Translating Arabic Metaphorical Expressions into English:
Mahfouz's *Morning and Evening Talk* as an Example

Mohammed Farghal and Raneen Mansour
Kuwait University, Kuwait

Abstract: *The objective of this study is to examine Arabic metaphorical expressions in English translation with an eye to exploring the coding of such expressions, the procedures employed in rendering them, and the treatment of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic parameters in translation. The corpus consists of 100 Arabic metaphorical expressions extracted from Najeeb Mahfouz's (1987) novel ḥadiiθ al-ṣbaaḥwa-l-masaa' along with their English counterparts in Christina Philips' translation Morning and Evening Talk (2007). The results show that the rendering of metaphorical expressions, which are mainly coded in terms of concrete-to-abstract borrowing (89%) rather than concrete-to-concrete borrowing (only 11%), involves several procedures: maintaining metaphor (57%), modifying metaphor (20%), demetaphoring metaphor (16%), and changing metaphor (7%). The results also indicate that while the syntagmatic parameter may be freely represented in terms of surface or underlying semantic roles which are sensitive to co-text in both source and target texts, the paradigmatic parameter is solely relevant to capturing the creative paradigm (whether in primary lexical correspondence, in synonymy or even co-hyponymy) regardless of the syntagmatic presentation. The study concludes that metaphors in literary discourse are part and parcel of the message and requires of the translator to take utmost care in preserving their aesthetic value by furnishing a comparably creative paradigm in the target text.*

Keywords: Arabic, English, metaphorical expressions, translation.

1. Introduction: Definition and typology of metaphor in English and Arabic

Metaphors are figures of speech in which comparisons are brought up between two concepts in an unusual way to attract the reader's attention and conceptualize ideas vividly. Following Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Schaffner (2004: 1257-1258) explains that "metaphors are not just decorative elements, but rather, basic resources for thought processes in human society". In Arabic, metaphor is called *ʾ isti'aarah* (a list of phonetic symbols is provided in appendix), which literally means *borrowing*. Atiq (1985: 167), cited in Ereksoussi (2014: 52), states that *metaphor*, (the term *borrowing* in Arabic,) consists of three elements: the entity from which we borrow, the entity borrowed, and the entity towhich we borrow. In terms of function of borrowing (metaphor), the medieval Arabic rhetorician Al-Jurjani (d. 1078, cited in Abu Deeb 1971) explains that we borrow something from one concept to another in order to highlight certain imagery or a point of similarity. Therefore, there must be a cognitive relationship (an area of cognitive

correspondence) between the entity or concept from which we borrow and the entity or concept to which we borrow. Looked at from a different perspective, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that metaphors underlie the human conceptual system where there is a systematic mapping of two conceptual domains: source and target, the second of which is interpreted in terms of the first.

Al-Sakaki(d. 1229), another medieval Arabic rhetorician, differentiates between implicit metaphor *al-' isti'aarahal-makniyyah*and explicit metaphor *al-' isti'aarahat-tasriiṣhiyyah*.In explicit metaphors, the entity mentioned is the one compared to, whereas in implicit metaphors it is the one compared. This distinction roughly reflects the difference between *simile* and *metaphor* in English scholarship. Metaphors are employed to establish a similitude between two entities or concepts without using a linguistic tool such as *like* and *as*. When using such tools, the figure of speech is called a simile, not a metaphor. For example, the utterance *she is like a flower* is a simile, but the utterance *she is a flower* is a metaphor. Gentner et al. (2001: 243) explain that "metaphors are often defined as nonliteral similarity comparisons. Metaphors are distinguished from similes by the inclusion of explicit comparison forms such as *like* in similes, but not metaphors".

In terms of orientation of similitude, Al-Jurjani (d. 1078, cited in Abu Deeb 1971) highlights three types of *borrowing*: concrete-to-concrete, concrete-to-abstract and abstract-to-abstract. For each type, a quality related to the first entity, whether abstract or concrete, is borrowed to the second one. For example, *ašraqat al-ḥuriyyatu min jadiid* [The freedom rose anew] is a *concrete-to-abstract* borrowing because the quality of *aš-šuruuq* 'rising', which is an attribute of the concrete entity *aš-šams* 'the sun', is borrowed to the abstract entity *al-ḥuriyyah* 'freedom'. Abstract concepts refer to diverse concepts such as personality traits, emotions, and cognitive processes, whereas concrete ones represent physical entities, defined by spatial boundaries and perceivable attributes (Wiemer-Hastings and Xu, 2005).

2. Metaphors: Semantic and pragmatic perspectives

From a semantic perspective, metaphors are considered falsities simply because they assign attributes to entities that belong to different semantic domains, thus literally producing contradictions. Taken literally, for instance, the metaphor *John is a machine* is a semantic contradiction because the attributes of the [- human] entity (machine) cannot semantically be mapped onto the [+ human] entity (John). Pragmatically, however, this utterance can readily be reinterpreted to communicate several indirect messages (or conversational implicatures, Grice 1975) in light of the contexts in which it is produced. According to Grice, metaphors like the one above flout the maxim of quality by the speaker's not speaking the linguistic truth of what is said though he/she is communicatively cooperating with the addressee and assumed to be committed to the underlying truth of what is said. In this way, the speaker can conversationally implicate that *John is not emotional* or *John is efficient in doing things* by uttering *John is a machine* in the appropriate context (see also Sperber and Wilson 1986 for

interpreting metaphors in terms of optimal relevance and Ereksoussi 2014 for interpreting Al-Jurjani's approach to metaphors in a similar way).

One should note that the bulk of idiomatic expressions in English and Arabic (as well as in other languages) may have started out as metaphorical expressions and have, over long periods of time, and due to extensive use, become part of everyday communication. Being an integral component of language, such idiomatic expressions are not subject to reinterpretation in terms of quality maxim or relevance the way creative metaphors are. By way of illustration, the idiomatic expression *a piece of cake* in the utterance *My exam was a piece of cake* is readily interpreted as meaning *My exam was very easy* simply because the idiomatic expression is part of the English language though it is interpreted figuratively rather than literally. By contrast, a creative metaphor like *My exam was a beef stew* must undergo serious cognitive processing in light of contextual elements in order to guess what the speaker means by saying that. In this regard, Thomas (1995) draws an interesting, subtle distinction between *sentence* and *utterance* meaning, on the one hand and *speaker* meaning on the other. While the former are part of the language and correspond to the conventional literal and non-literal use respectively, the latterrepresents what the speaker has on his/her mind when saying something, which may differ from both types of meaning.

