



The Application of Colina's Model of Translation Quality Assessment to the Translation of Some Figurative Expressions from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar into Arabic

Ruaa Farooq Mohammad 

Department of Translation / College of Arts / University of Mosul / Mosul - Iraq

Luqman Abdulkareem Nasser 

Department of Translation / College of Arts / University of Mosul / Mosul - Iraq

Article Information

Article History:

Received Apr 18, 2025

Revised May 01, 2025

Accepted May 18, 2025

Available Online December , 2025

Keywords:

Colina,
Translation,
Figure,
Arabic,
English

Correspondence:

Ruaa Farooq Mohammad

ruaa.23arp182@student.uomosul.edu.iq

Abstract

In this paper , Colina's Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) model to the translation of figures of speech is examined . The study emphasizes how adaptable and successful this model is at assessing translations according to their intended uses and contextual elements. It also investigates how figurative language, in particular personifications, similes, and metaphors, can improve communication by expressing meanings that go beyond the literal. The study illustrates the model's applicability for evaluating literary translations by examining a few chosen figures of speech from Julius Caesar by William Shakespeare and four of its Arabic translations. The study has concluded that Colina's TQA model offers a trustworthy framework for assessing the caliber and suitability of translated figurative language.

DOI: [10.33899/radab.2025.159255.2359](https://doi.org/10.33899/radab.2025.159255.2359), ©Authors, 2023, College of Arts, University of Mosul.

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

تطبيق نموذج كولينا لتقييم جودة الترجمة على ترجمة بعض العبارات المجازية من مسرحية يوليوس قيصر لشكسبير إلى اللغة العربية

رؤى فاروق محمد * لقمان عبدالكريم ناصر **

ملخص

يدرس هذا البحث نموذج كولينا لتقييم جودة الترجمة (TQA) وبطريقه على ترجمة بعض العبارات المجازية . إذ تؤكد الدراسة على مدى مرونة هذا النموذج ونجاحه في تقييم الترجمات وفقاً لاستخداماتها المقصودة وعناصرها السياقية. كما تبحث الدراسة في كيفية مساهمة اللغة المجازية، وخاصةً المجاز والتشبيه والاستعارات، في تحسين التواصل من خلال التعبير عن معاني تتجاوز المعنى الحرفي. وتوضح الدراسة مدى قابلية تطبيق النموذج لتقييم الترجمات الأدبية من خلال إجراء فحص عملي لبعض العبارات المجازية المختارة من مسرحية

* قسم الترجمة/ كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل / الموصل -العراق

** قسم الترجمة/ كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل / الموصل -العراق

يوليوس قيصر لويليام شكسبير وأربع من ترجماتها العربية. ووفقًا للنتائج، يُقدم نموذج كولينا لتقييم جودة الترجمة إطارًا موثوقًا لتقييم جودة وملاءمة اللغة المجازية المترجمة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: كولينا، ترجمة، مجاز، عربي، إنكليزي.

Introduction

Translation is a difficult process that calls for knowledge of the functional and contextual aspects of both the source and target texts in addition to linguistic competence. Beyond strict linguistic equivalency, the functionalist approach to translation—especially Skopos theory—focuses on the goal and communicative function of the translation. Skopos theory, which was first presented by Hans Vermeer in 1978, highlights that the main objective of any translation is to achieve its intended purpose, which can change based on the audience, context, and cultural setting.

Models such as Colina's componential-functional approach to Translation Quality Assessment (TQA), which assesses translations by considering both linguistic features and their alignment with the text's communicative function, have been made possible by this theoretical shift. Colina's model combines a functionalist framework with empirical analysis to provide a more dynamic and goal-oriented approach to evaluating translation quality.

The handling of figurative language is another crucial component of successful translation, particularly in literary contexts. Metaphors, similes, and personifications are examples of figures of speech that are essential for enhancing language, adding aesthetic value, and expressing meanings that go beyond the literal. To maintain the emotional and rhetorical impact of such figures, translations must be sensitive to linguistic subtleties as well as cultural connotations.

