

*The Controversy over Translators' Guided
or Free Choice of Lexis on Rendering
Literary and Scientific Texts*
Mahir Hussein Ali Al-Jarjary *

تأريخ القبول: 2022/9/24

تأريخ التقديم: 2022/9/10

Abstract

One of the pivotal points in translation is the translator's success in choosing the appropriate lexis to convey the right and full meaning of the text at hand. Such a success usually outlines the range of freedom granted to the translator to select the right meanings of the lexis to come out with the required meaningful reliable translations. The current study aims at investigating, theoretically and practically, the range of freedom available to translators in making decisive choices between both guided translation and free translation to decide upon the right lexical items and expressions in translating literary and scientific texts. It is worthy to note that although a translator utilizes their knowledge, judgment, experience, and background knowledge to come out with appropriate translations, both genres, i.e. literary and scientific texts with the subjectivity and objectivity that characterize them respectively, put a further burden on the translator's shoulder in terms of being either guided or free in the choice of the appropriate lexis to capture the intended meaning fully and come up with an acceptable translation. As such, this study hypothesizes that translators' poor knowledge of both lexical meaning and lexical formation can affect the range of lexical item choice in the translation process. It can also break the bond between the lexical items and the things, ideas, and states they represent. The outcome of all this will be mistranslation. One of the key findings of this study is that, in contrast to scientific lexis, where the translator must

*Asst.Lect/ Dept. of Translation / College of Arts / University of Mosul.

be objective and guided, literary lexis are free to be translated according to the translator's opinions, knowledge, and feelings.

Keywords: Lexical Item, Guided Translation, Free Translation, Scientific Translation, Literary Translation.

1. Introduction

Language is the best means of communication across different languages and diverse cultures. Yet, communication cannot be feasibly carried out if the linguistic items used in either spoken or written language are decontextualized. They, i.e. linguistic items, should rather be introduced within contexts represented by well-interwoven texts as far as their unity, intentionality, cohesion, coherence, clarity, understandability and familiarity are concerned. Language is also a tool used by the members of a social group to express their thoughts, feelings, needs and other daily interaction requirements. It is, as Bussmann (1996: 627) views it, a “vehicle for the expression or exchanging of thoughts, concepts, knowledge, and information as well as the fixing and transmission of experience and knowledge”. It is the product of a set of cognitive processes that determine the selection of the appropriate lexical items out of the mental lexicon, and the combination of these items into higher units represented by phrases, sentences, texts or discourse (Quintero and Buendía, 2001: 177).

In translation, the right and precise conveyance of ideas from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL) remains the most demanding task. This is so as translators are required to put forward translations in the target language that fully reflect the meaning already implied by the source language and be knowledgeable about the series of cognitive, motor and reflective processes that would enable them to successfully manage the translation task especially when it comes to the selection of the source language lexis that best fit or equalize their counterparts in the TL.

The current research seeks to shed light on a point that attends to both meaning and lexis in translation. Translation for Newmark (1988: 5) is “rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text”, from the

definition, it is clear that meaning is the salient goal to be brought about at the expense of the lexis that is required to put a piece of translation, a text, in its final shape. Additionally, in the translation task, much confusion is expected since one particular meaning of the lexical item is required to put forward a meaningful and appropriate text. Yet, problems arise when translators lack the strategies that enable them to choose the right lexical item at the right time for the right purpose.

Such problematic points are better highlighted when posing the following research questions:

1. Why does a translator choose a certain lexical item rather than another?
2. How do translators decide upon the best lexical item in the target language for a counterpart one in the source language when there are other possible similar but slightly different lexical items?
3. When is the translator opted to or obliged to choose a lexical item?
4. Does the text type opt the translators or oblige them to choose a certain lexical item or a style?
5. What are the factors that affect a translator's choice of a lexical item or a style rather than another?
6. What role is played by context in making translators resort to the on-spot choice of the right lexis while translating?

2. Translation: Basic Elements

Albeit Austin's seminal work *How to do Things with Words* (1962) on speech acts and Chesterman (1985: 5) view of translation as "something people do with words", people's doing with words to come out with precise translations is not easy task as single words are supposed to combine into larger combinations which combine to make sentences that are said to be right and meaningful. It can be deduced from the few preceding lines that the understanding of any text to rightly translate it requires attending to previous practices, experiences, beliefs and suppositions that have been accumulated throughout a translator's personal, social and cultural life. In this perspective, reference should be made to the term "internal resources" which is borrowed from Pavlovic (2007: 89), and is

defined as the resources that the translator possesses based on past experiences, competencies and knowledge.

Style forms one of the prominent aspects of the art of translation. The different styles and patterns in which the translated texts emerge entail their nonsystematic nature that is in essence the product of the various techniques adopted by the translators at the levels of lexis, grammar, meaning, and culture, which in turn highlight the fact that not all translators translate in the same way in all cases. Robinson (1997: 38-39) states that translation is a highly complicated process that requires rapid multilayered analyses of semantic fields, syntactic structures, the sociology and psychology of reader- or listener-response, and cultural difference that further requires the existence of an element of choice. On his part, Munday (2009: 227) points out that certain prominent stylistic properties of individual translators can be identified from the analysis of the texts translated by them due to the individual translator's idiolect or lexical priming. Hatim (2009: 44) adds that the text type, whether "informative, expressive and operative intentions (or rhetorical purposes) and functions (or the uses to which texts are put), is said to have a direct result for the kind of semantic, syntactic and stylistic features used and for the way texts are structured, both in their original form and in the translation". Accordingly, experienced translators usually and easily recognize the source language structure, and render it into a target language structural equivalent with the provision of the appropriate lexical items that seem to come to them automatically, without conscious thought or logical analysis.

