

## Insights into the Dynamics of Loss and Gain in Translating Figurative Language

**Prof Ramadan Ahmed AL-Mijrab**

University of Benghazi, Libya

**ABSTRACT:** Literary translation is regarded as one of the most challenging forms of translation due to its rich meanings that are often confined within narrow boundaries. This implies that a significant portion of the meaning within a literary text may be concealed and implicit, necessitating the translator to either omit or supplement the text during the translation process to achieve the closest equivalent. The unpredictability of literary texts in translation arises from their deviation from the conventional methods employed in traditional texts, as they may exhibit ambiguity and do not adhere to the same linguistic structure and style, resulting in a lack of coherence. Consequently, literary texts may encompass multiple meanings which has given rise to various interpretations of those meanings, thereby complicating the task of literary translation in the pursuit of the closest equivalent. This paper deals with the translation of literary texts and clarifies certain methods employed in addressing this type of literary translation, including semantic orientation, comparative theory, and linguistic theory. Additionally, it will examine pragmatic orientation and the theory of Grice. It can be argued that literary translation is a formidable endeavor, and the theories we have examined may not facilitate the production of an equivalent translation, especially between two incongruent languages linguistically and culturally, like English and Arabic. Nevertheless, from a translation standpoint, it can be stated that all of these trends and theories can be utilized to cultivate various types and methods for accomplishing the challenging task of literary translation.

**KEYWORDS:** Figure of Speech, Translation, Loss and Gain, English, Arabic

### INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of this paper is to address the translation of literary texts between two dissimilar languages, English and Arabic, focusing on figurative language. The main question of this analytical descriptive study is to address the inquiry: Can we achieve success in translating literary texts between two distinct languages, not solely regarding syntax but also concerning figures of speech? Literary language is a discourse that is highly charged with meaning and put into a small space; it is a discourse in which there is an instance of this type of implicit meaning that finds shelter in literary language. Beaugrand (2003, p. 1) states that "the conception of the literal translation mistakenly implies that single words or even pieces of words have determinate meaning by themselves". In other words, it is the identification of these implicit types of meaning and the transfer of their aesthetic and pragmatic functions that make the translation of literary language a challenging task. The difficulty in translating literary language results, therefore, from its very nature as a creative use of language, which relies on a high level of processing because of its low degree of predictability.

What makes literary language less predictable and therefore more interesting is the unintelligibility, non-ordinariness, and incoherence it is commonly known for. This unusualness, compared with everyday ordinary speech, is what practically attracted the mention of an abundant number of linguistic and theoretical research. Culler (1983, p. 134) points out in this regard that "the difference which seemed the source of value becomes a distance to be bridged by the activity of reading and interpretation. The strange, the formal, the fictional must be recuperated or naturalized, brought within our ken, if we do not want to remain gaping before monumental inscriptions". This attraction has extended amply to translation as well, and translation theorists have become concerned with the implications of literary cross-linguistic variation for translation. Thus, additional translational problems, in addition to existing ones of ordinary speech translation, come to the fore. Literary work contains dimensions of meaning; therefore, it allows numerous readings and interpretations. Its interpretation differs from one individual to another within the same linguistic community, let alone individuals from different cultures.

Accordingly, translators are faced with the task of bridging the gap in terms of meaning. Basically, they are usually caught between the desire to reproduce all meaningful aspects existing in the source language (SL) and the available resources of the target language (TL) which do not always allow for a total and complete transaction. This should not, however, raise an alarming concern among translators because, as Hervey and Higgins (1992, p. 24) postulate, "it is much more realistic to start by admitting that the transfer of meaning from ST to TT necessarily involves a certain degree of translational loss; that is, a TT will always lack certain culturally

relevant features that are present in the ST." By accepting the loss, the translator can concentrate on the realistic aim of reducing and compensating for translation loss rather than the unrealistic one of seeking an identical translation for the ST (Hervey and Higgins, 1992). In doing so, not all translation obstacles will simply fade away. The translator will still have to choose from a multitude of translation theories and approaches to achieve this realistic goal. Baker (2024) contends that scholarly discussions regarding culture, language, and translation are not intended to be manipulative, whether deliberately or overtly. Nevertheless, they might fail to adequately consider the political aspects of language and translation. Translating a literary work is not an easy task, especially when it comes to the linguistic devices that characterize this type of discourse. Among these devices is the use of figurative language, which is our main focus here. Unlike literal ordinary language, the figurative use of language often poses challenging tasks in its interpretation, as it operates on different interdependent levels of meaning.