3. Metaphor translation

Hiraga (1991, 1994), Mandelblit (1995), Schäffner (2004), Kovecses (2005), Al-Zoubi*et al* (2007), Al-Hasnawi (2007), Maalej (2008), Iranmanesh and Kaur (2010), among others, have all explored the nature of metaphors and their translation from a cognitive linguistic perspective. According Mandelblit (1995), for example, the translation of a metaphor using similar mapping conditions in the Source Language (SL) and Target Language (TL) is less time and effort consuming than the translation of an SL metaphor with different mapping conditions. For Kovecses (2005), four possibilities may emerge in metaphor translation: (1) metaphors of similar mapping conditions and similar lexical implementations, (2) metaphors of similar mapping conditions but different lexical implementations, (3) metaphors of different mapping conditions but similar lexical implantations, and (4) metaphors of different mapping conditions and different lexical implementations (cf. Iranmanesh and Kaur's (2010) six mapping schemes).

Based on Mandelblit's (1995) distinction between similar mapping conditions (SMC) and different mapping conditions (DMC) in metaphor translation, Al-Hasnawi (2007) suggests three cognitive mapping conditions for translating metaphors: (1) metaphors that have similar mapping conditions, (2) metaphors that have similar mapping conditions, but are lexicalized in a different way, and (3) metaphors that have different mapping conditions. To explain, the metaphor 'heart-broken' is rendered into *maksuur-il-qalb* [heart-broken]مكسور القلب in Arabic where both metaphors have similar mapping domains, while the metaphor in 'The singer was on fire yesterday' is translated as *'aš'ala-l-muɣannii al-masraḥa 'amsi* [The singer ignited the theatre yesterday] أشعل المغني المسرح

أمسwhere the two metaphors have similar mapping conditions, but are lexicalized differently. Last, the metaphor in 'to dig deep to find happiness' may be metaphorically translated into *yuṭaaridu-s-saʿaadata*[to chase happiness] يطارد السعادة exhibits different mapping domains.

In addition to other formal features, literary texts in particular are more challenging to translate than other text types because they are the natural habitat of metaphors, particularly the creative paradigms that embody the poetic function of language (Jakobson 1960), whose main role is to furnish literary discourse with an aesthetic nature. Newmark (1988) points out the challenging task of translating metaphors and suggests several procedures for rendering them, which range between literal translation and paraphrase. From a pedagogical perspective, however, Ali (2006) is critical of translation theorists' prescribing a set of procedures for dealing with metaphors because it gives student translators the false impression that any alternative is as good as any other.

Being an outstanding aesthetic feature of literature rather than merely a decorative feature, the option for maintaining literary metaphors in translation contributes highly to the visibility of the translator, which reflects Venuti's (1995) important distinction between foreignization and domestication as two translation strategies usually governed by power relations between SL and TL. Farghal and Almanna (2015) emphasize that one of the main factors to get a proper translation of literary texts is to recognize all aesthetic aspects provided and understand them very well so that the translator is able to appreciate and interpret source texts. Schaffner (2004: 1254) writes: "The phenomenon of metaphor has regularly been of concern to translation scholars who have argued about problems of transferring metaphors from one language and culture to another". However, it is not only culture-specific features that usually make it difficult for translators to render metaphorical expressions into appropriate equivalents in the TL, but there are also other universal aspects involving shared human perceptions that the translator needs to take into consideration.

By way of illustration, the rendition of the Arabic metaphor *ṣafaʿat-humaraaratu-l-'ayyaam* [The bitterness of days slapped him] into English allows for different options, which most likely affect either the degree of accuracy in conveying the intended meaning or the metaphorical image provided in the source text (ST). A faithful literal translation would produce*The bitterness of days slapped him*, which maintains the same paradigm in the TL but fails its surface syntagmatic norms by employing a corresponding active structure where a passive structure would be used in English, viz. *He was slapped by the bitterness of days*. While the latter rendering maintains both the TL's paradigmatic and underlying syntagmatic norms, there may still be room for syntagmatically improving the rendering in terms of naturalness, viz. *He was slapped by the bitterness of his days* or paradigmatically in terms of synonymy, viz. *He was slapped by the bitterness of the passage of time*.

Moreover, the translator may modify the metaphor while preserving the aesthetic value of discourse, viz. *He was overwhelmed by the troubles of his life*. In this regard, Mehfooz (2016: 2) argues that "[un]doubtedly the most eloquent

and expressive text is the one which combines brevity in diction with depth of meanings. These properties are such that all the excellence of the text is concentrated on the use of correct words and figures of speech". When dealing with metaphors in translation, both form and content are interlocked. It is far from being satisfactory to render the communicative import of a metaphorical expression apart from its creative paradigm, especially in literary discourse. This is because literary metaphors are mainly constitutive rather than decorative, and their aesthetic value needs to be relayed in translation (also see Ghazala 2011 for a cognitive-linguistic perspective of metaphors in general and Al-Harrasi (2003) for an ideological dimension in translating conceptual metaphors in political discourse). Thus, the translator will be betraying literary discourse if he/she renders the aforementioned Arabic metaphor into *He led an unhappy life*.

Muhaidat and Neimneh (2014) examine a number of metaphorical expressions in Mahfouz's *qaṣru-š-šuuq* (*Palace of Desire*) arriving at the general conclusion that metaphor translation falls into either dynamic/functional equivalence (Nida 1964; De Ward and Nida 1986) or ideational equivalence (Farghal 1994), among other cases where some formal elements may be maintained. Their qualitative analysis may be criticized on four accounts. First, it fails to bring out the subtleties involved in the several procedures that may translators employ when encountering metaphorical expressions. Second, it does not provide us with a corpus that can be quantitatively analysed to see the frequency of employing different procedures. Third, the analysis mainly discusses examples that fall under idiomatic expressions rather than creative metaphors. Finally, and most seriously, the bulk of the analysis is merely descriptive, telling the reader how the translator renders the metaphorical expression without showing qualitatively how fitting the rendering is.

