Linguistic Experience and Identity: Contextualizing the Mental Lexicon In English-Arabic Poetry Translation
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ABSTRACT

Monolingual Language behavior rests on three components: human agent, code and message. Translation processing requires three more constructs: translator, two codes, and a message in two texts. Equivalence theories attempted to supersede faithfulness and sameness of meaning in translation, but equivalence is a “convenience”, and is “always relative” (Baker 1992). Translational commensurability and semantic transportation thwart obtaining equivalence; therefore, the Interpretive Frame includes experience and identity among the elements necessary for any translation (Author, 2008). To explore poetic aesthetics, experience is related to personality observed in the Mental lexicon, while identity is related to phonic appeal observed in euphony. These relations are investigated in Arabic translations of English poems by Coleridge, Keats, Tennyson, Wordsworth, and Auden. Preliminary results show that: 1) the Mental Lexicon and euphony vary according to experience and identity, 2) contextualizing lexical appropriateness, euphony and metaphors contributes to poetic aesthetics.
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“Aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae.” That is “poets want to instruct or to delight” (Horace 19 BC, Ars Poetica line 333)

THEORIZING THE TRANSLATION ACT

Aesthetics looms high in Poetic language, but the aesthetic function of language is far from being central or well defined in language studies. Perhaps the emergence and advances of the linguistic enterprise in European context in the twentieth century has helped to shift the focus in favor of structural description, information conveying and interactive models. Fifty years ago, William Elton observed that “Whether or not one concurs in these indictments,1 and whether or not one agrees regarding the ‘present stone age of aesthetic inquiry’ one may conclude that an inspection of the linguistic foundations of the subject is long overdue”.2 Elton’s observation represents a philosophical perspective, but it points to fundamental relation between language and aesthetics, to the linguistic roots of the phenomenon. The present position maintains that the contextualization of experience and identity lies at the roots of the beautiful in language.

Interpretation in pre-formulation and the formulation of this interpretation by a process given here the general term of contextualization, mark the most crucial act of creativity in language use. The linear actualization of our language output in accordance with the conventional or creative sequencing of phonological, grammatical and lexical units, represents a crude realization of contextualization. Now, because linguistic behavior rests upon three components, human agent, code and message,1 and because translation among natural languages aspires to keep the “same” message while changing the human agent and code, this apparently simple task of keeping the “same” message, constitutes the main ground for theorizing (explaining) the rendering of a text, or part of it, in a language other than its own. Observation shows that the crossing from one linguistic code to another induces difference in translation, while the changing of human agency invites inadequacy. Additionally, translation involves displacement, a property which results from the fact that in actual effect a translation cannot precede or coincide with the Source Text (ST), but must follow in time and is usually performed in a different place. Historically, equating translational messages and its styles in the Translated Text (TT) with those of the ST preoccupied literary critics and language specialists, while incommensurability,3 indeterminacy, interpretation and disquotation preoccupied philosophers of language and philosophers of science. The above traditions amalgamate to define the orbit of translation theory.

A glance at the history of the theory of translation, shows that determining the accuracy of the message in the TT compared to the ST under various names such as faithfulness to the original,4 sameness of meaning and style, and equivalence, is at the core of the debate. Hence, the rejection of translation by
Roger Bacon, the emphasis on sameness of message and style by Tytler, the strife for a theory that accounts for accuracy in Benjamin, the levels of equivalence in Catford and Nida, and the indeterminacy of translation by Quine, all revolve around the transportation of meaning between the ST and TT. When it shifts to a new language, new audience and a new purpose, semantic transportation incurs difference, which leaves no room for equivalence between the ST and the TT.

Translation as interpretation shifts the debate in two respects: firstly, the main concern becomes the human agency (not the message or code), and secondly, the main treatment investigates the processing of crossing, interpreting, the code to reach the TT, and not only the commensurability of the translation product. In general, the opposition to and rejection of interpretation in language and translation comes from ideologues who posit one possibility, one expression or one meaning, in a text, translated or otherwise. Rejection of interpretation is also typical of individuals who tend to put convenience, practice, and/or lack of interest above explicating the fundamentals of translation. Holders of these positions gloss the issues raised by interpretation as non-questions, irrelevant, or both.

Like interpretation, translation is practised, studied and claimed by scholars who belong to different disciplines including philosophy, literary criticism, authorship and linguistics. Only in the realm of language studies, however, has translation matured and diversified to a full branch of humanities, utilizing Information Technology (IT) and multimedia including Computer assisted Translation (CAT) and the Internet. In the same vein, it can be said that certain problems of linguistic philosophy and philosophy of science, such as the incommensurability of translation, assertion, self-attribution, interpretation, as well as difference and inadequacy in translation, are uniquely served when examined from a linguistic point of view. This viewpoint explicitly states that it has not vested interest in studying translation save the linguistic phenomenon itself. Other specialists approach interpretation and translation from their own epistemic paradigm which is, in turn, based on disciplinary axioms and assumptions grounded in objectives external to language. The linguistic approach aims at explaining translation and interpretation as they are used in in ordinary language, without any caveat which would put them in the service of external notions such as literary merit, religious creed or philosophical disputation.