### APPROACHES TO FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE

A language that incorporates figures of speech is referred to as figurative language. In general, approximately twenty different types of figures of speech are utilized across various languages. A figure of speech serves as a literary device that communicates meaning in a non-literal manner, frequently utilizing creative language to enhance expression and elicit emotion. These include metaphors, metonymy, similes, personification, and synecdoche, among others. Figures of speech are categorized into schemes and tropes. Schemes alter the order of words for a particular effect, while tropes employ words in a manner that diverges from their literal interpretation. By transforming commonplace expressions into more imaginative phrases, figures of speech stimulate our senses and prompt us to engage critically with the deeper meanings.

From what precedes, it can be deduced that the interpretation of figures of speech needs a theory of meaning that goes beyond their literal interpretation. It goes without saying that an approach to figurative language should not be restricted to a syntactic analysis that does not concern itself with its hidden meaning, social role, and pragmatic function. Wardhaugh (1993, p. 259) argues that "syntax provides just the information we need to give a semantic interpretation to any sentence we use or hear." Almjirab (2025, p. 27) postulates that "language extends beyond simple sounds, words and grammatical frameworks; it is intricately intertwined with human communication and cultural settings. Each instance of language usage mirrors the speaker's social experiences, influenced by their distinct socio-cultural environment and exposure to diverse texts". However, syntactic analysis still serves as the fundamental basis for any subsequent interpretation, whether it falls within the realm of semantics or pragmatics.

### THE SEMANTIC APPROACH

Semantics is a field within linguistics focused on the study of meaning in language. It highlights the importance of words and sentences as core components of our reality. In the realm of natural language processing, semantic analysis assesses and represents human language, analyzing texts written in English and other natural languages in a manner that reflects human comprehension. The potential for future advancements is particularly encouraging in the area of sentiment lexicons. Semantics plays a crucial role in the processing of natural languages and supports learning. Unlike syntactic analysis, the semantic approach goes beyond the investigation of the formal characteristics of a figurative text to explore its genuine meaning. It links these components to their real-world counterparts. Within the semantic framework, Levinson (1983) distinguishes two interpretative approaches: the comparison theory and the interaction theory.

### THE COMPARISON THEORY

The notion of comparison bears resemblance to syntactic analysis. This transformation can ease the responsibilities of the translator by converting the sentence into a kernel level where the figurative meaning is clarified. The deep significance of the phrase سفينة الصحراء (the desert ship) can be articulated in English as: a term for a vessel utilized in the desert, which can then be reverted to its surface structure as a camel. In other instances, translators may need to accept the translation of the deep structure as the final output. For instance, the translator might retain the simile form in the target language when there is no metaphorical equivalent, as illustrated by the famous Libyan saying: بطنك وطنك, which translates to *your country is your stomach*. It is essential to comprehend that translation is confined to the deep level because any further adaptation to the surface level leads to an unacceptable and incomprehensible translation in English. Nevertheless, the surface meaning suggests that this ancient proverb characterizes a person marked by greed, selfishness, and a lack of patriotism. Therefore, we must acknowledge the importance of the comparison theory for translators. However, it is not without its limitations. It overlooks the connotative plurality (various interpretations), as it asserts singularity (one definitive meaning).

### THE INTERACTION THEORY OF METAPHOR

Eva Feder Kittay (1987) articulates this interaction in terms of semantic field theory. In this theory, the meaning of a term is a function of its relation (of affinity or contrast) to the other terms in its semantic or conceptual field. The theory adopts a different method in the interpretation of figurative language. It is based mainly on deriving semantic meaning from the association of words with other words. It concerns the characterization of semantic features of the lexical items used in the structure, for instance: *The*

*company is to axe two hundred jobs.* To interpret the figure of speech in this sentence, interaction theory would map the semantic features of the verb *axe* as requiring a subject that is [+animate], whereas *company* is [-animate]. Therefore, the figurative usage lies in the personification التثخيص of an inanimate object. This technique allows the translator to identify the figurative meaning by offering a possible way of organizing the interrelationship among words.

