

**DIACHRONIC TRANSLATION OF FIGURES OF
SPEECH IN SELECTED POEMS OF AL-
MU'ALLAQĀT**

RAZAN KHASAWNEH

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2025

**DIACHRONIC TRANSLATION OF FIGURES OF
SPEECH IN SELECTED POEMS OF AL-
MU'ALLAQĀT**

by

RAZAN KHASAWNEH

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

March 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To begin with, I thank Allah for giving me the strength to accomplish this work and for his uncountable blessings upon me.

I express my sincere thanks and gratitude to my supervisor, **Dr. Mohamed Abdou Moindjie**, for his valuable and constant guidance, kind assistance, encouragement, and invaluable suggestions. I have learned a lot from him, and without his remarkable efforts, this thesis would not shine. I would also like to extend my thankfulness to my co-supervisor, **Dr. Shaidatul Akma Adi Kasuma**, who has helped and advised me in completing my thesis.

First, I would like to dedicate this thesis to the late soul of my father, our hero. Your presence is greatly missed, but your love will always remain in our hearts.

I am deeply thankful to my mother for encouraging me to go on with every adventure, especially this one. Thanks for being there for me and for my kids. Thanks for your love and daily prayers.

My beloved husband, Dr. Bilal, who has walked every step of this journey with me. I must admit that you were a big motive in accomplishing this work. Thanks for making the impossible possible. I want to especially thank my two minions, Ameer and Adam, for all the laughs and joy. You have made me stronger, better, and more fulfilled than I could have ever imagined. I love you 'infinite.'

Many thanks to my sisters Dr. Ramada, Raeda, and Ronza; I will always be grateful for you being there for me and my kids through this journey and in life. And my brothers Rami and Riyad, may Allah protect you and always be on your side. For the little ones in our family.

Last but not least, a thank you goes to my husband's family and my friends for always being proud of me in every step I take. Thanks for your support and encouragement. Finally, myself.

For the people holding to their ground and the souls, we lost in Gaza, Palestine.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	xiv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xv
ABSTRAK	xvi
ABSTRACT	xviii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of the Study	1
1.3 Statement of the Problem	4
1.4 Research Objectives	8
1.5 Research Questions	8
1.6 Significance of the Study	9
1.7 Limitations of the Study	10
1.8 Definition of Key Terms	11
1.9 Outline of the Thesis	12
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2.1 Text Types	14
2.2 Style	17
2.3 Literary Language	19
2.4 Translation	22
2.4.1 Translation Accuracy and Acceptability	24
2.5 Literary Translation	26
2.5.1 Translation and Culture	27

2.5.2	Poetry Translation.....	30
2.6	Translation Procedures.....	32
2.6.1	Borrowing	33
2.6.2	Calque	34
2.6.3	Literal Translation	36
2.6.4	Transposition	37
2.6.5	Modulation	39
2.6.6	Equivalence	41
2.6.7	Adaptation	43
2.6.8	Omission	45
2.6.9	Addition	48
2.6.10	Compensation	49
2.6.11	Paraphrase	52
2.7	Discourse Approach in Translation.....	54
2.8	Figures of Speech.....	56
2.8.1	Simile	56
2.8.2	Metaphor	58
2.8.3	Onomatopoeia	60
2.8.4	Personification	62
2.8.5	Irony	63
2.8.6	Idioms	65
2.8.7	Euphemism	66
2.8.8	Metonymy	67
2.9	Overview of the Arab Poets	69
2.9.1	The Poet Al-Zuhair (520 – 609 AD)	69
2.9.2	The Mu'allaqā of al-Zuhair	71
2.9.3	The Poet Antara (525 - 608 AD)	72

2.9.4	The Mu'allaqā of Antara	73
2.9.5	The Poet Imru'al- Qays (497-545 AD)	74
2.9.6	The Mu'allaqā of Imru'al- Qays	76
2.10	Overview of the English Translations	77
2.10.1	Sir William Jones Translation (1782).....	77
2.10.2	Frank E. Johnson Translation (1893)	79
2.10.3	Arthur J. Arberry Translation (1957)	79
2.11	Related Studies.....	81
2.11.1	Studies Related to the Translation of al-Mu'allaqāt.....	81
2.11.2	Studies Related to House's Translation Quality Assessment Model (1977-1997)	84
2.12	Theoretical Framework.....	93
2.12.1	An Overview of Translation Quality Assessment Models	94
2.12.2	House's Translation Quality Assessment Model (1977-1997).....	96
2.12.3	Abdul-Raof's Categorization.....	99
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHEDODOLOGY		104
3.1	Introduction.....	104
3.2	Research Method	105
3.4	Justification of the Corpus	106
3.5	Design of the Research	108
3.5.1	Data Identification and Collection.....	108
3.5.2	Data Sampling	110
3.5.3	Data Analysis Procedures	111
CHAPTER 4 RESEARCH FINDINGS		114
4.1	Introduction	114
4.2	Figures of Speech Distribution	114
4.2.1	Metonymy	114

4.2.1(a)	Metonymy in Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā.....	115
4.2.1(b)	Metonymy in Antara's Mu'allaqā.....	116
4.2.1(c)	Metonymy in Imru'al- Qays Mu'allaqā	118
4.2.2	Metaphor	120
4.2.2(a)	Metaphor in Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā.....	121
4.2.2(b)	Metaphor in Antara's Mu'allaqā.....	122
4.2.2(c)	Metaphor in Imru'al- Qays Mu'allaqā	124
4.2.3	Simile	126
4.2.3(a)	Simile in Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā.....	127
4.2.3(b)	Simile in Antara's Mu'allaqā.....	128
4.2.3(c)	Simile in Imru'al- Qays' Mu'allaqā.....	130
4.3	Accuracy and Accessibility.....	133
4.3.1	Accuracy and Acceptability in Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā.....	133
4.3.2	Accuracy and Acceptability in Antara's Mu'allaqā	135
4.3.3	Accuracy and Acceptability in Imru'al- Qays' Mu'allaqā	137
4.4	Register Analysis	139
4.4.1	Al- Zuhair's Mu'allaqā	139
4.4.1(a)	Field.	139
4.4.1(b)	Tenor	140
4.4.1(c)	Mode	142
4.4.1(d)	Genre.....	142
4.4.2	Antara's Mu'allaqā	144
4.4.2(a)	Field	144
4.4.2(b)	Tenor	146
4.4.2(c)	Mode	147
4.4.2(d)	Genre.....	148
4.4.3	Imru'al- Qays' Mu'allaqā	150

