Adab Al-Rafidain

The impact of readership on translating metaphor into Arabic

Mohammed Abdulrazaq Shindallah

M.A. Student / Department of Translation/College of Arts / University of Mosul

Luqman Abdulkareem Naser

Prof/ Department of Translation /College of Arts/ University of Mosul

Abstract

This research deals with the concept of readership and its influence on the translation of literary texts in general, and figurative language in particular. The research aims to determine the relationship between the readership and the translation process, and to determine the method of translation used by a translator for each type of reader. The research hypothesizes that readership affects the selection of a translation strategy. Therefore, the research suggests an evaluation of the translation in terms of the nature of the reader to highlight the translator's knowledge of this variable .

Theoretically, the study presents an account of the concept of readership as well as a brief account of literary texts , especially the figurative language as a representative of such texts. Practically, a group of texts, specifically five types of metaphor from Shakespeare's comedy "The Merchant of Venice" and four translations were selected as research samples to determine the extent to which the translators adopt certain strategies toward the intended reader.

It is concluded that the selected translators show no consistency in using a specific strategy towards the readers; in other words, they have addressed different readers in their renditions of the figurative language.

تأثير مفهوم القارئ في ترجمة المجاز الى اللغة العربية

محمد عبد الرزاق شندالة* لقمان عبد الكريم ناصر**

المستخلص

يتناول هذا البحث مفهوم القارئ واثره في ترجمة النصوص الادبية بشكل عام واللغة المجازية بشكل خاص حيث يقدم البحث إطاراً نظريا لماهية مفهوم القارئ واثر علاقته في الترجمة واستراتيجياتها حيث تمثل تلبية متطلبات القارئ مشكلة حقيقية تواجه المترجم في الترجمة و خاصة عند ترجمة اللغة المجازية. تفترض هذه الدراسة أن نوع القارئ يوثر في اختيار استراتيجية الترجمة لذا يهدف البحث الى تحديد العلاقة بين القارئ وعملية الترجمة وتحديد طرائق الترجمة المستعملة لكل صنف من القراء. حيث يقترح البحث آلية لتقييم الترجمة من حيث طبيعة القارئ لإبراز مدى معرفة المترجم بهذا المتغير .

* طالب ماجستير / قسم الترجمة / كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل
** استاذ / قسم الترجمة / كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل

تقدم الدراسة من الناحية النظرية وصفًا لمفهوم القارئ بالإضافة إلى وصف موجز للنصوص الأدبية وبشكل خاص اللغة التصويرية كممثلة عن هذه النصوص. وفيما يخص الجانب العملي فقد تم اختيار خمسة انواع من المجاز من مسرحية شكسبير الكوميدية "تاجر البندقية"، واربع ترجمات لها كعينات بحثية لمعرفة مدى تبني المترجمين لاستراتيجيات معينة تجاه القارئ المقصود.

خلصت الدراسة الى أن المترجمين المختارين لا يظهرون اتساقًا في استخدام استراتيجية محددة تجاه القراء ؛ بعبارة أخرى ، لقد خاطبوا قراء مختلفين في ترجمة اللغة التصويرية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القارئ ، المجاز ، استراتيجية الترجمة

1. Introduction

Catford (1965; 20) defines translation as the replacement of material in one language, i.e. Source Language by an equivalent material in another language, i.e. Target Language. Venuti (1998:127) adds that the task of the translator is considered rather difficult because he has to present an accepted translation for different tastes, that is a translator, in the process of translation, must take many variables or determining factors into consideration while selecting a translation strategy. Some of these factors are Text typology, universal and cultural specific terms, the intentionality of the SL writer, and readership.

2. Text Typology

Texts are classified on different bases such as function, purpose, the field of discourse, etc. Newmark (1988:39), in this regard, points out that there are three types of texts according to the basis of the three functions of the language. These types according to Newmark are:

A- The Expressive texts: such as poetry, political speeches, and Autobiography

B- The Informative texts: such as Scientific, commercial, and economic texts.

C- The Vocative texts: such as notices, instructions, and persuasive writing.