However, the problem with this theory is that the semantic features that can be claimed to identify the meaning of a figure of speech do not always capture the force of the figurative usage. Another difficulty that an interpretation in terms of semantic features might pose is their infiniteness. A single word can open onto an unlimited number of associative features. Only context can confine this indefinite plurality of meanings. Interpretation of figurative language should start from the notion of context as an important variable for its understanding and translation.

### THE SPEECH ACT THEORY

In the field of language philosophy, extensive work has been conducted to examine the criteria for the truth and falsity of constatives or statements. The three primary theories of truth; coherence, correspondence, and pragmatic theories. are included in these endeavors. However, the issue of performatives appears to have been overlooked. Consequently, Austine (1962) overlooked his analyses of performatives to address this oversight. A significant finding of Austine's research was the identifications under which performatives can be classified as happy or unhappy, successful, or unsuccessful (Mabaquiao 2018).

An approach to figures of speech would not be comprehensive without a treatment of how they perform specific pragmatic goals (acts). This is because metaphors are not just inert linguistic signs but rather meanings that "show how to do things with words," as Austin (1962) entitled his book. They are acts that cause wonder and puzzlement. Consider, for example, the ancient Arabic poetic line: أحبها وتحبني ويحب ناقتها بعيري (I love her, and she loves me. And my he-camel loves her she-camel). It remains to be said that this poetic verse represents one of the most beautiful verses of pre-Islamic poetry; it reflects a dazzling romantic scene by using the image of a camel as a symbol of beauty and appreciation. However, the English translation fails to render the perlocutionary force of the ST because the acceptability of the elements of the figure of speech in the sentence varies cross-culturally. We cannot, therefore, resist the figurative language demands of pragmatic interpretation. That is, we cannot isolate the linguistic signs from their untended meaning (illocutionary force) and the communicative purpose they seek to attain (perlocutionary force).

### THE PRAGMATIC APPROACH

Pragmatism is a perspective that asserts there are multiple ways to interpret the world and conduct research to investigate reality, indicating that utilizing a blend of different methods may provide a more thorough understanding of the phenomena being studied. Unlike semantics, pragmatics goes "beyond the word and illustrates that sentences themselves can be, to some degree, anticipated from their context just as words can" (Bell 1991, p. 209). In the field of pragmatics, we can identify two main approaches that are useful for interpreting figurative language. 1. The Gricean theory regards figures of speech as deviations from the cooperative principle but elucidates their meaning through the framework of conversational implicature. 2. Searle's Speech Act Theory perceives figures of speech as performative units rather than simply stating events.

### THE GRICEAN THEORY

Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) primarily focused on the connection between direct and indirect speech acts. Indeed, a multitude of indirect speech acts can convey a specific meaning and addresses this differentiation between saying and meaning. Grice (1975) is the first to present the cooperative principle and elaborates on conversational implicature. Within his framework, he differentiates between what is said and what is meant and postulates that speakers have the ability to generate implicit meanings which their listeners can infer from the context of their conversations. He proposes that there exists an accepted mode of communication that is recognized as standard behavior. When an utterance is articulated or received, we generally presume that it will be truthful, contain the appropriate amount of information, be pertinent, and be expressed in comprehensible terms. There exists a correlation between the conventional meaning of an utterance and any implicit meaning it may possess, and this relationship is calculable. However, what Grice does not articulate is that interaction is 'cooperative' in the sense defined in the dictionary.

### METHODS OF FAILING TO ADHERE TO A MAXIM.

Conversational participants are expected to support the cooperative principle, which he (1975, p. 45) defines as "make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage of which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." In this respect, he (1975, p. 45 46) identifies four maxims that should be operational in conversation.

**The maxim of quantity**, where one tries to be as informative as one possibly can, and gives as much information as is needed, and no more.

**The maxim of quality**, where one tries to be truthful, and does not give information that is false or that is not supported by evidence.

**The maxim of relation**, where one tries to be relevant, and says things that are pertinent to the discussion.

**The maxim of manner**, when one tries to be as clear, as brief, and as orderly as one can in what one says, and where one avoids obscurity and ambiguity.

