning to the mind, arousing the imagination, the power of persuasion (Maraghi, 1993, 281), good imagery, 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 extended to literary texts and their metaphors as well (Sheikhun, 1994, 83).

The rhetorical position of metaphor in most of the books in the fifth period 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 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 metaphorical 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, whereas it has received little attention in the earlier periods (Maraghi, 1993, 268). In the third period of Farsi metaphor-research, there is not much analytical view in the books 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 although they are weak in comparison to those in Arabic books.

A Criticism of Negligence to the Nature of the Persian Language

Nature of Persian language is the characteristic of Persian books. It should be indicated that Arabic language has long been the source of rhetorical debates, and except sporadic sentences that have criticized Greekism of the Arabic rhetoricians, there is no mention of negligence to the nature of 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 point more than others. In current studies, Arabic and Persian language and their characteristics are lost and threatened in the face of the Western dominant research so they require more serious attention.

Nativism in the rhetorical and metaphorical discourse 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 Tharvatan, that does not seem to be helping the problems of rhetoric and metaphor.

Conclusion

The rises and falls of metaphorical discussions in Arabic books preceded the ones in Persian books. In the first, second, and early years of the third period, a book on the subject of metaphor in Persian had not yet been compiled so it is not possible to study metaphor in Arabic and Persian during the same period. 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 period in Arabic. Likewise, the second and third period of Persian metaphor is matched with the fourth and fifth period in Arabic respectively. 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 movements were influenced by Western research, and if this negligence toward native researches continues in two above languages, 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, paying attention to the nature of languages when using other nations' research, and finally, preserving the imaginary aspects of the metaphor in contrast to the merely scientific approach of some schools and theories are among areas for further study in future Arabic and Persian research.

Bibliography

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 Abuhelal Askari, Hassan bin Abdullah bin Soheil. 1993. *Me'yar al Balagheh*.
5 Translation of the Book of Sana'atain translated by Mohammad Javad
6 Nasiri. Tehran: University of Tehran.
- 7 Abbas, Muhammad. 2008. *Abdul Qahir Jarjani and New Perspectives on Literary*
8 *Criticism*. Translated by Maryam Musharraf. Tehran: Nashcheshmeh.
- 9 Agh Ula, Abdul Hussein. 1994. *In Dorar al- Adab*. Qom: Hijra.
- 10 Al-Ameli, al-Sheikh Moien Daghigh. 2012. *Dorous Fi al- Balagheh*. Beirut: Dar
11 Jawad al-A'mah.
- 12 Aljarm, Ali & Amin, Mustafa. 2012. *Al-Balagheh al-Wahdah*. Qom: Zawi-al-
13 Qirbi.
- 14 Al-Maraghi, al-Mustafa. 1993. *Ulum al Balagheh*. Lebanon-Beirut: Dar al-Kutab
15 al-Umayyah.
- 16 Al-Maraghi, al-Mustafa. *Mahasen al-Kalam*. Edited by Mohammad Fesharaki.
17 Isfahan: Isfahan Cultural Center.
- 18 Al-Mobarad, Abi al-Abbas Mohammed bin Yazid. 2010. *Al-Kamel, Al-Jazeera*
19 *Al-Awl*. Edited by Mohammed Abolfazl Ibrahim. Beirut: Al-Maktaba Al-
20 Assariyah.
- 21 Althimi al-Timi, Abi Abideh Moammar. 1981. *Majaz al Quran, Al-Jazeera Al-*
22 *Aul*. Edited by Mohammad Fad Sezkin. Beirut: al-Rasala Institute.
- 23 Al-Sakkaki. *Miftah Al-Alum*. Qom: Urmia Library Publications.
- 24 Al-Sayyed Sheikhun, Muhammad. 1994. *Metaphor, Its Genesis and Evolution*.
25 2nd ed. Dar al-Hidayah.
- 26 Al-Zuba'i, Talib Mohammed and Halawi, Nasser. 1996. *Al-Bayyan and al-*
27 *Badieh*. Beirut: Dar al-Nazeja al-Arabiya and Al-Jawrah.
- 28 Amarati Moqaddam, David. 2016. *Rhetoric from Athens to Medina*. Tehran:
29 Hermes.
- 30 Attfazani. 1995. *Al-Matool*. Qom: Dawari School.
- 31 Attiq, Abdulaziz. 2016. *The history of the Arabic rhetoric*. Beirut: Dar al-Nahda
32 al-Arabia.
- 33 Fouruzanfar, Badi Alzaman. 1997. *Ma'a:ni and Bayan*. Edited by Seyyed
34 Mohammad dabir Siaghi. Tehran: Academy of Persian Language and
35 Literature, Letter of the Academy, Annex 3.
- 36 Fundersky, Mirza Abutaleb. 2002. *Excerpts of the exquisite Bayan*, Corrected by
37 Seyedeh Maryam Ravatian, First Edition. Isfahan: Islamic Propaganda
38 Office of Isfahan Branch.
- 39 Haghshenas, Ali Mohammed. 1991. *Literary, Linguistic Papers, "The*
40 *Classification of Jarjani Metaphor, Special Reference to the Classification of*
41 *Aristotle's Metaphor"*. 1st ed. Tehran: Niloufar.