The importance of text typology has also been highlighted by Reiss (1989: 110) who states that text type is one of the major factors that affect the process of translation. In this regard, Chen and Zhang (2020: 35) state that each text type has its own method of translating. For the informative text, the translator has to follow the Semantic translation, he must transmit all the content of a text without redundancy, and he must focus on the contents rather than the literary style of the author, so the translation must be explicit and brief. As for the expressive text, the communicative method must be adopted. The translated text must reflect the aesthetic qualities of the ST, as well as ensure the accuracy of delivering the information.

3. Universal and Cultural Specific Terms

Lado (1957: 111) defined culture as "structural systems of patterned behavior". Translators take into consideration the cultural features of a text, besides the ideological connotations that are contained in that text. The translator becomes more obvious when the text is extremely sensitive Hatim and Munday (2004: 103). The importance of culture in the formulation of a language has also been highlighted by Bassnett (1992: 14) who says that "No language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture". Nida (1993: i) specifies the relationship between language and culture when he says: "The role of language within a culture and the influence of the culture on the meanings of words and idioms are so pervasive that scarcely any text can be adequately understood without careful consideration of its cultural background". Where language reflects the interests, ideas, and customs of a society. Words or phrases of a language manifest the important areas of a culture, whether religious, political, ritual, etc. some of these vocabularies are confined to some communities, i.e., culture-specific terms; other vocabularies are common to a wide range of communities, i.e., universal terms.

As for translation, Nord (1991: 92) states that translation varies among cultures; translation also varies inside the same culture at different times, which is the main reason why translations once judged acceptable at a particular point in time, and less accepted at another.

These differences among cultures form an area of difficulty or rather than untranslatability, the degree of which depends on whether the languages involved in translation are culturally close or remote. This implies that translation between languages of unrelated cultures is more complex than performing translation between languages that are culturally related. However, this does not imply, that translation between languages that are culturally related or similar is an easy activity (Ilyas, 1989: 123).

A universal term, that is common to some communities, Arabic and English in this case, i.e., sun, moon, or pray can be translated semantically or literally since it has the same denotation in both cultures, Whereas a culture-specific term, that is restricted to a community or has a deferent denotation from one community to another, cannot be translated semantically, it must be translated communicatively. For example, the phrase (news that warms the chest) must be communicatively translated into Arabic as (خبر يثلج الصدر) since joy is associated with coldness, but not warmth, in Arabic culture (Ilyas,1989: 128).

4. Intentionality of the SL writer

The notion of intentionality is interpreted in a variety of ways by different scholars. Searle (1983: 6), for example, states that speakers express their attitudes, beliefs, desires, and intentions verbally adding that spoken sentences can express the propositions.

Regarding translation, Newmark (1988: 12 -13) states that each text has its own intention. A reader may find that two texts may depict the same discussion expressing the same facts and figures, but the type of language used and even the grammatical structures in each case may indicate distinct points of view. This text intention indicates the SL writer's point of view on the subject matter.

The translator intention is supposed to be the same as that of a writer. But sometimes a translator may intentionally change his translation for a specific reader, for example A translator may translate a handbook of instructions for a less educated reader, allowing for a considerably wider explanation in his translation than the reproduction. Accordingly, Daraghmeh et. al. (2010: 15-16) state that translators may intervene to decrease the ideological loads of the source text. For example, when a Palestinian translator translates the phrase "terrorists" into "gunmen", the message is emptied of its ideological force, and when translating "Israeli defense force" into "قوات الاحتلال الاسرائيلي", the translator produces the opposite image presented by the original.

5. Readership

One of the most basic and important aspects of translation is that of readership. It is important since it affects the quality of translation. In this regard, Newton (1992:224) says that since the translation of the information of a text is not intended for publication, it is done in a cheap and quick way for a certain type of readership. Style, in this case, is not an important matter. However, Hervey et al. (1995:131) confirm this fact when they say that all texts are directed to a certain consumer and say that each kind of text tends to the tastes of a particular readership. The type of translation is strongly related to the type of readership.