In order to provide a thorough method for evaluating translations, this paper incorporates functionalist theories and figurative language studies into Colina's model. This study shows how Colina's TQA model can be used to evaluate the functional sufficiency and aesthetic fidelity of figurative expressions in translation by examining a few figures of speech from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and their Arabic translations.

Skopos Theory and Methods of Functionalism

The functionalist approach to translation places more emphasis on the text's overall goal and moves away from precise linguistic equivalency to the translation's communicative purpose. According to this viewpoint, a translator's ability to fulfill the intended purpose of the source text within a particular cultural and situational context is more important than how closely it follows the original text's structure.

Skopos theory, first presented by Vermeer in 1978, is one of the fundamental models of this methodology. According to Skopos theory, a translation's success is primarily determined by its capacity to accomplish its intended purpose, or "skopos," in the target context. According to this model, the source text is seen as raw material that can be modified to meet the needs of the intended audience, cultural norms, and communication goals. Vermeer underlined that appropriateness is decided by purpose and that there is no one "correct" translation.

This concept is consistent with Nida's previous dynamic equivalency theory (1976, 1982), which holds that translations ought to try to evoke in the target audience the same reaction that the original elicited in its source audience. Unlike formal equivalence, which emphasizes structural fidelity, dynamic equivalence prioritizes meaning and audience impact. Nida's linguistic approach introduced the idea that translations must consider cultural and experiential relevance to be effective.

Further development within the functionalist framework is seen in Nord's pedagogical model for translation (1991, 1997, 2007), which introduced the concept of "situation-in-culture." Nord argued that a

translation must be analyzed within the context of its cultural environment, and she provided a detailed checklist

House (1977, 1997) also contributed significantly to Translation Quality Assessment with a model that evaluates translations on three primary dimensions: functional adequacy (the extent to which a translation fulfills its communicative purpose), textual adequacy (the preservation of coherence and cohesion), and content accuracy. House categorized texts into genres—informative, expressive, operative, and audio-medial—each requiring distinct translation strategies. She also introduced the distinction between overt translations (which remain visible as translations) and covert translations (which are seamlessly integrated into the target culture).

Colina further advanced the field with her componential-functional model of TQA (2003, 2008, 2015). She critiques earlier anecdotal and purely theoretical models for being either too subjective or impractical. Instead, she proposes an empirical, testable model grounded in functionalist theory, which evaluates translations based on both textual features (like coherence and cohesion) and functional alignment with the target context. Colina's model allows for customization based on the intended use of the translation, making it applicable in a wide range of academic and professional settings.

Key Contributions

The main contributions in this regard include Vermeer (1978) in his ideas on Skopos theory . Another contribution is that of Nord (1991, 1997, 2007) . House (1977, 1997) added more about genre-based strategies, functional adequacy, and textual adequacy during the same time period. In her empirical, functionalist model for TQA, Colina (2003, 2008, 2015) placed a strong emphasis on textual coherence and functional appropriateness. In conclusion, the functionalist method provides a versatile and context-sensitive framework for translation, especially through Skopos theory and its associated models. These models emphasize that, particularly when working with intricate rhetorical devices like figures of speech, successful translation involves more than just maintaining linguistic accuracy; it also involves achieving communicative objectives.

Colina's Functional-Componential Model

Sonia Colina's contributions to Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) stem from her conviction that translation theory ought to offer useful, verifiable frameworks rather than being an arbitrary or abstract field. A notable development within the functionalist paradigm is Colina's functional-componential model (2003, 2008, 2015), which blends linguistic theory with empirical testing.

Colina criticizes previous TQA models for depending too much on subjective assessment, anecdotal evidence, or general theoretical presumptions that haven't been put into practice. Her method, on the other hand, is based on a functional interpretation of translation that emphasizes the necessity of a methodical and contextually aware examination of the source and target texts. Colina argues that translation is the process of modifying a text to fit a new culture, context, and communication goal rather than just a linguistic conversion.