4.4.3(a)	Field	150
4.4.3(b)	Tenor	151
4.4.3(c)	Mode	153
4.4.3(d)	Genre.....	153
4.5	Summary of the Findings.....	155
CHAPTER 5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	156
5.1	Introduction.....	156
5.2	Textual Aspects.....	156
5.2.1	Metonymy	156
5.2.1(a)	An Analysis of a Selection of Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā	156
5.2.1(b)	An Analysis of a Selection of Antara's Mu'allaqā	167
5.2.1(c)	An Analysis of a Selection of Imru'al- Qays' Mu'allaqā	176
5.2.2	Metaphor	187
5.2.2(a)	An Analysis of a Selection of Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā	187
5.2.2(b)	An Analysis of a Selection of Antara's Mu'allaqā	198
5.2.2(c)	An Analysis of a Selection of Imru'al- Qays' Mu'allaqā	206
5.2.3	Simile	218
5.2.3(a)	An Analysis of a Selection of Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā	218
5.2.3(b)	An Analysis of a Selection of Antara's Mu'allaqā	229

5.2.3(c)	An Analysis of a Selection of Imru'al- Qays' Mu'allaqā	241
5.3	Genre Analysis	255
5.3.1	An Analysis of Al- Zuhair's Mu'allaqā.....	255
5.3.1(a)	Field	258
5.3.1(b)	Tenor	258
5.3.1(c)	Mode	258
5.3.1(d)	Genre	258
5.3.2	An Analysis of a Selection of Antara's Mu'allaqā.....	263
5.3.2(a)	Field	258
5.3.2(b)	Tenor	258
5.3.2(c)	Mode	258
5.3.2(d)	Genre	258
5.3.3	An Analysis of a Selection of Imru'al- Qays' Mu'allaqā.....	271
5.3.3(a)	Field	258
5.3.3(b)	Tenor	258
5.3.3(c)	Mode	258
5.3.3(d)	Genre	258
5.4	Summary of the Findings	279
5.5	Limitations of the Study	284
5.6	Contribution of the Study	285
5.7	Research Implications	286
5.8	Recommendations	286
5.9	Conclusion	287
	REFERENCES	288
	APPENDICES	

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4.1	Metonymy Size in the ST 116
Table 4.2	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones's (1782) Translation (of al- Zuhair's Mu'allaqã 116
Table 4.3	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Johnson's (1893) Translation of al- Zuhair's Mu'allaqã 116
Table 4.4	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry's (1957) Translation of al- Zuhair's Mu'allaqã 117
Table 4.5	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones's (1782) Translation of Antara's Mu'allaqã 117
Table 4.6	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Johnson's (1893) Translation of Antara's Mu'allaqã 118
Table 4.7	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry's (1957) Translation of Antara's Mu'allaqã 118
Table 4.8	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones's (1782) Translation of Imru'al- Qays's Mu'allaqã 119
Table 4.9	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Johnson's (1893) Translation of Imru'al- Qays's Mu'allaqã 119
Table 4.10	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry's (1957) Translation of Imru'al- Qays's Mu'allaqã 120
Table 4.11	Metaphor Size in the ST 122
Table 4.12	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones's (1782) Translation of al- Zuhair's Mu'allaqã 122
Table 4.13	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Johnson's (1893) Translation of al- Zuhair's Mu'allaqã 122
Table 4.14	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry's (1957) Translation of al- Zuhair's Mu'allaqã 123

Table 4.15	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones’s (1782) Translation of Antara’s Mu’allaqā	123
Table 4.16	The number and percentage of procedures observed in Johnson (1893) translation of Antara’s Mu’allaqā	124
Table 4.17	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry’s (1957) Translation of Antara’s Mu’allaqā	124
Table 4.18	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones’s (1782) Translation of Imru’al- Qays’s Mu’allaqā	125
Table 4.19	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Johnson’s (1893) Translation of Imru’al- Qays’s Mu’allaqā	125
Table 4.20	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry’s (1957) Translation of Imru’al- Qays’s Mu’allaqā	126
Table 4.21	Simile Size in the ST	128
Table 4.22	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones’s (1782) translation of al- Zuhair Mu’allaqā	128
Table 4.23	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Johnson’s (1893) Translation of al- Zuhair’s Mu’allaqā	128
Table 4.24	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry’s (1957) Translation of Antara’s Mu’allaqā	129
Table 4.25	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones’s (1782) Translation of Antara’s Mu’allaqā	129
Table 4.26	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Johnson’s (1893) Translation of Antara’s Mu’allaqā	130
Table 4.27	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry’s (1957) Translation of Antara’s Mu’allaqā	130
Table 4.28	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Jones’s (1782) Translation of Imru’al- Qays’s Mu’allaqā	131

Table 4.29	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Johnson's (1893) Translation of Imru'al- Qays's Mu'allaqā	132
Table 4.30	The Number and Percentage of Procedures Observed in Arberry's (1957) Translation of Imru'al- Qays's Mu'allaqā	132
Table 4.31	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of al-Mu'allaqāt	134
Table 4.32	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Metonymy in Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā	135
Table 4.33	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Metaphor in Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā	135
Table 4.34	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Simile in Al-Zuhair's Mu'allaqā	138
Table 4.35	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Metonymy in Antara's Mu'allaqā	140
Table 4.36	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Metaphor in Antara's Mu'allaqā	142
Table 4.37	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Simile in Antara's Mu'allaqā	144
Table 4.38	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Metonymy in Imru'al- Qay's Mu'allaqā	145
Table 4.39	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Metaphor in Imru'al- Qay's Mu'allaqā	147
Table 4.40	Accuracy and Acceptability Occurrences in the Three Translations of Simile in Imru'al- Qay's Mu'allaqā	147
Table 4.41	Field	135
Table 4.42	Tenor	136
Table 4.43	Genre	138
Table 4.44	Field	140

Table 4.45	Tenor	142
Table 4.46	Genre	144
Table 4.47	Field	145
Table 4.48	Tenor	147
Table 4.49	Genre	149

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1	
Theoretical framework adapted from House's (2015) TQA model and Abdul-Raof's (2006) categorization of figures of speech	104
Figure 3.1	
Adopted from House (1997) and Abdul-Raof (2006)	114

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

SL	Source Language
TL	Target Language
ST	Source Text
TT	Target Text
TQA	Translation Quality Assessment

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	I J M E S Transliteration System for Arabic
Appendix B	Arabic Texts
Appendix C	English Translations