Linguistically speaking, four observations can lead the way to the open space for investigating translation at large and translating poetic aesthetics in particular:
1) Translation generates difference.
2) Translation is inherently inadequate.
3) The first, pre-dictionary, translation is an act of interpretation.
4) Translation involves processing the crossing of language boundary.

The first observation attested in much of the literature on translation, shifts the focus away from faithfulness to the original and equivalence, to allow for a definition which takes translation to be primarily an act of interpretation. The second observation, inadequacy of translation, is tied up to difference since for a ST which is translated into the same TL a number of times, the latest translator always vetoes certain shortcomings and failures in previous translation(s) of the same ST. The third observation asserts the precedence of interpretation over any translation, since the first translator has no conventional form of norm to be guided by. The fourth observation involves processing the stages of interpretation in a new language, first in the ST and then in interpretation in preformulating and formulating the TT.

To demystify interpretation and to bring it under explicit investigation, seven basic constructs have been postulated within the Interpretive Frame (IF): being, understanding, environment, experience, assertion, identity (ID) and user. Interpretation, however, is processed in the FPD. The interpreter, reader or translator, looks for and identifies a textual stretch, one utterance or more, that can give a reading, meaning, to the entire text or part of it. The Interpretive Stretch (IS) provides a focal point in the interpretive model which offers a hermeneutic paradigm that stretches from linguistic necessity to linguistic infinity, putting the reader and the IS at the core of the interpretive act. Thus, poetry translation needs to satisfy three basic criteria: 1) to be new, 2) to be accepted as appealing, 3) to contextualize the translator’s ML achieving translational approximation.

Current Issues
In my book, Linguistic Interpretation, topics such as translational commensurability, necessity, interpretative latitude and assertion have been discussed from the perspective of the user of the IF in the translation of the Quran from Arabic into European languages. The current perspective examines the contextualization of the ML through investigating the translator’s experience and ID. In addition to elaborating on these two constructs of the IF, the present discussion studies examples from Arabic translations of English poems. The discussion is guided by three questions posed by the IF and FPD:
1) What are the main constructs of the translator’s experience? and what are their linguistic realization?
2) What are the main constructs of the translator’s linguistic ID? and what are their linguistic realization?
3) What are the linguistic processes and realizations of contextualizing the translator’s ML that produce aesthetic quality? The above questions can be narrowed down to three objectives:
1) To postulate the main constructs of the translator’s linguistic experience, and to describe their linguistic realization in translation.
2) To postulate the main constructs of the translator’s linguistic ID and describe their linguistic realization in translation.
3) To investigate the processing of contextualizing the ML through experience and ID using interpretation to create poetic effect.

Crossing the boundary of language, the translator creates his/her version of the poem while doing his/her best to realize the message in the best creative aesthetic form within reach.

Current Corpus and Method
If objectively measured, our linguistic output would be really impressive in quantity. However, what matters for
historical and academic purposes is not the bulk of individual or communal verbiage, but the documented corpus available to be studied. In the case of an author or a translator, the accessible corpus (AC) is the result of life experience, embodying the verbal legacy left for researchers and interested individuals and communities to use and/or enjoy. For a preserved AC to be valid, researchers need to take a number of points into consideration in order to obtain a researchable corpus. Firstly, both Author Identity (AI) and Text Integrity (TI) are to be established in order to determine the degree of validity of the AC. Through the known history of writing and records a great deal has been published anonymously, or under the name of an institution, legal and official bodies, or names of persons other than the writer or translator. The actual author is not mentioned, because he/she is either commissioned, changed or just employed as an institutional voice.

The current corpus includes selections from four English poems and their Arabic translations: Coleridge’s “Kubla Khan”, Auden’s “In Memory of W. H. Yeats”, Wordsworth’s “Immortality Ode” and Lord Alfred Tennyson’s “Ulysses”.

EXPERIENCE: VOCABULARY PROFILE AND THE ML

Experience is one of the seven elements of the IF. It results from the interaction between the individual and environment in a wide sense. Like experience, environment is an element of the IF, which contains, among other things, language and physical existence, i.e. the physical world. Only one construct, experience, personality, and its linguistic realization will be examined here (Table 2). To pin down the relationship between personality and experience, two steps are taken: description of the ML in terms of Vocabulary Profile (VP) of the ST and TTs, and examination of lexical appropriateness.