Venuti (1998: 14) confirms this point by saying that the process of a translation varies according to the type of readership. Oittinen (2000:43-44) also points out that the choice of translation strategy heavily depends on the choice of the type of readership. Adamczyk-Grabowska (1988:137-8) confirms that before starting the process of translation, a translator must keep in his mind the type of readership to whom he is translating to. Dimitrova (2005: 141) gives empirical support to translators that they often direct themselves towards a targeted readership, and specifies the existence of different scales of readership. But the problem here is that SL readership is different from that of TL Ferreira (1999:360), where such a difference is caused by different cultures.

Newmark (1988: 13) states that readership diversity is not affected by culture only, but by the education level, social class, age and gender of the readership. An SL writer writes his piece of work to a specific type of SL readership, a translator of this work must read it thoroughly taking into consideration the type of readership and context, and when translating this work he keeps in his mind a specific type of TL

readership, it is not necessary to be the same as that of SL readership; since readerships are the not the same among cultures.

6. Readership and Translation Strategy

Venuti (1998: 240) states that translation strategies "involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it". He makes use of the concepts of domesticating and foreignizing to refer to translation strategies.

Scholars of translation differentiate between the strategies that deal with the whole text and those that deal with parts or segments of a text labeled with various notions. In this regard, Newmark (1988: 81) differentiates between methods and procedures, where he points out that "while translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language".

As for the relationship between readership and translation strategy. Translators use various methods and strategies in translation to meet the needs of different factors; one of these factors is the readership. Sometimes, the translator is obliged to modify the SL text in order to satisfy these needs. In this regard, Lefevere (1992: 66) mentions that a publisher sometimes modifies a text to avoid any offense to a readership. To do so, different translation procedures are used. This fact is highlighted by Venuti (1998:67) who points out that the text appeal to a broad audience must be facilitated by translation procedures. For example, Venuti (1998:16) claims that footnotes are an academic norm, and adding them to the Korkas (2005:3) also adds that in some cases, readership can affect the linguistic choices in the creation of a target text that meets the text's requirements. To sum up , it can be said that readership is one of the factors that determine the method that must be adopted for each type of text (Nasser and Safi, 2014: 45).

Newmark (1988: 13) adds that there is more than one type of reader. In fact, he differentiates between three types of readers: the highly educated reader; i.e. a specialized reader in a specific field, the mid-educated reader; i.e. a reader who has a moderate knowledge of a specific field, and a less educated reader; a simple reader who doesn not know the subject matter. Newmark points out that each reader has his own strategy for translation. Transference or borrowing SL words into TL is just enough for an expert reader. An educated reader requires a functional equivalent procedure, i.e. generalizing, neutralizing, or using a culture-free word. A less educated or layman reader needs the cultural equivalent. In other words, each reader has his own language, a layman needs straightforward language, but an expert requires highly figurative language that is very metaphorical and indirect to leave the interpretation to his imagination. An educated reader, on the other hand, would be satisfied with an indirect language with little simplification. For instance, (Na Cl) is enough for a specialist reader who works in chemistry, he knows the exact meaning of these single letters, while for an educated reader it must be (Sodium chloride) to get the exact meaning, the layman is not capable of detecting the right meaning until it is (salt).

7. Translator and Readership

One of the biggest obstacles that the translator faces during the process of translation is that of readership. He must produce an accepted version for different types of readers. In this regard, McAuley (2015: 221) states the success of a translation depends on the interaction between the translator on the one hand, and the readership on the other hand; interaction of different factors: the linguistic and semantic components of the translation, reader's ability to realize these intentions, and the readiness of the target audience to accept a target text with those encoded intentions. That explains why we have more than one translation of a single work.

Newmark (1991: 46) adds that, only in so far as the original text does not contradict known material and moral truths, the translator must be "faithful" to it. The translator must correct dissent, inside or outside the translation, if a defective text is likely to mislead the readership. The translator is responsible for the translation, even if it means adding a 'not found' footnote to a neologism that must be interpreted. The translator does not need to be an expert on the subject matter of the text, but it must be comprehended and translated in a suitable, peculiar, ordinary, or technical language.