Because it divides the essential components of a translation into distinct elements that can be evaluated separately, her model is componential. These components include, among others, lexical choice, coherence, cohesion, syntax, and pragmatic considerations. Colina's model provides a comprehensive assessment of a translation's efficacy by looking at how these elements work in the target text. The alignment between the communicative intent of the source text and the target text's capacity to accomplish comparable goals within the target audience is given special attention.

Colina's model places a strong emphasis on empiricism. Colina's framework enables the practical evaluation of translations using actual data, in contrast to strictly theoretical approaches that place an emphasis on abstract principles. This makes it possible for assessors to determine the success of a translation by looking at particular, quantifiable results, like how well the translation achieves its intended

communicative objectives. Colina adds that by identifying particular strengths and shortcomings in terms of functional adequacy, this empirical approach makes it easier to compare various translations for the same source text.

Furthermore, Colina emphasizes that a translation's success is greatly influenced by contextual factors. These elements include the genre of the text, the expectations of the target audience, and the cultural context in which the translation will be received. According to Colina's model, the translator must take into account the sociocultural dynamics of the target community in addition to the text's linguistic components. This realization is consistent with the main tenets of Skopos theory, which supports translation tactics informed by the target text's function and goal in its new context.

In actuality, Colina's model offers a flexible and exacting framework for assessing translations. It is applicable in a number of fields, including technical translation, literary translation, and audiovisual translation, because of its functional focus, which enables it to take into consideration the subtleties of various translation scenarios. Additionally, the componential analysis makes sure that no element of the translation—such as word choice, sentence construction, or cultural quirks—is missed during the evaluation process.

Crucial Elements of Colina's Model:

The main features of this model is the componential Analysis in which translation is analysed into measurable components (e.g., coherence, cohesion, pragmatics). Testing the efficacy of translation using actual data and quantifiable results is part of the analysis. Context sensitivity is addressed in another section of this model. This entails realizing how important situational, cultural, and audience-based elements are to the success of translation. The model can be regarded as a holistic assessment that offers a comprehensive evaluation of both linguistic and functional aspects of the translation .

Figures of Speech

Figurative language is an expressive form of communication that goes beyond the literal meanings of words to convey deeper, more imaginative ideas. It employs figures of speech such as metaphors, similes, personifications, and symbols to enhance the richness of language. Kennedy (1979) considers figurative language as language that utilizes figures of speech to present ideas or emotions in a more creative and vivid manner. Perrine (1981) agrees, noting that figurative language relies on unconventional or metaphorical expressions to communicate complex thoughts and feelings that cannot be fully captured by literal language.

The main goal of figurative language is to enrich the expression of ideas. Tajali (2003) explains that it serves three key purposes: clarity, force, and beauty. By departing from straightforward meanings, figures of speech make language more engaging and expressive. Gray (2008) describes figures of speech as any grammatical or expressive form that deviates from the most direct way of conveying meaning. Often referred to as "poetic ornaments," these expressions allow authors to communicate more indirectly, creating a more layered and nuanced message. Personifications, which give inanimate objects human characteristics, and metaphors, which compare one thing to another to improve understanding, are two examples.

Rich connotative meanings are provided by figures of speech from a linguistic standpoint. According to Regmi (2015), they offer linguistic and emotional depth in addition to a literal interpretation. Figures of speech encourage listeners to see past literal interpretations and consider language in a more symbolic or figurative manner. This is further supported by Gautam (2014), who claims that a figure of speech adds layers of meaning and increases the impact of a message by expressing something that goes beyond its literal sense.

Figurative language is a potent means of communication, not just a decorative tool. According to Khairunnisa and Juanda (2022), it is a technique for emphasizing a point by employing words or phrases whose meanings deviate from their literal interpretation. It enables writers and speakers to convey ideas

and feelings in a more imaginative and creative way. Furthermore, Kamali and Juanda (2024) point out that figurative language is frequently used to give expressions emphasis, variation, and hidden meanings. Figurative language offers a distinctive way of expressing ideas by transcending the literal, arousing feelings, conjuring images, and more successfully holding the attention of the audience.