Experience: Size and Variation of the VP

Although poetic language is more than the size and kind of lexicon deployed, the lexicon does play a central role in the quality of a poem and its translation. The contextualization of the lexicon cuts deep into the making of the texture of poetic aesthetics, and therefore, establishing the link between the translator’s experience and language can start with a description of the size and diversity of the translator’s ML. Computational lexicology and specialized software are of great help in improving the description. Translation creates new texts in a new language, which raises interesting questions about the VP and the ML in the TT, and consequently the translator’s VP. The outline of the VP and ML in two poems, “In Memory of W B Yeats” and “Kubla Khan” and their translations into Arabic, pave the way for the study of lexical appropriateness. Words in the Arabic translations are manually calculated, and the variables include: 1) type/token analysis, 2) content/function words, 3) content and size of the ML, 4) TT Arabic/ST English ratio, 5) the individual versus the communal ML. In reading the results one should remember that the TTs are short, (2,609) words, and manually calculated.

In three Arabic translations of Auden’s “In Memory of W. B. Yeats” and six Arabic translations of Coleridge’s “Kubla Khan”, the Arabic words in the TT are less than the English words in the ST (Line 1, Table 3 and 4), and so is the number of tokens (line 4, Table 4). Types and tokens (lines 3 & Line 4, Tables 3 & 4) show quantitative differences. Now in the case of Al-Naimi’s translation, more tokens and types are used, and the large number of tokens makes his T/T ratio the smallest. The number of function (grammar) words used by Al-Naser is the smallest (line 8), while the ML is influenced by the large number of tokens employed by Al-Naimi (line 5, Table 3). The TT/ST ratio demonstrates this fact clearly (Al-Naimi 0.75, Al-Hirz 0.71 and Al-Naser 0.64), which means that the results are overshadowed by the difference in the number of words used by Al-Naimi in the translation of the same ST, compared with the other two translators.

The results from the translation of Coleridge’s “Kubla Khan” by six translators provide interesting facts about the VP.

There are similarities in the number of Types and Tokens in the TTs (Table 4 and Histogram 1), but Al-Zubeidi’s translation uses more tokens. Al-Naimi uses less content/function ratio than the other translators, followed by Al-Shabab. Crucial differences appear in the size of the IML; the highest
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The percentage of IML words is in Al-Shabab’s translation followed by Al-Naser’s. This represents individual characteristic and deviation from the common occurrence, and hence it defies frequency and trend. Here, as in the case of the high percentage of Offlist words, an explanation is required. Still, this finding needs to be verified in larger of Data. It is enlightening to study various aspects of the ML in terms of size and distribution of lexical versus grammar words. This will offer a chance to compare different translations and to pin down the linguistic features that need further attention.

Nation’s vocabulary profiler (Nation, www.vocabularprofiler.com) was used to calculate the lexical components of the English poems, for which the Arabic texts had to be manually calculated. Table (5) reports the results of three translations and the English ST by Auden. The vocabulary size appears in the number of tokens in line 1, Table 5, showing two things. First, there are more words in the English ST, which reflects the differences in the two writing systems. Arabic incorporates pronouns and other grammatical functions (e.g., comparative and superlative structures) in one written word, while English realizes pronouns and some certain functions in separate words. Second, a more prominent feature is seen in the presence of differences in vocabulary size among the three translations: the difference between the lowest number (SN) and the highest (MN) is 60 words, while the translation by KH falls in the middle (Table 5).

The number of types (line 2 Table 5) shows that MN and KH use almost the same number of words, while SN uses less types. Thus, SN uses less tokens and less types than the other two translators. The number of types in the English ST is comparable to the Arabic text, a fact which reflects the repetition of pronouns and certain grammar words like prepositions in En-

### Table 3. Vp of three translators of “in memory of W. B. Yeats”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>ST*</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>KH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words in text</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines in poem</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT Ratio</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content (types)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function (Types)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont./function Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML (total types)</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IML types</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CML types</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IML-CML Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Tokens</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT Tokens</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT -ST Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Compleat VP is used for English ST)*

Types: Total number of lexicon words types used by one translator, shared or not.

Tokens: Total number of actual graphological words used by one translator, shared or not.

CML (total types): Number of types shared with one of the two or two translators.

IML (Types %): Number of types in one individual translator, and their percentage of the CML.

CML (type%): Number of types in all three translators, and their percentage of the IML.

TT – ST Ratio: Quantity of TT words in relation to the ST words

### Table 4. VP of six translators of “Kubla Khan”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Al-Naser</th>
<th>Masiri &amp; Zaid</th>
<th>Al-Naimi</th>
<th>Abbas</th>
<th>Al-Shabab</th>
<th>Al-Zubeidi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words in text</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines in poem</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT Ratio</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content (types)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function (Types)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont./function Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML (total types)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IML types</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CML types</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IML-CML Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Tokens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT Tokens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT -ST Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study of content and grammar words shows that SN’s translation has higher Lexical Density followed by KH’s and MN’s.19

All the results in Table (5) can be obtained from Nation’s Vocabulary Profiler computer program for the English text (see column 4, Table 5). But the results for the Arabic translations (columns 1, 2 and 3) are obtained by manual calculations. Naturally, there are tiny details encountered in the calculation of this Arabic corpus, ranging from the definition of a word to the lack of frequency counts and software designed for Arabic corpora, comparable to Nation’s program or to the British English Corpus. The main results of VP analysis can be summarized in the following points:

1. MN’s translation uses more words, lower type-token ratio and higher type per token.
2. SN’s translation uses the smallest number of words, highest type-token ratio and smallest type per token.
3. SN’s translation has marginally smaller IML than those of MN and KH.
4. The IML-Types ratio is relatively large: more than 41%, which is not expected to be found in translating varieties other than poetry or in longer texts.