4. Objectives of study and methodology

The present study aims to examine the translation of metaphorical expressions from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives. First, it looks at the coding of metaphorical expressions in terms of concrete-to-abstract borrowing versus concrete-to-concrete borrowing. Second, the study explores the translation procedures which translators may employ when rendering metaphorical expressions and critically show how successful/unsuccessful they are. Third, the syntagmatic parameter of metaphorical expressions in translation is examined. Finally, an account of the paradigmatic treatment of metaphorical expressions in translation is provided.

The textual data of this study consists of one hundred examples of metaphorical expressions extracted from Najeeb Mahfouz's novel *ḥadiiθu-ṣ-ṣabaaḥiwa-l-masaa'* [Morning and Evening Talk] (1987) and their English translation counterparts from Christina Philips' *Morning and Evening Talk* (2007). The choice of Mahfouz hardly needs any justification as he is the only Arab Nobel Laureate and is widely read in the Arab world, as well as internationally in translation. In addition, Mahfouz is well known for dealing with local realities (in Egypt) in a highly vivid style that communicates universal

relevance. As for the choice of the novel, it is motivated by the fact that it is very rich in metaphorical expressions.

5. Data analysis and discussion
5.1 Coding metaphorical expressions
To start with the coding of metaphorical expressions, the data shows that 89 instances (89%) employ concrete-to-abstract borrowing, while only 11 cases (11%) utilize concrete-to-concrete borrowing (which is in line with Shen 2012). This clearly indicates that the borrowing of a concrete entity to metaphorically describe an abstract entity is much more frequent than borrowing a concrete entity to metaphorically describe another concrete entity. This may lie in the essence of metaphoring where abstract entities are made more cognitively processable/accessible by describing them in terms of concrete entities. Following are illustrative examples: (my modified literal translation in square brackets)
1. tasallalat’ilay-haahumuumunlaamafarra min-ha   (p. 7)
   [Inescapable worries sneaked into her]
   Inevitable worries sneaked into her. (p. 3)

<div dir="rtl">تسللت إليها هموم لا مفر منها</div>

2. ɣaaṣa ’aḥmadufiiḥayaat-hi-l-xaaṣṣatiḥattaaqimmatira’si-hi (p. 16)
   [Ahmed dived into his private life up to the top of his head]
   Ahmed dived into his private life to the top of his head. (p. 10)

<div dir="rtl">غاص أحمد في حياته الخاصة حتى قمة رأسه</div>

3. taɣfuuðilaalu ’ašjaari-l-balx (p. 5)
   [The shades of oak trees napped]
   The shades of walnut trees slumbered. (p. 1)

<div dir="rtl">تغو ظلال أشجار البلخ</div>

4. wa-kaanat-iš-šaqqatutušriqu bi-l-’anaaqatiwa-ḥusn-ið-ðawqi   (p. 29)
    [The apartment was shining with elegance and good taste]
    The apartment was shining with elegance and good taste. (p. 21)

<div dir="rtl">وكانت الشقة تشرق بالأناقة وحسن الذوق</div>

To explain, the concrete ‘act of sneaking’ by humans is borrowed onto the abstract ‘inevitable worries’ in (1). Similarly, the concrete ‘act of diving’ by humans is borrowed onto the abstract ‘private life’. In (3), by contrast, the concrete ‘act of napping’ by humans is borrowed onto the concrete ‘oak trees’. The same applies to (4) where the concrete ‘sun shining’ is borrowed onto the concrete ‘apartment’.

5.2 Translating metaphorical expressions
The textual data shows five procedures that the translator follows when rendering metaphorical expressions. The following table displays the frequency and percentage of each procedure:

Table 1. Distribution of translation procedures

Type of Procedure	Frequency	Percentage
Maintaining metaphor	57	57%
Modifying metaphor	20	20%
Demetaphoring metaphor	16	16%
Changing metaphor	7	7%

5.2.1 Maintaining metaphor
Table 1 above shows that in more than half of the textual data the translator has paradigmatically maintained the same ST metaphors through one-to-one lexical correspondence or through synonymy (or even hyponymy), see section (5.4 below). This clearly indicates that the translator is well aware of the importance of transferring source culture metaphorical norms in literary translation, in order to capture the aesthetic value of the foreign text. Not only does this foreignizing strategy (Venuti 1995) help in bringing out the indigenous artistic features of the ST, but it also makes the translator more visible in his/her product, and it bridges the gap in the power relations between English and Arabic by having a clear focus on source language (SL) metaphorical norms. The following two examples are illustrative:

5. 'ammaaḥabiibatufaqadtawwajat al-kuhuulatuḥayaata-ha al-jaafata (p. 63)
   [As for Habiba, her middle age crowned her middle age]
Habiba's arid life was capped by middle age. (p. 50)

أما حبيبة فقد تَوّجت الكهولة حياتها الجافة

6. tašarraba bi-ḥamaasijiili-θ-θawrati-n-naaṣiriyyah(p. 76)
   [(he) absorbed the Nasserite revolution generation's zeal]
   … and was infused with the zeal of Nasser's generation. (p. 63)

تشرّب بحماس جيل الثورة الناصرية

As can be observed in (5) and (6), the translator has successfully captured the creative metaphors in the ST by offering a comparable degree of creativity in the target text (TT) through similar paradigms, despite the fact that one-to-one lexical correspondence is not adhered to. To explain, the renderings "Habiba's middle age crowned her arid life/Habiba's arid life was crowned by middle age" and "… and he absorbed the zeal of Nasser's generation" respectively preserve the same paradigm through one-to-one lexical correspondence in (5) and (6) rather than synonymy (the translations of 5 and 6 above). However, the translator's renderings also succeed in preserving the metaphorical features by remaining within the same cognitive domain (paradigm) of the ST metaphor. Therefore, this translation procedure proves to be the most effective option when encountering metaphorical expressions, because it communicates an analogous aesthetic image in the TL.