To sum up, figurative language is crucial for improving communication. It allows speakers and writers to express ideas in a more vivid, indirect, and engaging way. Language becomes more dynamic when figures of speech are used to express deeper meanings and feelings that the audience can relate to. Figurative language, whether employed in literature, everyday speech, or creative writing, gives ideas life that is not possible with literal language.

Data analysis

The following are some selected cases of figures of speech taken from Julius Caesar. The analysis includes giving the interpretation of the selected figure and then analysis of four Arabic renditions depending on Colina's model to test the applicability of this model and to assess the four renditions accordingly. The table of analysis is followed by a discussion of the appropriateness of the translations .

1. Simile

"Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world like a Colossus" Act 1, Scene 2

Interpretation

The line "Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world like a Colossus" is spoken by Cassius in Act 1, Scene 2 of William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. The setting of this scene is a public place in Rome, near the Forum. The characters present include Brutus, Cassius, and several others who are discussing Julius Caesar's growing power and influence. In this scene, Cassius is trying to persuade Brutus to join the conspiracy against Caesar. Cassius uses the metaphor of a "Colossus" to describe how Caesar has become so powerful and dominant that he seems to tower over the world, like the Colossus of Rhodes, one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. The "narrow world" refers to how small and insignificant Cassius and others feel in comparison to Caesar's might. Cassius expresses his frustration and resentment towards Caesar's perceived dominance and the fact that others, including Brutus, allow Caesar to rise to such a position of power. This metaphor is meant to stir Brutus's feelings and persuade him to act against Caesar.

LT	1. Why, man , he doth bestride the narrow world like a colossus (p:7 , l:37) (simile)	Colina model of TQA				Appr op.
	TLT	Qualit y of content	Functional Adequacy			
			Aestheti c value	Intentionali ty	Figura tive	
1	(تتنبه ايها الرجل .. انه يخطو الآن بقدميه في عالمنا الضيق في مشية كمشية العملاق الضخم (p:31 , l:19	-	+	+	+	-
2	(أي رجل انه ليركب الخافقين كالتمثال (p:15 , l: 19) الهائل)	+	-	-	+	-

3	(لا جرم، انه ليذرع رقعة الارض الضيقة بفسيح خطواته كأنه المارد) (p:16 , l: 3)	+	+	+	+	+
4	(انه ليركب متن الدنيا كالتمثال الهائل الذي تتضاءل تحته الاشياء) (p:75, l:11)	-	-	-	+	-

Discussion

In this example , the figure of speech “Why, man , he doth bestride the narrow world like a colossus” is a simile in which there is an explicit indication of similarity between Caesar who has become so powerful and dominant that he seems to tower over the world, and the Colossus of Rhodes, one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. T(1) and T(4) both give unnecessary additional information when T(1) used **ضخم** (big) with **عملاق** (giant) which implies “something very big”. So, it is unnecessary to say **ضخم** after **عملاق**. T(4) used **الذي تتضاءل تحته الاشياء** after **التمثال الهائل** which is a clarification of something intended to be implied . Such a clarification decreases the aesthetic value of the literary work . As for the intended message of the use of simile , all translators have expressed the point that Caesar is like something big and all of them used an explicit device of similarity **ك** . T(2 and 4) use **التمثال الهائل** which does not give the intended meaning of being powerful instead **المارد** is more appropriate in that it is used in Arabic to express power. Therefore, T(3) rendition is the most appropriate one.

