Adab Al-Rafidain

The Impact Of Readership On Translating Simile Into Arabic

Mohamed Abdel Razzaq Shindala

M.A Student/ Translation Dept. / College of Art / University of Mosul

Luqman Abd-AlKarim Nasir

Prof/Translation Dept. / College of Art /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 simile 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 towards the intended reader.

أثير مفهوم القارئ في ترجمة التشبيه الى اللغة العربية

محمد عبدالرزاق شندالة*   لقمان عبدالكريم ناصر**

المستخلص:

يتناول هذا البحث مفهوم القارئ واثره في ترجمة النصوص الادبية بشكل عام واللغة المجازية بشكل خاص ، ويقدم البحث إطاراً نظريا لماهية مفهوم القارئ واثر علاقته في الترجمة واستراتيجياتها إذ تمثل تلبية متطلبات القارئ مشكلة حقيقية تواجه المترجم في الترجمة و لاسيما 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

٭ طالب ماجستير/قسم الترجمة /كلية الاداب/جامعة الموصل

٭٭ استاذ / قسم الترجمة /كلية الاداب/جامعة الموصل

المستعملة لكل صنف من القراء. و يقترح البحث آلية لتقييم الترجمة من حيث طبيعة القارئ لإبراز مدى معرفة المترجم بهذا المتغير.

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

الكلمات المفتاحية: القارئ ، التشبيه ، 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, intentionality of the SL writer, and readership.

2. Text Typology

Texts, have been classified on different bases such as: function, purpose, 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 are:

A- The Expressive texts : such as poetry, political, speeches, Autobiography.
B- The Informative texts : such as Scientific, commercial and economic.
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) defines 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 relation between language and culture where 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 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 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 cultural-specific term, that is restricted to a community or has a different 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, believes, desires, and intentions verbally adding that spoken sentences have the capacity to express the propositions. He (1983: 27) confirms that language is derived from intention.

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.

A translator's 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 to publication, it is done in a cheap and a 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 he says

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 (1988:137-138) confirms that before starting the process of translation, a translator must keep in his mind the type of readership for 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. In this regard, Silis (2007:7) states that the differences in readership expectations reflect the discrepancy between both the source language and target language cultures.

Newmark (1988: 13) states that readership diversity is not affected by culture only, but by the education level, the 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 the procedures 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 offence 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 appeals to a broad audience must be facilitated by translation procedures. Venuti (1998: 16), for example, says that adding footnotes to the translation can narrow the domestic audience to a cultural elite since footnotes are an academic convention. 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 texts (Nasser and Safi, 2014: 45).

Newmark (1988) adds that there is more than one type of readers. 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 has no knowledge about 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 a straightforward language, but an expert requires a 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 from 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 the 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, where 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   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 an 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 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 Munday2004: 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 the 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 or 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, beside 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 device (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 to 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.

10. Simile

Larson (1998 :271) states that simile is a type of figurative language that involves a comparison between two different entities by using "as" or "like". Two objects are compared to each other to show the similarity between them. Consider the following example :

He ran like the wind.

In the above example, the word (he) is compared with the word (wind), by using the word (like), that he has the quality of running fast just like the wind does.

Simile refers to the case where two dissimilar things are made to appear alike, by the existence of the words "as" or "like" Baake (2003: 55).

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. Consider the following example suggested by Aziz (1999: 22).

Her cheeks are like roses   وجنتاها كالتفاح

Now let us consider the renditions given by four translators and see what strategies are adopted in their translations and how they deal with English similes .

11. Related studies

Nasser and Safi (2014), in their research titled as "Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy Julius Caesar into Arabic" do a similar study on the figures of speech of the Tragedy Julius Caesar. Nasser and Safi study three different figures of speech, those are : pun, metaphor and metonymy. The current study is different in that it just focuses on the simile type of figures of speech.

12. Data Analysis and discussions

To achieve the aims of the study and investigate the validity of the hypothesis ,five images of (similes) from the play "The Merchant of Venice" by Shakespeare and four of their Arabic renditions are taken to be analyzed to be the data of the study. The researcher adopts the model of Newmark, i.e. Semantic and Communicative methods of translations in the analysis.

SL Text (1):

SL Text (1)	Why should a man whose blood is warm within/<u>Sit like his grandsire cut in alabaster?</u> (Act: 1.Sc. : 1. L. : 83-84).	Type of figure	Readership		
		Simile	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	translator	TL texts			
T1	حسين احمد امين	اذا ما الذي يدعو انسانا يجري الدم دافئا في عروقه الى <u>الجلوس جلسة تمثال من الرخام لاحد اجداده؟</u>			*
T2	خليل مطران	علام يرضى الانسان- اذ الدم ما يزال حارا في عروقه- <u>ان يتشبه بالمرمر المصنوع منه تمثال جده.</u>		*	
T3	رحاب عكاوي	علام يرضى الانسان- اذ الدم لا يزال حارا في عروقه- <u>ان يتشبه بالمرمر المصنوع منه تمثال جده.</u>		*	
T4	محمد عناني	ان كان دم الانسان الساخن يجري في جسده، <u>فلماذا يقبع دون حراك تمثالا لعجوز من مرمر؟</u>			*