Function is a further aspect of the art of translation that can be preserved when a translator is knowledgeable about the relationship that exists between a source text type and the translation method. Reiss (1976 cited in Hatim, 2009: 44-45) argues that in an informative text, the translator must, in the first place, focus on having semantic equivalence and then move to the connotative meanings and aesthetic values. The same author further states that in an expressive text, the translator's main concern should be preserving the aesthetic effects side by side with the pertinent aspects of the semantic content", while in an operative

text, the translator is supposed “to heed the extralinguistic effect which the text is intended to achieve, even if this has to be undertaken at the expense of both form and content”.

Context, in case rightly handled, is also identified as a further means to bring about precise effective translation. Guessing the meanings of the new lexis is encountered in everyday interaction or translation. This is so because different meanings of a lexical item can be construed or suggested when presented in isolation. Yet, this does not apply to the lexical items used in texts or utterances to be translated. It is said that the nature of the translated text or discourse, scientific or literary, imposes restrictions on the translator’s task in this respect and makes them adopt one of the two strategies, namely Guided Translation as they are not opted to choose but rather use lexis that should be proper and to the point in meaning, or Free Translation when the translator is opted to choose as they are not restricted by a textual meaning that imposes an inevitable selection of one lexis rather than another. To conclude, Anderman (1996: 4) states that the way lexical items interact with their surroundings through the so-called syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations plays a paramount role in the cohesive construction of a text.

A final element to be attended to in the art of translation is the **relation between textual meaning and lexical meaning**. The former, i.e. textual meaning is said to be the outcome of the combination of different elements that make up the text. Here, translators reject lexical choices in translation as they set out of the conception that the lexicon of a language form merely a list of lexical items alphabetically ordered and accompanied with a definition, as is the case with most monolingual dictionaries, or a direct equivalent in the other language, as found in the bilingual ones. If this is the case, it would be very easy to translate from one language into another, since the translator’s sole task would be replacing lexical items in the source language with their equivalents in the target language. Yet, the problem here would be a production of rigid translations with noticeable *defects* in the textual meaning that is in most cases misleading and incomprehensible. The latter, lexical meaning is known to be the outcome of the choices at a

lower level, i.e. lexical choices that play a focal role in the overall organization of the text.

3. Types of Translation Involved in the Current Study

Pym (2010: 31) speaks of dichotomies coined by researchers engaged in investigating, studying, searching, and analyzing the art of translation in one way or another. For instance, Levy (1969) distinguishes between “illusory” and “anti-illusory” translations; House (1997) refers to “overt” and “covert” translations; Nord (1997: 47-52) prefers the terms “documentary” and “instrumental” to describe different translations; Toury (1980) talks about translations being “adequate” (to the ST) or “acceptable” (in terms of the norms of reception); Venuti (1995), referring back to Schleiermacher, identifies “fluent” translations and opposes them to “resistant” translation.

The present study, however, adds a further dichotomy represented by “free” and “guided” translations in terms of the translator’s being opted or obliged to choose certain lexis while doing the task of translation. In the following paragraphs, the light will be shed on the types suggested by the researcher, i.e. “free” and “guided” translations, then on “scientific” translation and “literary” translation as both types form focal points closely related to the title under study.

3.1. Free Translation vs. Guided Translation

While it is unanimously viewed that the prime goal behind the translation of any text should be the transference of almost entirely the same meaning of the original text and the reproduction of almost the same reaction, understanding and enthusiasm on the part of the reader of the target language as that of the source language reader, translation has been viewed differently by different scholars and theorists as the focus has been on different factors that may impact a translator’s choices and turn translation into both a process and an art.

Translation is a process when certain steps should be adopted and followed and little or no freedom is left for the translator in terms of the manipulation of the basic elements that are required for

the production of translations that are meaningful and effective. In other words, translators find themselves in the mid of a challenge of selecting lexical and grammatical choices from a wide range of alternatives available to them side by side with many factors that influence the choice of one of them. The process type of translation highlights one of the two types of translation that forms the core of the current research, namely Guided Translation.

Translation is also viewed as art when translators are not found to work with blinkers and within set boundaries. They rather have the freedom to make choices here and there right at the level of single lexical items choice through expressions through whole sentences. This forms the second type of translation, viz. Free Translation. It is worth noting that in considering such dichotomies within the domain of translation, the focus is on the extent of choice that a translator is allowed to make. In other words, translators have a wide range of renditions to choose from, and “the factors that influence their choices are not restricted to those of the source text (and) if there are different equivalents to choose from, the selection criteria must come from somewhere close to the translator” (Pym, 2010: 38).

It is worthwhile that the elaboration on the meanings of these terms will pave the way to further relevant discussion. Yet, unfortunately, by consulting many relevant dictionaries and the internet, there is no full equivalence between guided translation and free translation, between Arabic and English. The dictionaries only give the meaning of the term *Free to free (to choose or undertake), voluntary, having the power of free choice and having the choice or option* (Baalbaki, 2010: 1003), while the term Guided means *unfree (to choose or undertake), not endowed with a free will, having no power of free choice, forced, compelled and obliged* (Baalbaki, 2010: 1043). As such, free translation can be defined as the choice between two things or more, in our case the choice between two lexical items or more. Here, the translator will be responsible for their all choices/options. Guided translation, on its part, can be defined as the type of translation where no room is left for the translator to choose between things, i.e. they are not free in their choices.

To conclude, one can explain the translator's technique of using lexical items in the target text as the woman's face and makeup. Let us consider the woman face is the text and the makeup as the lexical items. If the woman uses the right makeup type and colour (i.e. lexical items) at the right point of her face (i.e. the text), of course freely and according to her previous experiences in putting on makeup, the face will be shiny and clear. Consequently, this will make the woman more confident and prouder (i.e. the translator will be more confident with the target text). One should not forget that if she does not have enough makeup types and colours, then she will be obliged to choose the available ones only, then she is Guided. Accordingly, translators are Free and Guided in their choices from time to time. Yet, the question is: On what basis do translators make their choices? The answer to such a question is that they build their choices leaning on what they have learned through practicing, accumulating background knowledge, biases towards the source language or the target language, etc. All of these determine the translators' choices and give them the inspiration into what to choose or not.