In this regard, Daraghmeh et. al. (2010: 15) say that the translators of news adjust the translation and modify the source text in accordance with the needs of the readership by making paradigmatic choices, and textual manipulation. The strategy of translation is affected by the readership, to the degree that the translator may change the propositional content of the ST, whereas Venuti (2005:198) says that some translators resort to omitting the difficult parts of the ST, for the target reader may lack the coherent plot, or the reader may need special knowledge of a literature. Modifying or changing the ideas of a text is considered excessive. Translating a text in a way that achieves the same equivalent effects on the target reader as that experienced by the original one, shouldn't distort or change the original message. When a translator opts to modify a text, when a situation is needed, this modification must be confined to the minimum limits Golan (2006:21). Nord (2006: 33) believes that the translator should assess the audience's comprehension and cooperation abilities, as well as predict the effects that various modes of expression may have on the readership. Regarding a functional approach to translation, Newmark (1988: 40-45) relates the notion of readership to the function of the text, claiming that the readership, or the addressee, lies at the heart of the vocative function. The term vocative refers to the sense of encouraging readers to act, think, or feel in the way that the text intends. Newmark (1988: 41) also points out that there are two important factors concerning the notion of readership the first one is the relationship between the writer and the readership that is embedded in almost all vocative texts. The second factor is that such texts should be written in immediately comprehensible language to interact with the readership. Shi (2005:4) speaks in terms of style, he states that a translator who wants to make his translation version more acceptable to the reader, must pay attention to the principal part of a style. Korkas et al. (2005: 5) state that the matters of readership and style can be highlighted by viewing the same topic in different genres. For instance, a public health brochure on AIDS has a lower degree of specialization and is intended for a larger (and less academically competent) readership than a scientific paper on the same subject. Texts that are less specialized are frequently more expressive, with greater redundancy and a more varied register. A translator must also take into consideration the cultural, ideological, and political aspects of the target reader, because such linguistic expressions may have values related to SL and its readers, but clash with the beliefs and standards of the target readers. This tendency, in translation theory, is called "the cultural turn" cultural turn Hatim and Munday (2004: 102).

8. Kinds of Readership

Hervey et. al. (1995: 12) believe that, when a text is translated for a modern reader, that differs from the original, it may lose some of its true meaning and inherent value. Nasser and Safi (2014: 45) state that people share many differences in many aspects. The level of education is one of these aspects. In fact, people differ in their level of education even. Such differences constitute a main problem for the translator since he has to deal with different levels of people, eventually with different points of view regarding life, culture, and how texts are written; even in the same culture, time constitutes a big problem. This is due to the fact that when translating old texts for a modern audience, some lexical items' references may need to be adjusted because they change over time.

Scholars classify readers into many types, and point out the characteristics of each reader. Newmark (1988: 15), for example, points out that there are three types of readers: the expert, the educated layman, and the uninformed. Sager (1997: 28) states that there are two types of readers: primary and secondary. The distinction between the two notions is important for translation, because it is related to the difference between message and text. By primary reader, he means "A primary reader is a person a writer has in mind when producing a message". Secondary readers, on the other hand, are "all readers not included in a writer's original scope of addressees". Nasser and Safi(2014: 50) mention that there are three types of readers: specialist, educated, and layman.

9. Figurative Language

Figurative language refers to words or phrases that have another meaning; a second meaning; a figurative one, besides their literal meaning, which is given in the dictionary. For example, the word (tree) literally denotes a plant larger than a bush, while figuratively it can be used to describe (family members), if it is

used in the context of family. Trope is another word that refers to the use of figurative language as a rhetorical devices (Thornborrow and Shân, 1998:77). Figurative language is any process that enables the same linguistic expression to refer to different kinds of things Crystal (2008: 491)

Evans and Green (2006: 290) state that figurative language denotes the use of phrases or expressions in such a way that is different from the actual use or meaning of them; it refers to the non-literal use of language. In non-literal meaning , speakers say something but intend something else. They say something that is completely different from the actual meaning of the words themselves. They use figurative language to add special effects to their language. In other words, literal language denotes directly and exactly what it refers to ,while figurative language refers indirectly to the thing it denotes to show some effects. Consider the following example :

Achilles is brave.

Achilles is a lion.

In the first example, the word (brave) denotes directly what it refers to, however in the second example, the word (lion) denotes indirectly courageousness. This interpretation comes from our knowledge about lions as they have the qualities of courageousness and fearlessness.

