[#2] JCLL-49144

[NO TITLE]

Nengah Arnawa [nengaharnawa] - Arts and Humanities (General) - Incomplete

[#3] JCLL-49145

[NO TITLE]

Nengah Arnawa [nengaharnawa] - Arts and Humanities (General) - Incomplete

[#4] JCLL-49151 Last action: Confirming Submission 2021/01/14 - 08:04

The Metaphor of Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations

Nengah Arnawa [nengaharnawa] - Linguistics - Waiting to be Qualified by Editor-in-Chief

View The Submission Profile | En | FA | HOME

Created in : 0.46 seconds with 30 queries by YEKTAWEB 4256

Gmail

Nengah Arnawa <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com>

Your article status changed in Language Related Research

Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <lrr@modares.ac.ir> 18 Januari 2021 14.30
Balas Ke: Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <journals@modares.ac.ir>
Kepada: "nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com" <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com>

TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY
JOURNALS SYSTEM

سامانه نشریات دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

ارسال کننده مقاله: گرامی، سلام

وضعیت یکی از مقالات شما با کد JCLL-49151 و عنوان The Metaphor of Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations در پایگاه جستارهای زبانی به حالت **در انتظار انتخاب داور توسط دبیر علمی** تغییر نموده است.

برای پیگیری وضعیت و یا هر نوع اقدام می توانید به بخش کاربری پایگاه وارد شده و به صفحه شخصی و سپس صفحه پرونده این مقاله مراجعه نمایید.

اطلاعات لازم برای ورود به پایگاه:

نام کاربری: nengaharnawa

رمز عبور: [ورود مستقیم]
ورود با اکانت: [Google] [Yahoo] [ORCID]

با احترام
مدیر پایگاه

Dear Submitter: Dr Nengah Arnawa

Your article status with the code "JCLL-49151" and with the title "The Metaphor of Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations" in Language Related Research changed to: **Waiting for the Reviewer Selection by Scientific Editor**

In order to view details or send any comments, you can log into the site and go to the private page and then visit the article profile page.
You paper awaits reviewers' selection by the Associate Editor.

Your login information:

Username: nengaharnawa

Password: [Direct Login]
Login via: [Google] [Yahoo] [ORCID]

Sincerely,
Site Manager

Use UTF-8 encoding | Unsubscribe | توقف دریافت ایمیل
journals.modares.ac.ir

Email from articles review system - ID:49151

Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <lrr@modares.ac.ir> 3 April 2021 22.3
Balas Ke: Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <journals@modares.ac.ir>
Kepada: "nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com" <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com>

TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY
JOURNALS SYSTEM
سامانه نشریات دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

Dear Author,

Please apply the changes as carefully as possible.

Review of the manuscript entitled The Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations
This is a review of the revised version of the above manuscript.
Upon critically reading this revised version, I found that, most of my previous comments were dealt with by the authors. The following are my comments on the revised version, some of which might be just repetitions of my previous comments. There are many minor points that I commented on within the manuscript file attached, including grammatical corrections and APA style comments. I will appreciate it if the authors highlight the changes they will made in the future versions of their manuscript. Doing so, can help the reviewers in detecting the changes.

1. Page 4: last paragraph.
The heading of this section is 'Research Questions' while there is no trace of formulating questions. That is, the authors should have formulated actual questions here. Or, they can omit the heading, if the journal style allows, and integrate this part to the ending parts of the introduction section.

2. page 5, first paragraph
This is not a good phrasing for the definition of metaphor. You simply use the term 'metaphorical' to define 'metaphor' which is perplexing for the readers.
A more common definition is the one proposed by Lakoff and Johnson. The author should refer to the conveyance of meaning via conceptualizing it from one domain to another in defining metaphor.

3. Page 5, teh ending part of the first paragraph:
How interpersonal meaning is related to conversational implicature? This needs further elaboration.
Also, this sentence is grammatically erroneous and needs edition and modification.