Discussion:

In this text, the writer uses simile. Simile is like metaphor, the only difference between them is that simile has the words "like" or "as" in its structure, while metaphor does not. The writer uses this simile expression "<u>**Sit like his grandsire cut in alabaster**</u>" to show that a man should work, but not to stay idle. The writer or   "Gratiano", the character, tries to encourage his friend "Antonio" because "Antonio" was sad, giving an image that a man who does nothing, looks like a marble statue. T (1) and T(4) translate this expression <u>semantically</u> into "<u>**الجلوس جلسة تمثال من الرخام لاحد اجداده؟**</u>" and " <u>**فلماذا يقبع دون حراك**</u> <u>**تمثالا لعجوز من مرمر؟**</u>" respectively in a way that maintains the same meanings chosen by the SL writer. these translations keep the emotional value of the text and call for the reader to analyze the figurative language to reach the intended meaning of the SL writer. It is clear that T(1) and T(4) use an indirect language to maintain the original SL image chosen by the writer. T(1) and T(4) presuppose that the reader has the ability to analyze such highly figurative language. This ability is restricted to specialist readers who have the required background knowledge, therefore, these translations are considered to be directed to specialist readers. T (2) and (3), on the other hand, translate it also semantically into " <u>ان</u> <u>**يتشبه بالمرمر المصنوع منه تمثال جده**</u>". What makes their translation different from that of T(1)and T (4), is adding the word "<u>يتشبه</u>" which eases the understanding and analyzing of the simile expression. T (2) and T (3) do not explicate it completely, nor keep it as it is. They provide a little help for the reader to analyze the intended meaning. It is clear that these translations are directed to a reader less than a specialist one, who is in this case an educated reader.

SL Text (2):

SL Text (2)	<u>His[Gratiano] reasons are as two grains wheat hid in two bushels of chaff</u>... (Act: 1. Sc.	Type of figure	Readership

No.	translator	TL texts	Layman	Educated	Specialist
	: 1. L. : 115-118).	**Simile**			
T1	حسين احمد امين	<u>فأما ما قد يحويه كلامه من معان فأشبه بحبتين من القمح في جوالين من التبن.</u>			*
T2	خليل مطران	<u>الاسباب التي يبنى عليها اقاويله، اشبه بحبتي قمح في مكيالين مفعمين بالتبن.</u>			*
T3	رحاب عكاوي	<u>الاسباب التي يبنى عليها اقاويله، اشبه بحبتي قمح في مكيالين مفعمين بالتبن.</u>			*
T4	محمد عناني	<u>اما معانيه فهي مثل حبتين من حبوب القمح ضائعتين في كومتين من تبن كثيرة.</u>	*		

Discussion:

In this text, the writer uses the simile expression "**His reasons are as two grains wheat hid in two bushels of chaff** " to give an image that a worthless speech is like two grains in two bushels. It is clear that T (1), T (2) and T (3) adopt a semantic method of translation in translating the expression, by which translators use the exact image of the author "grains, bushels" therefore, interpreters render such expressions into " **فأما ما قد يحويه كلامه من معان الاسباب التي يبنى عليها اقاويله، اشبه بحبتي قمح في مكيالين** " and "**فأشبه بحبتين من القمح في جوالين من التبن مفعمين بالتبن.** ". T (1),T (2) and T (3) keep the same emotional value of the SL text, leaving the interpretation for the reader, presupposing that the reader is able to analyze this figurative language. This ability is restricted to specialist readers. Therefore, the reader in this case is a specialist . It is noted that the situation is completely different for T (4). Where he uses a communicative method of translation, he translates it into "**اما معانيه فهي مثل حبتين من حبوب القمح ضائعتين في كومتين من تبن كثيرة.** ", he tries to explicate the intended meaning by adding the word "**ضائعتين**". The translator uses a direct language, in a way that makes the reader easily get the intended meaning. Therefore this translation is directed to a layman reader.

SL Text (3):

SL Text (3)	How <u>like a fawning publican</u> he looks! (Act: 1. Sc. : 3. L. : 36).	Type of figure	Readership		
		Simile	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	translator	TL texts			
T1	حسين احمد امين	<u>ما اشبهه بالعشار الذليل.</u>			*
T2	خليل مطران	<u>ما اظهر الرفض على وجهه المرائي بالتقوى.</u>	*		
T3	رحاب عكاوي	<u>ما اظهر الرفض على وجهه المرائي بالتقوى.</u>	*		

T4	**محمد عناني**	**كم يتظاهر بالتقوى و الورع.**	*

Discussion:

The writer uses this simile expression to show enmity and hatred. It is noted that it is communicatively translated by T (2), T(3) and (4), into: " **ما اظهر الرفض على وجهه المرائى** respectively. " **بالتقوى.** , " **ما اظهر الرفض على وجهه المرائى بالتقوى.** " and " **كم يتظاهر بالتقوى و الورع.** " Translators use direct language and explicate what is intended by the author in an easy way, presupposing that a less educated reader doesn't have the ability to analyze the highly figurative language. Therefore, there translations are considered to be directed to a layman reader who may find some difficulty in understanding such a figurative expression. T (1) , on the other hand, translates the expression semantically into " **ما اشبهه بالعشار الذليل.** " in a way that keeps the emotional value of the original text and make the reader depends on his background knowledge ability to analyze the intended meaning of the writer. Therefore, this translation is directed to a specialist reader.