The translation of similes sometimes becomes difficult and very tricky, posing many different troubles if the translator is not aware of the cultural differences, especially in the case of the absence of the corresponding equivalent in the TL.

9. Metaphor

The history of metaphor as Punter (2007: 11) states, goes back to Aristotle time; it is obvious that Western literary, linguistic and critical traditions were interested in differentiating between literal, and figurative language.

The word metaphor is derived from the Greek word (metaphora) which means "to carry over" where an aspect of one thing is carried over (transferred) to another thing, and that thing is then spoken of as if it was the first. A metaphor might also be described as a word that is used imaginatively to describe somebody or something as another object in order to reveal that they share the same qualities and to make the description more forceful. Thornborrow and Shân, (1998: 78).

Metaphor is a linguistic device that is used to make comparisons between one thing (person) and something else. Metaphor can be very simple, or extremely complex. Metaphor is a common figure of speech that existed in many languages; this figure of speech is used to make comparisons between two things. Larson (1998: 271).

By metaphor, Newmark (1988: 104) means "any figurative expression: the transferred sense of a physical word (its most common meaning); the personification of an abstraction, the application of a word or collocation to what it does not literally denote, i.e., to describe one thing in terms of another". Newmark also states that metaphor has basically two purposes; cognitive purpose to describe a mental process or an action more comprehensively and concisely than is possible in literal or physical language; and aesthetic one to please or to surprise. In a good metaphor, the two purposes coincide like content and form. Metaphor is a very essential element of communication. As metaphor is part of language, it is not possible to analyze a metaphor outside the linguistic and cultural contexts. interpreting universal metaphors indicating similar ideas in different cultures is very easy.

10. Data Analysis:

SL Text (1):

SL Text (1)	**Such a hare is madness of the youth, to skip o'er the meshes of good counsel the cripple. (Act:1. SC.: 2. L. :18-20).**		**Type of figure**	**Readership**		
			Metaphor	**Layman**	**Educated**	**Specialist**
No.	**Translators**	**TL texts**				
T1	حسين احمد امين	كما يفعل الارنب الجبلي في الربيع، والشباب الطائش في ربيع العمر، اذ يقفزان فوق حبائل النصائح الحكيمة التي ينصبها الشيوخ الكسيحون.		*		
T2	خليل مطران	ما اشبه جنون الشباب بالأرنب الوثاب. وما اشبه العقل بالشرك الضعيف، افلت منه ذلك الارنب فمضى لغير ماب.			*	
T3	رحاب عكاوي	ما اشبه جنون الشباب بالأرنب الوثاب. وما اشبه العقل بالشرك الضعيف، افلت منه ذلك الارنب فمضى لغير رجعة.			*	
T4	محمد عناني	وجنون صبانا وثاب. يفلت من اشراك النصح المقعد كالأرنب من شرك الصياد.				*

Discussion:

In this text, the metaphorical expression "Such a hare is madness of the youth" is semantically translated by T4 into "وجنون صبانا وثاب" in such a way that keeps the same lexical items chosen by the original writer. The translator, in this case, keeps the emotional value of the text and gives the reader the chance to analyze the figurative language to understand the original meaning or intention of the writer. T (4) presupposes that the reader has the ability to analyze such a highly figurative expression. This ability is confined to specialists or highly educated readers who have the required background knowledge. For this reason, this translation is considered to be directed to specialist readers. Translator (1), on the other hand, uses the communicative method in translating the same expression into " كما يفعل الارنب الجبلي في الربيع، والشباب الطائش في ربيع العمر". The situation here is completely different from the above one. It is clear that T (1) uses direct language to explain the intended meaning in such a way that makes the reader realize the intention of the SL writer easily. T (1) presupposes that the reader lacks enough background knowledge, or finds difficulty in analyzing such a highly figurative language. Therefore, his translation is considered to be directed to a layman reader who lacks the ability to figure out or analyze the indirect language. T (2) and T (3) change the metaphor to simile to make it easier for the reader to analyze the intended meaning. A small explication would be fair enough to a reader who is not a specialist. This procedure is appropriate for the educated reader. Therefore, this translation is directed to an educated reader.