5.2.2 Modifying metaphor

Modifying ST metaphor, which comes second in frequency (20 instances), involves replacing the original paradigm in the metaphorical expression with a related paradigm that captures a relatively similar aesthetics and import in the TT. This procedure can be rightly invoked when the ST metaphor proves unworkable in the TT, but lends itself to coding in a similar way. Below are two illustrative examples:

7. tasarraba-l-xawfu'ilaaqalbi-hi.   (p. 8)
   [Fear sneaked into his heart]
   His heart was infused with fear.   (p. 4)

<div dir="rtl">تسرّب الخوف إلى قلبه</div>

8. wa-nfajarat'ašyaa'ujadiidatun(p. 89)
   [New things exploded]
   New events swept in.   (p. 77)

<div dir="rtl">وانفجرت أشياء جديدة</div>

   In example (7), the translator has opted for replacing 'the act of sneaking' by 'the act of infusing', thus a much stronger metaphorical expression is employed in the TT. It is true that the new metaphor reads smoothly and preserves the aesthetic value of the text, but the question is whether the ST metaphor requires this modification or it is just a luxury that the translator has decided to settle for. Actually, the latter situation applies here because the ST paradigm can be smoothly and naturally coded as *Fear sneaked into his heart*. Note that the image encapsulated in this rendering is much less intense than the image in the English translation of (7), thus appropriately reflecting the image in the ST metaphor. The case of (8) is quite different because a faithful rendering of the Arabic creative metaphor would give *New events exploded,* which may not be congruent with TL metaphorical norms. It may be argued, therefore, that the translator has succeeded in modifying the image into a more natural one in the TT.

5.2.3 Demetaphoring metaphor

Demetaphorizaion of metaphorical expressions, which is the weakest procedure, comes third in frequency (16 instances). It is considered inappropriate because it adversely affects the aesthetic value of the text by offering commonplace expressions that lack the emotiveness of the ST counterparts. The following examples are illustrative:

9. wa-raaḥattabuθθuqalaqa-haa li-l-jamiiʻ(p. 98)
   [She started transmitting her anxiety to everybody]
Rashwana conveyed her anxiety to everybody. (p. 86)

<div dir="rtl">وراحت تبث قلقها للجميع</div>

10. wa-'iðaa bi-qalbi-haayaxuunu-ha bi-l-maraḍ(p. 99)
    [and then her heart betrayed her by getting ill]
    Then her heart had to bear disease.   (p. 87).

<div dir="rtl">وإذا بقلبها يخونها بالمرض</div>

11. fa-talakka'a' 'injaabu-haafatratan(p. 159)
    [Her pregnancy was latent for some time]
She did not conceive for some time.   (p. 146)

<div dir="rtl">فتلكأ إنجابها فترة</div>

It is evident that the translator has failed to textualize the Arabic creative images, along with the emotiveness encapsulated in them in (9)-(11). The English renderings are not metaphorical and are lacking in aesthetics and emotiveness, despite the fact that the translator could have used ones that are comparably aesthetic and emotive. Following are suggested renderings for (9)-(11), respectively:

12. Rashwana started to air her anxiety to everybody.
13. Then her heart betrayed her by falling ill.
14. Her pregnancy was behind schedule.

The translated forms in (12-14) are supposed to convey more vividly the features of the ST metaphors.

5.2.4 Changing metaphor

Changing metaphorical expressions, which comes last in the translation procedures (7 instances), will usually imply the unavailability of TT metaphors that reflect the same images, hence the procedure is TT-oriented rather than ST-oriented. It involves changing the SL metaphor altogether by calling up a TL metaphor that sails away from the *paradigm* but captures the *metaphoricity*. Following are illustrative examples:

15. yaṭiiru bi-ṭumuuhi-hi-l-waṭanii(p. 26)
    [He flies with his national ambitions]
    His ambitions for the nation reached distant horizons. (p. 19)

<div dir="rtl">يطير بطموحاته الوطنية</div>

16. miθlumašaahiiru-l-futawaatiallaðiinayahdimuuna-l-laððaatifiiḥayyi-hi-l-
    'ariiq(p. 53)
    [like the celebrated strongmen who destroy the pleasures in his time-proven
     quarter]
    Like the celebrated strongmen who brought misery to the ancient quarter.   (p.
     43)

<div dir="rtl">مثل مشاهير الفتوات الذين يهدمون اللذات في حيّه العريق</div>

17. yu'aaxiibayna 'arwaaḥi-him naqdu-θ-θawrati(p. 59)
    [Criticizing the revolution brothers their souls]
    Their hearts united in criticizing the revolution. (p. 48)

<div dir="rtl">يوآخي بين أرواحهم نقد الثورة</div>

All the English renderings in (15)-(17) capture the imports in their Arabic counterparts but without using the same ST images, that is, they employ their own metaphorical paradigms, arguably for lack of such paradigms in the TL. This is true in the case of (16) and (17) where the images of 'destroying pleasures' and

'brothering souls' in Arabic are alien to TL metaphorical norms; hence, they are replaced with the images of 'bringing misery' and 'uniting hearts'. As for (15), one may claim that the translator could have maintained the Arabic metaphorical paradigm by offering something like *He flew high with his national ambitions*.