As the maxims are defined, there may exist an overlap concerning the length of what is expressed between the maxims of quantity and manner; this overlap can be elucidated (partially if not entirely) by considering the maxim of quantity (though this interpretation may be somewhat artificial) in terms of information units. In simpler terms, if a listener requires, for instance, five units of information from the speaker but receives either fewer or more than the anticipated amount, then the speaker violates the maxim of quantity. Conversely, if the speaker provides the five necessary units of information but is either too brief or excessively verbose in their delivery to the listener, this leads to a breach of the maxim of manner. Nonetheless, the distinction between these two maxims can often be quite subtle or ambiguous, leading to situations where it could be argued that both the maxims of quantity and quality are infringed upon by the same underlying factors.

However, it has been argued that Grice's cooperative principal maxims are not universal because there are communities to which not all of the maxims apply. As far as translation is concerned, we should indeed be more interested in how the maxims apply cross-culturally. For instance, to be informative in a language like Arabic, where directness is conventional and unmarked, as in the sentence *نولني الملاحه*, may result in relatively unexpected or marked behavior to an English receiver. "Give me the salt shaker" is a less direct way, but "more informative than required"; in Gricean terms, it is more customary: "Can you pass the salt shaker?" Let us take another clearer example. *الرجا إيفانونا بنواياكم فورا* may result in an offense in English if it is rendered literally as *kindly inform us immediately of your intentions*, where a conversation way of requesting a favor would be *we should be grateful if you would let us know*. (Hatim and Mason, 1990 p. 76).

The cooperative principle may differ not only cross-culturally but also from one discourse to another. For example, in a technical discourse, participants may be required to adhere completely to all maxims, whereas in an informal discourse it may be entirely the opposite. Consider for instance the use of pseudo agreement devices by the speakers to avoid disagreement or put the audience under pressure. Yet this is not necessarily implying any non-cooperation. agreement. In this respect Grice indicates that the flouting of the maxims is not to be taken as non-cooperative. He (1979, p. 52) argues that "though some maxims are violated at the level of what is said, the hearer is entitled to assume that the maxim, or at least the overall cooperative principle, is observed at the level of what is implicated."

Figurative language is one of the most obvious cases where maxims of conversation are violated if taken literally. It mainly flouts the maxims of truth, relevance, and manner. The translator has to go beyond the literal meaning; otherwise, utterances might appear redundant, nonsensical, irrelevant, or obscure (Dijk 1981). According to Grice, the deviation of metaphor from the maxims of conversation is apparent because the speaker and the hearer share mutual intelligibility that what is said is meant to be interpreted figuratively. For instance, the Arabic famous political saying *سياسة الكيل بمكيالين* (The policy of weighing with two measures) involves what Grice calls "categorical falsity" and is accordingly a clear instance of maxim violation. For the cooperative principle to be sustained in this case, the audience should be aware of the fact that what is intended is the figurative and not the literal meaning. Failing to do so will result in a translation without the original's communicative import: *The policy of weighing with two measures*. An appropriate translation should rather render the conversationally implicated meaning: *Double standard policy*.

Figurative language cannot, however, be dealt with solely in relation to Grice's cooperative principle. Although the theory of implicature may rescue the cooperative principle in identifying the implied meaning, it does not offer a theoretical framework for the translator to identify the function of figurative language in addition to its meaning. The issue is that, as Gutt (1991, p. 180) puts it, "the translator is confronted not only with the question of how he should communicate, but what he can reasonably expect to convey by means of his translation." In this respect, Sperber and Wilson (1986, p. 170) suggest that Grice's maxims can be reduced to one principle, which they call the principle of relevance. This means that the relevance of a certain utterance to a specific context is necessary for an appropriate interpretation and understanding of this utterance. However, it may still be argued that even when the relevant information is identified, we still have to ask how this can be done. In other words, the question is how to determine the exact proposition that is intended by the speaker as the relevant one.