SL Text (2):

SL Text (2)	**Why look you how you storm!/I would be friends with you, and have your love.** **(Act: 1. SC. : 3. L. : 133-138).**	Type of figure	Readership		
		Metaphor	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translators	TL texts			
T1	حسين احمد امين	<u>ما كل هذا الغضب؟</u>	*		
T2	خليل مطران	<u>انظر كيف تشتاط</u>		*	
T3	رحاب عكاوي	<u>انظر كيف تشتاط</u>		*	
T4	محمد عناني	<u>عجبا! لم هذا الغضب الجامح؟</u>	*		

Discussion:

In this text, the metaphorical expression "Why look you how you storm" has been semantically translated by T (2) and T (3) into "انظر كيف تشتاط.". They have used some modifications in the original SL image, such as changing the word (storm) to (تشتاط), since it collocates with (الغضب) in Arabic . This change is appropriate for educated readers. Therefore, this translation is directed to an educated reader. The situation is different in the case of T (1) and T (4), where both of them use a communicative method in translating (storm) into (الغضب) and (الغضب الجامح) respectively. They use direct language to explicate the intended meaning of the word (storm), T (2) makes it even more easier by providing the word (الجامح) which collocates with (الغضب) , so such translations are perfect to address a layman reader.

SL Text (3):

SL Text (3)	**I am sorry thou wilt leave my father so./<u>Our house is hell</u>… (Act: 2. Sc. :2. L. : 1-2).**	Type of figure	Readership		
		Metaphor	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translators	TL texts			
T1	حسين احمد امين	يؤسفني ان تترك خدمة ابي على هذا النحو.. ـ وهو <u>الجحيم</u> بعينه ـ كنت فيه شيطانا فبيتنا مرحا يخفف بعض الشيء من عناء الملل		*	
T2	خليل مطران	انا متكدرة لتركك ابي، وستكون لك وحشة في هذا <u>البيت الجهنمي</u> ، الذي كنت تؤنسه احياتا.			*
T3	رحاب عكاوي	انا حزينة لتركك ابي، وستكون لك وحشة في هذا <u>البيت الجهنمي</u> ، الذي كنت تؤنسه احياتا			*
T4	محمد عناني	كم انا اسفة لرحيلك.. <u>منزلنا مثل جهنم</u>.. لكنك عفريت ازرق تسرق منه طعم الملل بمرحك.		*	

Discussion:

In this text, T (2) and (3) interpret the metaphorical expression "Our house is hell" semantically into "البيت الجهنمي". The same SL image of "hell" has been kept without any change, leaving the reader to rely on his/ her background knowledge to analyze the intended meaning. It is obvious that such translations are performed to address a specialist reader who can analyze such a highly figurative language. The situation is slightly different, by T (1) and (4) where they translate it also semantically, but with limited modification. T (1) makes a limited modulation by adding the lexical item (هو) which gives the intended connotation. Yet, T (4) translates it by changing the metaphor to simile. Both of the translators (1) and (4) use indirect language to leave the interpretation to the reader, such translation is intended for an educated reader.

SL Text (4):

SL Text (4)	He sleeps by day/<u>More than the wildcat.</u> (Act: 2. Sc. : 5. L. : 45-49).	Type of figure	Readership		
		Metaphor	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translators	TL texts			
T1	حسين احمد امين	<u>ينام بالنهار اطول مما ينام السنور</u>			*
T2	خليل مطران	<u>ننوم، كالسنور البري.</u>		*	
T3	رحاب عكاوي	<u>ننوم، كالسنور البري.</u>		*	
T4	محمد عناني	وبطيء في شغله ابله طيب النوايا اكول وكسول <u>ونؤوم طول النهار كقط من قطاط البراري.)</u>	*		

Discussion:

The metaphorical expression "More than the wildcat" in this text is translated semantically into " اطول مما ينام السنور" by T (1), where he maintains the original SL image that shows a wildcat sleeping most of the day. In fact, this image has the same connotation in Arabic. T (1) tries to keep the SL image to give the reader the chance to analyze the intended meaning relying on his literary ability, where T(1) presupposes that the reader has such ability to analyze the intended meaning, therefore such translation is considered to be directed to a specialist reader. T (2) and (3) perform a modulation on the translation, where they change the metaphor to simile. In fact, such modulation doesn't change the SL image, but make it easier for the reader to understand the intended meaning. Therefore, this translation fits an educated reader. The situation is totally different by T (4), where he uses rather simple and direct language to explicate what is meant by the metaphor, or the intention of the writer, so this translation seems to be appropriate for a layman reader.