5.3 The Syntagmatic parameter
Syntagmatic relations are horizontal features that represent surface as well as underlying semantic/thematic roles in propositions. When rendering metaphorical expressions, the translator may or may not maintain surface syntagmatic relations while holding the semantic roles such as *agent*, *patient*, *goal*, etc. (see Fromkin*et al*; Larson 1984; Kreidler 1998, among others) constant. However, the two options may not affect the paradigmatic make-up of the metaphor. Below are examples illustrating both possibilities:

18. … wa-raa'a šajarati-l-balxiallatišahidatḥubba-humaa-l-qadiim(p. 39)
    [… behind the oak trees that witnessed their old love]
    … behind the walnut tree that had witnessed their long love. (p. 28)

وراء شجرة البلخ التي شهدت حبهما القديم

19. saqaṭa-r-rajulufiiqabḍati-l-saraṭaan(p. 62)
    [The man fell into the grip of cancer]
    The man fell into the clutches of cancer.   (p. 49)

سقط الرجل في قبضة السرطان

20. fa-bala‘ati-ð-ðulumaatuṣadiiqa-hufiimaa bala‘at(p. 70)
    [The darkness swallowed his friend among others]
    … his friend was among those swallowed by darkness. (p. 57)

فبلعت الظلمة صديقه فيما بلعت

21. wa-laakina-ḍ-ḍaḥikaɣalaba-hufiisukri-hi   (p.133)
    [But the laughter overcame-him in his drunkenness]
But in his drunkenness, he was overcome by laughter. (p. 122)

ولكن الضحك غلبه في سكره

As can be seen, the translator has preserved the surface semantic roles in (18) and (19), viz. both ST and TT have the surface semantic role structure *location-experiencer-theme* (i.e. *behind the walnut tree-walnut tree-their love*, respectively) in (18) and the structure *patient-agent* (i.e. *the man-clutches of cancer*, respectively) in (19). By contrast, the surface semantic role structures in (20) and (21) are rightly replaced with underlying ones in order to achieve naturalness of expression, viz. the metaphorical *agent-patient* structure in (20) and (21) (i.e. *darkness-his friend* and *laughter-him*, respectively) is replaced with a *patient-agent* structure in both of them (i.e. *his friend-darkness* and *he-laughter*, respectively). Note how the English renderings in (20) and (21) may sound more natural than the renderings in (22) and (23) respectively, which maintain surface semantic role structures:

22. … darkness swallowed his friend among others.
23. But in his drunkenness, laughter overcame him.

   Sometimes, an explicit semantic role in the ST is deleted in the TT because it
   is co-textually recoverable, as can be witnessed in (24) and (25) below:
24. 'istaḥwaðat'alay-ha-l-'umuumatu(p. 24)
    [Motherhood overwhelmed her]
  … and was overwhelmed with motherhood. (p. 17)

<div dir="rtl">استحوذت عليها الأمومة</div>

25. fa-hazzat-hunašwatun(p. 71)
    [An ecstasy shook him]
and was shaken by a delirium. (p. 57)

<div dir="rtl">فهزّته نشوة</div>

      As is clear, the *experiencer-theme* (i.e. *her-motherhood*) semantic role
structure in (24) and the *patient-agent* one (i.e. *him-ecstasy*) in (25) are replaced
with only a *theme* (i.e. *motherhood*) and an *agent* (i.e. *delirium*) templates
respectively, because both the *experiencer* and *patient* roles are accessible in the
co-text. Ellipsis of such co-textually retrievable semantic roles improvises
cohesiveness in English discourse (see Halliday and Hassan 1976 for a full
account of cohesion). Arabic, by contrast, usually maintains clitic pronouns
(which are exclusively non-subject pronouns) as a cohesive tie, while it generally
drops subject pronouns, being a pro-drop language (for more details, see Farghal
2017).

      The preservation of the syntagmatic parameter in translation (whether it be
in surface, underlying or co-textual relations/see examples above) is noted in 73
instances in the textual data. It is also noted that the tendency to preserve rather
than miss this parameter is translation- procedure sensitive. The bulk of
preservation cases occurs when the translator maintains the same metaphor in the
TT, viz. out of 57 cases maintaining the same metaphor, only 5 instances miss the
syntagmatic parameter. This simply indicates that there is a strong tendency to
preserve the syntagmatic parameter when the ST metaphor is maintained in the
TT. Following are two examples from this category showing where the
syntagmatic parameter is preserved in one case (26) and missed in the other case
(27):
26. hazzamawtu-hu al-mubakkiru'aa'ilatasuruurin min-l-'a'maaqiwa-
    kaðaalika'aa'ilata
'amrin (p.28)
    [His early death shook Surur and Amr's families deeply]
His premature death shook Surur and Amr's families profoundly. (p. 19)

<div dir="rtl">هزّ موته المبكر عائلة سرور من الأعماق وكذلك عائلة عمرو</div>

27. al-'ixwaanutujjarudiinin   (p. 69)
    [The Muslim Brothers are merchants of religion]
The Muslim Brothers buy and sell religion.   (p. 55)

<div dir="rtl">الإخوان تجّار دين</div>

      While both (26) and (27) maintain the same Arabic metaphorical
expressions in English, only the first preserves the syntagmatic parameter. To
explain, the Arabic *agent-patient* (i.e. *his premature death-Surur and*

Amr'sfamilies) semantic role structure is kept in the translation of (26), whereas the Arabic *theme* semantic role template (i.e. *The Muslim Brothers*) in (27) is replaced with an *agent-patient* (*The Muslim Brothers-religion*) semantic role in the English translation. To preserve the syntagmatic parameter in (27), one could offer (28) below:

28. The Muslim Brothers are religion merchants.

In the rest of the corpus, which involves other translation procedures (44 instances), the syntagmatic parameter is preserved in 21 cases and missed in 23 cases. First, the category of *modifying metaphor*, which accounts for 20 instances in the data, contains 11 instances preserving the syntagmatic parameter and 9 instances missing it. The two examples below are illustrative:

29. wa-waḍuḥa 'anna-l-ḥubba 'aḏalla bi-janaahi-hi-l-'usrata-l-jadiidata(p. 24)
   [It became clear that love shaded the new family with its wing]
   It was evident that love sheltered the new couple in its wing. (p. 16)

وضُح أن الحب أظلّ بجناحه الأسرة الجديدة

30. ṭaraqa-ha-l-mawtu bi-luṭfinwa-damaaθatin(p. 95)
   [Death knocked her with kindness and gentleness]
   Death came kindly and gently. (p. 84)

طرقها الموت بلطف ودماثة

While the semantic role template *agent-patient-instrument* (i.e., love-the new couple-wing) is preserved in the English translation of (29), the Arabic template *patient-agent-manner* (i.e. *her-death-with kindness and gentleness*) in (30) is replaced with an *agent-manner* (i.e. *death-kindly and gently*) structure in the English translation.

