Literary Translation 4

So I had nothing known O, now for ever

Farewell the tranquil mind farewell content,

Farewell the plumed troops and the big wars

That makes ambition virtue! O, farewell,

Farewell the neighing steed and the shill trump, (III, iii, 352- 356)

This extract marks a turning point in the play and in Othello's life sinee lago's scheme thereafter lake hold of Othello's mind and consciousness and render him incapable of rational thinking. The repetitive of "farewell" is instrumental in highlighting both Othello's ominous tone and his surrender of life's pleasures. This repetition hammers down both the content (the abandonment of peace) and the tone (repetition becomes a sort of a bell that foretells the coming chaos). The omission of the repetition constitutes a gross error of judgement on the part of the translator and sodas the variation, which fails to lake into account the psychological and dramatic value of the repetition.

It may be safe to assume that reiterative devices, when motivated as in literature, should be strictly observed by translatorsI since rhetorical devices are not haphazardly employed in literature and then observance is usually conductive to a greater understanding of character portrayed and psychological probing. Although the linguistic and cultural constraints of a language may drive the translator to avoid repetition for fear of sounding monotonous or too overtly foreign, it appears that preserving repetitive devices even though they may seem jarring or in appropriate goes hand in hand with translators' attempt to capture the author's " meaning," which conveys, among other things,through rhetorical devices.

A good translator should be alert to the particular function of the reiterative device and its rhetorical weight. Repetition is, sometimes employed to convoy ideological underpinnings.

5

عند منتصف الليل استيقضت، كما اعتادت ان تستيقظ في ها الوقت من كل ليلة بلا استعانة من منبه او غيره ولكن بايحاء من الرغبة التي تبيت عليها فتواظب على ايقاظها في دقة و امانة. وظلت لحظات على شك من استيقاظها قاختلطت عليها رؤى الاخلام و همسات الإحساس، حتى بادرها القلق الذي يلم بها قيل ان تفتح جفنيها من خشية ان يكون النوم خانها..

هي العادة التي توقظها في هذه الساعة، عادة قديمة صاحبت شبابها منذ مطلعه و لاتزال تستأثر بكهولتها، تلقتها فيما تلفت من اداب الحبة الزوجية، ان تستيقظ في منتصف الليل لتنتظر بعلها حين عودته من سهرته فتقوم على خدمته حتى ينام.

5a

> She *woke* at midnight. She always *woke up* then without having to rely on an alarm clock. A wish that had taken root in her *awoke* her with great accuracy. For a few moments She was not sure she was *awake.* Images from her dreams and perceptions mixed together in her mind. She was troubled b anxiety before opening her eyes, afraid sleep and decieved her…

> Habit *woke* her at this hour. It was an old habit she had developed when young and it had stayed with her as she matured. She hard learned it along with the other rules of married life. She *woke up* at midnight to await her husband's rechurn from his evening entertainment. Then she would serve him until he went to sleep. (Hutchins 89 :1)

5b

> She *woke up* at midnight. She always *woke up* then without having to rely on an alarm clock. A wish that had taken root in her *awoke* her with great accuracy. For a few moments She was not sure shehad been woken up …

> Habit *woke* her *up* at this hour. It was an old habit she had developed when young and it had stayed with her as she matured. She hard learned it along with the other rules of married life. She *woke up* at midnight to await her husband's rechurn from his evening entertainment. Then she would serve him until he went asleep. (Hatim 97: 34)

The excerpt, taken from the Nobel-prize is is the openly winner Najeeb Mahfouz, is the opening Paragraph of the frsit part of his famous trilogy, which chronicles the upheavals and sufferings of a whole nation in the early dead's of the twentieth century. Extract 5a shows a heavy reiteration of the verb (استيقظت)

 " She woke up" to captive the ironic purpose of the original. The opening sentences of the novel seem to comment on the endless routine of the conventional Arab housewife who used to spend her days cmd night caning for the male figure in her life: husband, father and son, with the gradual and eventual de humanization of her entity, crushing her individuality. The reiterative device, represented by the

repetition of "woke her up" underlives that dehumanization underscores the dilemma of that earhole whose whole existence hangs on her "waking up," to the never ending duties and chores of everyday life.

Sample 5b, which is laken from a textbook on tranhnation, highlights the rhetorical function of irony by repeating the phrase "she woke up" exactly like the source text; extract 5a, however, repeats derivations of this phrase such as "she woke", "she woke up", "awoke her", "she was awake", etc.