2. Metaphor

“There is a tide in the affairs of men, Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune” Act 4 , Scene 3

Interpretation:

The line” There is a tide in the affairs of men, Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune” is spoken by Brutus in Act 4 , Scene 3 of William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. The setting is in Brutus’s tent. The characters present include Brutus, Cassius, and several others. In this scene Brutus is trying to urge his fellow conspirators to take decisive action against their enemies, believing that their best chance for victory is at hand. He emphasizes that they might lose their advantage and fail in their cause if they do not act now. The metaphor reflects Brutus’s belief in fate and timing, and his desire to push forward before the opportunity passes. Brutus uses the metaphor of a “tide in the affairs of men” to express the idea that life offers great opportunity, but these moments are fleeting. Like a high tide, if seized at the right time(‘ at the flood”), they can lead to failure or stagnation.

S LT	2.(There is a tide in the affairs of men, Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.) (p:60 , l:18)	Colina model of TQA				Approp.
	TLT	Quality of content	Functional Adequacy			
			Aesthe tic value	Intentionality	Figurati ve	

1	T (وثمة مد في شؤون البشر كالمد في البحر: فان اغتنمت الفرصة في عنفوانها جاءت لصاحبها بالحظ السعيد) (p:109, l:17)	-	+	+	+	-
2	T (واعلم ان من بين الاوقات ساعة ما اشبهها بمد البحر اذا عرفها الانسان وانتقع بها ارتفع الى السماء) (p: 86, l: 19)	+	-	+	+	-
3	T ولتعلم بعد ان الانسان في مجرى حياته وتيار شئونه قد يصادف الفرصة السعيدة, والساعة الميمونة فتعرض له العناية بفيض من الامداد وطوفان من النصر والفتوح, فان اغتنم الفرصة واندفع في تيار ذلك الفيض, وقبض على ناصيته افضى به الى النجاح, واداه الى ساحل الغنم والسلامة) (p: 95, l:23)	-	-	+	-	-
4	T في حياة الانسان ساعة يعلو فيها مد البحر امامه: فان اغتنمها وصل الى شاطئ السعد) (p:171, l:23)	+	+	+	+	+

Discussion

In this metaphor “ a tide in the affairs of men”, even though all of the translators have given the same intentionality of the text, only T(4) has given an appropriate rendition of the metaphor. T(1) and T(2) have changed the metaphor into a simile by adding "ك" in T(1) and "اشبهها" in T(2), which reduces the aesthetic value and hence reduces the functionality of the text. T(3) went too far in clarifying the text, which is not accepted in literary translation in that it not only minimizes the figurative power of the text but also deprives the reader of his right to interpret the text and consequently affects the functionality of the text.

3.Apostrophe

“O, pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth” Act 3 , Scene 1

Interpretation:

The line “O, pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth” is spoken by Antony in Act 3 , Scene 1 of William Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. The setting of this scene is in Rome, shortly after Caesar's death. Antony speaks to the crowd, using emotional language to sway public opinion against the conspirators. When he says this line, the characters present include Antony, Brutus, Cassius, and several others. When Mark Antony says, "O, pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth," he is addressing Caesar's lifeless body. The metaphor of the "bleeding piece of earth" symbolizes Caesar himself and Rome, suffering from the wounds inflicted by his assassination. This line expresses Antony's deep grief and the pain of the nation as it grapples with the consequences of the murder.

S LT	3. (O, pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth.) (p:39 , l:26)	Colina model of TQA				Appro p.
	TLT	Quality of content	Functional Adequacy			
			Aesthe tic value	Intentionalit y	Figurati ve	
1 T	(صفحا يا قيصر! واغفر لي ايها الرميم الدامي) (p:77, l:9)	-	-	-	+	-
2 T	(غفرانك غفرانك ايتها الجثة الدامية والطينة الطاهرة) p:59, l:9)	-	-	-	+	-
3 T	(معذرة وغفرانا يا كتلة التراب الدامية) p:59, l:13)(+	+	+	+	+
4 T	(اواه يا بضعة الثرى الدامية!) p: 135, l: 11)(+	+	+	+	+

Discussion:

In this example, The Apostrophe in the line "O, pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth" is in the comparison of Julius Caesar's dead body to a "bleeding piece of earth." Shakespeare compares Caesar's body to the earth (land of Rome), which suggests that Caesar, once a powerful figure, is now reduced to an inanimate, lifeless part of the world. T (1) focuses more on Caesar's physical decay ("bloody remains") rather than the metaphorical link between Caesar's body and the earth. T (2) introduces additional elements like purity and focuses more on the physical body, which strays from the original metaphor that connects Caesar's death to the land of Rome (the "piece of earth"). However, T (3) and (4) both is quite close to capturing the metaphor from the original text. T(3) uses "كتلة التراب" (a lump of earth), while T(4) uses "بضعة الثرى" (a piece of soil), both effectively conveying that Caesar becomes part of the earth. Both T (1) and T (2) focus on the physical body of Caesar which strays from the original metaphor that connects Caesar's death to the land of Rome (the "piece of earth") such deviation decreases the aesthetic value of the literary work. As for the intended message of the use of metaphor T(3) and T(4) are the most appropriate translations, as they preserve the original metaphorical link between Caesar and the land of Rome, while T(1) and T(2) deviate by focusing on the physical body, weakening the metaphor's impact.

4.Irony

Interpretation:

The line “As Caesar loved me, I weep for him; as he was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was valiant, I honour him; but, as he was ambitious, I slew him” is spoken by Brutus in Act 3 , Scene 2 of William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*.

The setting of this scene is The Forum. The characters present include Brutus and the citizens of Rome, as well as the lingering presence of Mark Antony, who will later refute Brutus's claims. The irony lies in Brutus's belief that he acted for the greater good while underestimating how the crowd would react to his rationalizations. In this line, Brutus employs situational irony during his speech to the Roman citizens. In this scene, he contrasts his personal feelings for Caesar with his justification for the assassination, presenting it as an act of love rather than betrayal. Brutus claims he loved Caesar but killed him for his ambition, which he believes was a threat to the republic. Parallelism: Brutus uses a repetitive structure ("As Caesar loved me... as he was fortunate... as he was valiant... as he was ambitious") to logically list Caesar's qualities, with each clause following the same format. This repetition emphasizes Brutus's reasoned approach to Caesar's death.

Antithesis: Brutus contrasts his feelings and actions in each clause, setting up opposing ideas like "weep" for Caesar's love, "rejoice" for his fortune, "honour" his bravery, and finally "slew" him for his ambition. This juxtaposition underscores the complexity of Brutus's emotions and motives.

Through these devices, Brutus tries to portray his actions as a balance between love and duty, aimed at preserving Rome rather than acting out of personal animosity.

S LT	8.(As Caesar loved me, I weep for him; as he was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was valiant, I honour him; but, as he was ambitious, I slew him.) (p:41, l:15)	Colina model of TQA				Appr op.
	TLT	Qualit y of content	Functional Adequacy			
			Aesthetic value	Intentiona lity	Figura tive	
T 1	ترجمة حسين أحمد: (بمقدار حب قيصر اياي أبكيه وأنديه . بمقدار نجاحاته أفرح له .. بمقدار بسالته أوقره و أحبيه .. غير اني بمقدار طموحه أثور عليه لأطيح به وأقتله) (p:80, l:9)	+	+	+	+	
T 2	ترجمة محمد حمدي:(كان قيصر حبيبي فأنا أبكيه كان سعيدا مجدودا فأنا أهنيه كان شجاعا مقداما فأنا أطره ولكن كان جشعا طماعا فذبحته) (p:61, l:12)	-	-	-	+	
T 3	ترجمة محمد السباعي:(انني اذا ذكرت محبة قيصر لي بكيته ورثيته, واذا					

	ذكرت علاء نجمه وسمو جده سررت وطربت, واذا ذكرت جرأته وإقدامه, أكبرته وأجللته و لأنني أنست منه الطمع والشراسة (قتلته) (p:62, l:8)	—	—	—	+	
4	T ترجمة محمد عناني: (لقد أحبني قيصر, وها أنا ذا أبكيه, وأقبلت الدنيا عليه, فها أنا ذا أعتبط له, وكان شجاعا فها أنا ذا أكرمه! ولكن الطمع استولى عليه فقتلته) (p:138, l:18)	—	—	—	+	