### FIGURATIVE VERSUS LITERAL LANGUAGE

Figurative language refers to the use of words or expressions that are meant to be understood in a figurative sense rather than a literal one. This occurs in situations where an initial interpretation does not seem to make sense when taken literally (Lyon 1981). In contrast to literal language, where the "literal sentence meaning and the speaker's utterance meaning are identical" (Searle, 1969, p. 81), explains that words or expressions are utilized in their dictionary definitions. Figurative language intentionally disrupts the conventional system of literal usage by positing that terms associated with one object can be metaphorically applied to another (Hawkes 1979). This process of transferring one object to symbolize other results in the creation of images or pictures that are used for a more vivid or dramatic effect rather than for a straightforward interpretation. For example, consider the following excerpts from Shakespeare's *King Lear*:

1. Lear: Thou art a boil.

A plague-sore, or embossed carbuncle

In my corrupted blood

(Act 2, scene 4) 2.

Fool: Thou gav'st them

2. Fool: Thou gav'st them

the rod and put'st down thine own breeches

(Act 1, scene 4)

3. Cordelia: Unhappy that I am, I cannot heave

My heart into my mouth (Act 1, scene 1)

The first example consists of a common figure of speech where disease imagery is used to refer to a human being. For instance, Fairclough (1989) points out that the metaphorical representation of social problems as diseases is extremely common. In extract 1 above, Lear is telling his daughter that she is like a painful and inflamed spot under his skin (boil-sore-carbuncle). What Lear means here is not the literal meaning of his words but rather the figurative one intended to dramatically describe the harm his daughter inflicted on him. The translator's task is to identify and render this meaning, preferably using an equivalent figure of speech in the TL in order to preserve its sense of dramatization:

1a انت داء You are a disease.

انت سقم بلا دواء أم أنت عدوى بلا شفاء You are an incurable illness, or perhaps an infection with no cure.

تجربن في دمي المغشوش You run through my adulterated blood.

It can be said that the above mixed metaphor in Lear's line has been treated by Arabic rhetoricians as a kind of simile, distinctively termed eloquent simile. It is a sort of simile wherein the grounds (aspects of similarity) and the syntactic devices are not mentioned.

The mechanical translation above can be changed more freely as follows:

1b كأنك الدمل as if you were a boil

الوجع المبرح The excruciating pain

والطاعون ينخر في دمي And the plague gnawing at my blood

Let us consider another instance of a metaphor that is regarded as a simile in Arabic.

3 Time is a test of trouble الزمن مكابدة.

But not remedy لا شفاء

The same goes for examples 2 and 3. In example 2, the words *rod* and *breeches* are not used in their dictionary sense; they are used figuratively to refer to *power* and *high social status*. In the third example, if Cordelia's speech is considered literally, it would seem meaningless and nonsensical. Only an interpretation of its figurative meaning would unveil that *heart* stands for love and *mouth* for speech. Thus, figurative speech can be described as a departure from the literal sense. This detachment can happen in a variety of ways as we shall illustrate through some types of figurative language such as simile, metonymy, synecdoche and metaphor. However, these two levels of meaning are to be considered as (Leech) 1969, p: 147) puts it "two ends of a scale, rather than clear-cut categories".

### TYPES OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE

**Simile.** Simile is that type of figurative language that proposes the transference and explains it by using such syntactic devices as *like*, *as if* or *as...as* (Hawkes 1979, p. 3). Reflect again on the following extracts from King Lear

4. We two alone will sing like birds

i'th' cage

كلانا سيغني مثل عصافيرين داخل القفص

(Act 5, scene 3)

5. Fool: She will taste as like this as Literally: الأحمق: ستكون طعميهما مثل

a crab does to a crab

طعم السلطعون بالنسبة للسلطعون

(Act 1, scene 5)

In pattern 4, both the points of similarity and the syntactic device are mentioned. King Lear is comparing himself and his daughter to birds by using the syntactic device *like*. In Pattern five, the Fool is saying that his daughter Regan will prove to be as lecherous as her sister: *as a crab does to a crab*. Pattern 5 is similar to pattern 4 except in the sense that the simile in 5 is inverted for the sake of overstatement.