It is apparent that Sample 5b is presented as a solutionto a problem posed by sample 5a namely, the translation does not reflect exactly the rhetorical device of repetition. But closer look at the published transaltion, that is sample 5a reveals that the transaltord were fully awarIn liree of thr ironic aspect of repetition, but because of the pecularity of the English, or the transaltor's own style, they might felt that repetition will be counter-productive, and does not convey the significance and the flavour of reiteration. Translation 5b, however, conveys the full force of the repetition with its underlying irony seemingly endless repetitive chores of traditional Arab housewife.

Metaphor and Simile

Metaphor is almost invariably defined as a figure of speech in which an expression literally denoting one object or idea is applied to another in order to suggest a similarity or likeness. Thus, in metaphor, a comparison is made between two seemingly unrelated subjects.

More recently, on the other hand, metaphor has been more appropriately defined as, not just a comparison, but "an implied analogy which imaginatively identifies one object with another and ascribes to the first object one or more of the qualities of the second or invests the first with emotional or imaginative qualities associated with the second" (Holman 1985: 264). For example, when we refer to a man or some aspect of his character by saying *'That man is a fox'*, we in fact ascribe to that man such attributes as cunning and craftiness for which the animal fox is proverbially known.

Simile as figurative device involves nearly the same prerequisite for metaphor - the perception of some likeness between the two objects of the comparison - except that whereas the latter implicitly identifies one thing with another, the former

explicitly expresses the comparison by means of such words as 'like', 'as', 'than', etc. The above given example of metaphor may thus be turned into a simile by saying *'That man is as crafty as a fox'*.

Metaphor has also been widely discussed in translation studies, where it has been given more or less the same definition as 'the description of something in terms of another as a way of illuminating or developing meaning', or "the application of a word or collocation to what it does not literally denote" (Newmark 1988: 104). The issue, however, has proved to be a challenging one. Research into the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural dimensions of metaphor as well as its treatment in actual translations have shown that the SL image cannot always be retained in the TL.

Since a metaphor in the SL is, by definition, a new piece of performance, a semantic novelty, it can clearly have no existing 'equivalence' in the TL: what is unique can have no counterpart. Here the translator's bilingual competence leads him/her to the fact that any equivalence cannot be 'found' but will have to be created.

For example, the metaphor 'angelic face' can be analyzed using the terms below (suggested by Newmark 1988: 105) as :

Object: the person, thing, or idea described or qualified by the metaphor ('face' in the example)

Image: the item in terms of which the object is described ('angel' in the example).

Sense: the literal meaning of the metaphor; the similarities between the object and the image ('such attributes as kindness, beauty, gracefulness, purity, etc. which an angel and the person being described have in common ').

Metaphor: the figurative word used ('angelic' in the example); a metaphor may also extend over many lines, in which case it is termed 'extended metaphor'.

There *are* of course cases where metaphors may be said to work through some direct resemblance between object and image. The point to be made here, however, is that in such cases the sense of a transferred image is not present; the metaphor normally goes unnoticed, largely due to the relative ease with which the area of semantic overlap can be found between the two things being compared.

For example, the comparison between the *'leg of a horse'* and the *'leg of a table'* is based on the fact that both the animal and the piece of furniture have their legs to

hold them up and to keep them in a standing position, the difference being that, unlike horses, tables do not walk with their legs.Instances like these are understood almost literally rather than figuratively, and cannot actually be described as metaphorical in any creative sense of the word because they have lost their initial power to produce comparison. Hence, they are commonly referred to as 'dead' or 'fossilized' metaphors.

As far as translation is concerned, it can be stated generally that dead metaphors are not difficult to translate. This is largely due to the fact that they have universal applications for all languages. Consider, for example, the use of English 'head' and its Arabic counterpart (رأس) to denote the part that resembles a head (its shape, position, and/or function) in a wide variety of things, such as 'pin' , 'nail', 'hammer', 'matchstick', 'lettuce', 'company/organization', 'state', 'list', 'table', etc. SL expressions involving such usages are usually rendered into the TL through direct translation.

One, however, should hasten to warn against the overgeneralization of this procedure to cases where it may not be applicable for one reason or another. For example, the use of English 'foot' in expressions like 'the foot of the page/wall/ mountain' is not similarly counterparted in Arabic where the word (اسفل), meaning 'the lower part' is normally used. And while English uses 'eye' to refer to the 'hole of a needle', Arabic has a special name for it, viz. On the other hand, the word for 'eye' in Arabic, i.e. (عين), is used with a variety of meanings which are nonexistent in English, e.g., 'an important person', 'a reconnoiter', 'prime: of the very best quality' as in (عيون الشعر) meaning 'the choicest works of poetry '), etc.