The findings reported above relate to the number of words used by each translator. The corpus is revealing but too small. Still, it sets the direction for investigating larger corpora, and different aspect of ML in poetic aesthetics.

**ML: Lexical Appropriateness**

The aspects of a TT which result from the active involvement of the translator in the translation process are many. This involvement goes beyond the size of ML and “intervention” in the ST. Unlike experience or ID, “intervention” does not refer to an inherent construct of the translator. Basically, “intervention” is a procedure of formulation and/or editing the TT, while poetry translation is primarily an involvement with the two vital elements of language and culture, where the translator’s experience accounts for much in conveying the poetic value of the ST.

The construct of personality, including personality traits, ability, skills, and type of intelligence, is to be demonstrated in, and/or maybe correlated with, lexical appropriateness and emotive language in two areas of linguistic features described below in translations of Auden’s “In Memory of W. B. Yeats”. The first line of the poem sets the theme, and the rest of the stanza foreshadows the universal impact of the theme, ending the stanza with a reference to objective criteria, the instruments we have.

1. He disappeared in the dead of winter;
2. The brooks were frozen, the airports almost deserted,
3. And snow disfigured the public statues;
4. The mercury sank in the mouth of the dying day.
5. What instruments we have agree
6. The day of his death was a dark cold day.

From death, to nature, to airports and public statues, up to instruments of objective measurement, all and each give witness of an unusual event to be announced. Let us examine the rendering of this adroit entry point to the elegy. After interpreting ST utterances, the first step in interpreting in a new
Three lexical items, jadāwilu, jamidāt maTārātu khāwīya, appear in the three renderings in various morphological forms. They are part of the CML in the three translations. There are words which appear in one rendering, and hence call for attention, being candidates for the IML and possibly for insightful creative contextualization of the three above mentioned shared words. The words in the ILM in the three renderings, are, Haythu (at a time) a grammar word and khāwīya (completely empty) adjective (SN), ‘awSāhuḥ (its parts) noun, and almahjūra (deserted) adjective (MN), kānat (was) modal verb, muqāra (desert-like) adjective (KH). The first word in SN and KH and the connective article fa, preceding the first word in MN, can be deleted. The last two words in the ST, almost deserted, give rise to different rendering; almost is omitted in SN’s translation, and the adjective deserted has three renderings. SN’s khāwīya emphasizes emptiness, MN’s almahjūra in Arabic may suggest that the airports are left, which is not the case since they are not left (not in use) but just almost empty. The third rendering by KH, qafr (a kind of semi-desert); SN’s khāwīya is neutral, but lacks the qualification almost.

In the following case ‘arthalju and shawaha are used by all three translators to render snow and disfigured.

Line 3. And snow disfigured the public statues;
watamāthīlu sāHāti shawahahā ththalju; (SN)
mashal tsāHātī liyamara shawahahā ththalju (MN)
shawaha ththalju malāmiha l’tamāthīli fī sāHāti ll’āmah, (KH)

The use of the exact word order by KH reveals direct parallel rendering as the following shows: snow disfigured the public statues; ‘arthalju shawah tamāthīla l’āmah (KH)

MN’s translation uses the verb shawaha before the noun arthalju sticking to unmarked Arabic grammar. But at the same time MN uses two redundant lexical items malāmiha (features) of the statues) and l’āmah (public) areas in cities.

SN’s rendering shares all its lexical items with the other two translators, but uses marked word order keeping the verb phrase shawahahā ththalju (disfigured [by] snow) to the end of the sentence. Resorting to parallel interpretation can be at the level of lexical items only (SN), syntax, or both. SN’s four-word translation of this line can be syntactically formed using various possible order:

Line 3. And snow disfigured the public statues;
watamāthīlu sāHāti shawahahā ththalju (SN)
a. washawaha thalj tamāthīlu sāHāti (grammatically possible)
b. wathalj shawahahā tamāthīlu sāHāti (grammatically possible)
c. watamāthīlu sāHāti thaljun shawahahā (grammatically possible)

NS’s choice of a particular syntactic structure is the result of his high interpretive perspective and creative writing, coupled with his sustained effort to create a specific effect. His interpretation is a result of deliberation and experience.

The last version of SN’s translation, reported above, uses Samīmi, i.e., the “core/mid” (of winter). In MN’s javfi it purports the inner empty part (opposite of core); while KH’s wiHshatī (dreariness/loneliness) is far from the semantic notion of “core”, but also it evokes “solitude and being deserted”. It shows a known Arabic collocation, but, at the same time, it shows a departure from the ST item, dead, in order to offer an acceptable Arabic expression.