In Arabic, simile is frequently used in poetic and persuasive discourses. From all the types of patterns mentioned above, English only deals with types 1 and 2 as a kind of simile. Whereas the other three patterns are considered metaphors. In addition to the previous patterns of simile in which none of the common elements is mentioned, the simile is rather indicated indirectly in the following example. .

|                                                                     |                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| سيذكرني قومي إذا جد جدهم.                                           | My people will remember me in their difficult time.               |
| وفي الليلة الظلماء يفتقد البدر                                      | For it is in the dark night that people seek the bright full moon |
| وجهاها مشرق كالشمس.                                                 | Her face is shining like the sun.                                 |
| It is worth mentioning that there are different patterns of simile: |                                                                   |
| 1. وجهها مشرق كالشمس.                                               | Her face is shining like the sun.                                 |
| 2. وجهها كالشمس                                                     | Her face is like the sun.                                         |
| 3. وجهها الشمس في إشراقها                                           | Her face is the sun shining.                                      |
| 4. وجهها الشمس                                                      | Her face is the sun.                                              |
| 5. الشمس وجهها                                                      | The sun is her face.                                              |

In pattern 1 all the elements of simile are mentioned: the subject that the simile is applied to, *her face*; the point of similarity, *shining*; the syntactic device, *like*; and the term of simile, *the sun*. Both Arabic and English consider pattern 1 a simile. In pattern 2 the points of similarity are not mentioned. In pattern 3 the syntactic device is not mentioned. As can be seen from these examples, the syntactic devices of comparison in simile make the relationship between its elements more explicit than it is in metaphor.

### METONYMY كناية

Arab grammarians (Ibn Ibn-Manzūr 1970, Al-Jurjani 1983) examined the notion of metonymy الكناية, which originates from the root كنى possessing various meanings in Arabic lexicons. They perceive metonymy as the opposite of direct meaning, employing both semantic and pragmatic analyses. This suggests that a statement alludes to an extra meaning beyond its standard interpretation, owing to a specific closeness between the two meanings. In the case of metonymy, the name of one entity is transferred to take the place of another entity with which it is associated (Hawkes 1979, p. 4). Another definition of metonymy provided by Eco (1985, p. 219) is the following: a "substitution of two terms for each other according to a relation of contiguity." The following example reads: *The UN fails to pass a resolution condemning Israel's occupation of Gaza*. لغزة. للأمم المتحدة تفشل في اتخاذ قرار بدين الاحتلال الإسرائيلي لغزة. The process of metonymy is exemplified in this sentence by the use of *The UN* to refer to this international organization, which also involves a process of personification. Personification in this event is no different from metonymy; in the former, "we are imputing human qualities to things that are not human" but without referring to the "actual human being" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 35), as in this instance:

*Gaza suffers from the Israeli heavy bombardment*. غزة تعاني من القصف الإسرائيلي العنيف. In the case of metonymy, we are in fact referring to an actual person, as in the previous sentence, where *the city of Gaza* represents the people of Gaza in Palestine who are killed by the Israeli troops. The significance of metonymy is played down in literature due to the strong power of metaphor. Yet, it is greatly valued in poetry thanks to its "compressed allusive character" (Leech 1969, p. 153).

### SYNECDOCHE مجاز مرسل

It is another way in which language is used figuratively. The transference in synecdoche takes the form of part of something being used to stand in place of a whole thing or vice versa. It is defined by Eco (1985, p. 219) as a "substitution of two terms for each other according to a relation of greater or lesser extension," as in: where *black box* stands for the person: *He is his father's black box* مستودع اسرار والده. It implies the son is the repository of the father's untold story, something opaque to outsiders, but vital for understanding what happened to the father. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 36) clarify that in the case of synecdoche, the point is not just to use a part for a whole, but rather to pick out a particular characteristic of the whole that is associated with the part. Consider this example: The Arabs in the past usually appoint an eloquent person to be their spokesperson called لسان القوم *the tongue of the people*. Synecdoche may, then, be seen as a case of metonymy (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980).