**TERJEMAHAN DIAKRONIK GAYA BAHASA KIASAN DALAM PUISI
TERPILIH AL MU'ALLAQĀT**

ABSTRAK

Analisis terjemahan diakronik melibatkan kajian tentang cara terjemahan berkembang dari semasa ke semasa yang mencerminkan perubahan dalam norma linguistik dan perspektif budaya. Melalui analisis pelbagai terjemahan sesebuah puisi dari pelbagai zaman, perubahan dalam strategi terjemahan, keutamaan, dan pilihan leksikal dapat dikenal pasti. Kajian ini merupakan kajian deskriptif perbandingan bidang terjemahan sastera yang menumpukan kepada terjemahan Arab-Inggeris bagi unsur gaya bahasa kiasan dalam puisi terpilih daripada al-Mu'allaqāt. Kajian ini mengkaji unsur gaya bahasa diterjemahkan dalam tempoh yang berbeza, khususnya dalam aspek penterjemahan daripada bahasa Arab ke bahasa Inggeris serta prosedur terjemahan yang telah digunakan. Tambahan lagi, kajian ini bertujuan mengenal pasti ketepatan dan tahap kebolehterimaan terjemahan berkualiti bagi unsur gaya bahasa kiasan. Penyelidik menggunakan model TQA House (1997) serta kategori unsur gaya bahasa kiasan oleh Abdul-Raof (2006). Data dikumpulkan daripada tiga Mu'allaqāt karya al-Zuhair, Antara, dan Imru' al-Qays serta tiga terjemahan Inggeris oleh Jones (1782), Johnson (1893), dan Arberry (1957). Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa terdapat persamaan dan perbezaan dalam terjemahan disebabkan pelbagai kekangan yang mempengaruhi pilihan penterjemah, terutamanya aspek budaya, leksikal, dan keaslian bahasa yang mempengaruhi tahap register (bidang-field, penutur-tenor, dan mod-mode) serta genre. Ini menyebabkan peralihan semantik, penambahan, atau pengguguran dalam teks terjemahan (TT) berlaku. Selain itu, teks terjemahan mempunyai ayat yang lebih pendek dan kepadatan leksikal yang lebih rendah, yang menunjukkan bahawa teks terjemahan menjadi lebih ringkas, jelas, dan kurang

kompleks pada dekad kebelakangan ini. Kajian ini mendapati bahawa terjemahan yang lebih terkini, iaitu oleh Arberry dan Johnson, lebih setia kepada teks sumber berbanding terjemahan terdahulu oleh Jones. Kajian terkini menyumbang kepada pemahaman tentang keputusan yang dilakukan oleh penterjemah dan perkembangan diakronik dalam terjemahan mereka. Tambahan pula, kajian ini mencadangkan versi baharu model House (1997) dengan memasukkan skala kualiti yang boleh digunakan dalam menilai perubahan daripada teks sumber. Dapatan kajian ini memberi implikasi terhadap pengoptimuman terjemahan manusia dan sastera daripada bahasa Inggeris ke bahasa Arab.

**DIACHRONIC TRANSLATION OF FIGURES OF SPEECH IN SELECTED
POEMS OF AL-MU'ALLAQĀT**

ABSTRACT

Diachronic translation analysis involves studying how translation evolves over time, reflecting changes in linguistic norms and cultural perspectives. By analyzing different translations of a poem from different periods, shifts in translation strategies, priorities, and lexical choices can be uncovered. This study is a comparative descriptive study of literary translation that focuses on the Arabic-English translations of figures of speech in selected poems of *al-Mu'allaqāt*. The study examines how figures of speech are dealt with over different periods. It particularly examines how they are translated from Arabic into English and what translation procedures have been adopted. In addition, this study aims to identify the accuracy and acceptability of quality translations of figures of speech. The researcher follows House's (1997) TQA model and from Abdul-Raof's (2006) figures of speech categoris. The data are extracted from three *Mu'allaqāt* of al-Zuhair, Antara, and Imru'al- Qays and three English translations by Jones (1782), Johnson (1893), and Arberry (1957). The study reveals that some similarities and differences occurred due to several constraints that controlled the translators' choices related to cultural, lexical, and naturalness, which affected the levels of register (field, tenor, mode) and genre. This has resulted in semantic shifts, additions, or omissions in the TTs. In addition, the translated texts had shorter sentences and a lower lexical density, which suggests that the translated texts became simpler, more straightforward, and less complex in recent decades. It is found that most recent translations, i.e., Arberry and Johnson's, are more faithful than the earlier one, i.e., Jones. The present study contributes to understanding the decisions made by translators and the diachronic development of their translations. Moreover,

the study proposes a revised version of House's (1997) model by including a scale of quality that can be adopted in terms of shifts from the ST. The findings implies optimization of human and literary translation from English into Arabic.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the study's background, the statement of the problem, the aims of the study, the research objectives, research questions, the limitation of the study, as well as the significance of the study, the definition of key terms, and outline of the thesis.

This study is a comparative study that examines and assesses the translation strategies adopted by Jones (1782), Johnson (1893), and Arberry (1957) in translating figures of speech: simile, metaphor, and metonymy, which has been adopted from Abdul-Raof's (2006) categorization in translating three *Mu'allaqāt* of al- Zuhair, Antara, and Imru'al- Qays. The researcher follows House's (1997) translation quality assessment (TQA) model of register and genre to establish the function of accuracy and acceptability of the data under study.

1.2 Background of the Study

The fundamental function of translation is bridging the gap between various cultures and disseminating ideas and knowledge worldwide. According to Translatic (2020) the world would be poorer culturally and economically without translation. Thus, translation is among the most crucial factors contributing to the prosperity of countless ancient and modern cultures (Burrow-Goldhahn, 2018). Accordingly, translation is the action of translating words or texts from one language into another. This can be seen in Hassan's (2011) definition, where he states that translation is the replacement of meaning one language (SL) by equivalent meaning in another language (TL) which is done by changing the form of first language with the form of the second language.

Translation has been employed randomly without following any translation strategies or theories in the past, until the emergence of Translation Studies as a formal academic discipline in the late 1970s (Bassnett, 2013). This development introduced systematic frameworks and methodologies, bringing structure and scholarly rigor to what had previously been a random and unsystematic practice. Translators encounter both linguistic and cultural challenges tied to the context, content, and the process of translating the text (Hanrahan et. al, 2015). In this respect, several aspects are critical to good translation. These aspects include rules for translating figurative language, working with lexical mismatches, rhetorical questions, and the involvement of cohesion devices, among other topics encompassed in translation theory (Vallejo, 2023).