Second, the demetaphorization procedure includes 5 cases of preserving the syntagmatic parameter and 11 cases of missing it. Just like in modifying metaphors, there seems to be a tendency (which is stronger here) to miss the syntagmatic parameter when demtaphoring metaphorical expressions. Following are two examples illustrating preserving and missing this parameter:

31. wa-šahida 'ayḍanwaθbata 'uktoobar 1973   (p. 59)
   [He also witnessed October leap 1973]
   He lived through the October 1973 attack. (p. 48)

وشهد أيضا وثبة أكتوبر

32. wa-nkasaratnafsu-haa   (p. 92)
    [Her self broke]
   She felt defeated. (p. 81)

وانكسرت نفسها

Despite demetaphorization, the Arabic *experiencer-patient* (i.e. *he-October leap*) semantic role structure is maintained in the English translation in (31). By contrast, the Arabic *patient* (i.e. *her self*) semantic role is replaced with an English *experiencer* (i.e. *she*) semantic role in (32).

Finally, we move to the treatment of the syntagmatic parameter when the translator decides to change the metaphorical expression altogether. There are 7

examples employing this procedure where the syntagmatic parameter is kept in 5 and missed in 2. Below are two illustrative examples:

33. wa-'aḥadda-l-ḥasaduqalba-huwa-lisaana-hu(p. 107)
     [Envy sharpened his heart and tongue]
      … and envy united his heart and tongue. (p. 96)

وأحدّ الحسد قلبه ولسانه

34. yu'aaxiibayna 'arwaaḥi-him naqdu-θ-θawrati(p. 59)
     [Criticizing the revolution brothered their souls]]
     Their hearts united in criticizing the revolution. (p. 48)

يوآخي بين أرواحهم نقد الثورة

    While the Arabic semantic role template *agent-patient* (i.e. *envy-his heart and his tongue*) is preserved in the English rendering in (33), the Arabic template is missed in (34). To explain, the English translation presents 'their hearts' as *experiencer* and 'criticizing the revolution' as *patient*, whereas the Arabic template presents 'criticizing the revolution' as *agent* and 'their souls' as *patient*.
    To summarize this section quantitatively, Table 2 below displays the distribution of *preserved* vs. *missed* of the syntagmatic parameter across translation procedures.

Table 2. Distribution of *preserved* vs. *missed* across syntagmatic parameter of translation procedures.

Type of Procedure	Preserved	Missed
Maintaining metaphor	52 (51%)	5 (5%)
Modifying metaphor	11 (12%)	9 (9%)
Demetaphoring metaphor	5 (5%)	11 (11%)
Changing metaphor	5 (5%)	2 (2%)

5.4 The Paradigmatic Parameter
The paradigmatic parameter reflects vertical relations rather than horizontal ones. In terms of translating metaphorical expressions, the translator may maintain the creative vehicle by accessing a corresponding one in the semantic blanket of the TL. Alternatively, the translator may opt to choose a synonym or a co-hyponym while still maintaining the metaphorical paradigm. Consider the following two examples from the corpus:

35. taɣfuuðilaalu 'ašjaari-l-balx.   (p. 5)
    [The shades of oak trees napped]
    The shadows of walnut trees slumbered.   (p.1)

تغفو ظلال أشجار البلخ

36. al-naksatuallatiizalzalat al-jiila-n-naasiriyyi(p. 65)

[The setback which quaked the Nasserite generation]

… the setback that shook Nasser's generation.   (p.52)

النكسة التي زلزلت الجيل الناصري

In (35), the translator has maintained the ST metaphor but has changed the paradigmatic relations in the TT. To explain, in the semantic blanket of English or the spread of words in it, the lexeme that formally corresponds to the verb *yaɤfuu* in Arabic is the verb *nap* in English. However, the translator has opted for *slumber*, which is a cognitive synonym of *nap,*hence he has maintained the metaphorical paradigmatic relation. Similarly, but in a different paradigmatic relation (hyponymy), she has replaced *'ašjaaru-l-balx* 'oak trees' with 'walnut trees' *'ašjaaru-l-jawz*. This, again, has not affected the metaphoricity of the rendering in the TL. Paradigmatic options, cognitive synonymy in particular, prove to be a viable option in translating metaphorical expressions. To rephrase (35) in light of formal lexical correspondence, the rendering will be (37) below:

37. The shadows of oak trees napped.

Clearly, the same degree of metaphoricity is exhibited in (37). One should note, however, that neither oak trees nor walnut trees are popular trees in Egypt, the setting of the novel under study. One may wonder why Mahfouz has chosen the 'oak tree' as a symbol of 'serenity' and 'romance' in more than one instance in the novel. The same applies to the translator who has chosen the 'walnut tree' for that purpose. It would have made more sense in the Egyptian context to refer to a 'palm tree' or a 'mango tree' for such a motif in the original, as well as in the translation.

As for (36), the translator has maintained the same vehicle 'setback' in the TT, which occupies the same niche in the semantic blanket of Arabic, i.e.*naksah* in reference to the Arabs' defeat of 1967 in the Arab-Zionist-entity war. Paradigmatically, she could have chosen the near-synonym *defeat* without affecting the metaphoricity in the paradigm. By contrast, the translator has opted to replace the tenor '*the act* of *quaking'* to a cognitive synonym '*the act ofshaking'*, a decision that maintains the metaphoricity of the rendering although at a slightly lower degree of creativity. The translator may have been guided by the naturalness of expression, apart from the creative degree of the Arabic paradigm which can be captured in (38) below:

38. … the setback that quacked Nasser's generation.

In terms of type of translation procedure, the paradigmatic parameter is preserved in all cases of maintaining metaphor (57 instances). Two more examples are given below:

39. haḍamanazawaati-haajamiiʿan bi-buṭuulatinxaariqatin(p. 50)

[He digested all her outbursts with extraordinary heroism]

He digested all Samiha's outbursts with extraordinary heroism. (p 40)

هضم نزواتها جميعا ببطولة خارقة

40. fa-štaʿalatɤiiraturaḍiyyati(p. 100)

[soRadia's jealousy ignited]
Radia's jealousy was ignited.   ((90)

<div dir="rtl">فاشتعلت غيرة رضية</div>

In both (39) and (40), the translator preserves the paradigmatic parameter, viz. the English paradigm *digest-outbursts* corresponds to the Arabic paradigm *haḍama-nazawaat* in (39). Similarly, in (40), the English paradigm *be ignited-jealousy* corresponds to the paradigm *'išta'alat-ɣiiratu* in Arabic.