4. Page 5, paragraph 2: The following sentence needs further elaboration
In accordance with language, metaphor provides linguistic corpus to give an empirical justification to a system of language

5. Page 5, paragraph 2: In the following sentence, how can use of metaphor show politeness? This is vague and needs further elaboration.
In accordance with social communication, it is a behavioural and social controller used to show language politeness.
6. Section 2.2.1 is written discretely. There is no link among the many ideas mentioned.

7. Since the focus of the present study is cultural pragmatic representation in metaphors, the following study on cultural metaphor can be a good one to link studies on CMT to cultural studies and cultural pragmatic representation:

Dabbagh, A. (2017). Cultural Linguistics as an investigative framework for paremiology: comparing *time* in English and Persian. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 27*(3), 577-595. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12162

8. The paragraph beneath the section 3.1 is not related to research design. It mainly states the research purpose and data analysis.

9. THe coding procedure for the extracted metaphors is not described.

10.The procedure you follow in order to observe confirmability, dependability, and transferability concerns should be directly dealt with.

11. The third paragraph of the discussion section:
First, it is claimed that "knowledge of socio-cultural variables is an UNDERLYING assumption that expresses the tenor of each metaphorical vehicle". Then, it is claimed that this is in line with the pragmatic principle. While, it might sound logical, but in the next line the authors just referred to the DIFFERENCE between semantic representation and pragmatic interpretation and nothing is mentioned about one being the underlying assumption of the other.

12. There are some unreliable journals in the list. I strongly advise the authors not to cite papers from these journals due to their unclear reviewing process.

13. APA style is not followed in many parts of the in-text citation.

Considering my detailed comments above, I recommend a minor revision.

Your article status changed in Language Related Research

Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <lrr@modares.ac.ir>
Balas Ke: Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <journals@modares.ac.ir>
Kepada: "nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com" <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com>

9 Mei 2021 19.1

TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY
JOURNALS SYSTEM

سامانه نشریات دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

ارسال کننده مقاله: گرامی، سلام

وضعیت یکی از مقالات شما با کد JCLL-49151 و عنوان The Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations در پایگاه مجله‌های زبانی به حالت در انتظار جمع‌بندی داوری توسط دبیر علمی تغییر نموده است.

برای پیگیری وضعیت و یا هر نوع اقدام می توانید به بخش کاربری پایگاه وارد شده و به صفحه شخصی و سپس صفحه پرونده این مقاله مراجعه نمایید.

اطلاعات لازم برای ورود به پایگاه:

نام کاربری: nengahamawa

رمز عبور: [ورود مستقیم]
ورود با اکانت: [Yahoo] [Google]

با احترام
مدیر پایگاه

Dear Submitter: Dr Nengah Arnawa

Your article status with the code "JCLL-49151" and with the title "The Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations" in Language Related Research changed to: **Waiting for Reviewers Conclusion by Scientific Editor**

In order to view details or send any comments, you can log into the site and go to the private page and then visit the article profile page.
The manuscript awaits the Associate Editor's decision.

Your login information:

Username: nengahamawa

Password: [Direct Login]
Login via: [Google] [ORCID]

Sincerely,
Site Manager

Email from articles review system - ID:49151

Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <lrr@modares.ac.ir>
Balas Ke: Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <journals@modares.ac.ir>
Kepada: "nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com" <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com>

11 Mei 2021 14.34

TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY
JOURNALS SYSTEM
سامانه نشریات دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

Upon critically reading this revised version, I found that though some of the suggested comments were taken care of, unfortunately, most of my previous comments were not dealt with by the author(s). Therefore, in this round of review, I provided those unaddressed comments again and also left the authors some new comments for their due consideration. Since there are numerous points, I refer the authors to the attached file, which includes the in-text comments on this manuscript.

Comments to the author
Review of the manuscript file-jcll-49151-anonym-by-refr-58175
This is a review of the above manuscript. In what follows, I will report my general comments on the manuscript. Then I will provide my detailed comments on the manuscript referring to the paragraph and page numbers. These comments can be found on the Word file of the manuscript, as well. Finally, I will provide my review suggestions in terms of publication.