There are two levels of meaning in language: literal and figurative. The literal meaning mirrors exactly what it says, it is defined by Hutabarat (2018, p. 59) as "a meaning without any other meanings besides the lexical meaning or the surface meaning of words or sentences." He (2018) describes literal meaning as easy to understand without misunderstanding or misinterpretation between the speaker and the listener. On the other hand, figurative meaning, or non-literal use of language, does not convey the word's literal meaning and is characterized by various rhetorical devices, such as: irony, metonymy, metaphors, and idioms, among others. (Saeed, 2022). Accordingly, Agastya (2015) argues that figurative meaning exists when a word or sentence includes an additional meaning besides its lexical meaning. Therefore, the translator must recognize the context to grasp the intended meaning. Hutabarat (2018) states that understanding the non-literal meaning must be ensured to avoid any confusion in everyday conversation.

It is generally agreed that literary translation is, in particular, the most challenging form of translation (Farghal & Mansour, 2020; Marabout, 2010). Saks

(2021) and Newmark (2003) who explored the translation of poetry suggest that poetry is the most testing form of translation. Therefore, poetry might be the least translated literary genre (Venuti, 2011). Poetry heavily relies on specific linguistic features such as rhythm, rhyme, figures of speech, and cultural and emotional nuances. These features are deeply tied to the source language culture, making them difficult to replicate in the TL. As a result, translators hesitate to translate poetic texts, contributing to its limited representation compared to other genres.

Dastjerdi, Hakimshafaaii, and Jannesaari (2008) argue that what is lost in translation is essence of poetry, or the form of the poetic text. Matiu (2008) argues that translators need to be skilled and possess linguistic and literary competence, as well as talent and awareness of the poetic codes of the two languages, as it is difficult for non-native readers to comprehend the message that the poem presents immediately. Accordingly, awareness of poetic language and elements ensures that the translator can maintain style and meaning of the original text while making it suitable for the target readers.

Most studies on poetry translation conclude that poetry translation is impossible (Papavassiliou, 2012; & Tisgam, 2014). This applies to the translation between Arabic and English, which hold several issues from the perspective of translation studies (Alzghoul & Alazzam, 2021). Khalifa (2015) argues that most English language translators of Arabic poetry face a highly challenging task due to the unique qualities of Arabic language and Arabic poetry. Badawi and Badawi (1975) states that these challenges emerge as the translator's focus switches between the form and the content. Moreover, Arabic and English belong to two different language families and culture. If any minor detail is missing in a translated poem, it is due to variances in language phonology, syntactic structure, vocabulary, literary history, prosody, or poetics (Jafari

& Karimnia, 2015). Correspondingly, language plays a significant role, which differs from normal, daily usage. Additionally, language might also differ between old and modern poetry. Octavio Paz (2017, p. 159) states that "no text can be completely original because language itself, in its very essence, is already a translation - first from the nonverbal world, and then, because each sign and each phrase is a translation of another sign, another phrase."

In the context of this study, when examining translations of the same literary work or poem across different periods, a diachronic approach becomes invaluable. Diachronic translation analysis involves studying how translation evolve over time, reflecting changes in linguistic norms and cultural perspective. By analyzing different translations of a poem from different periods, shifts in translation strategies, priorities, and lexical choices can be uncovered. Such analysis deepens our understanding of translation practices and enriches the relationship between past and present literary traditions. And since "the target language has no direct equivalence for a word that occurs in the source text" (Baker, 2018, p. 18), the accuracy and acceptability of translation can still be evaluated.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Literary translation is distinct from all other fields of translation; this can be explained by the fact that literary works have unique features that set them apart from other fields (Hakemi, 2013). Landers (2001) argues that the difference between a vibrant, moving, and intriguing literary translation and one that is stiff, rigid, and artificial depends on how well the beauty and flavor of the original are represented in the translated literary work. Therefore, to accomplish the translation's main objective, convey the intended message, and transfer it correctly, the translator must be imaginative, creative, and linguistically skilled.

Machali et al. (2000) argue that translation is a recreation process. In translating poetry, the translator must consider certain aspects, as this genre has unique characteristics that set it apart from other types of texts, such as linguistic, syntactic, cultural, and quality aspects. Figurative language plays an important role in this genre, which fulfills the three linguistic requirements of *forth*, *beauty*, and *clarity* (Tajalli, 2003). Nolan (2005) states that it is crucial to identify figures of speech in the ST to be able to translate them. Failing to identify them may lead to misinterpretation as they often carry cultural and symbolic meaning that goes beyond the literal meaning. By understanding their function and meaning, translators will be able to find an equivalent expression in the TL that preserves their intended effect and meaning. According to Al-Harashseh (2013), when translators attempt to create an appropriate translation of figures of speech, they must consider that the connotative meaning of a specific word in the SL may not align with its connotative meaning in the TL. However, some translators use literal translation, especially when they do not find an equivalence, which can lead to misunderstanding, ambiguity, or distortion of the intended meaning. An accurate translation does not necessarily involve a literal translation of the ST (Hall et al., 2018), the translators must follow the right procedures to produce a good translation with good quality. In this case, it is important to focus on quality issues through quality assessment by evaluating the accuracy and acceptability of the translation carried out by translators. Melis and Albir (2001) argue that there are three domains to assess translation quality: assessment for published translations, assessment in professional practice, and assessment in translation teaching. Translated poems, as a type of published translation, can therefore be assessed using the criteria and methodologies developed for this domain.

Studies related to figures of speech translation from Arabic into English and vice versa in the poetry genre have been conducted regarding the challenges, translation procedures, and critical assessment of the translations conducted (Al Salem, 2014; Alawi & Jarrad, 2018). The gap of knowledge detected in the literature review is that most studies did not consider the quality of the translated figures of speech in poetry, specifically metonymy, metaphor, and simile, in terms of their accuracy and acceptability. In addition, the previous studies did not explore diachronic translations or whether translation practices and translation itself have evolved over time. For example, Najeeb (2022) has examined the quality of two Arabic translations of Shirley Jackson's English short story *The Lottery* by adopting House's (1997) model. Another study conducted by Al Abri (2016) has described the errors in his own translation of United Nations documents between English and Arabic. These two studies differ from the current study in content and genre. The first study (Najeeb, 2022) adopted short stories as a literary genre; however, it did not discuss the translation of figures of speech in particular. The second study (Al Abri, 2016) did not adopt a literary genre as a study sample or focused on figures of speech. Whereas other studies are conducted in other languages besides Arabic and English, such as Esmail and Jaza'ei (2015), who have focused on applying House's model to two English translations of the Turkish poems of *Nazim Hikmet* to evaluate the quality of translation. Ghafouripour and Eslamieh (2018) have employed House's model in two English translations of the Persian poems of *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*. Regarding diachronic translation, Thawabteh (2014) has conducted a study to shed light on the development of legal texts language representing three sporadic periods: post-First World War, post-Israeli occupation of Palestine, and post-foundation of the Palestinian National Authority (PNA), adopting three marriage contracts as a case study.

