

Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar " into Arabic

Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman A. Nasser * & Safwan H. Safi **

تأريخ القبول: ٢٠١١/١١/١٤

تأريخ التقديم: ٢٠١١/٣/٣

1. 1. Readership and Translation

Readership is a very important aspect in translation. The translator has to take into consideration many factors during the process of translation and one of these factors is readership besides the intentionality of the SL writer, universality and cultural specific terms, and SL and TL norms. Readership is important especially when the translation is done for publication. This means that the quality of translation is affected by readership. In this regard, Newton(1992:224)says that information-only translation is not intended for publication; therefore, it is produced quickly and cheaply for a specified readership. In such a case, style is not an important consideration. However, Hervey et al. (1995:131) assert the fact that all texts are consumer-oriented and say that every type of text appeals to the tastes of a particular audience. The kind of translation is, in fact, highly related to the kind of readership. Venuti (1998:14) asserts this point and says that the reception of a certain translation varies according to the readership. The difficulty, in this regard, is that the SL readership is never the same as those of the TL (Ferreira, 1999:360). This difference reflects the cultural differences. Accordingly, Silis (2007:7) says that the difference of readership expectations shows the discrepancies between SL and TL cultures. Readership can be regarded as one of the criteria of assessing translation. Venuti(1998:48) thinks that "the success of a translation reflect the appeal of a wider, middle-brow readership, youthful and educated".

1. 2. Readership and the Translator

The task of the translator regarding readership is rather difficult because he has to present an accepted translation for different tastes. A proposed solution is given by Venuti(1998:127) who argues that a mass readership of a

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

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

Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar " into Arabic Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman.A & Safwan H. Safi

foreign text is enabled by making the translation intelligible within the various domestic identities that have been constructed for the foreign culture. Wright(2001:12) asserts this difficulty saying that the translator has to answer a very important question before starting his work " What is the audience or readership for his translation?". Qian (2004:2) also maintains that a good translation has to take into consideration the author's meaning, the objective truth of the text and the modification of this truth to meet the needs of the comprehension of the intended readership. The same difficulty is mentioned by Korkas et. al. (2005) who assert that translators address different readerships at different levels of professional competence.

Readership also affects the method of translation and the degree to which the translator may change the propositional content of the original text. In this regard, Venuti (2005:198) says that some translators tend to omit difficult parts of the text because they lack a coherent plot or require a specialized knowledge of literature. Changing the idea of a work in translation is rather excessive. Translating in such a way that the translation achieves effects equivalent to those of the original should not alter or distort the original message. If modifications of the message are needed, they should be as minimal as possible (Golan, 2006:21). Venuti (2005 :182) adds that the translator's choices of words are made to enhance intelligibility for a broad readership. Nord(2006:33)also thinks that the translator should evaluate the audience's capacities of comprehension and cooperation and anticipate the possible effects which certain forms of expression may have on the readership. Within a functional approach to translation, Newmark (1988: 40-45) connects the concept of readership with the function of the text saying that the core of the vocative function is the readership, the addressee. The term vocative is used in the sense of calling upon readership to act, think or feel, in fact to react in the way intended by the text. He (1988: 41) points out that the first factor in all vocative texts is the relationship between the writer and the readership. The second factor is that these texts must be written in a language that is immediately comprehensible to the readership. Shi(2005:4) suggests that translators must always bear in mind the central principle of style if they, for the sake of the readership, want to make their version more acceptable and appealing.

1. 3. Readership and Translation Strategy

There are different translation strategies that are used by translators according to the needs of many factors. One of these factors is readership which determines the kind of strategy to be adopted for each kind of texts. 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 asserts this point and maintain that readership affects the linguistic choices in the production of a target text that satisfies the demands of the text. Silis(2007: 217) thinks that the solutions of translation problems should be taken in favour of the target text readership expectation, yet at the same time the translator has to avoid the distortion of the source text material. He adds that strategic decisions in translation depends on the expectations of a foreign readership. Higashino(2001:61) believes that the intended readership determines whether translation by cultural substitution is the best option or not. He adds that it is important for the translator to analyse the intended readership to decide what kind of strategy should be taken. Lefevere (1992: 66) mentions that sometimes the text is modified in the publisher's aim to avoid any offence to the readership. Venuti(1998:67) admits that translation strategies must facilitate the appeal of the text to a mass readership.