It is often the case that the sense of a metaphor cannot be easily found or directly defined because of that 'implied analogy'. If you call someone 'a snake', for example, what actual resemblance to a snake would you take as the sense of that metaphor? By calling that person a snake, you certainly do not mean that he/she is a limbless reptile, or capable of producing venom, or dangerous to approach. In this case, the relationship of similarity between the object and the image cannot be said to be direct. What may be described as the sense of the metaphor in the present instance would be easier to-understand if put in the following terms: *the feeling of caution, fear, and apprehension, which people normally have towards snakes is being felt towards the person referred to in the metaphor.* In other words, the type of metaphor exemplified here works through some common attitude which the speakers of a language take up towards the object and image involved in the figurative expression they use.

It should be emphasized that here too no translation procedure can be said to be applicable to each and every instance of metaphor, as speakers of different languages may have different attitudes towards more or less the same creatures, objects, and/or phenomena in their respective cultures. Translators often encounter cases where a metaphor meaning one thing in one culture has an entirely different interpretation in another. For example, 'a rainy day' in most European countries is a time you need to make provision for (*'save something for a rainy day'*), but a very welcome occasion in the scorching deserts of the Middle East, where people ***pray*** for rain. Furthermore, the choice of a particular translation procedure may be subject to the type of the text to be translated and the purpose it is designed to serve.

In an attempt on their part to provide alternative solutions to problem in translating metaphor, some translation theorists and teachers have proposed a number of translation procedures whereby to translate metaphors from one language into another. These procedures include:

(1) retaining the same SL metaphorical image in the TL,

(2) replacing the SL metaphorical image with a TL simile, keeping the image,

(3) replacing the SL metaphorical image with another established TL one,

(4) retaining the same metaphorical image plus sense,

(5) converting metaphor to sense, and

(6) omitting the metaphor (when it occurs in an anonymous text).

The choice from among the aforementioned procedures is made depends on the structure and function of the particular metaphor within the context concerned. This also depends on the notion of 'similarity or comparison underlying metaphorical expressions, and what constitutes the primary function of metaphor: whether it is always used for practical description and understanding, or may also be used for purely aesthetic purposes.

The is also a tendency among student translators (and even practicing translators sometimes) to apply one or other of the aforementioned translation procedures (e.g., the literal translation of the so-called ' dead metaphors', or the conversion of an SL metaphor into a TL simile) rather mechanically, often resulting in renditions that either sound unnatural and foreign, or fail to produce a textual effect equivalent to that of the SL expression.

However, the translation of literary works is one type of translation where translators try their best to be as artistic, creative, and skillful as possible, and where methodological stands are generally more discernible than elsewhere.

Some writers go even so far as to deny the claim that metaphors are comparisons, that they simply record pre-existing similarities. There are cases, it is argued, where metaphors *create* similarities rather than give an objective description of them (see Kittay 1987: 17). Evidence for this argument can be found in the following lines from a poem entitled (أنشودة المطر) 'Rain Song' by the late Iraqi poet al-Sayyaab:

عَيْنَاكِ غَابَتَا نَخِيلٍ سَاعَةَ السَّحَرْ،

أو شُرْفَتَانِ رَاحَ يَنْأَى عَنْهُمَا القَمَرْ.

عَيْنَاكِ حِينَ تَبْسُمَانِ تُورِقُ الكُرُومْ

وَتَرْقُصُ الأَضْوَاءُ ...كَالأَقْمَارِ في نَهَرْ

يَرُجُّهُ المِجْدَافُ وَهْنَاً سَاعَةَ السَّحَرْ

كَأَنَّمَا تَنْبُضُ في غَوْرَيْهِمَا، النُّجُومْ ...

Your eyes are two palm tree forests in early light,
Or two balconies from which the moonlight recedes
When they smile, your eyes, the vines put forth their leaves,
And lights dance .. like moons in a river
Rippled by the blade of an oar at break of day;
As if stars were throbbing in the depths of them ... (Jayyusi 1987: 427)

Quite obviously, there seems to be no place here for the traditional view that metaphor is a primarily visual or conceptual similarity between dissimilar things. In the above metaphor, it would be futile to look for direct resemblance between object, ' eyes', and image, 'two palm tree forests' (line 1) and 'two balconies .. .' (line 2). Indeed, when the poem was first published (1960), it was widely criticized for "the apparent absence of visual similarity" between the two components of the metaphor. In a metaphor like this one, however, the relationship of similarity, instead of being described as direct or visual, would more appropriately be said to lie "in the mind of the maker of the metaphor, rather than in the specific qualities of vehicle (image) and tenor (object)". Notice that the poet describes the eyes by using a complex metaphor (lights dancing like moons in a river, and stars throbbing in their depths), whereby he expresses both "the complex reality of her eyes ".

An essential feature of a successful metaphor, that is, consists in that there is a certain distance between its object and image: they must be sufficiently different for their juxtaposition to arouse a sense of novelty.