When opting for modifying metaphor as a translation procedure, there is a strong tendency to miss the paradigmatic parameter (out of 20 cases, the paradigmatic parameter is missed in 17 and kept in 3 only). Following are two illustrative examples:

41. ɣazat-hu-l-ka'aabatu(p. 190)
    [The gloom invaded him]
    He was overcome with gloom.   (p. 176)

<div dir="rtl">غزته كآبة</div>

42. ḥalimat bi-'an tasbiqa-l-'armalatu 'abaa-haa 'ila-l-'aaxirati(p. 211)
    [She dreamed of the widow outracing her father to the Hereafter]
    … hoped the widow would depart for the Hereafter before her father.   (p. 198)

<div dir="rtl">حلمت بأن تسبق الأرملة أباها إلى الآخرة</div>

In (41), the translator has missed the paradigmatic parameter by modifying the Arabic paradigm *al-ka'aabatu-ɣazat* (*gloom-invaded*) into *gloom-be overcome* while maintaining metaphoricity, though using a modified paradigm. One may argue that the Arabic paradigm is more creative than the modified English one and that it could well be maintained in translation, viz. *He was invaded by gloom*. By contrast, the translator has preserved the Arabic paradigm in (42) by investing synonymy in the TL in a less creative way. To observe the creativity deficit, compare the English rendering in (42), where death is conventionally viewed as *departing,* with (43), in which *death* is creatively viewed as a *race*:

43. … hoped that the widow would outrace her father to the Hereafter.

The two remaining translation procedures (demetarphoring and changing metaphors) categorically miss the paradigmatic parameter by the fact that the former turns a metaphorical expression into a literal one, while the latter adopts a different paradigm in the TL. Following are two illustrative examples:

44. lamyataḥarrar min taqaaliidi-l-'usratiwa-l-bii'ati(p. 82)
    [He did not free (himself) from the customs of his family and environment]
He never renounced the customs of his family and environment.   (p. 70)

<div dir="rtl">لم يتحرر من تقاليد الأسرة والبيئة</div>

45. wa-lammaaḥatama-l-qaḍaa'uṭaraqa-ha-l-mawtu bi-luṭfinwa-damaaθatin(p. 95)
   [When the destiny decreed (the end), death knocked her with kindness and
     gentleness]
   When the end was decreed, death came kindly and gently.   (p. 84)

<div dir="rtl">ولما حتم القضاء طرقها الموت بلطف ودماثة</div>

In (44), the translator has dispensed with the Arabic metaphor by rendering its communicative import apart from metaphoricity, i.e. *renouncing something* vs. *freeing oneself from something*. As for (45), the translator has decided to employ a different English metaphor, which corresponds to the Arabic metaphor in function rather than in paradigm. In both cases, the paradigmatic parameter is missed. To be faithful to the metaphorical paradigms by Mahfouz, one may offer (46) and (47), respectively:

46. He did not free himself from the customs of his family and environment.
47. When the end was decreed, death knocked on her door kindly and gently.

Note that in (47) the Arabic metaphor, while preserving the paradigmatic parameter, is modified syntagmatically to render it naturally in English.

To conclude this section, Table 3 below displays the distribution of *preserved* vs. *missed* of the paradigmatic parameter across translation procedures:

Table 3. Distribution of *preserved* vs. *missed*paradigmatic parameter acrosstranslation procedures.

Type of Procedure	Preserved	Missed
Maintaining metaphor	57 (57%)	__
Modifying metaphor	3 (3%)	17 (17%)
Demetaphoring metaphor	___	16 (16%)
Changing metaphor	___	7 (7%)

6. Conclusion

The present paper has shown that metaphorical expressions are an integral part of literary discourse which need to be captured in translation. The textual data indicates that Christina Philips is generally aware of the importance of preserving the aesthetic value of Arabic metaphorical expressions in English translation, viz. 57% of the corpus involves maintaining the ST metaphors in the English translation. This is also evident in the translator's option for the procedure of modifying ST metaphors in light of TL norms (20%) while preserving their aesthetic value. The aesthetic value of ST metaphors is also satisfied when changing metaphors (7% only), although their cognitive representation is missed in favor of a target culture cognitive representation. By contrast to these three procedures, demetaphoring ST metaphors (16%) neutralizes their aesthetic value by merely relaying their communicative import apart from metaphoricity, which seriously damages the vividness and creativity of literary discourse.

The data also shows that coding metaphors in terms of concrete-to-abstract borrowing (89%) is much more common than coding them in terms of concrete-to-concrete borrowing (only 11%), which clearly tunes with the human need to make abstract referents easier to comprehend by explaining them in terms of

analogues with concrete referents. The analysis further shows that the syntagmatic parameter of metaphors may effectively operate between surface, underlying and co-textual semantic roles, and may or may not be preserved regardless of translation procedure, despite large variation (Table 3). The paradigmatic parameter, by contrast, is categorically preserved when maintaining metaphors (57%), but it is mainly missed when modifying metaphors (17% vs. 3%) and wholly missed when demetaphoring and changing metaphors.

Mohammed Farghal
Department of English
Kuwait University
Email: m_farghal@hotmail.com

Raneen Mansour
Department of English
Kuwait University
Email: mansouraneen@gmail.com

References

Abu Deeb, Kamal.(1971). 'al-Jurjani's classification of 'isti'ara with special reference to Aristotle's classification of metaphor'.*Journal of Arabic Literature, 2*:48-75.

Al-Harrasi, Abdulla. (2003). 'Ideological conceptual metaphors in Arabic-English translation of political discourse'.*International Journal of Arabic-English Studies (IJAES)*, 4:85-105.