SL Text (5):

SL Text (5)	Never <u>so rich a gem</u>/Was set in worse than gold. (Act: 2. Sc. : 7. L. : 54-55).	Type of figure	Readership			
		Metaphor	Lay man	Educ ated	Speci alist	

No.	translator	TL texts			
T1	حسين احمد امين	يا لها من فكرة حقيرة ان تودع <u>مثل هذه الجوهرة الثمينة</u> في غير وعاء من ذهب			*
T2	خليل مطران	وهل يعقل ان <u>توضع لؤلؤة غالية هذا الغلاء</u> في شيء ادنى من الذهب؟			*
T3	رحاب عكاوي	وهل يعقل ان <u>توضع لؤلؤة ثمينة هذه الثمانة</u> في شيء ادنى من الذهب؟			*
T4	محمد عناني	لا يمكن ان توضع <u>جوهرة مثلك</u> في ادنى من ذهب خالص.	*		

Discussion:

In this text, T (1), (2), and (3) semantically interpret the expression into: "مثل هذه الجوهرة" and "توضع لؤلؤة" "ثمينة هذه الثمانة". They transfer this image to Arabic without any change, since Arab reader is familiar with such an image. The SL expression "so rich a gem" is semantically translated into "مثل هذه الجوهرة الثمينة" by T (1). Whereas T (2) and T (3) interpret it into "توضع لؤلؤة غالية هذا الغلاء", they change the word "gem" to "لؤلؤة", but this change doesn't alter the image provided by the writer, nor explicate it. T (1), T (2) and T (3) keep the SL image as it is. They deal with it as a puzzle to give the reader the space to enjoy reading it. These interpretations maintain the emotional value of the SL image and call for the reader to analyze the figurative language to reach the intention or the intended meaning of the original writer, therefore this translation is directed to a specialist reader.

The situation is completely different for T (4), where he simplifies the metaphor, by adding the word "مثلك", to the degree that a layman can understand it easily. T(4) leaves no chance for the reader to enjoy solving the puzzle. T (4) changes the indirect language to direct language. In fact the writer uses the metaphor "gem" to implicitly refer to "Portia", but the T (4) changes the image and makes it explicitly refer to it. In other words, he interprets and explicates the intention of the writer directly. Therefore this translation is considered to be directed to a layman reader.

Conclusion:

Translation of figurative language is one of the most difficult tasks that face the translator of literary works. This difficulty stems from the fact that the translator handles indirect language which reduces a certain idea to express a point of similarity between two elements that are related to different semantic fields as in the case of metaphors. This similarity could be a formal or objective one in the connotational or denotational meaning. The translator faces the problem of translating figurative language in that he has to decide whether to render the text as it is (that is to keep the image used in the figure), to replace it with a target language that has the same effect of the original image, or to explicate the implied similarity by using simile or explanation. The translator may also resort to show the intended meaning directly or to use a collection of choices by combining simile and sense.

This paper shows that translators usually neglect the variable of readership as seen in the absence of readership strategy. Table (1) below shows that the translators have addressed different readers in their renditions of the figurative language. However, translators (2 and 3) have shown a sort of strategy in that they address specialists and educated readers; whereas, translators (1 and 4) have not shown a specific

strategy. The researcher recommends that readership should be taken into account in translation in general and in the translation of figurative language in specific.

Table (1): Consistency of Translators vs. Readership

Text No.	Translator (1)	Translator (2)	Translator (3)	Translator (4)
1	*Layman*	*Educated*	*Educated*	*Specialist*
2	*Layman*	*Educated*	*Educated*	*Layman*
3	*Educated*	*Specialist*	*Specialist*	*Educated*
4	*Specialist*	*Educated*	*Educated*	*Layman*
5	*Specialist*	*Specialist*	*Specialist*	*Layman*

References

Adamczyk-Garbowska M. (1988). Polskie tłumaczenia angielskiej literatury dziecięcej: Problem krytyki przekładu. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im Ossolińskich.