1. 4. kinds of Readership

People differ in many aspects. One of these aspects is the level of education ;in fact, even educated people differ in their intellectual potentialities. These differences represent another problem for the translator because, s/he will be dealing with different levels of mentalities and different points of view concerning life and culture. Even within the same culture, time represents a problem with regard to readership bbecause some old texts may require certain adjustment when translated to contemporary readership in that the reference of some lexical items change by time. Hervey et. al. (1995:12) believe that a given text may lose some of its meaning and value when translated to a modern readership that differs from the original one. Venuti(1998:12) argues that the translator can address both popular and elite readerships by defamiliarizing the domestic text for foreign literature.

1. 5. Readership Requirements:

Poel(2003:19) maintains that the editor is responsible for meeting the needs of readership because he understands the readership of each text. He

adds that the text will not be received by the potential readership if it contains old information in that it will informatively be too low. Sîlis(2007:215) argues that the translation will not be successful if the text has not met the target readership requirements. Venuti(1998:11) also thinks that fluent translation that avoids dialect enables a foreign text to engage a mass readership. Another variable that affects readership is text typology. The kind of the text to be translated determines the readership of the text. For example, a text on chemical elements will be read by those interested in chemistry. In this regard, Venuti(1998:23) says that technical documents are usually translated for specialized readerships. Newton(1992:xvi) believes that most publications aim at a specialist readership and assumed a prior knowledge of the subject's technical aspects that the general reader is unlikely to possess. Venuti(1998:9) mentions that translation studies, for example, tend to be published by small presses for a limited academic readership. In fact, journals are an easier and more effective way of reaching a mass readership for the purpose of popularizing scientific knowledge. (Franceschi, 2009 :4)

1. 6. Readership and Literary Translation

The problem of readership is rather great in translating literary language because the target readership of these texts is wider than that of scientific texts. Tobias (2009:34) says that the effect of any translation strategy adopted is central to how the literary work is received by the target readership. Hervey and Higgins (2002:274) argue that literal meaning is given a higher priority than style to address a lay readership or a specialist one to maximize or minimize foreignness in the TT. In this regard, Venuti(1998:16) says that there are two directions in treating a literary text. The first is the literary qualities of the text and the limitation set by the assessment of the domestic readership the translator hopes to reach. He adds that the style of a certain text must be determined by the purpose of the original text and the characteristics of the intended readership of the translation. Legrand (2005:38) thinks that the literary translator must adapt the translation to facilitate understanding by the readership in the host language even though this strategy entails moving away from a strictly literal approach. The issue of readership can be highlighted by considering the same topic in different genres. Venuti(1998:117) mentions that publishers tend to translate for wider readership and they are conscious about translating for

specific domestic readership. He(ibid:68) adds that a best seller is that who reaches a mass readership.

Figurative language

Beside its literal meaning, which is usually given in a dictionary, a word has another meaning ; a figurative one. The lexical item "tree", for example, has the literal meaning of " a large plant " whereas figuratively it can be used to describe a plan of a family if it is used in the context of a *family tree*. **Trope** is another word for the figurative usage of language, which refers to language used in a figurative way for a rhetorical purpose. Tropes are frequent in most language uses. Tropes include metaphor, punning, simile, metonymy, synecdoche, ect. (Thornborrow and Shân, 1998:77)

Whenever scientists use figurative language, they run the risk that the image it evokes in the minds of an audience may be different from what they intended, especially if the audience contains people of various disciplines. (Baake, 2003;122)

Metaphor

The word *metaphor* comes from the Greek word *metaphora* and it means 'to carry over, ' whereby aspects of one object are carried over (transferred) to another object, and that object is then spoken of as if it were the first. A metaphor may also be defined as: The imaginative use of a word or a phrase to describe somebody or something as another object in order to show that they have the same qualities and to make the description more forceful, e. g. *She has a heart of stone*. (OALD, 1995) Metaphor is a linguistic process used to make comparisons between the attributes of one thing and something else. Metaphor commonly means saying one thing while intending another, making implicit comparisons between things linked by a common feature, perhaps even violating semantic rules. A metaphor is a way of transferring a large amount of information by the use of a minimum number of words. In fact, one advantage of metaphor is to be concise. Generally, Metaphor is a very important element of communication. Since metaphor is part of language, it is impossible to analyze a metaphor outside its both linguistic and cultural contexts. Translating universal metaphors denoting similar ideas in different cultures is rather easy. Metaphors related to the parts of human body are examples of the case.