3.2 Literary Translation vs. Scientific Translation

No two translations are the same since "lexical items have different resonances and connotations for everyone, and when a translator works, s/he dredges up expressions, interpretations, vocabulary and insight from a host of subconscious pools of language and experience" (Paul, 2009: 2). As such, a scientific translator is defined by McKay (2006: 136) as "a translator who works with scientific, computer or engineering materials, whereas a literary translator is a translator who works with novels, stories, poems or plays" (McKay, 2006: 134). This is quite evident in the translation of different types of texts that subsume their own parts of speech, i.e. pronouns, nouns, adverbs, adjectives, articles, prepositions, etc., decided by the writer's style and their position in the sentence. Added to that, the choice of the appropriate lexical item, can be difficult for the translator as most lexical items, besides their basic "dictionary" meanings, can express many "implications,

connotations, and attitudes” (Edmonds and Hirst, 2002: 105) and duly makes the translator’s freedom at stake when making choices between two or more options.

Landers (n.d.: 72) states that a universal claim is that translators only deal with lexical items, “but this is partly true” since the basic elements of the text, i.e. ideas should be attended to. And in literary texts, cultural elements also come to the forefront.

On this basis, **literary translation** is viewed as the translation of literary genres, namely novel, story, poetry, theatre, prose, and prose poem with the purpose identify the source language writer’s intentions. Venuti (1995: 41) points out that “literary translation remains a discursive practice where the translator can experiment in the choice of foreign texts and the development of translation methods, constrained primarily by the current situation in the target-language culture”.

Anani (2003: 7,9) outlines semanticists’ differentiation between denotation mainly by reference and connotation where other elements are required. For instance, the phrase “جهاز تنظيم الأسرة”; a governmental agency can be rendered by the successful translator as “authority” or “agency”, not organization, committee, commission, foundation or establishment” that denotes nongovernmental institutions.

Paul (2009: 5) thinks that translators of literary texts, in addition to the ability to convert lexical items literally from the source language to the target language, should be “much more creative, involving an instinctive understanding of the way that lexical items and phrases can work together to best effect” to bring about the source text meaning, intentions and the subtle cultural biases towards source language culture that are inherent in the translated terminology.

To conclude, the problem of literary translation emerges from what is called the “The Principle of Choice” which presupposes the existence of many unavoidable alternatives in the target language acquired by the translator through their long experience, their literary background knowledge and “The Principle of Availability”, i.e. what is bearing in their mind and sentiment (Anani, 2003: 217). So, recognizing the context determines the

appropriate and needed terminology that is equivalent in its effect and intention to that in the source text.

Scientific translation is usually done of texts with one focal point or piece of information, with every part contributing to the main line of argument, without digressions or repetitions. Also, the texts are objective and aim at informing rather than entertaining, and duly stick to the standard written form of language which is characterized by clarity, directness and the absence of ambiguous or complicated sentences. In other words, the vocabularies have very specific meanings and are accurately used and scientific terms and jargon are used only when they are required for accuracy. Since the emphasis in scientific texts is on conveying information, such texts use more nouns and verbs compared to adjectives or adverbs. Samuelsson-Brown (2004: 7) states that translators of scientific texts have to keep abreast with and acquire a large vocabulary for the concepts and objects which may be discipline-specific and know the precise meaning and usage of each specialized lexical item.

Yet, as Newmark (1988) remarks, the dilemma in scientific translation is the new terminologies which makes translators be guided rather than free. Hartley (2009: 112) adds that “terms are lexical items which have specialized reference within a particular subject domain”, i.e. one object, otherwise information will get mixed and quite confusing.

Since scientific texts, unlike literary texts, are not laden with emotives, connotations, sound effects and metaphors (Newmark, 1988: 157), focus should be on the facts or scientific theories, the translation of which requires good knowledge of “the subject matter, or a proven ability to research, disseminate and extrapolate information successfully” (Paul, 2009: 8). Likewise, Hervey et al. (1995: 124-125) point out that scientific translation is the translation of “empirical/descriptive texts written in the context of scientific or technological disciplines” which requires familiarity with “its own ‘scientific’ register, its own terminology, its own genre marking characteristics”, so as to avoid the problems of the impossibility of deducing the exact meaning, wrong familiarity with the meanings of the terms, failure to recognize the term as a scientific term and hence carelessly rendering it in its ordinary sense, and availability

of semantically independent scientific terms and brand names that are normally translated or transferred one-for-one and free of linguistic as well as situational and topic context (Newmark, 1991: 89).

The same view is shared by Pym (2010: 21) who puts forward the issue of “naturalness” in the target language by posing the following questions: should the translator use loans from the source text, or should new terms be invented from the resources considered “natural” in the target language?

The preceding conditions, that the scientific translator should meet, can be met by the availability of updated data-banks as sources of constant consultation, constant follow-up of the matter of innovation in scientific texts with the new vocabulary they introduce, awareness of the loose or informal use of scientific terms, and a firm grasp of the immediate textual context and the wider scientific context (Hervey et al., 1995: 125).

To conclude, scientific translators are prone to the issues of responsibility or legal liability as their one mistake may result in “financial damage or loss of life and limb” and the translated text “might create a serious misnomer showing ignorance, thus undermining the reader’s confidence in the text”, unlike literary translators who are not held responsible for their published target texts and their choice of wrong synonyms is viewed as a stylistic error at worst.

3.2.1 Differences between Literary Translation and Scientific Translation

The evident contrast between literary and scientific translation is on one hand the “non-scientific” nature of literary translation which is defined by literary style and literature the most significant aspect of which is that it exists only in the mind, not in the actual world, realized to be subjective and reflects the emotional feelings expressed in the language used in literature, and on the other hand, the “non-literary” nature of scientific translation that is objective and reflects the precision of terms used in the scientific literature and where the world is described as objects around us through facts and informational claims (Finlay, 1962: 57-61).