In the translation of line (2) aspects of the shared and individual choices highlight the interaction between the individual and the communal in lexis and structure.

The last version of SN’s translation, reported above, uses Samīmi, i.e., the “core/mid” (of winter). In MN’s javfi it purports the inner empty part (opposite of core); while KH’s wiHshatī (dreariness/loneliness) is far from the semantic notion of “core”, but also it evokes “solitude and being deserted”. It shows a known Arabic collocation, but, at the same time, it shows a departure from the ST item, dead, in order to offer an acceptable Arabic expression.

The last version of SN’s translation, reported above, uses Samīmi, i.e., the “core/mid” (of winter). In MN’s javfi it purports the inner empty part (opposite of core); while KH’s wiHshati (dreariness/loneliness) is far from the semantic notion of “core”, but also it evokes “solitude and being deserted”. It shows a known Arabic collocation, but, at the same time, it shows a departure from the ST item, dead, in order to offer an acceptable Arabic expression.

Language concerns the search for lexical items, which scans the ML, bilingual dictionaries, previous translations, internet sources and open access corpora. For our three translators, who are familiar with the academic and literary language, the IML seems to be the prime source for lexical items. The first step of searching the IML focuses on the interpretive latitude of parallel translation exemplified in the case below.

He disappeared in the dead of winter:

laqad laṭma lla`āmah, (MN)
laqad khāwiya fi Samīmi shawahahā thhalju; (SN)
laqad raHala fī samīmi shawahahā thhalju (KH)

There is complete agreement on rendering winter shiti”, some agreement on disappeared ‘iktfa, raHala, and no agreement on dead Samīmi, javfi, wiHshati. The word winter shiti did not take the translators into great deal of elaboration. In MN and KH, the use of laqad, a grammar word which has the function of indicating “perfect aspect”, signifying the completion, is not necessary. None of the three translations of dead is automatic or parallel, except the first draft of SN’s translation mawāt, in state of death (see illustration below).

Illustration (1). Al-Naser’s manuscript of Auden’s Arabic translation (lines 1-11)

The brooks were frozen, the airports almost deserted, the inner emptiness, MN’s almahjūra (at a time) a grammar word which has the function of indicating “perfect aspect”, signifying the completion, is not necessary. None of the three translations of dead is automatic or parallel, except the first draft of SN’s translation mawāt, in state of death (see illustration below).

The last version of SN’s translation, reported above, uses Samīmi, i.e., the “core/mid” (of winter). In MN’s javfi it purports the inner empty part (opposite of core); while KH’s wiHshati (dreariness/loneliness) is far from the semantic notion of “core”, but also it evokes “solitude and being deserted”. It shows a known Arabic collocation, but, at the same time, it shows a departure from the ST item, dead, in order to offer an acceptable Arabic expression.
FIRST PERSON ID AND CREATIVE VARIATION

Certain features of the individual’s distinctive language result from experience, which evolves in a certain environment, and which constitutes another element of the IF. However, while environment is to a large extent external, physically outside the language user, experience, as the previous sections have shown, results from the cohabitation of life events, personality traits and intelligence on the one hand, and environment including the linguistic code on the other hand. Both environment and experience play a role in forming the individual’s social and psychological Self.

Linguistic ID can be defined as a linguistic construct realized in distinctive recurrent features observable in the spoken or written corpus of a language user in the capacity of speaker/writer, interpreter or translator. Because experience evolves in a real-life situation and is molded by personality, including intelligence, competence, skills, traits and predispositions in addition to environmental conditions, the term experience here is a neutral term. The designated features of linguistic ID and their correlates in linguistic realization, when attested in a text, give support to the notion of linguistic ID, and more specifically to author ID. But as it applies to one individual language user, linguistic ID is a relative matter in the sense that a language user whose life thrives with wide experience and who has developed his/her language with a specialization, a content, or specific personal ID features, would clearly be different from someone who is semi-illiterate and/or limited in their life and language development. However, professional and specialized language varieties may suppress certain ID features as in the case of scientific terminology and style which requires a particularly detached, less personal way of writing- handwriting remains an exception- while refinement may result in professional, rather than personal linguistic features. Participation in producing various language varieties and assuming different social roles by the same individual may blur or hinder the relationship between ID and linguistic features, in the sense that persons developing a multitude of roles and styles, makes it difficult for the analyst to generalize about their distinctive linguistic features. Still, the hypothesis is quite valid, in the sense that even in the case of dynamically evolving individuals there remains specific linguistic features peculiar to the language user when speaking from “first person”, not quoting or using conventional norms. Six constructs of the ID are stated in Table (6).

The constructs of ID are suggested mainly in their relation to the linguistic realization of the ID, and therefore the term linguistic ID is preferred to reflect the focus on the linguistic aspects of the individual’s ID.