Traditionally, metaphors are believed to be the most “fundamental form of figurative language. Furthermore, a metaphor may be “the transferred sense of a physical word”, “the personification of an abstraction” or “the application of a word or collocation to what it does really denote. ” (Newmark, 1988:104) A single word, a collocation, an idiom, a sentence etc. may be a metaphor.

Types of Metaphor

There are more than twenty different types of metaphor according to different classifications. Yet, the most important types are those mentioned by Newmark(1988) including dead metaphors, cliché metaphors, stock or standard metaphors, adapted metaphors, recent metaphors and original metaphors.

- A *stock or standard metaphor* is used to cover a physical or mental situation. Normally a stock metaphor has a certain emotional warmth, which may sometimes be difficult to translate since the same image should be reproduced in the TL as that in the SL text, e. g. *keep the pot boiling, throw a new light on*. Usually, the SL image is replaced with an established, equally frequent TL image when translated. It is not recommendable to translate stock metaphors in literary texts by sense, which is often done. Another way of translating a stock metaphor is to convert it to a simile.

- *Original metaphors* may be universal, cultural or obscurely subjective and ought to be translated literally or transferred with care. The original metaphor often “contains the core of an important writer’s message, his personality, his comment on life” and if translated, it may enrich the TL. To Newmark (1988:106-112) “The sense of the metaphor is frequently culture-specific” which can cause problems to the translator, since different cultures, with different languages, may have different ways of representing or creating symbols. Snell-Hornby (1985:56-57) points out that it may be difficult to determine into which category a metaphor belongs on a scale ranging from dead metaphors to original or individual metaphors. The reader's knowledge and experience also decide in what way a metaphor is perceived.

Similes

A simile is a way of comparing one thing with another, of explaining what one thing is like by showing how it is similar to another thing, and it

explicitly signals itself in a text, with the words *as* or *like*. The phrase *as cold as ice* is a common simile; the concept of coldness is explained in terms of an actual concrete object. The word *as* signals that the trope is a simile. (Thornborrow and Shân, 1998:78). The difference between a metaphor and a simile is that while the former assumes “that the transference is possible or has already taken place” the latter “proposes and explains it” by using terms such as *like* or *as if*. When a simile is used, the relationships between the elements are more visual than when a metaphor is used. Thus, the effects a simile offers may be greater than those of the metaphor. (Hawkes 1972:2-3) A simile may also be explained as an image expressed in the form of a comparison where one thing is compared to another, e. g. *brave as a lion*. (Liljestrand 1993:69)

Metonymy

Metonymy, like metaphor, is a figurative use of language rather than a literal one. *Metonymy* is Greek for *a change of name*. In this case, the name of a referent is replaced by the name of an attribute, or entity related in some semantic way, or another kind of link, i. e., the ground of the substitution is not similarity as it is in the case of a metaphor, but association. For example, *the press* is a metonymy to describe newspapers on account of the printing press used to produce them; *the crown* to describe the monarch on account of their headwear; *cardigan* to describe a garment (Thornborrow and Wareing, 1998:92).

Synecdoche

Synecdoche is usually classed as a type of metonymy. It refers to using the name of part of an object to talk about the whole thing, as when *black tie* is used to mean formal wear for men, *strings* is used to mean stringed instruments in an orchestra, and *wheels* is used to mean a car. *Giving someone your hand in marriage* is another example of using *hand* metonymically for the whole person (Thornborrow and Wareing, 1998:91) Figurative language use is one way in which the phenomenon of language change takes place, as words acquire metaphorical or metonymic meanings different from their original literal ones, and the new usages become absorbed into the language as commonplace. (Thornborrow and Wareing, 1998:92)

Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar " into Arabic Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman.A & Safwan H. Safi