Citreon (1966: 181-183) mentions several significant distinctions. Literary translation, he claims, is concerned with fiction, poetry, plays, essays, or belle-letters, whereas scientific translation is concerned with natural sciences and their applications in chemistry, medicine, engineering, and other fields. Literary translation stresses the form because it is concerned with belle letters, whereas scientific translation emphasizes the content. As a result, due to the collection of complex systems that such texts contain, which are linked to other systems outside of them, translating literary works can be difficult for the translator (McGuire, 1980: 77). In contrast, translating scientific texts from one language to another does not provide the same challenges (Nida, 1964: 223) since they are less context-dependent.

Additionally, a literary translator is mainly concerned with lexical items because literary translation is rich in metaphor, simile, and metonymy, whereas a scientific translator is concerned mainly with terms rather than figures of speech to bring about pragmatic objectivity as opposed to aesthetic value.

Finally, a literal translation of scientific terminology is quite demanding since changing them entails changing scientific information. In the absence of an equivalent translation, the so-called loan words are borrowed and explained to the recipient. In the case of a literary text, the translator is free to use whatever vocabulary they want as long as the spirit, basic connotations, and scientific characteristics of the text are maintained.

4. From Theory to Practice: A Dovetailed View

Translation is the rewriting of an original text including its intention, reflection of a certain ideology, and introduction of new concepts, new genres and new devices. Such a rewriting, on the contrary, can also repress innovation, distort main original ideas and contain unintentional errors.

Since communicative translation, a prominent example of rewriting, aims at leaving an effect on the target text readers that is similar to that experienced by the readers of the source text, translators are supposed to improve the source text and adapt it as much as possible to the target language textual and cultural norms.

Kiraly (1995: 60) states that “the nonliterary translations that most graduates of translator training programs are likely to encounter professionally, would require communicative translation”. Opposite to that, literary and authoritative texts which are closely bound to the source culture and its values might require semantic translation.

Both communicative and literary types of translation, side by side with the types referred to in the preceding sections, require a careful and well-planned selection of the lexis that fit the contexts of use. Samuelsson-Brown (2004: xi) states that “these categorisations are not entirely accurate but are generally accepted” While the latter, according to Venuti (2000: 285), performs only a semantic transfer and deals with texts that entertain a relation of exteriority or instrumentality to their language, the former is concerned with texts so bound to their language that the translating act inevitably becomes a manipulation of signifiers, where two languages enter into various forms of collision.

Building on that, the guided or free choice of lexis may be quite misleading and problematic and may corrupt the final rendered target text when there are few uses of word variety (Venuti, 2000: 288). The guided translator would use only a few varieties of lexical items during the translation process. Otherwise, s/he will be free. For example, the Arabic lexical items خوف (fear), هلع (appeal), رُعب (panic), خشية (fright), رُهاب (phobia), دُعر (terror), etc. denote a variety of lexical items that mean (fear) and have the same general meaning, albeit each one of them has its specific meaning according to the context of its use. Misuse or the wrong selection of any of them may corrupt the target text. The inexperienced translator may use (fear) on rendering any one of these lexical items; hence, there would be inappropriate rendering of the target text.

A further example is represented by the translation of the Arabic lexical items (الطلاء، الراح، صافية، سلاف), each of which has its specific meaning and the situation to be used in, (wine) in English (Anani, 2005: 273). Commenting on this, Dam-Jensen (2012: 159), in his paper on students’ translation processes, argues that investigating the strategies used by students to decide upon a certain type of translation shows that no reasons are there, in the majority

of cases, and that personal judgement, evaluation, and preference play a crucial and effective role in this respect.

5. Data Analysis and Discussion:

With the exception of some translations of literary works that have become great works of literature, there is no doubt that the transfer of literary works between languages – such as the work below – by skilled translators closely associated with literature, language, and translation is missing something. A skilled translator compensates for what the original text loses when it is translated, resulting in a work of literature that is equal to, if not better than, the original text in the target language.

The researcher chooses two English texts and their Arabic translations to determine what is being stated above. The first text is a literary extract from (*Hamlet*, Act I, Scene I, pp.6-7), whereas the second is a scientific text from (*Rafidain Journal of Science*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 1-11, 2021).

SL Text: (Literary Text)

Enter Ghost

Marcellus Peace, break thee off. Look where it comes again!

Barnardo In the same figure like like the king that's dead.

Marcellus Thou art a scholar; speak to it, Horatio.

Barnardo Looks 'a not like the king? Mark it, Horatio.

Horatio Most like. It harrows me with fear and wonder.

Barnardo It would be spoke to.

Marcellus Speak to it, Horatio.

Horatio What art thou that usurp'st this time of night,
Together with that fair and warlike form
In which the majesty of buried Denmark
Did sometimes march? By heaven I charge thee, speak!

Marcellus It is offended.

Barnardo See, it stalks away!

Horatio Stay! speak, speak! I charge thee, speak!