Discussion:

In this example , the figure of speech “As Caesar loved me, I weep for him; as he was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was valiant, I honour him; but, as he was ambitious, I slew him” is an irony in which Brutus begins by highlighting positive emotions, mourning Caesar, celebrating his successes, and honoring his bravery. However, the final clause introduces a stark contrast: despite all the affection and admiration, the speaker justifies the act of killing Caesar due to his ambition. In T (2, 3, and 4) The phrase "الطمع والشراسة" (greed and gluttony) changes the meaning from "ambitious," which shifts the focus from ambition to negative traits that may not align with the original intent. Such changing decreases the aesthetic value of the literary work. As for the intended message of the use of irony all translators have expressed the point that Brutus mixed emotions towards Caesar illustrate the complexity of loyalty and betrayal. In T (2,3, and 4), the use of "الطمع والشراسة" (greedy and gluttony) instead of "ambitious" changes the meaning, which weakens the irony and does not give the intended meaning while T (1) accurately reflects the contrast between admiration and betrayal, maintaining the focus on ambition. Therefor it is the most appropriate one.

Conclusions

The research concludes that Colina’s translation quality assessment model applies to the translation of figures of speech. It also concludes that translators sometimes do not pay attention to the functional adequacy of the rendition of figures of speech. This affects the appropriateness of the rendition. Keeping the aesthetic value of the figure of speech is also necessary to reach an appropriate rendition.

References:

1. Colina, S. (2003). *Teaching translation: From research to the classroom*. McGraw-Hill.
2. Colina, S. (2008). Translation quality evaluation: Empirical evidence for a functionalist approach. *The Translator*, 14(1), 97-134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2008.10799251>
3. Colina, S. (2015). *Fundamentals of translation*. Cambridge University Press. Kindle Edition.
4. Gautam, K. R. (2014). *Figures of speech in Flax-Golden tales* (Unpublished M.Ed. thesis). Sapta Gandaki Campus, Tribhuvan University.
5. Gray, J. (2008). *The elements of style*. Pearson Education.
6. House, J. (1977). *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
7. House, J. (1997). *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited*. Gunter Narr Verlag.
8. Khairunnisa, S. A., & Juanda. (2022). *Figurative language in the novel of Little Women by Louisa May Alcott*. Program Studi Sastra Jepang, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Komputer Indonesia.
9. <https://www.unikom.ac.id>

10. **Kamalia, S. N. N., & Juanda. (2024). Hyperbole in the lyrics of Billie Eilish's "Birds of a Feather". *Journal of English Literature Studies*, Volume(Issue). [Email: seminnk123@gmail.com]**
11. **Kennedy, X. (1979). *Literature: An introduction to fiction, poetry, and drama* (2nd ed.). Little, Brown and Company.**
12. **Nida, E. A. (1976). A framework for the analysis and evaluation of theories of translation. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), *Translation: Application and research* (pp. 1-14). Gardner Press.**
13. **Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The theory and practice of translation*. E.J. Brill.**
14. **Nord, C. (1991). *Text analysis in translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi,**
15. Nord, C. (1997). *Translation as a purposeful activity*. St. Jerome.
16. Nord, C. (2007). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. St. Jerome Publishing.
17. Perrine, L. (1981). *Sound and sense: An introduction to poetry* (5th ed.). Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
18. Regmi, L. R. (2015). Analysis and use of figures of speech. *Journal of NELTA Surkhet*, 4, Article 12864. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jns.v4i0.12864>
19. Tajalli, G. (2003). *Idioms and metaphorical expressions in translation*. SAMT.
20. Vermeer, H. J. (1978). *Skopos and translation commission*. Heidelberg: Universitas.