No.	Translator	TL Texts	Punning		
			Layman	Educated	Specialist
1	غازي جمال	هو عمل يا سيدي... أنا يا سيدي، مرقع الأنعال البالية.			*
2	عبدالحق فاضل	يا سيدي أرجو أن أزاولها نقيّ الضمير. وهي في الواقع يا مصلح الخطي السيئة.	*		
3	محمد حمدي	يا سيدي هذا عملي وأرجو أن أقوم به مرتاح الضمير وهو حقاً يا سيدي مرقع النعال العتيقة			*
4	بيروت	إنه نوع من العمل أتمنى أن لا أعاب بشأته، إن عملي هو ترقيع النعال البالية المتهرنة.		*	
5	محمد عواد العسيلي	إنها يا سيدي حرفة لي أن أتخذها غير باغ ولا غاد، إني في الحق يا سيدي مصلح ما بلى من النعال.		*	

Data Analysis and Discussion

In order to find whether the translators of literary language in general and figurative language in specific have taken into consideration the factor of readership or not, five Arabic renditions by (غازي جمال، بيروت، محمد، محمد عواد العسيلي، عبدالحق فاضل) of eight figurative expressions taken from the Shakespearian tragedy of Julius Caesar have been analysed. The analysis includes determining the intended readership by each translator in each case, supposing that there are three kinds of readership (layman, Educated, and specialist). The researcher takes into account that a layman generally needs a rather simple language whereas a specialist looks for a highly figurative and indirect language. An educated reader would be satisfied with a compromise method of translation.

Texts Analysis

Discussion:

In this text, the metaphorical expression "a mender of bad soles" has been translated semantically into مرقع الأنعال البالية by translators (1 and 3) in a way that keeps the same words chosen by the SL writer. This rendition keeps the emotional value of the text and calls for the reader to analyse the figurative language to reach the intention or the intended meaning of the original writer. It presupposes that the reader is capable of analysing such highly figurative language. This ability is restricted to those specialists who have the required background knowledge, therefore, it is considered to be directed to specialists. The situation is completely different in the rendition

given by translator (2) who produced a rather communicative translation مصلح الخطى السيئة. It is clear that the translator has used direct language which explicates the intended meaning in a way that makes the reader realize the intention of the original writer more easily supposing that the reader may find some difficulty in analysing such a figurative expression. Therefore, his rendition is considered to be directed to a layman who lacks the ability to analyse indirect language. A compromise method has been used by translators (4 and 5) who tried to address educated people but not specialist.

SL Text (2)			Type of Figure		Readership		
			Punning		Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translator	TL Texts					
1	غازي جمال	لا. . . أرجوك لا تغضب علي، لأنك لو احتجت إليّ <u>فيوسعي أن أرفعك</u> .					*
2	عبدالحق فاضل	كلا. أضرع إليك يا سيدي ألا تشتط مع. ومع هذا، لنن فعلت يا سيدي، <u>ففي وسعي أن أصلحك!</u>	*				
3	محمد حمدي	مهلاً يا سيدي لا تحنق عليّ لأن <u>في إمكاني. . . أن أرفع لك</u> .					*
4	بيروت	لا يا سيدي، لا تغضب مني، أرجوك، لكنك إذا احتجت يوماً ما إلى إسكافي <u>فإنني مستعد إلى أن أرفعك</u> .					*
5	محمد عواد العسيلي	بل أدعوك يا سيدي ألا تنبري لي. لكنك إن انبريت <u>فإنني قدير على إصلاح ما انبرى</u> .			*		

Discussion:

It is obvious here that the metaphorical expression "I can mend you" has been translated semantically into "في إمكاني.. . أن أرفع لك" "ففي وسعي أن أرفعك" "مستعد إلى أن أرفعك" by translators (1, 3 & 4) respectively in a way that keeps the same lexical items chosen by the SL writer. This rendition keeps the formal structure of the text and its aesthetic function. It presupposes that the reader can analyse such a highly figurative language. Specialists who have the required background knowledge will be able to enjoy the beauty of the original language. The situation is completely different in the rendition given by translator (2) who produced rather a communicative translation "ففي وسعي أن أصلحك". It is clear that the translator has used a direct language which explicates the intended meaning in a way that makes the reader realize the intention of the original writer more easily supposing that the reader may find some difficulty in analysing such a figurative expression, therefore, his rendition is considered to be directed to a layman who lacks the ability to analyse indirect language. Also, this rendition

Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar " into Arabic Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman.A & Safwan H. Safi

will decrease the aesthetic function of the text. Another method has been used by translator (5) who tried to address educated people but not specialists through his rendition “فإنني قددير على إصلاح ما انرى”. He tried to keep the possibility of double interpretations implied in the original punning.