The current study is a new study and approach that assesses the translation of figures of speech in *al-Mu'allaqāt* poems translated over three different periods of time. Berdom (2007) has examined the quality of Arabic to English-translations of *al-Mu'allaqāt* in order to shed light on the problems encountered during the process of translation, keeping in mind the gap between the two linguistic systems of both languages. Meanwhile, Almasaeid (2013) has presented a study about the cultural, linguistic, and aesthetic problems associated with the translation of love "Alghazal" theme in *al-Jāhiliyyah* poetry of *al-Mu'allaqāt*. Eddin (2015) study has explored the types of lexical incongruence that can be found when translating between Arabic and English and its effect on the level of accuracy of translatability. In a study co-authored by Shaatti, Hamzah, Rashid, and Hajimaming (2016), researchers conducted qualitative research to study the loss and gain of the sociocultural implicit meanings in the English translations of *al-Mu'allaqāt* and evaluate the success of four translations of *al-Mu'allaqāt* in conveying the sociocultural implicit meanings from the ST to the TT.

The poems of *al-Mu'allaqāt* have been widely translated into English. Poetry in general and *al-Mu'allaqāt* in specific include a large variety of figures of speech such as metaphor, similes, metonymy, and antithesis, which might pose difficulties for translators, making it a difficult task. If translators cannot recognize figures of speech and their meaning, they will fail to translate the meaning accurately into the TL, which could cause confusion (Nolan, 2005). As a result, this ambiguity or confusion will lead the readers of the TT to misinterpret the poet's intended message. Hence, this study is a comparative one; it compares and evaluates three translations of figures of speech of three *Mu'allaqāt* of al-Zuhair, Antara, and Imru'al-Qays, translated into English in three different periods by Sir W. Jones (1782), Johnson (1893), and Arberry (1957).

The reason that these translations are chosen for discussion is that they were translated in different periods of time by Jones (1782), Johnson (1893), and Arberry (1957).

This study is a comparative analysis study that aims to compare three English translations of figures of speech in three Arabic *Jāhiliyyah* poems of *al-Mu'allaqāt* translated over three different periods of time to find out how translators have dealt with figures of speech and which translation procedures they have employed in the process of translation. Besides, it aims to compare the translation function of accuracy and acceptability of figures of speech and how the textual aspect (figures of speech) enhances or affects the contextual aspect of field, tenor, mode, and genre by applying House's (1997) TQA model.

1.4 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

1. To describe how translators translate figures of speech of *al-Mu'allaqāt* across various periods.
2. To investigate the translation procedures used by the translators in translating the figures of speech of *al-Mu'allaqāt*.
3. To compare the translation function of accuracy and acceptability of figures of speech of *al-Mu'allaqāt*.
4. To describe how the textual aspect (figures of speech) affects the contextual aspect (field, tenor, mode).

1.5 Research Questions

The present study seeks to provide answers to the underlying questions:

1. How do translators translate figures of speech in *al-Mu'allaqāt* across various periods?

2. What are the translation procedures the translators use in translating the figures of speech of *al-Mu'allaqāt*?
3. How do the accuracy and acceptability of figures of speech of *al-Mu'allaqāt* function comparatively?
4. How does the textual aspect (figures of speech) affect the contextual aspect (field, tenor, mode)?

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study belongs to the field of comparative analytic translation. Many researchers have tackled the translation of *Mu'allaqāt*; however, few researchers have paid attention to the translation accuracy and acceptability of figurative language as a separate field of study. Accordingly, the present study is original as it compares three poem translations with a time gap between one translation and another, specifically on the translation of figurative language: metonymy, metaphor, and simile, which are adopted from Abdul-Raof (2006) categorization of figures of speech. The primary motivation for selecting these figures of speech is their complexity, cultural reference, and the fact that they are the most debated ones in translation studies since every figure of speech carries a figurative meaning and can create ambiguity that affects clarity (Fadaee, 2011). Although there are many studies on literary translation (Abdel-Hafiz, 2014; Al Salem, 2014; Al-Assaf, 2019), work on evaluating poetry translation in terms of its accuracy and acceptability is still rare as most of the studies focus on the general translation of poetry. In addition, *al-Mu'allaqāt* poems are problematic in their turn due to their nature, culture, and their highly articulated language. According to Al-Khatib (1971, p. 22), the language of *al-Mu'allaqāt* "possess a wealth of vocabulary and near-synonyms, while, on the other hand, a single verb or adjective bore numerous meanings."

From a different point of view, this study is worth undertaking as it aims to provide additional information related to the decisions made by translators in the translation process pertaining to the accuracy and acceptability of the translation outcome. Moreover, this research is expected to help and guide translation researchers gain a better understanding of text evaluation based on House's (1997) model of translation quality assessment, particularly in poetry translation. Hence, this study can help researchers predict the errors in the translation of literary work, thus contributing to the improvement of their accuracy.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

A comparative study employs quantitative and qualitative approaches to examine and evaluate a particular phenomenon in different areas to identify similarities and/or differences (Coccia & Benati, 2018). This study is a bilingual comparative study; it compares the English translation of figures of speech in three Arabic *Mu'allaqāt*. Moreover, it evaluates the accuracy and acceptability of the English translations. This analysis mainly uses Abdul-Raof (2006) categorization of figures of speech. Another framework is utilized, and that is House's (1997) TQA model.

Hence, the scope and limitations of this study are that it includes only three original poems of *al-Mu'allaqāt* out of seven of al- Zuhair, Antara, and Imru'al- Qays, and three translations of each poem into English by the translators, Jones, Johnson, and Arberry. The researcher selected these three poems for the present study because their translations are presented and shared by the three translators. In addition, the above-mentioned translators translated these poems over different periods. There are 16 types of figurative language; however, the present study limits itself to three types, namely simile, metaphor, and metonymy, which have been adopted from Abdul-Raof (2006) as his theory is more convenient for Arabic texts. The researcher selected only three figures

of speech, as they are the most debatable ones. The study also limits itself to the assessment of the translation of figures of speech by following House's (1997) model of TQA, as it is applicable and helpful in the field of poetry translation (Ghafouripour & Eslamieh, 2018). In addition, it attempts to retain the naturalness and accuracy of the literary work.