SL Text (4):

SL Text (4)	I come by note to give, and to receive. **Like one of two contending in a prize**/That thinks he hath done well in people's eyes…(Act: 3. Sc. : 2. L. : 140-145).	Type of figure	Readership		
		Simile	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	**translator**	**TL texts**			
T1	**حسين احمد امين**	اننى اقف امامك ايتها السيدة متناهية الحسن، **وقوف احد المتنافسين على جائزة،** يحسب انه قد ارضى الناس بأدائه.			*
T2	**خليل مطران**	اتيت وهذه الورقة في يدي لأقبل واتقبل **مشبها بذلك صاحب الفوز في الصراع المشهود.**	*		
T3	**رحاب عكاوي**	اتيت وهذه الورقة في يدي لأقبل واتقبل **مشبها بذلك صاحب الفوز في الصراع المشهود**	*		
T4	**محمد عناني**	**لكننى مثل الذى ينازل الغريم في حلبة** وعندما يسمع تصفيق الجموع والصياح يظن انه ربح!			*

Discussion:

The writer uses this simile expression to express happiness by giving an image of man who wins a prize in a competition. The expression " **Like one of two contending in a prize**" is semantically translated by T (1) and T (4) into " **وقوف احد المتنافسين على جائزة** " and " **لكننى مثل الذى ينازل الغريم في حلبة** ". These translations maintain the same image of the original SL text.

These words have the same connotation in Arabic, although the term حلبة seems more appropriate than جائزة . Therefore, such translations are directed to a specialist reader. T (2) and (3), on the other hand, use the communicative method in translating the expression, they don't keep the image provided by the writer, rather they use a direct language and explain the expression in a detailed way. They use the word "<u>مشبها</u>" to explicate the simile expression in a way that makes any less educated level reader understand it easily. Therefore, such translation is aimed to be read by a layman reader.

SL Text (5):

SL Text (5)	But like <u>the martlet/Builds in the weather on the outward wall</u>.. (Act: 2. Sc. : 9. L. : 27-31).	Type of figure	Readership		
		Simile	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	translator	TL texts			
T1	حسين احمد امين	<u>فلا تسمع غير نصيحة العين الحمقاء التي لا ترى المخبر فتنخدع انخداع الخطاف الذي يبني عشه فوق جدران المنازل الخارجية فيعرضه للرياح والمخاطر.</u>	*		
T2	خليل مطران	<u>لاكتفائهم بشهادة النظر عن تبطن السرائر فهم كالخطاف الذي يبني أعشاشه فيما برز من أعالي الجدران، فيتعرض بذلك للطوارئ والآفات.</u>	*		
T3	رحاب عكاوي	<u>لاكتفائهم بشهادة النظر عن تبطن السرائر فهم كالخطاف الذي يبني أعشاشه فيما برز من أعالي الجدران، فيتعرض بذلك للطوارئ والآفات.</u>	*		
T4	محمد عناني	<u>اكثر خلق الله هم الجهلة من ينخدعون بما تشهد عين الغفلة عين لا تنفذ للباطن بل تبني مثل الخطاف الاعشاش على الجدران بمهب الريح و في مجرى الاخطار.</u>	*		

Discussion:

In this text, the simile expression "**But like <u>the martlet/Builds in the weather on the outward wall</u>**" is communicatively translated by all the 4 translators. They use a simple direct language, they explicate the image provided by the SL writer. The writer implicitly indicates that the "martlet" will be in danger when it builds its nest in the weather. T1 explains it by adding "<u>**فيعرضه للرياح والمخاطر**</u>" . T2 and T3 add "<u>**فيتعرض بذلك للطوارئ والآفات**</u>" . T4, on the other hand, adds "<u>**بمهب الريح و في مجرى الاخطار**</u>". All the translators explain the intended meaning in such a way that any low educated reader can easily figure out the intended meaning. Translators presuppose that the reader, in this case, lack the ability to analyze such a highly figurative language. For this reason, this translation targets a layman reader.

Conclusions :

Translation of figurative language is one of the most difficult tasks that faces 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 with simile. This similarity could be a formal or objective one in the connotational or denotational meaning. The translator who faces the problem of translating figurative language has to decide whether to render the text as it is (that is to keep the image used in the figure), or to replace it with a target language one 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 the 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, translator no. 1 has shown a sort of strategy in that he addresses specialist and layman readers; whereas, translators (2 , 3 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.

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

5	*layman*	*layman*	*layman*	*Layman*

Table (1): Consistency of Translators vs. Readership

References

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

Aziz, Y. (1999). Principles of Translation. Benghazi : University of Qar Younis.

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%3D10.1.1.556.621 2%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.