SL Text (3)	<u>You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things!</u> (Act: I, Sc. : I, L. : 37)		Type of Figure	Readership		
			Metaphor	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translator	TL Texts				
1	غازي جمال	<u>أف لكم يا بلهاء، وخالي الشعور يا أنانيون</u>	*			
2	عبدالحق فاضل	<u>يا أخشاب، يا أحجار، يا أخط من الجمادات العديمة الشعور!</u>			*	
3	محمد حمدي	<u>واها لكم يا أحجار يا أصنام يا أشباح بلا أرواح</u>		*		
4	بيروت	<u>يا لكم من بلهاء، خالية قلوبكم من الإحساس</u>	*			
5	محمد عواد العسيلي	ما تكونون؟ كونوا حجارة أو حديدًا؟			*	

Discussion:

In this text, the metaphorical expressions “You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things” have been translated semantically into

“يا أخشاب، يا أحجار، يا أخط من الجمادات العديمة الشعور”

by translators (2 & 5) respectively in a way that keeps the same words chosen by the SL writer. These renditions keep the emotional value of the text and call for the reader to analyse the figurative language to reach the intended meaning of the original writer. It presupposes that the reader is capable of analysing such highly figurative language. This ability is restricted to those specialists who have the required background knowledge. Therefore, it is considered to be directed to specialist. The situation is completely different in the rendition given by translators (1 & 4) who produced a communicative translation in their renditions “أف لكم يا بلهاء، وخالي الشعور يا أنانيون” and “يا لكم من بلهاء، خالية قلوبكم من الإحساس”. It is clear that both translators have used direct language which explicates the intended meaning in a way that makes the reader realize the intention of the original writer more easily supposing that the reader may find some difficulty in analysing such figurative expressions. Therefore, their renditions are considered to be directed to a layman who lacks the ability to analyse indirect language. Another method has been used by translator (3)

who added the sense beside using the same image to address educated but not specialist readers.

SL Text (4)	I know he would not be a wolf But that he sees the Romans are but sheep;(Act: I, Sc. : III, L. : 104-105)		Type of Figure	Readership		
			Metaphor	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translator	TL Texts		Layman	Educated	Specialist
1	غازي جمال	أنا أدري أنه لم يتجاسر على أن يغدو مستبداً علينا، كالذئب الذي يصير كاسراً على قطيع النعاج، إلا إذا وجد أننا وديعان، وخائفين كالخراف.		*		
2	عبدالحق فاضل	إنني موقن أنه ما كان ليصير ذنباً لولا أنه ليرى الرومانيين إلا نعاجاً،				*
3	محمد حمدي	إنه لم يصر ذنباً ضارياً إلا لما رأى الرومان قطعاً من النعاج			*	
4	بيروت	أنا أدري أنه لم يتجاسر أن يتحول إلى ذئب كاسر إلا بعد أن أدرك أن الرومان ليسوا إلا بقطيع من النعاج، وديعين وخائفين.		*		
5	محمد عواد العسيلي	إنني لأعلم أنه ما كان لينقلب ذنباً لولا أنه رأى أهل روما غنماً،				*

Discussion:

It is noted here that two translators (2&5) have adopted a semantic method of translation in which they kept the same image of the original SL text (wolf, sheep) realizing the fact that these words have the same connotations in Arabic; therefore they rendered them into (نعاج و غنم) though the word نعاج gives a more appropriate connotation than غنم.

A different method has been used by translators (1&4) who tried to explicate the intended meaning by adding (مستبداً علينا كالذئب و خائفين كالخراف) و (ذئب كاسر و وديعين خائفين). Both of these renditions are directed to layman readership, though different procedures have been used as noted in the use of simile plus sense in the rendition of translator (1) and explanation in the rendition of translator (4). Translator (3) has given a rendition of rather limited modification by the addition of the lexical item ضارياً which gives the intended connotation ; therefore it is more appropriate for educated readers.

Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar " into Arabic Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman.A & Safwan H. Safi

SL Text (5)	He were no lion, were not Romans hinds. <i>I, Sc. : III, L. : 106)</i>	Type of Figure	Readership		
		Metaphor	Layman	Educated	specialist
No.	Translator	TL Texts			
1	غازي جمال	لم يستأسد قيصر إذا لم تكن نحن الرومان سرباً من الوعول.			*
2	عبدالحق فاضل	وما كان ليغدو ضرغاماً لو لم يكن الرومانيون وعولاً.		*	
3	محمد حمدي	بل إنه لم يتأسد إلا لما رأى الرومان سرباً من الوعول.			*
4	بيروت	لو لم يكن الرومان سرباً من الوعول لما استأسد قيصر عليهم.			*
5	محمد عواد العسيلي	وما كان له أن يصير ليثاً لولا أن أهل روما باتوا غزلة.		*	

Discussion:

In this text, the metaphorical expression has been translated semantically using the same SL images into **يستأسد** and **سرباً من الوعول** by translators (1, 3 & 4) respectively in a way that keeps the same words chosen by the SL writer. This rendition keeps the emotional value of the text and calls on the reader to analyse the figurative language to reach the intention or the intended meaning of the original writer. It presupposes that the reader is capable of analysing such highly figurative language. This ability is restricted for those specialists who have the required background knowledge, therefore, it is considered to be directed to specialists. The renditions given by translators (2 & 5) are slightly different in that the translators have only used different images for the SL images "lion and hinds" rendering the first one into **ضرغاماً** by translator (2) and into **ليثاً** by translator (5) depending on the connotations of these lexical items in the TL. These choices are more appropriate for educated readers.

SL Text (6)	For Antony is but <u>a limb of Caesar</u> (Act:II, Sc. : I, L. : 165)		Type of Figure		Readership		
			Metaphor		Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translator	TL Texts					
1	غازي جمال	فإذا فتكنا بأنتوني، وليس هو إلا <u>عضو من قيصر</u> .			*		
2	عبدالحق فاضل	فما أنتونيو إلا <u>شلو من قيصر</u> .				*	
3	محمد حمدي	وهل أنتونيوس إلا <u>فلذة من جسم قيصر</u> ؟				*	
4	بيروت	وهل يبدو أنتوني إلا <u>عضو من أعضاء قيصر</u> ؟			*		
5	محمد عواد الحسيني	وما أنتونيو إلا <u>وصلة من أوصال قيصر وطرفاً من أطرافه</u> .			*		

Discussion:

In this text, the metaphorical expression “a limb of Caesar” has been translated semantically into “شلو من قيصر” and “فلذة من جسم قيصر” by translators (2 & 3) respectively in a way that keeps the same words chosen by the SL writer. These renditions keep the emotional value of the text and call on the reader to analyse the figurative language to reach the intention or the intended meaning of the original writer. They presuppose that the reader is capable of analysing such highly figurative language. This ability is restricted for those specialists who have the required background knowledge; therefore, it is considered to be directed to specialist. The situation is somehow different in the rendition given by translators no. (1 & 4) who used semantic translation in their renditions “عضو من قيصر” and “عضو من أعضاء قيصر”. It is clear that both translators have used indirect language; therefore, their renditions are considered to be directed to educated people who have the ability to analyse indirect language. Translator (5) has used the same image_ وصلة من أوصال قيصر وطرفاً من أطرافه. with interpretation which is directed to educated people.

Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar " into Arabic Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman.A & Safwan H. Safi

SL Text (7)	Brave son, deriv'd from honourable lions!(Act: II, Sc. : I, L. : 322)	Type of Figure Metonymy	Readership		
			Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translator	TL Texts			
1	غازي جمال	والأبن الشجاع لأباء شرفاء،	*		
2	عبدالحق فاضل	ويأينها الشجاع، وسليل أصلاب الشرف.		*	
3	محمد حمدي	ويا بطل أبناؤها ويا سلالة مجدها راق		*	
4	بيروت	وابنها البار ذو سلالة مجدها عريق،		*	
5	محمد عواد العسيلي	ويا ابنها المجيد، ويا من أتى من أشرف الأصلاب		*	

Discussion:

All renditions in this case are communicative in that the SL figurative image "lions" has been rendered communicatively. However, further distinctions can be noticed in that four translators (2, 3, 4 & 5) have used some modifications in the original message so they did not use the same image (lions) because they knew that such an image in Arabic اسود will not give the same effect if collocated with شرفاء; therefore, they used the lexical item سلالة which is more appropriate in this context. The use of these lexical item needs a certain degree of education on the part of the reader in a way that makes it more complex than the simple language used by translator (1) who used direct language to address layman readership.