General comments

1. The topic seems to be an interesting one with a new look at metaphor analysis. I think this study can fill a gap in metaphor analysis.
2. The statement of the purpose of study and the significance of conducting the study is underdeveloped. Most of the space in the introduction was dedicated to reviewing the analytical approach in a more or less incoherent way.
3. There are many claims about Balinese culture with no reference provided. Though the claims might be correct, the readers need to see whose claims they are. This is, in fact, a serious shortcoming of this manuscript. The parts that needs reference for the claims made by the authors are commented in the word file attached.
4. The review of literature is not written systematically. It is suggested that the authors follow the following pattern:
   - Metaphor
   - Approaches to analyze metaphors
   - Prior studies on metaphor (with the focus on women representation)
   - The need for lexical-semantics combined with pragmatic interpretation, particularly in the context of the present study.

5. The method section is underdeveloped and needs to be enhanced. Details are provided below.
6. The discussion section is underdeveloped and needs enhancement. Details in this regard are provided below.
7. The language of the manuscript is OK.
8. Limitations and delimitations of the study should be mentioned in the discussion section.
9. It is suggested that the authors double-check the reference list in terms of APA 7th ed. meticulously.

Introduction

1. In some parts of the introduction, there are sudden jumps of ideas. The authors should deal with this problem via A linking phrase is needed to link the two sentences.
2. Page 2, paragraph 3:
Cultural metaphor is considered as a sub-concept of conceptual metaphor. Therefore, it sounds more sensible if the authors introduce conceptual metaphor and then link it to cultural metaphor and the Balinese example.
3. On page 2, paragraph 3 the authors wrote the following
The dichotomy extends to the appearance of paradoxical perceptions expressed through the phrases luh luih (noble woman) and luh luu (despicable woman). In Balinese culture, the phrase luh luih symbolizes a noble woman. In contrast, luh luu refers to a woman with bad connotations
It seems that this part is the motivation behind conducting the present study. Therefore, this part should be elaborated more for the readers.
4. On page 2, paragraph 3 the authors wrote the following:
According to Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2013), this paradoxical perception is also known as a conceptual metaphor.
Reference to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is needed here.
5. Page 4, paragraph 1:
The authors should be clearer in rationalizing the use of lexical semantic theory combined with analysis in generative grammar to describe Balinese metaphor related to women. Specifically, the role of generative grammar is not sufficiently elaborated.
6. It would be better if defining features of a metaphor was discussed first and then lexical-semantics approach to analysing metaphors were explained.
7. The research questions should be reformulated. As they are reported in the manuscript, they do not reflect the nature of the analysis.

Review of the literature

1. On page 6, paragraph 2, the authors wrote the following:
Other theories applied for metaphor analysis were conceptual metaphor theory or CMT (Pilyarchuk & Onysko, 2018),
This theory was proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980)!
2. Section 2.2.1 on metaphor should be placed at the beginning of the review of literature just before 'Prior studies on metaphor'.
3. Under section 2.2.3 the authors wrote the following:
Boldyrev & Dubrovskaya (2016) argued that cultures constitute behavioural patterns acquired by people throughout their lives as society members and transmitted by language symbols.
Reference should be made to pillars of cultural studies in Applied Linguistics, such as Clair Kramsch.
4. It is expected that more relevant studies be reviewed, e.g., studies on metaphor analysis in Balinese

language, especially the ones related to women metaphors conducted applying other theories and/or analytical frameworks.

Method
1. The authors should provide more detailed information about the sources of data and avoid providing general data sources. In other words, they need to actually mention the short stories, pop songs, and novels used as sources of data for the present study. Also, they need to contextualize the sources mentioned in terms of their genre, date of text production, the language of the texts, the audience of the texts, etc.
2. The process of data saturation, which is significant in qualitative data collection, should be included.
3. Details of in-depth interview and focus-group discussion should be mentioned. Also, the process of validation of the interview questions should be included.
4. What is the method of data analysis? Typological analysis? Grounded-Theory analysis? Content analysis? Any coding procedure?
Also, it is not clear based on what criteria the metaphors have been detected.
5. How about the analysis of in-depth interview and focus-group discussion data? No information is provided in this regard.
6. On the ending line of Data Analysis the following is written:
The results were cyclical and presented descriptively, as well as qualitatively.
What does it mean? How do the authors distinguish descriptive and qualitative results?