Al-Hasnawi, Ali. (2007). 'A cognitive to translating metaphors'.*Translation Journal*11(3).http://www.accurapid.com/journal/41metaphor.htm (Retrieved on 20 February, 2019).

Ali, A. Mehdi. (2006). 'On the translation of metaphor: Notions and pedagogical implications'. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies (IJAES)*, 7:121-136.

Al-Jurjani, AbdulQahir.(d. 1078).*'asraar al-balaaghah*[Secrets of Rhetoric]. Jeddah (Saudi Arabia): Daar al-Madani li-l-Nashr.

Al-Sakaki.(d. 1229).*miftaah al-'uluum*[The Key to Sciences]. Beirut: Daar al-Kutub al-'ilmiyyah.

Al-Zoubi, Mohammed,Mohammed, Al-Ali and Ali Al-Hasnawi. (2007). Cogno-cultural issues in translating metaphors. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 14 (3): 230-239.

Atiq, AbdulAziz. (1985). *'aalam al-bayaan*[World of Rhetoric]. Beirut: Daar al-Nahdah.

De Waard, Jan and NidaEugene. (1986). *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Nashville, TN.: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Ereksoussi, Z. M. (2014). 'The translation of Qur'an metaphors: Procedures and examples'. *Journal of Languages and Literatures*, 13: 48-99, Um Al-Qura University.

Farghal, Mohammed. (1994). 'Ideational equivalence in translation'. In Robert de Beaugrande, Abdulla Shunnaq and Mohamed Heliel (eds.). *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East,* 55-63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Farghal, Mohammed. (2017). 'Textual Issues Relating to Cohesion and Coherence in English/Arabic Translation'.*Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature*, 9 (1):29-50.

Farghal, Mohammed and Ali Almanna.(2015). 'Literary translation; A stylistic perspective'.In Mohammed Farghalet al, *Papers in Arabic/English Translation Studies* 1,123-141. Amman, Jordan: Fadaat for Publishing and Distribution.

Fromkin, Victoria, Robert Rodman and Nina Hyams.(2013). *An Introduction to Linguistics* (10th edition). Boston, MA.: Cengage Learning.

Gentner, Dedre, BrianBowdle, Philip Wolffand Consuelo Boronat. (2001). 'Metaphor is like analogy'. In DedreGentner, Keith Holyoak and BoichoKokinov (eds.), *The Analogical Mind: Perspectives from Cognitive Science*, 199-253. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ghazala, Hasan. (2011). *Cognitive Linguistics and the Translator*.London; Sayyab Books Ltd.

Grice, H. Paul.(1975). 'Logic and Conversation'. In Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts*, 41-58. New York: New York Academic Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. **and R. Hasan.**(1976). *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Longman.

Hiraga, Masako. (1991). 'Metaphor and comparative cultures'. *Cross-cultural Communication: East and West*, *3,* 149-166*.*

Hiraga, Masako. (1994). 'Diagrams and metaphors: Iconic aspects in language'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 22(1): 5-21.

Iranmanesh, Ahmad and KulwindrKaur.(2010). *A cognitive approach and translation strategies used in the subtitling of metaphors in three American movies.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya, Malaya, Malaysia.

Jakobson, Roman. (1960). 'Linguistics and poetics'. In T. Sebeok (ed), *Style in Language,* 350-377. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kovecses, Zoltan. (2005).*Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kreidler, Charles. (20120. *Introducing English Semantics*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors we Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Larson, Mildred. (1984). *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. New York: University Press of America.

Maalej, Zuhair. (2008). 'Translatingmetaphor between unrelated cultures: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective'. *Sayyab Translation Journal*, 1, 60-81.

Mahfouz, Najeeb. (1987). *Hadiiθ al-ṣabaaḥwa-l-masaa'*.Cairo: MaktabatMisr.

Mandelblit, Nili. (1995). *The Cognitive View of Metaphor and its Implications for Translation Theory*. Masstrucht: Universitaire Press.

Mehfooz, Musferah. (2016). 'A rhetorical analysis of figures of speech of simile, analogy and metaphor in Asrār al-Balāghah by ᶜAbd al-Qāhir Al-Jurjānī'.*Al-Qalam Journal*, 21 (1): 1-16.

Muhaidat, Fatima and ShadiNeimneh.(2014). 'Naguib Mahfouz's metaphors in English translation'.*International Journal of English and Literature (IJEL)*,4 (1): 109-116.

Newmark, Peter. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.

Nida, Eugene. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Phillips, Christina. (2007). *Morning and Evening Talk*. Translation of N. Mahfouz *hadiiθ al-ṣabaaḥwa-l-masaa'*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.

Schaffner, Christina. (2004). 'Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36: 1253-1269.

Shen, Yeshayahu. (2012). 'Metaphor and poetic figures'. In Raymond Gibbs (ed.), *TheCambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Thomas, Jenny. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction*. London: Longman.

Venuti, Lawrence. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wiemer-Hastings, Katia.andXuXu. (2005). 'Content differences for abstract and concrete concepts'.*Cognitive science*, 29: 719-736.

Appendix
List of Arabic Phonetic Symbols

/ð/ voiced interdental fricative
/ð̣/ voiced interdental emphatic fricative
/θ/ voiceless interdental fricative
/ḍ/ voiced alveolar emphatic stop
/ṭ/ voiceless alveolar emphatic stop
/ṣ/ voiceless alveolar emphatic fricative
/r/ alveolar rhotic liquid
/l/ alveolar lateral liquid
/š/ voiceless alveo-palatal fricative
/j/ voiced palatal affricate
/y/ palatal glide
//g/ voiced velar stop
//γ/ voiced uvular/post-velar fricative
/x/ voiceless uvular/post-velar fricative
/q/ voiceless uvular stop
/'/ voiced pharyngeal fricative
/ḥ/ voiceless pharyngeal fricative
/'/ glottal stop
/h/ voiceless laryngeal fricative
/i/ high front short vowel
/u/ high back short vowel
/a/ low half-open front-to-centralized short vowel
/ii/ high front long vowel
/uu/ high back long vowel
/aa/ lowopen front-to-centralized long vowel
/ee/ mid front long vowel
/oo/ mid back long vowel