1.8 Definition of Key Terms

1. **Al-Mu'allaqāt:** is a collection of seven odes regarded as a treasure in pre-Islamic Arabia, and they were put up on the curtains of the Kaaba Temple (Lahiani, 2020, p. 20).
2. **Delineation:** make a semiological analysis of the text, by cutting out and pairing the words which constitute single concepts in order to translate them into their proper counterparts (Jones, 2014, p. 5).
3. **Diachronic:** is the study of language which focuses on how language and its components evolve over time (Raclavský, 2014, p.1).
4. **Figurative language:** is the expression and words that deviates from the surface or obvious meaning and use of the expression and words (Giroux & Williston, 1974, p. 10), and employes figures of speech; for example, metaphor, simile, alliteration (Cuddon, 2013, p. 279).
5. **Genre:** is a certain communicative event that is identified by a group of communicative purpose(s) set by a group of professional or academic communities in which it occurs frequently (Bhatia, 1993, p. 13).
6. **Metaphor:** is the adaptation of words and expression of language to indicate something besides what it was intended to, or its literary meaning (Knowles & Moon, 2006, p. 3).

7. **Metonymy:** is a type of figure of speech in which the name of an attribute of any entity is used in place of the entity itself (Crystal, 2003, p. 303).
8. **Register:** is concerned with how meaning is expressed using words, grammatical constructs, and textual choices in a certain scenario (Ghafouripour & Eslamieh, 2018, p. 219) and subdivided into field, tenor, and mode.
9. **Simile:** is type of figurative language in that is used in literary texts and can be found in different languages and employs linguistic markers such as "like," "as," or "than." (Sigit & Sembiring, 2020, p. 3).
10. **Synchronic:** focuses on examining a language or its components as a fixed entity at a specific point in time (Raclavský, 2014, p.1).
11. **Translation:** is the perfect one-way replacement of the text in the source language with corresponding text in another language (Holubenko, 2023, p. 86).
12. **Translation quality assessment (TQA):** is the process of evaluating a translated text to identify the level of accuracy in terms of the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic function of the ST taking into account the cultural frame and expressive potentials of the source language and the target language (Al Qinai, 2000, p. 499).

1.9 Outline of the Thesis

The thesis consists of five chapters followed by a conclusion, as follows:

Chapter One presents an introduction to the thesis topic, which includes the background of the study, statement of the problem, aim of the study and research methods, research questions, limitations of the study, the significance of the study, and outline of the research.

Chapter Two provides a review of the related literature, which serves as a guide to this research. It discusses text types and styles, literary language, and translation and

thoroughly investigates literary translation. In addition to culture, poetry translation, translation procedures, discourse approach in translation, the translation of figures of speech, related studies, and theoretical framework.

Chapter Three embodies the methodology. It introduces the research type, the corpus of the study, and its justification. The design of the research, which includes data identification and collection, data sampling, and data analysis, is also set.

Chapter Four forms the research findings related to the translation procedures adopted while translating figures of speech (metonymy, metaphor, simile), accuracy and acceptability analysis, and genre findings of field, tenor, mode, and genre.

Chapter Five analyzes and evaluates of *al-Mu'allaqāt* poems according to Houses' (1997) quality assessment model on the level of register (field, tenor, mode) and genre. It shows the results of the analysis and presents the research's general findings , as well as the discussion with several supportive examples. Moreover, it illustrates the conclusion revisiting the limitations of the study and research questions. It also sheds light on the study's contributions and research implications. Recommendations for further research are also be put forward.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Text Types

Text is the authentic employment of language in the form of words, sentences, and paragraphs that hold a communicative purpose. It is defined by Halliday and Hassan (1976) as any written or verbal passage with different lengths. Brown and Yule (1983, p. 6) state that text is "the verbal record of a communicative act." It is also suggested by De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) that a text is a communicative event that satisfies the seven standards of textuality. Hence, many scholars sought to study text types and their importance in translation studies. Accordingly, Neubert (1985) defines text types as "socially effective, efficient, and appropriate molds into which the linguistic material available in the system of language is recast." Text types are seen as a theoretical framework that allows texts to be categorized according to their communicative goals, which fulfill a broad rhetorical function (Hatim & Mason, 1990). This means that communication marks the function of a text, as stated by Sager (1997), who argues that text types emerged as communication patterns for various communicative situations. Hence, text types can be defined using cognitive categories or strictly linguistic criteria (Trosborg, 1997). Another definition of text types is proposed by Eke (2016), who states that text types refer to the recognizable categories into which texts of translation are classified and which guide the translator while dealing with a text. Additionally, text types are text classes that hold specific features and are linked to particular communicative intentions (Tincheva, 2012). Regarding the definition of text types, Reiss (2014, p. 24) states that it "Should begin with the individual text, assigning it to the particular type for which there are appropriate translation methods best designed to preserve in translation the essential characteristics of the text".

However, many categorizations have been suggested for assessing texts according to a specific text type. Text types can be categorized based on a text's content, purpose, and form. Werlich (1976) puts forward five text types based on a dominant contextual focus or modes: instruction, argumentation, exposition, description, and narration. In addition to descriptive, narrative, and argumentative, De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) propose four extra types: scientific, dialect, literary, and poetic. Another categorization is proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990), who present three text types: argumentative, expository, and instructional. Their (1990) classification is based on Werlich's (1976) typology, which includes the previously mentioned text types. Furthermore, Reiss (2014) accounts for the existence of four text types, which she refers to as:

1. Content-focused texts (informative) are evaluated according to their semantic, grammatical, and stylistic features, which are presented in their translation. Examples include press releases and comments, directions for use, educational work, nonfiction books of all sorts, treatises, and news reports, among others.
2. Form-focused texts (expressive) are evaluated based on their aesthetic, stylistic, semantic, and grammatical features and translated accordingly. Examples include literary prose, imaginative prose, and poetry in all its forms.
3. Appeal-focused texts (operative) are the type of text that provides information from a certain point of view with a clear goal, including a non-linguistic result. They consist of all texts where the appeal aspect is dominant. For example, advertising, publicity, preaching, and propaganda.
4. Audio-medial texts are texts that necessitates the employment of accommodation in a non-linguistic medium in order to interact with the listener

in both the SL and the TL. Examples include radio, television scripts, and dramatic productions.