Metaphor and Simile: Distinctions and Implications for Translation

A metaphor may thus be found to be inappropriately turned into a simile, replaced by a non-metaphor, converted to sense, or its original image unsuitably replaced by another one-that is far less suggestive and forceful than the former. Cases like these often reflect unawareness on the part of the given translator of some very significant distinctions between metaphor and other figurative devices. This, perhaps, because he/she fail to bring up these distinctions. Translators need to bear in mind the distinctions between these two devices whenever they are encountered by a situation where they have to choose between two or more translation alternatives.

1. Range of comparison: One point of distinction between metaphor and simile is that the former has a wider range of comparison than the latter. In a sentence like *'That man walks like a peacock'* (ذاك الرجل يمشي كالطاووس), what the simile suggests is that the property which the man and a peacock have in common consists in their way of walking. There is no suggestion of the man's other peacock-like attributes, e.g., fine appearance, colorfulness, perhaps long-neckedness, etc., which can be vividly suggested by the metaphor 'That man is a peacock' (ذاك الرجل يمشي كالطاووس). The very explicitness and circumstantiality of simile is a limitation, while "the ability of metaphor to allude to an indefinite bundle of things which cannot be adequately summarized gives it its extraordinary power to open new paths of expression" Leech (1969: 156).

   Unless unavoidable for one reason or another, the translation of metaphor into simile would thus result in a considerable translation loss. Let us take as a case in point the metaphor contained in the following lines from Hamlet's famous soliloquy *(Hamlet,* Act lll, Scene 1) and the way it has been handled in a particular translation:

> To be, or not to be: that is the question:
> Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
> The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
> Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
> And by opposing end them?

In these lines Hamlet is wondering which is nobler, to suffer the blows of fortune or fight them. The decision he is trying to make is expressed metaphorically in the third and fourth lines: the objects '(outrageous) fortune' and 'troubles' are described in terms of the images 'slings and arrows', and 'a sea', respectively. To start with, the above metaphor seems to lend itself naturally to being retained in Arabic; images involving the sea and the various meanings associated with it (e.g. caprice, roughness, vastness, majesty, abundance, etc.) constitute some of the most frequently used metaphors in the language.

For example, the very idea expressed through 'a sea of trouble ' is more or less similarly rendered in an equally effective metaphor in the following line by the ancient Arab poet al-Mutanabbi (d. 965):

<div dir="rtl">ومُرهفٍ سرثُ بينَ الجحفلين به   حتى ضربثُ وموجُ الموت يلتطمُ</div>

Clearly, al-Mutanabbi's metaphor (موجُ الموت) *'waves (sea) of death'* closely resembles Shakespeare's 'a sea of troubles', where the objects 'death' and 'troubles', respectively, are described in terms of the same image, i.e., 'a sea' to express the idea of immensity or numerousness. The other image in Shakespeare's metaphor, namely 'slings and arrows ', can also equally naturally be maintained in Arabic. This being the case, one would expect the above Shakespearean metaphor to be naturally rendered into an equivalent Arabic metaphor with the same image. In the following translation, however, the situation is quite different. The metaphor in Hamlet's soliloquy is translated (Jamaal1983: 51-2) as follows:

<div dir="rtl">أنى لأتساءل فيما إذا كنت حقا موجودا في هذا الوجود أم غير موجود. فأي الحالتين أمثل يا ترى؟ أأستكين للرجم والمظالم أم انهض لمقاومة المصائب ولو كانت كرذاذ المطر شدة وقسوة؟</div>

In this translation, the SL metaphor 'sea of troubles' is rendered significantly less forceful by being shifted to a simile in the TL. 'Troubles', the object of the SL metaphor, are described in terms of being "as harsh and as violent as drizzle" (كرذاذ المطر شدة وقسوة"). Note also that the metaphor is further weakened by reducing the SL image 'sea' to a mere 'drizzle'. The other SL metaphor, 'the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune', is rendered almost non-metaphorically into "should I give way to curses and iniquities?", where neither the SL object nor the SL image is retained in the TL, which, as far as we can judge, is unjustifiable. The metaphors in question may more appropriately be translated into something like the following by Jabra (1986a: 93-4):

أأكون أم لا أكون؟ ذلك هو السؤال.

أمن النبل للنفس أن يصبر المرء على

مقاليع الدهر اللئيم وسهامه

أم يشهر السلاح على بحر من الهموم وبصدها ينهيها؟

Jabra's translation reflects his awareness of the above-made distinction between metaphor and simile; by retaining the SL objects and images, he was able to maintain the force of the original metaphors, their connotations, and their unrestricted range of comparison.