### METAPHOR الاستعارة

Aristotle's classic definition of metaphor is the application to one thing of the name of another. Linguists define metaphor as a linguistic process whereby aspects of one object are carried over or transferred to another object, so that the second object is spoken of as if it were the first. Without explicitly mentioning the resemblance between both objects, the points of similarity are established. They are often found to have a shocking and dramatic effect, *Israeli aggression on Gaza Strip* عدوان غاشم على قطاع غزة. Literary discourse is notorious for the use of metaphor as a tool to draw the attention of the reader/hearer by creating dramatic, witty, and colorful texts; *The enemy barks again, can he bite?* العدو ينبح هل يستطيع العض. While the general procedure of transferring meaning can accommodate most cases, surely the number of objects involved can vary. This process of transference enables users of language to produce new, wider, or more accurate meanings. It widens their freedom of expression and word selection, opening up a new horizon of imaginative of speech that seek, for different reason, be they rhetorical, poetic, critical etc., to go beyond the direct semantic meaning of the single word. Like other figures of speech, metaphor involves deviation from formal way of using languages. Accordingly, the meaning of any figurative expression can be successfully rendered through interpretation. In this respect, two main approaches to figurative interpretation: can be distinguished: semantic and pragmatic.

### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper has sought to explore various models of interpretation relevant to figurative language, thereby enhancing its translation. We have observed that the semantic approach is limited to the meaning of a figure of speech, whereas the pragmatic approach delves into its intended meaning and function as a speech act. Regarding the translation of figurative language, it is challenging to assert that any of the previously discussed approaches is entirely (in)appropriate, as each one presupposes or builds upon the others in a complementary manner. An effective rendering of figurative language should integrate all these interpretative methods as needed. Throughout this paper, we have noted that linguistic approaches to analyzing and interpreting figurative speech have generated more controversies than they have resolved. Identifying an equivalent for an unresolved issue within monolingual studies in another language presents an even greater challenge. From a translation standpoint, it is also crucial to explore various potential avenues for achieving equivalence in this type of language. In the quest for suitable equivalence, translators may sometimes need to navigate the situation in a way that aligns with the text producer's objectives, or they may concentrate on delivering a relatively objective account, i.e., monitoring the situation. In both approaches (managing and monitoring), losses and gains are inevitable, particularly between distinct languages such as Arabic and English.

### REFERENCES

- 1) Ibn-Manzūr. M. (1970) Lisan Al-Arab Publisher, Dar Lisan al'-Arab.
- 2) Al-Jurjani, A. (1983) Secrets of Eloquence. Dar Al-Masireh. Beirut.
- 3) Almjirab, R. (2025) *The Interplay of Linguistic and Cultural Factors in Translating Sensitive Texts*. DOI 10.32996/ijcrs
- 4) Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to Do things With Words*, Harvard University Press.
- 5) Baker, M. (2024) Narratives in and of Translation. University of Manchester.
- 6) Beaugrand, de R. (2003) On the Concept of Sensitive Translation.
- 7) Bell, R. T. (1991) *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*, Longman.
- 8) Culler, J. (1983) *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism After Structuralism*. Routledge.
- 9) Dijk, T. A. Van (1981) *Towards an Empirical Pragmatics Philosophica*, 27 (1), 127-38.
- 10) Eco, U. (1985) How culture Conditions the Culture We See. In Blonsky (ed), 157-75.
- 11) Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. Longman.
- 12) Grice, P. E. (1975) Logic and Conversation. In Cole P. and Morgan J. L. (eds) *Syntax and Semantics*,
- 13) *vol 3 Speech Acts*. Academic Press.
- 14) Gutt, E. A. (1991) *Translation and Relevance*. Blackwell.
- 15) Hawkes, T. (1979) *Structuralism and Semiotics*. Methen
- 16) Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990) *Discourse and the translator*. Longman.
- 17) Hervey, S. & Higgins, I. (1992) Thinking Translation. Routledge.
- 18) Ibn Manthour M. (1970), *Mujam clean Al-Arab*. Dar Sader, Lebanon.
- 19) Kittay, E. (1987) *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure* Oxford University Press.
- 20) Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
- 21) Leech, G. (1969) *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. Longman.
- 22) Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- 23) Lyons, J. (1981) *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- 24) Mabaquiao, N. (2018). Speech Act Theory: From Austin to Searle. *A Journal for Humanities*,
- 25) *Social Sciences, Business, and Education*, 19, 35-45.
- 26) Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- 27) Shakespeare, W. (1959) *King Lear*. Cambridge University Press.
- 28) Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986) *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Blackwell. Wardhaugh, R. (1993