However, texts do not constantly occur in their pure form. Real texts typically reflect characteristics of more than one type, making them multifunctional (Trosborg, 1997). Still, one of these types is usually identified as the dominant one and referred to as the type of text. This type is what Hatim and Mason (1990, p. 147) recognize as "hybridization," which includes a mixture of different text types, and translators are advised to be aware of it. This type is called by Reiss (2014) the mixed type, which results from the overlap of different types of texts that can happen anywhere. In short, hybrid or mixed text occurs when a text changes into another type serving another aim.

In addition to all the previously mentioned types, a new type is coined, and that is the text type that is produced by computer involvement. This type is presented by Trosborg (1997), who states that computers can only cope with explicit material in linguistic substance. In other words, computers cannot determine the intention of the document they are working with. She (1977, p. 37) adds that, "A translation produced by a computer is, therefore, another translation-specific text type." Further, text multifunctionality is now regarded as the norm, not the exception. This is confirmed by Hatim (2009, p. 45), who states that serving more than one function is not considered a flaw in text classification "nor indeed as a license for an 'anything goes' attitude in the production or analysis of texts or translations."

Text types are recognized by the situation and the compositional features of the text. Moreover, text types help the reader identify who is addressing them and how they are being addressed, whether as individuals or as a group (Sager, 1997). Recognizing the text type is critical in the translation process, and translators must be aware of the type of text they are working on. Recognizing the text type helps translators identify the

most appropriate equivalence at both the micro and macro levels of the text (Hatim & Mason, 1990). They (1990) add that various types of texts tend to set additional expectations on the translator, unlike those of non-evaluative exposition, as some types of texts and forms have different needs than others. Hence, recognizing the text type determines the reader's reaction to the text. Furthermore, text types identify the translation methods or the level of transability. This is confirmed by Reiss (2014), who mentions that text types agree with the translation methods and the primary elements and function, that need to be preserved in the TT. On the other hand, some scholars might deny the importance of categorizing text types, specifically if they discuss modern texts as only one of the text types and prefer to hold on to the divisions of literary and non-literary texts (Reiss & Vermeer, 2014). This is reported by Kussmaul (1997), who believes that text type is an ambiguous concept as it can refer to the types distinguished by Reiss (informative, expressive, and operative) or as an equivalent to *Textsorte* in German, such as instructions leaflets, manuals, and academic discourse.

2.2 Style

Style is derived from the Latin word *stylus*, which means stake or instrument of writing. According to Huang and Huang (2015), styles can "refer to language style or author's style. Wales (2014, p. 371) defines style as the unique way of expressing oneself in writing or speaking. Style is the writer's unique way of expressing ideas which are shaped using paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes, such as lexical items, figures of speech, sentence structure, and paragraph organization (Murtaza & Qasmi, 2013). Style is among the features that shape or make a text. Abram (1999, p. 303) defines style in relation to literature as "the manner of linguistic expression in prose or verse- it is how speakers or writers say whatever it is that they say." It is a linguistic decision a certain author makes within the constraints and limitations of language and grammar, i.e.,

within "the total options available in the syntactic, semantic, phonological, and pragmatic systems" (Ghazala, 2011, p. 41). On the contrary, Baker (2000, p. 245) introduces what is known as a translator's style; she defines style as "the manner of expression that is typical of a translator, [...] the translator's characteristic use of language, his or her individual profile of linguistic habits, compared to other translators." Style can be defined as the author's rhetorical practices or how a language is employed in a particular genre, time frame, or school of thought (Awa, 2019).

According to the previously mentioned definitions, it can be agreed that there is no agreement on the ultimate definition of style, which makes it ambiguous. However, it can be noted that there are three views regarding style: the author's style, the style of the text itself, and the translator's style, which denotes the translator's own approach to translation (Baker, 2000). Snell-Hornby (1995, p. 119) argues that any attempt to discuss style will remain unsatisfactory because there is no "coherent theoretical approach that is attempted" and "the problem of style recedes perceptibly into the background." Another view is introduced by Boase-Beier (2014), who notes that scholars have discussed the notion of style, but style's function and role are rarely studied. Nonetheless, style is important in the translation process as it helps build and preserve the message.

Style results from characteristics, selection of options, or producing a text or set of texts (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981). According to them (1981, p. 2), "we might look into the style of a single text; of all texts by one author; of a group of texts by similar authors; of representative texts for an entire historical period; and even of texts typical of an overall culture and its prevailing language." Hence, Munday (2008) enumerates that style may be understood in three different ways: individual style, which refers to a particular author; collective style, which refers to a specific genre such as a novel; and

the last type is period style, such as the Latin American Boom of the 1960s or the Romantic Period. He (2008, p. 20) adds, "The individual element in authorship is crucial. Each writer, and therefore each translator, has an individual style."

Translation involves navigating the interplay of structure, meaning, and style, which requires a collaborative effort between linguistics, semantics, and stylistic (Harliani, 2019). Baker (2000) discusses that translators should follow the original text style and not their own; she argues that translators must not adopt a style of their own as their job is to recreate a style that is closely related to the original text style. Obviously, different styles can cause translation problems. Stylistic equivalence alone would not be sufficient to achieve a generally equivalent TT because style is only one aspects that constitutes a text (Reiss & Vermeer, 2014). When it comes to the relationship between literary translation and style, Munday (2008, p. 20) states that since each author and each translator has an individual style, this can complicate things "for the analysis of style in literary translation since from the outset the translator is likely to be faced with a highly individual ST style."

2.3 Literary Language

When it comes to the definition of literature, it means "a body of written works related by subject-matter (e.g., the literature of computing), by language or place of origin (e.g., Arabic literature), or by prevailing cultural standards of merit" (Baldick, 2001, p. 141). It is a wide term that includes works related to the following key genres: epic, drama, lyric, novel, short story, and ode (Cuddon, 2013). In this sense, literary language is the language used in literary writing. It is evident that literary work is made up of a language that differs from the ordinary language that common people use in their daily lives, whether spoken or written. However, this changed as the language people use in their daily lives is now used in literature.

Carter (1997, p. 197) argues that literary language is a "continuum, a line of literariness in language use with some uses of language being marked as more literary than others." It is the language of novels, short stories, plays, and poetry, in which the latter is centered, a highly specialized and intensified form of language that employs all the elements of the language (Newmark, 2001). In short, literary language is the language used in literature with its own syntactic, stylistic, and aesthetic characteristics that express people's ideas, feelings, and emotions. Along similar lines, Fabb (2010) believes that there is a variation between literary language and ordinary language in terms of lexicon, phonology, and syntax, thus resulting in significant interpretation challenges. In addition, there is a rearrangement difference or change of words, sounds, and syntax, which is the outcome of using external barriers involving meter or rhyme (Fab, 2010).