Exit Ghost

(Hamlet, Act I, Scene I, pp.6-7)

TL Text (1)	TL Text (2)
<p>مرسلس: صمتاً، لا تتكلم! (يدخل الطيف)</p> <p>مرسلس: أنظر من أين يجيء ثانية. برناردو: في ذلك الشكل بعينه، كالمك الذي تُؤْفَى. مرسلس: أنت فقيه يا هوراشيو. خاطبه. برناردو: ألا يشبه الملك؟ تَبَيَّنُهُ يا "هوراشيو". هوراشيو: أشبه شيء به. إنه لأقضي عجباً وأرتعدُ رَهَباً. برناردو: كأنه يرغب في أن يوجه إليه الخطاب. مرسلس: كلمه يا "هوراشيو".</p> <p>هوراشيو: من أنت أيها الطارقُ في هذه الساعة من الليل طُرِقَ العاصِب، مُتَلَبِساً بشكل ذلك الملك النبيل الشجاع، الذي تَمَثَّلَتْ به جلالَةُ الـ "دانمرك" زمناً ثم الآن دُفِنَتْ بدفنه، باسم السماء أدعوك إلى التكلم، أجبُ. مرسلس: إنه لَمُعْضَب. برناردو: يتولى مُتَرَفِّعاً. هوراشيو: قف. تكلم. تكلم. أعزِّمُ عليك. (يغيب الطيف.)</p> <p>(يخرج الطيف) (Jabra, 1979: 29)</p>	<p>(يدخل الطيف.)</p> <p>مرسلس: صه. اقطع كلامك. أنظرها هو ذا عائد. برناردو: إنما ظاهره ظاهر الملك الذي مات. مرسلس: أنت فصيحٌ عليم. خاطبه يا "هوراشيو". برناردو: ألا يشبه الملك؟ تَبَيَّنُهُ يا "هوراشيو". هوراشيو: أشبه شيء به. إنه لأقضي عجباً وأرتعدُ رَهَباً. برناردو: كأنه يرغب في أن يوجه إليه الخطاب. مرسلس: كلمه يا "هوراشيو".</p> <p>هوراشيو: من أنت أيها الطارقُ في هذه الساعة من الليل طُرِقَ العاصِب، مُتَلَبِساً بشكل ذلك الملك النبيل الشجاع، الذي تَمَثَّلَتْ به جلالَةُ الـ "دانمرك" زمناً ثم الآن دُفِنَتْ بدفنه، باسم السماء أدعوك إلى التكلم، أجبُ. مرسلس: إنه لَمُعْضَب. برناردو: يتولى مُتَرَفِّعاً. هوراشيو: قف. تكلم. تكلم. أعزِّمُ عليك. (يغيب الطيف.)</p> <p>(Motran, 2012: 26-27)</p>

Discussion:

A close examination of the above text reveals a clear difference in the use of lexical items and structures between translators of the literary text (i.e. TT1 and TT2), and this difference in the use of the outcome - although the translators have tried to preserve the spirit of the original text - will lead to a difference in connotation and meaning depending on the context and the conditions of the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader.

Because the focus of this study is on the translator's freedom to translate lexis in literary and scientific texts and to keep things

simple and avoid theorizing, we will use a randomly selected excerpt from Hamlet's play as an example of a literary text, with two translations provided by translators Jabra (1979) and Motran (2012).

There are lexical differences employed by the translators during the translation process, yet, they are successful in translating the sense of the source text to the target language. Even though both translators have practiced all translation strategies, including deletion, addition, substitution, and other strategies, our focus here will be on the lexical level, rather than other linguistic levels. Lexical items, in some lines, will be compared in terms of the meaning of each user and decide the decision on the appropriateness of translation:

- The first line (Peace, break thee off. Look where it comes again!) was translated into (صمتاً، لا تتكلم! أنظر من أين يجيء ثانية) in TT1 (Jabra's translation) and into (صه. اقطع كلامك. أنظر ها هو ذا عائد) in TT2 (Motran's translation). It is apparent that (Peace) is being rendered freely into (صمتاً and صه). The target text (TT2) begins the dialogue in the lexical items of Marcellus with the lexical item (صه), which is an imperative verb for silence and not talk, while the translated text (TT1) begins with the lexical item (صمتاً), which is the source of the silencing request. The expression in the translated text (TT2) is closer to logic because the context requires an imperative verb rather than an infinitive. The difference is that the imperative verb is a request for superiority and a request for urgency, whereas (TT1) uses an infinitive which has a loosening of demand as if it places him solely on the option and does not ask him directly, and the distinction between the two uses is clear and wide. Although both translators were free to choose the equivalent lexical items in TTs, the translation of (TT1) is inappropriate.
- The translated text (TT2) continues the dialogue by Barnardo with the phrase (إنما ظاهره ظاهر الملك الذي مات), which is a phrase consisting of a nominal sentence blind in the meaning of (إنما). The translated text (TT2) is successfully used this structure and closed it with the phrase (الذي مات), and death includes those who died earlier and recently to agree with the analogy he wanted to

send, while we find the translator in (TT1) in the phrase (في ذلك) (الشكل بعينه، كالملك الذي تُوفِّي) uses a nominal phrase that is incomplete by meaning and composition, as well as the phrase (الذي توفي). (الوفاة) is said for those his soul just came out and does not work for those who died earlier (i.e. مات) (Omer, 2008: 2137-8). So the phrases used in (TT2) are more accurate and appropriate translation, and more coordinated and consistent though both translators select the lexical items in TTs freely.

- Moving to the translation of (Most like. It harrows me with fear and wonder), the translator in (TT2) rendered it into (أشبهُ شيء به.) (إنه لأقضي عجباً وأرتعدُ رهباً أشدَّ الشبه انه يرعدني) (خوفاً ودهشة). Here, the (TT1) is closer to appropriateness and accuracy in terms of provided connotative meaning than (TT2). The phrase in (TT1) is highly condensed and is not complicated, as opposed to (TT2), which is heavy in hearing and structure, as if it were ideals, adages, and commandments.
- The dialogue continues by Barnardo in the phrase (It would be spoke to.). The (TT2) rendered it into (كأنه يرغب في أن يوجه إليه) (يريد من يخاطبه) while (TT1) into (يفاعل). Here, the structure of (TT1) is the most powerful and precise in the provided meaning. The translator in (TT1) uses (يفاعل) formula, which is a conjugation formula that means mutual communication between two, which is the closest to the meaning of the context. It is intense and uncomplicated, as opposed to (TT2), which came with a long structure that causes the scatter of translation's central idea.
- The translator in (TT2) renders (Speak to it, Horatio) into (كَلِّمْه يا) (أساله يا هوراشيو), while the translator of (TT1) into (أسأل). Here, the structure of (TT1) was closer to the appropriateness of use than (TT2). In (TT1), the translator uses the imperative verb (اسأل). It is a verb that is appropriate to the position of the text and the situation, as opposed to (TT2). The (TT2) uses the imperative verb (كَلِّمْ) and the speech might be for other than the question as if talking about status. So (TT2), in translation, is far from the true reality of the text.
- Finally, concerning the translation of (Stay! speak, speak! I charge thee, speak!) by Horatio, (TT2) rendered into (قف. تكلم. تكلم.)