- 1 Hashimi, Ahmad. 2011. *Jawahir al-Balagheh*. Edited, Translated and
2 Transcribed by Mahmoud Khorsandi, Hamid Masjidarai. Tehran: Payam
3 Noavar Publications (Former Islamic Law).
- 4 Hawks, Trance. 2001. *Metaphor*. 2nd ed. Translated by Farzaneh Taheri.
5 Tehran: Center Publishing.
- 6 Hedayat, Reza Gholi Khan. 2004. *Madarij al-Balagheh*. 1st ed. Edited by Hamid
7 Hassani, Contribution by Behrouz Safarzadeh. Tehran: Academy of
8 Persian Language and Literature.
- 9 Homai, Jalaluddin. 1995. *Meanings and figurative language*. 3rd ed. Tehran:
10 Homa Publishing.
- 11 Hosseini Nishaburi, Burhanuddin Attaullah Mahmoud. 2005. *Badia-al-Sanayah*,
12 1st ed. Correction of Rahim Muslim Ghobadiani. Tehran: Mahmoud
13 Afshar Endowment Foundation.
- 14 Ibn Mu'tazid, Abdullah bin Mohammed. 2016. *Al-Badi*. Translated and Edited
15 by Yahya Kardgar & Bahauddin Eskandari. Qom: Bustan e Ketab
16 Institute.
- 17 Ibn Nadim, Muhammad bin Isaac. 1967. *Al-Fihrist*. 2nd ed. Translated by M.
18 Reza Tajadod, Tehran: Iran Commercial Bank Printing House.
- 19 Ibn Rashi al-Qirwani, Abi Ali al-Hasan. 2000. *Al-Umda*. (Vol. 1), Edited by
20 Salah al-Din al-Hawari, A. Hoda Oudah. Beirut: Dar al-Hilal.
- 21 Jahiz. 1926. *Albian and al-Tabin*. Edited by Hasan al-Sandoubi. Qom: Urmia
22 Library Publications.
- 23 Jarjani, Abdul Qahir. 1926. *Dalail Al-Ijaz Fi al- Quran*. Translated by Seyyed
24 Mohammad Radmanesh. Mashhad: Astan Quds Razavi.
- 25 Jarjani, Abdul Qahir. *Asrar Balagheh*. 4th ed. Translated by Jalil Tajliz. Tehran:
26 University of Tehran, 1995.
- 27 Kazazi, Mir Jalaluddin. 1991. *Bayan*. 2nd ed. Tehran: Center Publishing.
- 28 Khattib al-Qawzwini. 2008. *Talkhis al-Miftah*. Edited by Yassin Al-Aubi. Beirut:
29 Al-Maktabah al-Assariyah.
- 30 Moqimizadeh, Mohammad Mehdi. 2015. *Metaphor in Islamic Rhetoric*. Tehran:
31 Tahora.
- 32 Qodamah ibn Ja'afar. 1884. *Naqd al- Shi'r*. 1st ed. Constantinople: Javanib
33 Publication.
- 34 Taftazani, Sa'daldin. 2003. *Mokhtasar al Ma'ani*. Qom: Dar al-Fakr Publications.
- 35 Taj al-Halawi, Ali bin Mohammed. 2004. *Daghaigh al Shi'r*. Edited by
36 Mohammad Kazem Imam. Tehran: University of Tehran.
- 37 Tharwatian, Behrouz. 1999. *Bayan in Persian Poetry*. Tehran: Barg Publishing.
- 38 Thaqlab. 1995. *Qawaid al Shi'r*. Edited by Ramadan Abdul Tawab. Cairo:
39 Maktabah al-Khanji.
- 40 Radavian, Mohammad bin Omar. 2001. *Tarjoman al-Balagha*. 1st ed. Edited by
41 Ahmad Atash, with the effort and translation of the introduction by
42 Tofigh. H. Sobhani - Esmaeil Hakami. Tehran: Association of Cultural
43 Works.

- 1 Rajaie, Mohammad Khalil. 1993. *Ma'alim al- Balagheh*. 3rd ed. Shiraz: Shiraz
- 2 University.
- 3 Rami Tabrizi, Sharafuddin Hassan bin Mohammed. 1962. *Haqqaiq al-Hadeq*. 1st
- 4 ed. Edited by Seyyed Mohammad Kazem Imam. Tehran: University of
- 5 Tehran.
- 6 Sadeq Saeed, Ehsan. 2000. *Rhetorical Sciences in Arabic and Persian*. Damascus:
- 7 Islamic Republic of Iran Cultural Consultation, Iranian-Arabic Cultural
- 8 Research Unit.
- 9 Saleh Mazandarani, Mohammad Hadi bin Mohammad. 1997. *Anwar al-*
- 10 *Balagheh*. 1st ed. Edited by Mohammad Ali Gholaminejad. Tehran: Qibla
- 11 Cultural Center, and Heritage Publishing Office.
- 12 Safavi, Kuroush. 2004. *From Linguistics to Literature*. Volume 2: Poetry, 1st ed.
- 13 Tehran: Surah Mehr.
- 14 Safavi, Kuroush. 2017. *Metaphor*. 1st ed. Tehran: Scientific Publication.
- 15 Shafie Kadkani, Mohammad Reza. 1993. *Sowarr e- khiyal in Persian Poetry*. 5th
- 16 ed. Tehran: Agah.
- 17 Shafie Mostofi, Raziyeeddin Mohammad bin Mohammad. 2010. *Mat'lah*, MSc
- 18 Thesis. Qom: Qom University.
- 19 Shams al-Alma'i Garkani, Haj Mohammad Hussein. 1998. *Abda' al Badayah*. 1st
- 20 ed. by Hossein Jafari, with introduction of Jalil Tajliz. Tabriz: Aharar.
- 21 Shams Fakhri Isfahani. 2010. *Me'yar Jamali*. 1st ed. Edited by Yahya Kardgar.
- 22 Tehran: Library, Museum and Document Center of the Majlis.
- 23 Shams Razi, Razi. 1994. *Al-Mujamm fi Ma'ayar Asha'r al-Ajam*. Edited by the
- 24 efforts of Sirus Shamisa, First Edition. Tehran: Ferdows.
- 25 Shemisa, Sirus. 1999. *Bayan*. 7th ed. Tehran: Ferdows.
- 26 Waiz Kashefi Sabzevari, Kamaluddin Hussein. 1990. *Badayah al- Afkar fi*
- 27 *Sanayah al-Asha'r*. Edited by Mir Jalaeddin Kazazi. 1st ed. Tehran: Center
- 28 Publishing.
- 29 Watwat. 1983. *Hedayegh al-Sahar fi Daqayaq al-Sha'ir*. 1st ed. Edited by Abbas
- 30 Iqbal Ashtiani. Tehran: Taheri & Sanai Library.
- 31 Zaif, Shoughi. 2004. *History and notation of rhetorical science*. Translated
- 32 by Mohammad Reza Torki. Tehran: Side.
- 33