Euphony

The sound effect under the umbrella term musicality presents a subtle feature of the linguistic ID. It is not frequently attempted in translation due to the difficulties and risk of failure it incurs; but when successfully attained, euphony creates a special reward to the music connoisseur. In the current search for linguistic ID, the construct referring to euphony is labeled phonic appeal, where the focus is on the sound patterns, the effect of fusing them in the TT. Melodious language is found in various varieties of discourse,
but it remains strongly associated with poetic language. In
translation, even when poetry is rendered in a poetic form, the
phonetic effect of the versified TT may not be up to readers’
expectation. Still, a prose translation of poetry may well
reveal a measure of sound effect, which emphasizes the need
for close study of the phonetic properties of poetry translation.

Rendering an extract from “Ode: Intimations of Immortal-
ity from Recollections of Early Childhood” a romantic poem
by Wordsworth, Al-Naser finds appropriate lines length and
rhythmic beat to convey the apparently simple description
of the shining English countryside. Here, Al-Naser opts for
short utterances, each in a separate line leaving the reader
tempted to pause at the end of each line to appreciate the
artistic touch added to the scene.

The Rainbow comes and goes,
And lovely is the Rose,
The Moon doth with delight
Look round her when the heavens are bare,
Waters on a starry night
Are beautiful and fair;
The sunshine is a glorious birth;
But yet I know, where’er I go,
That there hath past away a glory from the earth.

(wordsworth)

yi’ti qawsu illqazaHi wayamDī
walwardu fatān
yatalaфаtu lIqamaru bbttihājan
‘indamā taSū ssamā’,
’amwāhun fi llayl ‘azhar
Hisānun jamālātun,
alshamsu mīlādun bahiy
lākin ma’a hādtā ‘urdik
Haythu talafaltu
(Al-Naser)

Words shine in the first part of the extract: qawsu illqazaHi
(water in bright night), lIqamar (the moon),
‘amwāhun fi llayl ‘azhar (water in bright night), Hisānun
jamālātun (beautiful ladies), and alshamsu mīlādun (the sun
in Arabic). But, things change in the last two lines which take
the reader to the sense of loss (‘anna llbahā ‘a qad maDā
ba’īdan ‘ann l‘arD).

The above deliberate mosaic flow of colour and sound
attested in Al-Naser’s rendering, is quite absent in Al-Masiri
and Zaid’s translation of the same stanza from Wordsworth.

Consistent with their implicit strategy of parallel transla-
tion and middle interpretive latitude, Al-Masiri and Zaid
describe the scene in seven lines of various lengths in parallel
to the ST and apply their immediate focus. The scene is set in
successive lines: gawsu illqazaHi (rainbow), wuridu (flow-
ers), alqamaru (the moon), samā’u (sky), miyāhu (water)
layl (night), nuftām (stars) jamālātun (beautiful ladies) shams
(sun). But no attempt is made to represent the sound level.

CONTEXTUALIZING TRANSLATIONAL
METAPHORS

Metaphors present the translator with a case where he/she
has to deliberate about possibilities and contextual
factors more than non-metaphorical usage. Direct con-
ventional rendering of a poetic metaphor is likely to re-
sult in unusual collocations, opacity or misinterpretation
on the part of the reader. Examples from Auden’s “In
Memory of W. H. Yeats” provides interesting cases of
metaphor translation.

1. He disappeared in the dead of winter:
‘ikhtāfī fi Samīmi shshītā’; (SN)
laqad ‘iktāfī fi jāwfi shshītā’ (MN)
waShshītī fi wShshītī (KH)

The word dead in line 1 is a case in point. All three trans-
lators have steered away from a direct translation. The first
draft of SN’s translation used mawāt (something left after
the dead), a choice which was revised upon deliberation. The
traces of deliberation and tension is clear in the three choic-
es, resulting in focusing on different semantic features or not-
tions: SN: Samīmi (mid/core), jawfi (emptiness) MN, KH:
wiShshīti (stated of loneliness and being deserted). Upon
deliberation one finds that all three cases prefer a non-meta-
phorical reading, putting meaning and individual interpreta-
tion before direct conventional rendering.

Rendering dying line 4 shows no agreement on translating
the metaphors.

4. The mercury sank in the mouth of the dying day.
waShshītī fi ghurati yawmin muHtaDirin qad ghār. (SN)
la-awsa fi wShshīti fi wShshīti (KH)

Hirz utilizes a double metaphor fi fami lIyawmin Imā’ili il-lāzzawāl. (MN)

Words shine in the first part of the extract: gawsu illqazaHi
(water in bright night), wuridu (flow-
Another interesting case occur in line 14.
14. The provinces of his body revolted,

tamaradat ‘aqālimu jasadeh, (SN)
fathārat ‘aqālimu jasadīh, (MN)
tamaradat muqāTa`ātu jasadeh (KH)

Here for the body to have provinces that revolt is a metaphor that has been copied by all three translators. The differences take the shape of deciding, after searching the ML and deliberating possibilities, on one of two lexical items provinces and revolted. The choice of either ‘aqālim by SN and MN or muqāTa`āt by KH to translate provinces is not substantially different. The choice of tamaradat by SN and KH to translate revolted seems more suited for the context than the choice of fathārat by MN, despite the fact that MN’s choice is nearer to the conventional translation of the lexeme revolt and its metaphorical derivations in Arabic. The Arabic word thārat seems too strong and disruptive for the context of a dying person whose body is not responding to his will to go on living. This reading, if adopted, would come in favour of tamaradat (rebelled) which appears to be more fitting in light of the strong connotations of bright beginning on the one hand, and dying end on the other hand.