SL Text (8)	Friends, Romans countrymen, <u>lend me your ears</u> ; (Act: III, Sc. : II, , L. : 75)		Type of Figure	Readership		
			Metaphor	Layman	Educated	Specialist
No.	Translator	TL Texts				
1	غازي جمال	أيها الأصدقاء، أيها الرومان، بني وطني، <u>أصغوا إلي</u> .		*		
2	عبدالحق فاضل	صدقاء، أيها الرومانيون، أيها المواطنون <u>أعيروني أسماعكم</u> .				*
3	محمد حمدي	أيها الإخوان. أيها الرومان. بني وطني <u>أعيروني أسماعكم</u> .				*
4	بيروت	أيها الأصحاب، أيها الرومان، بني وطني، <u>استمعوا لي</u> .		*		
5	محمد عواد العسيلي	أخلائي يا أيها الروم، يا بني وطني: <u>أتوني أذناً صاغية</u> .				*

Discussion:

In this text the metaphorical expression "lend me your ears" has been translated semantically by translators (2&3) into أعيروني أسماعكم which reflects the choice of the SL writer in a way that keeps the same image of "lending". It is clear that they are addressing specialists who are capable of analysing such a figurative language. A different strategy has been used by translators (1 &4) who tried to provide the intended meaning directly in a way that even the layman would understand the text easily. A third method which is used by translator no(5) is a mediation between the previous methods as seen in the use of أتوني أذناً صاغية which is not as literal as the ones given by translators (2&3) and at the same time not so communicative as the one given by (1&4) ; therefore it is more suitable for educated people.

Conclusions:

The 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 metaphors and similes. This similarity could be a formal or objective one in the connotational or denotational meaning. The translator faces the problem of translating

Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar " into Arabic Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman.A & Safwan H. Safi

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 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 showing the intended meaning directly or to use a collection of choices by combining simile and sense.

These options have their own conditions and limitations. For example, the translator cannot render a metaphor by reproducing the same mental image used in the source language if such an image is not used in the target language in similar contexts with the same frequency, despite the fact that he realizes that the power of the metaphorical expression keeps its strength in a way better than what happens when he renders it into its intended meaning. The last option is resorted to when the translator realizes that the reader will not understand the metaphorical expression with its implied image. Here comes the importance of readership in determining the choice of the method of translation adopted by the translator who faces such difficulties. The translator has to ask himself whether the reader is specialist in a way that the latter can analyze the literary stylistic elements and their different interpretations and has the ability to realize the implied connotations in the text. At that time, the translator can keep the power of the text through keeping the metaphorical image. On the other hand, if his reader is a layman, a different approach should be adopted including giving the intended meaning with some explanations. Another factor that affects the decision of the translator is the kind of metaphor he is dealing with. Translating an original metaphor that still keeps its expressive value should be handled in a way different from translating a recent one or rendering a stock metaphor that relates to the characteristics of a certain culture. The translator has another alternative when he deals with a dead metaphor that crossed the barrier of cultures to be a universal one in a way that it is dead as a metaphor and used as ordinary language.

This paper shows that the translators usually neglect the variable of readership as seen in the absence of readership strategy. The table below shows that the translators have addressed different readers in their renditions of the figurative language. However, translators no. 3 & 5 have shown a sort of strategy in that they addressed educated and specialists ; whereas, translators (1, 2 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)	Translator (5)
1	Specialist	Layman	Specialist	Educated	Educated
2	Specialist	Layman	Specialist	Specialist	Educated
3	Layman	Specialist	Educated	Layman	Specialist
4	Layman	Specialist	Educated	Layman	Specialist
5	Specialist	Educated	Specialist	Specialist	Educated
6	Layman	Specialist	Specialist	Layman	Educated
7	Layman	Educated	Educated	Educated	Educated
8	Layman	Specialist	Specialist	Layman	Educated

Readership Orientation

Bibliography

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

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.