Baake, K. (2003). Metaphor and Knowledge: The Challenges of Writing Science. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bassnett, S. (1992). Translation Studies. London / New York: Methuen.

Chen, H. and Zhang, X. (2020). Application of Reiss' S Text Typology in Translation- a Case Analysis of Franklin D. Roosevelt's fourth inaugural. In: East African Scholars Journal of Education, Humanities and Literature. 3. 2. Kenya, East African Scholars Publisher. pp 34-37.

Crystal , D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.). Blackwell publishing.

Daraghmeh, A., Herzallah, R. and Abdel Karim, A. (2010). "To Translate or to Subvert? Translating Politically Sensitive Texts in the Palestinian Context". In: Bethlehem University Journal, Vol. 29, Pluto Journals. pp. 12-39. Retrieved from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26448595.

Dimitrova, B. (2005). Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ferreira, S. (1999). Following the Paths of Translation in Language Teaching: From Disregard in the Past to Revival Towards the 21st ST Century, pp355-371.

Golan, J. (2006). Swear Words in Translation. M. A. thesis in English Language and Literature, Department of English and American Studies. Brno: Masaryk University.

Hatim, B. and Munday, J. (2004). Translation: An Advanced Source Book. New York: Routledge.

Hervey, S., Higgins, I. & Loughridge, M. (1995). Thinking German Translation :A Course in Translation Method: German to English. London / New York: Routledge.

Ilyas, A. (1989). Theories of Translation. Mosul: University of Mosul.

Korkas, V., Pavlides, P. & Rogers, M. (2005). Teaching terminology in postgraduate translation programmes: an integrated approach. retrieved from: https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:NtB2EBI5AkYJ:https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download%3Fdoi%3D10.1.1.556.6212%26rep%3Drep1%26type%3Dpdf+&cd=1&hl=ar&ct=clnk&gl=iq.

Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics Across Culture. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Larson, M. (1998). Meaning Based-Translation. A Guide to cross language equivalence. New York : University press of America.

Lefevere, A. (1992). Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame. London: Routledge.

McAuley, E. (2015). Audience Attitude and Translation Reception: The case of Genji Monogatari. In: Babel. 61. 2. pp 219 - 241. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.61.2.04mac.

Nasser, L. and Safi, S. (2014). Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar" into Arabic. In: Adab Al-Rafidayn. 69. pp. 43- 62. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324574297.

Newmark, P. (1988). Approaches to Translation. Oxford: Pergamum.

Newmark, P. (1991). About translation. UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Newton, J. (1992). Computers in Translation Researchers: A practical appraisal. In: J. Newton, Ed. ----- London and New York: Routledge.

Nida, E. (1993). Language, Culture, and Translating. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Nord, C. (1991). "Scopos, Loyalty, and Translational Conventions." In: Target. 3. 1. John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp 91-109.

Nord, C. (2006). Loyalty and Fidelity in Specialized Translation. In: Confluencias .Revista de Traducao Cientifica e Tecnica. No 4. pp 29-41.

Oittinen, R. (2000). Translating for Children. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Oittinen, R. (2000). Translating for Children. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Reiss, K. (1989). Text types, translation types and translation assessment, translated by A. Chesterman, in A. Chesterman (ed.) pp. 105-15.

Sager, J. (1997). Text Types and Translation. In: Text Typology And Translation. 26. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Co. pp 25- 41.

Searle, J. R. (1983). Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind, Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shi, A. (2005). Style and Stylistic Accommodation in Translation. Shanxi: Xinzhou Teachers University.

Silis, J. (2007). Translator's Faithfulness in the 21st Century :A Sociolinguistic View. Kalbotyra, 57(3), pp 211-218.

Thornborrow J. and Wareing S. (1998). Patterns in Language: An introduction to language and literary style. London / New York : Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1998). The Scandal of Translation: Towards an Ethics of difference. London : Redwood Books.

Venuti, L. (2005). " Local Contingencies: Translation and National Identities". In: S. Bermann and M. Wood, Eds. Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation. Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press. pp 177-203.