Another interesting metaphor is seen in line (45):
45. Emptied of its poetry.
mufrahgan min shi`reh. (SN)
mujaradan min shi`reh (MN)
mujaradān min shi`reh. (KH)

Empty of its poetry in line (45) is a reference to the vessel in the previous line. SN’s and MN’s translations use mufrahgan (emptied). In this context KH’s translation mujaradan (stripped) highlights the negative semantic feature of depriving someone of something by or for exposing the person, which maximizes the loss and gives the lost poet more significance in the nation’s cultural apparel. Hence, the lexical item and its contextualization extend the metaphor of the lwrāda `l’arlandī (the Irish blood vessel) would be supplying blood, poetry, within Ireland just like a blood vessel in the body.

It should be said at this point that the three translations agree on the grammatical structure, verb and direct object taking the form of two nouns in the genitive case. Again, disagreement about the decision concerning words has not necessarily blocked agreement concerning the structure of the sentence when using different lexical choices whose grammatical requirement are similar. The question of contextualizing the lexical choices is yet an independent issue, since one case of difference (translating provinces) has not affected the context negatively, whereas in translating revolted it has.

Rendering the Irish vessel, line 44 gives rise to more variations.

44. Let the Irish vessel lie

walyastalqi l’i`nā`u l’irlandiy (SN)

da’ l’iwarīda l’arlandī yatamadād (KH)

The ST refers to Ireland as the Irish vessel, a metaphor which is rendered differently: SN uses the metaphor of l’inā`u l’irlandiy (the Irish utensil); MN uses asasifnata ‘al`i’rlandiyata (the Irish ship); KH uses lwarīda `l’arlandī (the Irish blood vessel). The two translations by SN and MN treat the poet as 1) a vessel in the sense of container (SN), 2) a vessel in the sense of a sea boat. The context of the next line Emptied of its poetry would lend the first meaning of vessel ‘inā` (container) in relation to poetry, a nearer interpretation than asasifnata (ship). First, the poet contained in him before his death his poetry, which is no more the case after his death. Second, poetry as content, after the death of the poet, is no longer the property of the poet who may have an exclusive right to it before his death. The container, the producer, holder and owner, the poet, is separated from his poetry; the content is separated from the form. All these considerations, in addition to the softness of the word ‘inā` would support SN’s choice. The use of ship evokes the idea of transporting content, poetry, outside Ireland, a mission which also suits W. B. Yeats. The third rendering by KH, is particularly interesting, because the lwarīda `l’arlandī (the Irish blood vessel) would be supplying blood, poetry, within Ireland just like a blood vessel in the body.

DISCUSSION: CONTEXTUALIZING POETIC AESTHETICS

Contextualizing poetic aesthetics in translation merges the ML, interpretation, the aesthetic function and audience. It remains, however, grounded in the translator’s experience, in the translator’s linguistic ID, and in the Poetic function of
Where Alph, the sacred river ran
A Stately pleasure-dome
In Xanadu did Kubla Khan

through caverns measureless to man
Where Alph, the sacred river ran
A Stately pleasure-dome
In Xanadu did Kubla Khan

and snow disfigured the public statues;
The brooks were frozen, the airports almost deserted,
the mercury sank in the mouth of the dying day.

Now, some of the combinations in the examples above, can create aesthetic contextualization. But what does it take to create aesthetic contextualization? In brief, uniquely expressive contextualization in aesthetic poetics can be summed in one word: “unfamiliar”. It was seen through this paper, that the investigation, of the unfamiliar contextualization and aesthetic combinations are filtered through the translator’s linguistic experience and ID. The marked use of verb (fī ksanadū qublā khān/nafta ilmarṣūmi aṣDar) in the second line in Kubla Khan rendering, the unexpected metaphors in the fourth line in rendering In Memory of W. B. Yeats (wazi’baqf ghurati yawmī muHaDirin qad ghār), and the emotional appeal to face up to the challenges of changing times in rendering the last lines in Ulysses, are cases which illustrate definite mastery of sound, lexis and message, creating unfamiliar worlds, attractive to audiences cultivated in Arabic poetry and culture. Hence, the unfamiliar makes the aesthetic combinations realized in lexical choices, euphony and the emotional language reflexing the translator’s experience and linguistic ID.