قف، تكلم،! تكلم!) (أعزم عليك)، while we find (TT1) translated it into (استحلفك أن تتكلم!). Here, the structure of (TT1) was more plot and more structured in terms of meaning and connotation than (TT2). The phrase in (TT1) was concluded by the phrase (استحلفك أن تتكلم), which was often used as an eloquent statement indicating the oath in request to speak, contrary to the phrase (اعزم عليك) in (TT2) which is awkward by Arabic and has no way of influencing the recipient.

As shown by the analysis and discussion above, the translator in literary texts is frequently free to choose lexical items when translating. However, the translator of the literary text occasionally communicates his emotions and experiences, which might cause a deviation from the intended meaning of the source text. Therefore, the product does not necessarily have to be appropriate.

SL Text: (Scientific Text)

Simple and accurate spectrophotometric method for the estimation of benzocaine (BENZ) as pure form and in its formulation (ear drops) in aqueous solution has been developed. The method is based on the diazotization of BENZ, with equivalent amount of nitrite, in an acidic medium to yield the diazotized benzocaine. Then the diazotized benzocaine is coupled with 4-chlororesorcinol (4-CRL) reagent in basic medium to formed, an intense yellow azo dye, which is water-soluble and it has good stability. The yellow azo dye exhibits maximum absorption at 436 nm. The relationship between absorbance and concentration gave good range of determination from 10 to 50 μg BENZ in final volume of 10 ml i.e., 1 to 5 $\mu\text{g.ml}^{-1}$ with a molar absorptivity and Sandell's sensitivity index values of $3.722 \times 10^4 \text{ l.mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-1}$ and $0.0044 \mu\text{g.cm}^{-2}$ respectively, a relative error of -1.06 to $+2.47\%$ and a relative standard deviation was not more than 0.921% depending on the concentration level of BENZ, low detection limit of $0.1924 \mu\text{g.ml}^{-1}$ and low of quantitation value equal to $0.6416 \mu\text{g.ml}^{-1}$ have been estimated. The method has been applied to the estimation of BENZ in ear drop (otocol drops).

(Mohammed, et al. 2021: 1)

TL Text (1):

طريقة طيفية بسيطة ودقيقة لتقدير البنزوكائين (BENZ) بشكله النقي وفي مستحضره الصيدلاني (قطرة الأذن، اوتوكول). تعتمد الطريقة على ازوتة البنزوكائين مع كمية مكافئة من النتريت، في وسط حامضي لتحضير البنزوكائين المؤزوت. ثم يقرن البنزوكائين المؤزوت وفي الوسط المائي بوجود هيدروكسيد البوتاسيوم بالكاشف 4-كلوروريسورسينول لينتج صبغه ازوية صفراء اللون، ذائبة في الماء ولها استقراره عاليه. تعطي صبغة الأزو الصفراء أقصى امتصاص عند 436 نانومتر. وكانت العلاقة بين الامتصاص والتركيز في مدى تقدير من 10 إلى 50 ميكروغرام من بنزوكائين في الحجم النهائي 10 مل أي من 1 إلى 5 ميكروغرام. مل⁻¹ مع امتصاصية مولارية 3.722 x 10⁴ لتر. مول⁻¹. سم⁻¹ وقيمة معامل ساندل للحساسية 0.0044 مايكروغرام. سم⁻² وكانت قيمة الخطأ النسبي من -1.06 إلى +2.47% والانحراف القياسي النسبي ليس اكثر من 0.921% اعتمادًا على مستوى التركيز، وكانت قيمة حد الكشف 0.1924 وقيمة الحد الكمي 0.6416 مايكروغرام. مل⁻¹. تم تطبيق الطريقة لتقدير البنزوكائين في قطرة الأذن (اوتوكول).

(Mohammed, et al. 2021: 11)

TL Text (2):

تم تطوير طريقة طيفية بسيطة ودقيقة لتقدير البنزوكائين كصبغة نقيه وفي تركيبه (قطرات للاذن) في محلول مائي. تقوم الطريقة على ديازوتيزيشن ل البنزوكائين مع قدر مكافئ من النتريت وفي وسط حمضي للحصول على البنزوكائين المديز. ثم يصاحب الاخير كاشف كلوروريسورسينول-٤؛ في وسط أساسي لتشكيل صبغة أزو شديدة الاصفرار ذات قابلية ذوبان جيدة في الماء و استقرار جيد. ان لصبغة الأزو الصفراء قابلية امتصاص تصل الى ٤٣٦ نانومتر. تظهر العلاقة بين الامتصاص والتركيز مدى جيد من التحديد من ١٠ إلى ٥٠ ميكروغرام من البنزوكائين في الحجم النهائي ١٠ مل بمعنى ١ إلى ٥ ميكروغرام. مل⁻¹ مع امتصاص مولاري وقيم مؤشر حساسية ساندل البالغة ٣,٧٢٢-١٠٤ لتر.مول⁻¹. سم⁻¹ و ٠,٠٠٤٤ ميكروغرام. سم⁻² على التوالي، مع خطأ نسبي يبلغ -١,٠٦ إلى + ٢,٤٧% وانحراف معياري نسبي لا يتجاوز ال ٠,٩٢١%. وبالاعتماد على مستوى تركيز البنزوكائين وجد ان مدى الكشف الواطئ يبلغ ٠,١٩٢٤ ميكروغرام. مل⁻¹ وانخفاض قيمة الكمية تعادل ٠,٦٤١٦ ميكروغرام. مل⁻¹. تم تطبيق الطريقة لتقدير البنزوكائين في قطرة الأذن (قطرات اوتوكول).