Franceschi, L. (2009). The role of scientific journals following the unification of Italy. in: *World Library and Information Congress: 75th Ifla General Conference and Council*. 23-27 August 2009, Milan, Italy

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

Hawkes, T (1972). *Metaphor, the Critical Idiom*. Bristol: J. W Aronsmith Ltd.

Readership and the Translation of Figurative Language in the Shakespearian Tragedy "Julius Caesar " into Arabic Asst. Prof. Dr. Luqman.A & Safwan H. Safi

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

Hervey, S., Higgins, I. (2002). *Thinking French Translation, 2 ed. A Course in Translation Method: French to English*. London / New York : Routledge

Higashino, Y. (2001). Cultural Equivalence: Its Effectiveness and Complications Has “white gloves” Achieved the Equivalent Effect of “shiro tabi”? In: *Interpretation Studies*. (1), pages 53-63.

Korkas, V. Pavlides, P. & Rogers, M. (2005). *Teaching terminology in postgraduate translation programmes: an integrated approach*. Available from

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

Legrand, P. (2005). "Issues in the Translatability of Law". In: S. Bermann and M. Wood, Eds. Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation. Prenceton and Oxford, Prenceton University Press. ----

Liljestrand, B. (1993). *Så bildas orden*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Hertsfordshire: Prentice Hall International(UK) Ltd.

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

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

OALD = *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary* (1995). Ed. Hornby, A. S, fifth ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poel, K. (2003). *Text Editing From A Talent to A Scientific Discipline*. Kris Van De Poel, Universiteit Antwerpen.

- Qian, D. (2004). *A Computer-aided Approach to Accuracy in Specialized Translation*. Beijing : Beihang University press.
- Shi, A. (2005). *Style and Stylistic Accommodation in Translation*. Xinzhou Teachers University Shanxi
- Sîlis, J. (2007). *Translator's Faithfulness in the 21st Century :A Sociolinguistic View*. *Kalbotyra*, 57(3), pp 211-218
- Snell-Hornby, M. J. (1985). *Translation Studies; An Integrated Approach*. Revised ed., Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Thornborrow J. and Wareing S. (1998). *Patterns in Language:An introduction to language and literary style*. London / New York : Routledge.
- Tobias, S. (2009). Culture and Creativity: The Challenges of Translating Metaphor in Japanese-English Literary Translation. In: *Mediation and Conflict: Translation and Culture in a Global Context*. 7-10 July 2009, Conference Abstracts: Special and General Sessions, Monash University, p 34.
- 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*. Prenceton and Oxford, Prenceton University Press. pp 177-203.
- Wright, S. (2001). *From Academic Comparative Law to Legal Translation*. in Practice Available from [www. uni-kassel. de/~dippel/justitia/proc/](http://www.uni-kassel.de/~dippel/justitia/proc/)
[www. eleto. gr/download/Conferences/5th%20Conference/5th. . .](http://www.eleto.gr/download/Conferences/5th%20Conference/5th...)

القرّاء وترجمتهم للغة المجازية في المسرحية المأساوية لشكسبير (يوليوس قيصر) إلى العربية

أ.م.د. لقمان عبد الكريم و صفوان صافي

المستخلص

يسلط البحث الضوء على مفهوم القارئ، وأثره في ترجمة النصوص الأدبية بشكل عام، واللغة المجازية بشكل خاص. فالبحث إطار نظري لمفهوم القارئ، وعلاقته بالترجمة، واستراتيجياتها؛ إذ تشكّل تلبية متطلبات القارئ مشكلة للمترجم، وبشكل خاص في حالة ترجمة اللغة المجازية، ويهدف البحث الى تحديد العلاقة بين القارئ، واستراتيجيات الترجمة، وتحديد طرق الترجمة المستعملة لكل صنف من القرّاء .

. ويقترح البحث آلية لتقييم الترجمة من حيث طبيعة القارئ، فتظهر حينئذ معرفة المترجم بهذا المتغيّر. وفي الجانب العملي تم اختيار مجموعة من النصوص من مسرحية شكسبير المأساوية "يوليوس قيصر"، وخمس ترجمات عينات بحثية لمعرفة مدى تبني المترجمين إستراتيجيات معينة تجاه القارئ المقصود.