Findings
1. The detected metaphors should be underlined in the translation of the excerpts, as well.
2. I suggest that the authors manoeuvre more on the construction of thinking from concrete to abstract via providing and analysing more examples.
3. Page 17, first paragraph:
a. How is the semantic feature +CONCRETE relate to the beauty of women's eyebrows?
b. Similarity of the semantic features inherent in the vehicles of these metaphors should be shown.
4. More samples should be reported by the authors to support the findings.

Discussion
1. As a convention in writing discussion, the findings of the study should be discussed in light of the previous studies reviewed in the review of the literature section. Here, reference is made to some studies that have not been reviewed by the authors:
Almirabi (2015), Wijana (2015), Parera (1990), Taguchi (2016)
2. The purpose of the study and the main findings should be restated at the beginning of the discussion.
3. First, it is claimed that "knowledge of socio-cultural variables is an UNDERLYING assumption that expresses the tenor of each metaphorical vehicle". Then, it is claimed that this is in line with the pragmatic principle. While, it might sound logical, but in the next line the authors just referred to the DIFFERENCE between semantic representation and pragmatic interpretation and nothing is mentioned about one being the underlying assumption of the other.
4. At the ending line of the first paragraph under the discussion title, the authors wrote the following:
The success of the semantic decomposition process for a metaphorical vehicle is one of the assets in pragmatic interpretation.
The authors should support this claim by referring to their findings!
5. On page 13, paragraph 2, the authors wrote the following:
Socio-cultural knowledge is needed because every linguistic symbol is never used outside culture.
This claim needs support. Kecskes' ideas regarding language, culture, and context can be helpful.
6. Normally, in the discussion, we do not analyze new data!
7. In the middle of the discussion, the researcher compared the results of analyzing Balinese samples to that of Bahasa Indonesia and Malay language samples. However, it is not clear where the samples of Bahasa Indonesia and Malay come from?

Upon critically reading the manuscript, I will have to recommend a **major revision**, as there are too many fundamental issues to be dealt with in this manuscript before considering it for publication.

Reviewer file 1737 KB

Dear Editor;
I found the topic of the article quite intriguing and I think it could have been a worthwhile study. However, I am making my decision based on the following points.

- The title is vague; it does not make clear whether it is going to discuss the metaphors used by Balinese women, used to describe them, or it is just an expression used as a metaphor. Of course, it is later revealed that the former is the case; yet, many confusions persist.
- The manuscript seems to need language editing.
- The framework of the study is not really clear; is it a primarily linguistic study of those metaphors, is it a cultural study, or a women's study. I did notice that the authors tried to move from a semantics perspective to a pragmatics one, however, I believe they need to stay focused on one aspect of these metaphors (e.g. the cultural value of the metaphors) and use other arguments in periphery. What I see now, is rather confusing.
- It is not clearly emphasized why metaphors used to describe Balinese women are targeted for this study; is the paper going to draw cultural conclusions focusing on the representation of women in that society? It is somehow ambiguous.
- The methodology is also infected with ambiguities; it is not clear where exactly the corpus is collected from, what genres (and with what proportions) it encompasses, why those texts have been targeted, and many other questions. We are also kept in dark regarding the role of those five informants selected and we are not sure how they have contributed to the study. In another part of the methodology, an ethnographic stance is claimed, while I cannot realize in what aspect the study was ethnographic.
- Despite the interesting presentation of the results, we are not sure on what basis those excerpts of texts are selected and whether they are offering a representative sample of the corpus. Also, a broader perspective or pattern does not seem to have been drawn out of the data.
- The conclusion is too brief and, in fact, inconclusive. The fact that the interpretation of metaphors about women can start from a semantic analysis and move towards a pragmatic/cultural one does not really read like conclusion to me; rather, it best serves as the framework of the study.
- If I want to summarize my comments, I can say that, the study is worth publication, but it needs to be extensively revised. The author(s) need(s) to set off from a particular theoretical framework and stick to this pivotal focus throughout the whole study. For instance, they could focus on a feminist perspective and study the linguistic representation of Balinese women through metaphors in one particular genre (literature, daily conversations, news, etc.).