Discussion:

Before starting to analyze the translation of the aforementioned content, the researcher was behind something crucial for scientific texts: knowing who translated the source text into the target text. When translating some terminologies, researchers were consulted to provide the solution in TT1 but the researchers were not consulted when translating lexical items in TT2 to assess the translator's proficiency in translating scientific lexical items on his own.

Returning to the source text, let's see how the translators of TT1 and TT2 rendered the various lexical elements. The following aims to investigate how the lexical items in the source text (i.e. English) are rendered into target texts (i.e. Arabic). A quick glance through the source text reveals that it is primarily composed of verbs and nouns, with few adjectives and adverbs, as typical of scientific writing. Furthermore, it is crystal clear that there are various features that distinguish the source text (i.e. the scientific text). The most crucial ones are terminology, objectivity, and accuracy.

Referring to the distinctions between communicative and semantic translation established by Newmark (1988, 1991), it is clear that translators utilize semantic translation to concentrate on the phonological, morphological, and lexical structure of the text. As a matter of fact, in source text-biased genres, semantic translation is applied (i.e. the translator is guided). It is a translation of the source text's context-specific meaning using the target text's syntactic and semantic features. It resembles the formal correspondence of Nida, which emphasizes both form and content. It is more literal, informative, and author-centered.

Semantic translation is of three categories, transliteration, *claque* and gloss. Transliteration, the first type of semantic translation, has been applied frequently in the target texts. Lexical items, in TT1 and TT2, that have been transliterated are 'benzocaine' بنزوكائين, 'nitrite' نتريت, 'chlororesorcinol' كلوروريسورسينول, 'azo' آزو, etc. Because these lexical items do not have an equivalent in target text or no new names have been

developed for them in target texts, they can only be transliterated (i.e. the translators are guided). For lexical items like ‘diazotized’ the Arabic equivalent is المؤزوت which is a kind of semantic translation (i.e. claque). Here, the translator of TT1 appropriately translates the lexical item ‘diazotized’, however, the translator of TT2 transliterated it as ‘ديازوتيزيشن’ demonstrating that the translator is not knowledgeable about chemistry and did not consult the researcher(s). It is abundantly evident that both translators are guided in this regard.

Lexical items like ‘spectrophotometric’ can only be translated into القياس الطيفي or الطيف and nothing else. The same is true for lexical items like ‘absorbance’ امتصاص, ‘quantitation’ الكمية, ‘acidic’ حامضي, etc. Since neither translator can change the meanings of the lexical items mentioned above, both translators are guided here as well, as was already stated.

Finally, there were lexical and syntactic difficulties during the translation. The use of literal translation enabled the translators to overcome such difficulties, e.g. ‘simple and accurate method’ طريقة بسيطة ودقيقة, ‘The yellow azo dye exhibits maximum absorption’ ان لصبغة الأزو تعطي صبغة الأزو الصفراء أقصى امتصاص and ان لصبغة الأزو ان لصبغة الأزو الصفراء أقصى امتصاص, ‘The method has been applied to the estimation of...’ تم تطبيق الطريقة لتقدير, etc.

From the discussion stated above, it is apparent that the translator in scientific texts is frequently guided to select lexical items when translating and is unbiased since he is putting forward accurate, truthful, and consistent information and there is no space for personal views.

6. Conclusion

The translators’ use of the free translation of literary texts and guided translation of scientific texts is determined by the genre of the text, fidelity to the source text, naturalness in the target text, similarity and difference in perspectives and philosophies, and ideology, ethical beliefs and values they hold.

In the present research, light has been shed on translation at large including its main types in particular with much focus on the

translators' guided or free choice of the lexis and the challenges they face when choosing what is appropriate out of the wide varieties of lexical and grammatical elements. It has also been highlighted that since every facet of human life has its own language, including the artistic, literary, philosophical, scientific, and so forth, each one should be dealt with differently when it comes to translation. As such, competent translators of literary texts can create an effective target language text depending on their mastery of both source language and target language, idiom, rhythm, cultural elements, etc. Added to that, to give the literary translated text its distinctive influence, translators have to probe what is there beneath the lexical items in order to make sense of the ideas and deeply understand both the source language and target language cultures. Finally, in spite of the freedom granted in literary translation, novice translators can be guided since their limited knowledge of the varieties of meaning may denote lexical items that are not synonymous. Yet, in scientific translation, choices are extremely difficult despite of the translator's practice and experience; hence it is guided. A further finding is that the communicative value of the text influences the translation strategy choice. Here, the text type, readership, translators' roles, and the purposes of the texts all play a part in deciding the used translation technique. Also, scientific translations heavily follow semantic translation rather than communicative translation to enrich the target text repertoire.

REFERENCES

- Anani, M. (2003). *at-Tarjamtul-'Adabiyya baynan-Nadhriyyati wat-Tatbiiq* (Literary Translation between Theory and Practice), 2nd Edition. Cairo: Egyptian International Co. for Publishing – Longman.
- _____ (2005). *Nadhariyyatut-Tarjamatil-Hadiitha* (Modern Translation Theory). Galyoob: Al-Ahram for Publishing.
- Anderman, G. and Rogers, M. (1996). “The Translator and the Language Learner: Linguistics Revisited”. In G. M. Anderman (ed.). *Words, Words, Words: The Translator and the Language Learner*, pp.1-14.
- Anderman, G. M. (1996). *Words, Words, Words: The Translator and the Language Learner*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Baalbaki, R. (2010). *Al-Mawrid: A Modern Arabic-English Dictionary*, 9th Edition, Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin.
- Bussmann, H. (1996). *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Translated and edited by G. Trauth and K. Kazzazi. London and New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Chesterman, A. (ed.) (1985). *Readings in Translation Theory*. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.
- Citreon, I. J. (1966). “The Myth of Two Profession Literary and Nonliterary Translation”. In: *Babel*, Vol.XII, No.4, pp.181-188.
- Dam-Jensen, H. (2012). “Decision-making in Translation: A Pilot Study of Students’ Translation Processes”. *Fachsprache* 3-4: 146-164.
- Edmonds, Ph. and Hirst, G. (2002). “Near-Synonymy and Lexical Choice”. *Computational Linguistics*, Volume 28, Number 2, pp.105-144.
- Finlay, I. F. (1962). “The Translation of Technical and Literary Material, Science Versus Art?”. In: *Babel*, Vol.VIII, No.2, pp.57-61.

