Review of: "Gestalt-based Research on the "Tian wen" Translation: A Theoretical Framework"

Mingrong Ma[1]

1 Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

1. Title: The title structure needs improvement. Generally speaking, titles which are divided into two parts by a colon, indicate the research question in the previous part whereas the following part clarifies a specific text/ a case/an approach. The current title has a certain degree of overlapping if Gestalt is used as a theoretical framework in the article. If the article tries to put forward a new theoretical framework by employing Gestalt theory, then the current title works.

2. Abstract:

   Is "image-Gs" a widely accepted term? Does "IGs" refer to "image-Gs"? These seem unclear in the abstract.

   The author proposes a three-level framework for Tianwen. However, does this frame merely function for Tianwen or does it carry a comprehensive illustrating power for other texts? In the abstract, the author should make it clear.

   As a whole, from both the title and the abstract, the research question is not to be detected.

3. The body:

   The author mentions that image-G is a term coined by Jiang in 2002 and discusses its connection with Actualization theory. As for the term, caution should be taken for although a scholar has put forward it, does it receive wide academic acceptance, is it suitable in this current research? Why don't other widely accepted terms or theories be used,such as cognitive linguistics? And with regard to the actualization theory, the relation between image-G and the actualization theory is unclear, thus the theory employed seems to lack a solid base.

   Section 3 puts great energy in introducing the three principles. The author should remember that this is an academic essay rather than a coursebook for cognitive linguistics. More significantly, these three principles are discussed in cognivite linguistics, thus confirming the reviewer's previous doubt: why not use widely accepted theory rather than a bold term coined by merely one scholar 20 years ago?

   The criteria to divide the three levels of IGs are not mentioned, consequently, the author's brief explanation of the 3 levels does not sound sensible or logical.Rather, the division seems quite random and lacks of theoretical support.

   Section 5 mentions that based on Chuci scholars, one macro level can be divided into two meso-levels, which further confuses the reader or reviewer, for the first parts are based on IG theory while the actual discussion deviates from this term or theory.

4. General decision:

   Based on the above suggestions, this article lacks a solid and widely accepted theory as its framework. Since its purpose is also to put forward a framework, then it is like to expect a tall building on sand. Worse still, the criteria to

divide the three levels in the discussion are rather implicit and random and lacks theoretical support----thus the subsequent illustration and conclusion are not convincing or powerful. **Therefore, the reviewer's general decision is *major revision*.**