On the other hand, Wellek and Warner (1971) distinguish between literary language and scientific language, saying that scientific language is logic-based, more precise, and easier to understand, while literary language is extremely connotative and non-referential since it has an expressive component that reflects the writer's tone and attitude. Another distinction is made between literary language and technological or technical language; as Newmark (2001) remarks, the former's vital word class is the verb, which displays emotions and is accompanied by adjectives, while the latter's main distinguishing feature is the noun. Within this trend, Newmark (2001) distinguishes between literary and non-literary language as follows:

1. They include similar content; however, literary language concerns fiction, the imagined world, while non-literary language concerns reality.
2. Literary language tends to be more personal, but non-literary language is more controlled and includes several discourses related to class and occupation.

3. Literary language focuses on certain people and their imagined worlds, whether allegorical or typical. Non-literary language, on the other hand, is concerned with facts, in society or groups, processes, and objects, often at a reporting or indirect stage.
4. Literary language is mostly connotative, whereas non-literary language is denotative.

Moore (2017, p. 287) states, "What makes literary language literary, then, is our knowledge of its generic function and the place of the genre in a culturally negotiated hierarchy of aesthetic value." From a different point of view, Muslat (2012, p. 43) concludes that literary language is the result of "using words, syntactic structures and sentence patterns in a specific way that most likely creates emotional, mental, psychological, imaginary and even dream-like states which the ordinary language fails to achieve." In contrast, according to the Development Hypothesis proposed by Fabb (2010), literary language results from a development in ordinary language, as literary language includes elements and is guided by principles that do not exist in everyday language.

However, this type of language can impose obstacles for translators, as it is challenging to maintain the literary text's creative and imaginative effect when converting it to the TT. These difficulties, among others, cannot be handled if the translator does not have the qualifications to maintain and convey the original idea in the original text and transfer it to the TT. Bannikove (1977) argues that translators should be aware of the literary text language in which it was written. According to Newmark (2001, p. 9), "literary language, which may be innovative in punctuation, words, and syntax, but also natural and noninnovative, should not be normalized, lexically, grammatically or in the punctuation by the translator." In addition, a translator

should read and understand old texts to relive the same atmosphere when dealing with literary work (Muslat, 2012).

2.4 Translation

Translation is an old field that has always been part of human communication. It is used to transfer another civilization's ideas, feelings, culture, and beliefs. In fact, we translate every day, especially with the evolution we witness. Certainly, there are several situations where a person cannot understand the words or expressions of another person, which creates an understanding barrier, which is an important reason behind the spread of translation.

Translation is the action of conveying a specific concept or meaning from the SL into the TL. This process is critical in interlingual and intercultural meetings. Many experts, scholars, and linguists have defined translations. For example, Holubenko (2023, p. 86) defines translation as "the perfect one-way replacement of the text in the source language with corresponding text in another language." Accordingly, the translator adopts, reinterprets, modifies, reconstructs, or restructures the ST's thematic, spatial, temporal, and conceptual framework into the TL (Robinson, 2019). Levý (2011) states that translation is a way of interaction that aims to transfer information from the SL text to the TT reader.

Hassan (2011) points out that translation is the replacement of meaning in one language (SL) by an equivalent meaning in another language (TL) which is done by changing the form of the first language with the form of the second language. It involves conveying the message, meaning, or idea from the SL to the TL while ensuring the language style aligns to create the same effect for readers of the original and translated text (Widiyantari, 2012). Correspondingly, the core of translation is equivalence, which is the relationship between the ST and the TT, enabling the TT to be classified as a

translation of the ST. In the same line, Tymoczko (2014) lists two different types of equivalence: formal and dynamic equivalence.

Since language is formed of grammar, lexis, words, syntax, etc. the translation process includes replacing these grammatical and lexical features of the SL with corresponding or equivalent lexical and grammatical features in the TL. Regarding this, Larson (1994, p. 3) points out that translation is "concerned with a study of lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language text, which is analyzed in order to determine its meaning." Moreover, Wilss (1982) states, in his definition of translation, that the translator should understand the SL text's syntactic, semantic, stylistic, and pragmatic features of the.

According to what is mentioned above, the translator should have a good understanding of everything related to the two languages, and understanding the meaning plays a major role. Newmark (2003), in his definition of translation, stresses translating the meaning, mentions that translation is the transference of meaning from the original text into a different language in a similar way planned by the author. Thus, translation is not a simple task; it is more than just replacing words in a specific language with words in another. This becomes evident, especially when the languages are not closely related. In this sense, Ali (2018, p. 27) comments that translation "seems a spoon-feeding activity if it is taken mere transference of meaning from one language to another." Therefore, the translator should have certain skills and requirements that enables him or her to transfer the ST into the TT language to make it clear and understandable, i.e., translation competence.

Thus, the translator is expected to have five main competencies: linguistic or language competence, textual, subject matter, cultural, and transfer competence. Anggraini et al. (2020) state that translators are expected to produce a qualified

translation by mastering these five competencies. And obviously, without mastering a language, it will not be easy to translate a text from the ST to the TT. Pietrzak (2015, p. 323) mentions that "linguistic competence can function without translation competence, but translation competence will not exist without language competence." Baker (2018), in her book *In Other Words*, states:

most translators and interpreters prefer to think of their work as a profession and would like to see others treat them as professionals rather than as skilled or semi-skilled workers. But to achieve this, translators need to develop an ability to stand back and reflect on what they how they do it (p. 4).

There is no doubt that translation possesses some obstacles related to different aspects. However, for translators develop a successful translation, they should avoid the desire to translate word for word. The wider the difference between the two languages (SL and TL), the harder it is to transfer the message between them. In addition, Adewuni (2000) reports that considering the challenges, issues, and uncertainties that surround translation due to the diversity in languages, cultures, and the translators, it is still a reality. Therefore, translation strategies are essential as they enable the translator to solve the problems that might be encountered during translation (Dweik & Thalji, 2016).

2.4.1 Translation Accuracy and Acceptability

Three factors must be considered when it comes to translation quality, namely, accuracy, acceptability, and readability. The translator's first priority is ensuring the message is accurate and acceptable. According to Nida and Taber (1982), the accuracy of a text can only be assessed by how well the TL reader can understand the original author's intended message accurately. Accuracy, a term used in translation quality assessment, describes how closely a translation follows the original text ideas (Nababan,