Reviewer 3

1. Figure 3 and 7 should be combined so that the analysis was not long and trivial.

2. Conclusion needs to be developed so that it responses to the research problems.

3. Pay attention to the use of English carefully and be careful of using it carefully in

order to be native like speaker of English.

Dear Author,

Please apply the changes as carefully as possible. If these changes are not applied, your paper will be rejected.

Please carefully apply all these changes.

Best,
Ali Derakhshan

Comments to the author
Review of the manuscript entitled The Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations
This is a review of the revised version of the above manuscript.

Upon critically reading this revised version, I found that, unfortunately, most of my previous comments were not dealt with by the authors. The following are my comments on the revised version, some of which might be just repetitions of my previous comments.

1. Overall, the manuscript needs language editing. In many parts, there are lack of links among the ideas and the points are mentioned rather discretely.

2. The wording of the first four lines of the introduction section does not match the generic style of the introduction section.

3. On page 1 the authors wrote:
According to Ifantidou and Hatzidaki (2019); Xu and Wu (2014), the procedure is associated with cognitive semantic and pragmatic realization.
APA is not followed. It should be written as follows: According recent findings, e.g. (ifantidou & Jatzidaki, 2019; Xu & Wu, 2014)

4. First paragraph of page 2: The rationale for choosing metaphor as the research foci is not convincing for readers. The authors should provide a theoretical link between their research purpose and the theory of metaphor analysis. I revised this part using the authors' own wordings.

5. Page 2, paragraph 2: The following sentence is not clear. How exactly is cultural metaphor generated?

such as the ability of conceptual metaphor to generate cultural metaphor

6. Paragraph 2, page 3:
In this paragraph, so many ideas are mentioned without any explicit link among them. The authors should provide explicit link to make a flow of ideas rather than discrete ideas said one after another.

7. At the beginning of page 4:
I repeat my comment I provide in my first round of reviewing this manuscript:
There is a jump of ideas here. The authors should be clearer in rationalizing the use of lexical semantic theory combined with analysis in generative grammar to describe Balinese metaphor related to women. Specifically, the role of generative grammar is not sufficiently elaborated.

8. page 4, paragraph 2: What does semantic features' deep structure mean?

9. I repeat my comment I provide in my first round of reviewing this manuscript:
The statement of the purpose of study and the significance of conducting the study is underdeveloped. Most of the space in the introduction was dedicated to reviewing the analytical approach in a more or less incoherent way.

10. I repeat my comment I provide in my first round of reviewing this manuscript:
The research questions should be reformulated.

11. The definition provided for metaphor under Section 2.1 is not an appropriate one.

12. The formation of the sentence right under the Section 2.2 is more like the one used in method section. So, this sentence should be rewritten.

13. Section 2.2.2: discussion around Kramsch's ideas:
Kramsch did not work on Balinese women. This sentence is written as if three out of four pillars that Kramsch talked about is related to Balinese women! This is not at all true. The sentence needs serious revision.

14. The review of the literature still needs refinement. There is no flow of ideas in this review. That is, readers become flooded with lots of, seemingly related, ideas which the authors have failed to make a coherent link among them.

15. Section 2.4 should be mentioned at the end of the introduction right before the research questions. Of course, it needs revision to suit that place.

16. At the end of Section 3.2 the authors wrote:
Data coding was carried out by combining the code of the data source with the number of corpus.
The data coding process is vague as it is described here. More elaboration is needed.

17. Page 13, line 7:
A better source should be cited here. The one from pillars in qualitative research, especially with regard to interviews and focus group discussion can be a good choice.

18. Page 13, line 7: What does 'the implementation process' refer to? It is not clear.

19. Page 13: What does the authors mean by 'a cultural person'?

20. The level at which data saturation occurred is not clearly mentioned. What was that level of 'maximum data required'?

21. In Section 3.4 the authors refer to three types of classifications: How are these classifications conducted? Based on what criteria?

22. On Section 3.4, the authors referred to cyclical results. What does it mean that 'the results were cyclical'? Normally, the procedure of qualitative research is cyclical NOT the results.

23. How about the procedure you follow in order to observe confirmability, dependability, and transferability concerns?

24. Like I mentioned in my previous review of this manuscript, the claims about Balinese culture need to be supported by reference.

25. The second paragraph of the revised discussion:
This part is more like review of the literature rather than discussion. I think this part should deleted or added to the review of literature section.

26. Page 30, second paragraph:
First, it is claimed that "knowledge of socio-cultural variables is an UNDERLYING assumption that expresses the tenor of each metaphorical vehicle". Then, it is claimed that this is in line with the pragmatic principle. While, it might sound logical, but in the next line the authors just referred to the DIFFERENCE between semantic representation and pragmatic interpretation and nothing is mentioned about one being the underlying assumption of the other.

27. The revised conclusion is mainly reporting the results of the study. However, limitations and delimitations of the study and implications/applications of the study should also be mentioned.

28. There are some unreliable journals in the list. I strongly advise the authors not to cite papers from these journals due to their unclear reviewing process.

Considering my detailed comments above, I recommend a major revision.

Reviewer file 1737 KB

Dear Author,

Please apply the changes as carefully as possible.

Review of the manuscript entitled The Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations
This is a review of the revised version of the above manuscript.
Upon critically reading this revised version, I found that, most of my previous comments were dealt with by the authors. The following are my comments on the revised version, some of which might be just repetitions of my previous comments. There are many minor points that I commented on within the manuscript file attached, including grammatical corrections and APA style comments. I will appreciate it if the authors highlight the changes they will made in the future versions of their manuscript. Doing so, can help the reviewers in detecting the changes.

1. Page 4: last paragraph.
The heading of this section is 'Research Questions' while there is no trace of formulating questions. That is, the authors should have formulated actual questions here. Or, they can omit the heading, if the journal style allows, and integrate this part to the ending parts of the introduction section.

2. page 5, first paragraph
This is not a good phrasing for the definition of metaphor. You simply use the term 'metaphorical' to define 'metaphor' which is perplexing for the readers.
A more common definition is the one proposed by Lakoff and Johnson. The author should refer to the conveyance of meaning via conceptualizing it from one domain to another in defining metaphor.

3. Page 5, teh ending part of the first paragraph:
How interpersonal meaning is related to conversational implicature? This needs further elaboration.
Also, this sentence is grammatically erroneous and needs edition and modification.

4. Page 5, paragraph 2: The following sentence needs further elaboration
In accordance with language, metaphor provides linguistic corpus to give an empirical justification to a system of language

5. Page 5, paragraph 2: In the following sentence, how can use of metaphor show politeness? This is vague and needs further elaboration.
In accordance with social communication, it is a behavioural and social controller used to show language politeness.
6. Section 2.2.1 is written discretely. There is no link among the many ideas mentioned.

7. Since the focus of the present study is cultural pragmatic representation in metaphors, the following study on cultural metaphor can be a good one to link studies on CMT to cultural studies and cultural pragmatic representation:

Dabbagh, A. (2017). Cultural Linguistics as an investigative framework for paremiology: comparing *time* in English and Persian. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *27*(3), 577-595. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12162

8. The paragraph beneath the section 3.1 is not related to research design. It mainly states the research purpose and data analysis.

9. THe coding procedure for the extracted metaphors is not described.

10.The procedure you follow in order to observe confirmability, dependability, and transferability concerns should be directly dealt with.

11. The third paragraph of the discussion section:
First, it is claimed that "knowledge of socio-cultural variables is an UNDERLYING assumption that expresses the tenor of each metaphorical vehicle". Then, it is claimed that this is in line with the pragmatic principle. While, it might sound logical, but in the next line the authors just referred to the DIFFERENCE between semantic representation and pragmatic interpretation and nothing is mentioned about one being the underlying assumption of the other.

12. There are some unreliable journals in the list. I strongly advise the authors not to cite papers from these journals due to their unclear reviewing process.

13. APA style is not followed in many parts of the in-text citation.

Considering my detailed comments above, I recommend a minor revision.

اطلاعات لازم برای ورود به پایگاه:

نام کاربری: nengaharnawa

رمز عبور: [ورود مستقیم]
ورود با اکانت: [Yahoo] [Google]

با احترام
مدیر پایگاه

Use UTF-8 encoding | Unsubscribe |

journals.modares.ac.ir

Gmail

Nengah Arnawa <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com

Your article status changed in Language Related Research

Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <lrr@modares.ac.ir>
Balas Ke: Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <journals@modares.ac.ir>
Kepada: "nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com" <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com>

8 Juni 2021 16.42

TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY
JOURNALS SYSTEM

سامانه نشریات دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

ارسال کننده مقاله: گرامی، سلام

وضعیت یکی از مقالات شما با کد JCLL-49151 و عنوان The Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations در پایگاه جستارهای زبانی به حالت در انتظار جمع‌بندی داوری توسط دبیر علمی تغییر نموده است.

برای پیگیری وضعیت، و یا هر نوع اقدام می توانید به بخش کاربری پایگاه وارد شده و به صفحه شخصی و سپس صفحه پرونده این مقاله مراجعه نمایید.

اطلاعات لازم برای ورود به پایگاه:

نام کاربری: nengahamawa

رمز عبور: [ورود مستقیم]
ورود با اکانت: [Yahoo] [Google]

با احترام
مدیر پایگاه

Dear Submitter: Dr Nengah Arnawa

Your article status with the code "JCLL-49151" and with the title "The Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations" in Language Related Research changed to: **Waiting for Reviewers Conclusion by Scientific Editor**

In order to view details or send any comments, you can log into the site and go to the private page and then visit the article profile page.
The manuscript awaits the Associate Editor's decision.

Your login information:

Username: nengaharnawa

Password: [Direct Login]
Login via: [Google] [ORCID]

Sincerely,
Site Manager

Use UTF-8 encoding | Unsubscribe | توقف دریافت ایمیل

Gmail

Nengah Arnawa <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com>

Your article status changed in Language Related Research

Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <lrr@modares.ac.ir> 2 Juli 2021 01.58
Balas Ke: Modares Journal of Language-Related Research <journals@modares.ac.ir>
Kepada: "nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com" <nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com>

TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY
JOURNALS SYSTEM

سامانه نشریات دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

1400/4/30
۲۳۲۸۰۵

گرامی
سلام

بدین وسیله به اطلاع می‌رساند که مقاله شما با کد JCLL-49151 و عنوانThe Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretationsمورد پذیرش نهایی قرار گرفت و وضعیت آن به **پذیرفته علمی توسط سردبیر** تغییر یافت و در نسخه‌های آتی نشریه به چاپ خواهد رسید. از همکاری شما با نشریه جستارهای زبانی سپاسگزاریم.

با سپاس
دفتر نشریه جستارهای زبانی

اطلاعات لازم برای ورود به پایگاه:

نام کاربری: nengahamawa

رمز عبور: [ورود مستقیم]
ورود با اکانت: [Yahoo] [Google]

با احترام
مدیر پایگاه

2021/07/2
232805

Dear Submitter: Dr Nengah Arnawa

Your article entitled "The Metaphor about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations" was accepted to be published, and its status has been changed to Accepted Scientifically by Editor-in-Chief. Your article will be published in one the forthcoming issues ofLanguage Related Research. (LRR).

We appreciate you submitting your manuscript to LRR and hope you will consider us again for future submissions.
Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department. The production team will create the proofs which you will be asked to check. If we need additional information from you during the production process, we will contact you directly

Best,
The Language Related Research Office

Your login information:

Username: nengaharnawa

Password: [Direct Login]
Login via: [Google] [ORCID]

Sincerely,
Site Manager

Use UTF-8 encoding | Unsubscribe | توقف دریافت ایمیل
journals.modares.ac.ir

Metaphors about Balinese Women: From Semantic Analysis to Cultural Pragmatic Interpretations

Status: Published

Subject: Linguistics

Submitter: Dr Nengah Arnawa - nengaharnawa - nengah.arnawa65@gmail.com -

Attchments