In conclusion, I opened the current discussion with three questions about the constructs and realizations of experience, ID and contextualization. They can be reformulated in the following question. If the unfamiliar makes aesthetic combinations possible, then, where does the unfamiliar in language come from? In brief, we have seen that successful aesthetic combinations try to fulfill three requirements: 1) to be new, 2) to be acceptable and appealing, 3) to contextualize the ML to achieve a plausible translational approximation. Firstly, aesthetic combinations draw on the translator’s experience when interpreting the SL and TL creatively to produce utterances that have not been used before. Secondly, they reflect the translator’s ID, resulting in a special appeal to the target audience. Thirdly, aesthetic combinations produce translational approximation which fall on the translator’s her-

Table 6. Linguistic ID: constructs and realization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language User</th>
<th># ID Constructs</th>
<th>Ling. Realization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Writer/Poet</td>
<td>1 Simplicity</td>
<td>Simple description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Interpreter</td>
<td>2 Novel association</td>
<td>Creative collocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Translator</td>
<td>3 Affective domain</td>
<td>Emotive language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Phonic appeal</td>
<td>4 Euphony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Interpretation</td>
<td>5 Interpretive Stretch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Rhetoric</td>
<td>6 Rhetorical traditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The poetry translator occupies a strenuous niche between two languages and traditions, balancing linguistic experience and ID to create aesthetic appeal through contextualizing the ML. Accepting to engage in this special task and being ready to take the risk, the translator attempts to infuse harmony among contending textual constructs.

At Macrostructure level, the making of a text is anchored on a different strategy, a different plane of discourse, guided by a vision of the text structuring and the interpretive stretch. While keeping an eye on the texture of the immediate embroidery at hand, the translator of poetry into Arabic needs to perform the main function of the utterances in terms of suitability to Arabic poetic culture, a culture that holds poetic legacy in great esteem.
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ENDNOTES

1. Elton’s quotation (Elton 1959) coincides with Chomsky’s Syntactic Structures and Halliday’s “Categories of the Theory of Grammar”, two prominent models of linguistic studies in the second half of the twentieth century. The reference is to William James’ complaints about the complex treatment of aesthetics by German philosophers.

2. See Elton’s introduction to Aesthetics and Language 1959, p.2.


5. Doubt about “faithfulness” in translation is raised by Lefevere and Bassnett’s shift to the cultural rather than lexical equivalence. They write: “‘Faithfulness’, then does not enter into translation in the guise of ‘equivalence’ between words of texts but, if at all, in the guise of an attempt to make the target text function in the target culture, the way the source text functions in the source culture.” (Lefevere and Bassnett, 1990, p. 8). On a more drastic level, one finds that Tytler requirement of “re-producing the original” cannot be met. See Tytler 1797, p. 9.

6. Benjamin writes “If the kinship of languages is to be demonstrated in translations, how else can this be done but by conveying the form and meaning of the original as accurately as possible? To be sure that theory would be hard put to define the nature of accuracy and therefore could shed no light on what is important in translation…. here it can be demonstrated that no translation would be possible if in its ultimate essence it strove for the literateness to the original. For in its afterlife- which could not be called that if it were not a transformation and a renewal of something living- the original undergoes a change.” (Benjamin 1992, p. 74).


8. Nord clearly explains the relevance of purpose. She writes, “The main point about this functional approach is … the prospective function or skopos of the target text as determined by the initiator’s needs. This point of view corresponds to Vermeer’s ‘skopos theory’ (Reiss & Vermeer 2013)”. Nord, 1991, p. 9. Here, the “initiator” the customer is calling the tune, a position which invites comments. First not all customers know enough about the boundaries of the translatable. Second, different consumers may have different needs, some of which are generated by parties who have vested interest, as in the case of needs analysis in language planning. Third, what are the needs (purposes) of a poetry translation initiating? It is known that needs for language and translation change, and in translation when the need is satisfied, the TL community shifts to the use of the TL to satisfy the same need which called for translation in an early period of evolution. In the field of science translating a text help transfer the information, knowledge, and stops future translations of the text, while in other areas, Bible translation for instance, the need evolves and is determined by historical and cultural evolution (see Buber and Rosenzweig 1994, and Author, 2017a for Quran translation into European languages).


10. The terms “self-ascription and self-attribution” are used in Davidson 2006 to in his discussion of “first person authority”. I used “attribution” (Author 1986 and 1989) to discuss direct reporting, and “self-attribution” to study first person domain, author identity and editorial practice (Author 20017a, pp 55-58 and 2017b, pp. 126-132). See also Hickey.


12. See Author 2010.


14. See the hermeneutic continuum in Author, 2008, pp. 140-152.

15. Spoken and written anonymous texts have increased with new multimedia.


17. See full discussion in Author, 2017b, Chapter 2.

18. Ibid.

19. Compare the above discussion with that of Baka 2014.

20. Not to mention idiosyncrasies.

21. For the hermeneutic continuum see Author 2008, p. 140-142.

22. See Author, 2006 and 2017c in Arabic (رغم النسيم خواي، 6، 13-14).
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