The Controversy over Translators' Guided or Free Choice of Lexis on Rendering Literary and Scientific Texts **Mahir Hussein Ali Al-Jarjary**

- Hartley, T. (2009). "Technology and Translation". In: J. Munday (ed.). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (Revised Edition), pp.106-127.
- Hatim, B. (2009). "Translating Text in Context". In: J. Munday (ed.). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (Revised Edition), pp.36-53.
- Hervey, S.; Higgins, I. and Loughridge, M. (1995). *Thinking German Translation: A Course in Translation Method: German to English*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jabra, I. J. (1979) (Translation and An Introduction). **The Tragedy of the Prince of Denmark** (5th Edition). Beirut: The Arabic Foundation for Studies and Publishing.
- Kiraly, D. C. (1995). *Pathways to Translation: Pedagogy and Process*. Ohio: Kent State University Press.
- Landers, C. E. (ND). *Literary Translation: A Practical Guide*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- McGuire, S. B. (1980). **Translation Studies**. London: Methuen.
- McKay, C. (2006). *How to Succeed as a Freelance Translator* (1st Edition). USA: Two Rat Press.
- Mohammed, M. M.; Othman, N. S. and Al-Abady, F. M. (2021). "Using of 4-Chlororesorcinol as a Coupling Agent in Spectrophotometric Determination of Benzocaine". In: *Rafidain Journal of Science*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 1-11. [Rafidain Journal of Science \(mosuljournals.com\)](http://mosuljournals.com).
- Motran, Kh. (2012) (Translation). **Hamlet**. Cairo: Al-Hindawi Foundation for Education and Culture.
- Munday, J. (2009). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (Revised Edition). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- _____ (1991). *About Translation: Multilingual Matters*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Nida, E. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Omer, A. M. (2008). *Muʿjamul-Lughatil-ʿarabiyatil-Muʿasira* (Contemporary Arabic Language Lexicon) (1st Edition). Cairo: ʿalamul-Kutub.
- Paul, G. (2009). *Translation in Practice*. Champaign and London: Dalkey Archive Press.
- Pavlovic, N. (2007). *Directionality in Collaborative Translation Processes* (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation). Spain: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.
- Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. New York: Routledge.
- Quintero, J. P. and Buendía, C. T. (2001). “The Transference of Discourse Values in Translation via Lexis: Obscene Language as a Case in Point”. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 14: 177-196
- Raffel, B. (2003) (Annotated and An Introduction). **William Shakespeare: *Hamlet***. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Robinson, D. (1997). *Becoming a Translator: An Accelerated Course*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Samuelsson-Brown, G. (2004). *A Practical Guide for Translators* (Fourth Edition). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator’s Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____ (ed.) (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

المترجم وجدليّة حرية أو تقييد اختيار المفردة عند ترجمة النصوص الأدبيّة

والعلميّة

ماهر حسين علي الجرجري*

المستخلص

يُعد نجاح المترجم في اختيار المفردة المناسبة لنقل المعنى الصحيح والكامل للنص قيد الترجمة إحدى النقاط المحورية في عملية الترجمة. وعادةً ما يحدد هذا النجاح نطاق الحرية الممنوحة للمترجم لاختيار المعاني المناسبة للمفردات من أجل الحصول على الترجمات الموثوقة ذات المغزى المطلوب، وتهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى البحث من الناحيتين: النظرية والعملية، في نطاق الحرية المتاحة للمترجم في اتخاذ خيارات حاسمة بين كل من الترجمة المقيدة والحرّة للبت في المفردات والتعبير الصحيحة عند ترجمة النصوص الأدبية والعلمية، وتجدر الإشارة إلى أنه على الرغم من أن المترجم يستعمل معرفته وقراراته وخبرته ومعرفته الأساسية للخروج بترجمات مناسبة، فإنّ كلا النوعين، أي النصوص: الأدبية والعلمية مع الذاتية والموضوعية التي تميزهما على التوالي، وضعت عنباً إضافياً على كاهل المترجم من حيث كونه إمّا مقيداً أو حرّاً في اختيار المفردة المناسبة من أجل الوصول للمعنى المقصود بالكامل والتوصل إلى ترجمة مناسبة. وعلى هذا الأساس، نفترض الدراسة أنّ المعرفة الضيقة للمترجمين بكل من معنى المفردة وتكوينها يمكن أن تؤثر على نطاق اختيار المفردة في عملية الترجمة، كما يمكنه أيضاً كسر الرابطة بين المفردات والأشياء والأفكار والحالة التي تمثلها؛ نتيجة كل هذا سيقودنا إلى الترجمة الخاطئة، وإحدى النتائج الرئيسة لهذه الدراسة: على العكس من المفردة العلمية، حيث يجب أن يكون المترجم موضوعياً ومقيداً، فإنّ المفردة الأدبية تتمتع بفضاء من الحرية لترجمتها وفقاً لآراء المترجم ومعرفته ومشاعره.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المفردة، ترجمة مقيدة، ترجمة حرّة، الترجمة العلمية،

الترجمة الأدبية.

* مدرس مساعد/ قسم الترجمة/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل.