Adab Al-Rafidain

The Translation of Arabic Metadiscourse in Naguib Mahfouz's Novel "The Thief and The Dogs" into English

Salam Salih Albirifkani
M.A. Student / Department of Translation/College of Arts / University of Mosul

Salim Fathi Yahya
Prof/ Department of Translation /College of Arts/ University of Mosul

Abstract

This study investigates the concept of metadiscourse in general and the multifunctionality problem of metadiscourse in particular. The concept of metadiscoure is still fuzzy and its taxonomies involve many disparate elements. The differences between Arabic and English in relation to linguistic and convention would make the problem of metadiscourse more complicated as far as translation is concerned. This study hypotheses that there is a similarity between English and Arabic metadicourse items. Therefore, not being able to grasp the function of these metadicourse items leads to have inappropriate renditions of translation. It also hypotheses that Arabic categories of metadiscourse can be applied to that of English when translations are involved.

The aim of this study is to identify the metadiscourse items in the source language (ST) and their renditions in the target language (TL) and also to figure out to what extent the translators were successful in managing the linguistic and rhetorical functions of metadicourse items utilized in SL. The source text (ST) excerpts of this study are taken from a novel titled "The Thief and The Dogs" written by Naguib Mahfouz (1964) and translated into English by Le Gassic and Badawi (1984) and Elyas (1975). This study adopts the model of Eugen Nida (1964) in order to make a judgement on the appropriateness of metadiscourse renditions on the target text (TT). It shows that English utilizes metadiscourse items as Arabic does, despite the fact that the classification system of metadicouse in these two languages are somehow different.

The findings of this study revealed a number of inappropriate renditions along the two parameters of metadiscourse: textual and interpersonal. It was also found that Eugene Nida's model is applicable to literary genre. The conclusion verified the validity of the hypothesis of the pesent study and suggested some recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

ترجمة الإدخالات الخطابية في رواية نجيب محفوظ "اللص والكلاب" إلى الانجليزية

سلام صالح البريفكاني*   سالم فتحي يحيى**

المستخلص :

تبحث هذه الدراسة في (مفهوم ماوراء الخطاب) بشكل عام، وفي مشكلة تعدد الوظائف في مفهوم (ما وراءالخطاب) بشكل خاص. فلا يزال مفهوم (ما وراءالخطاب) مفهوماً ضبابياً تتشكل تصنيفاته من عناصر متباينة ومتفاوتة. ان الاختلافات اللغوية والعُرفية بين اللغتين العربية والإنجليزية ستجعل مشكلة ما وراء الخطاب أكثر تعقيدًا في حالة الترجمة بين اللغتين. وتفترض هذه الدراسة وجود تشابه بين عناصر ما وراء الخطاب في اللغتين الإنجليزية والعربية. لذلك، فإن عدم القدرة على فهم وظيفة عناصر ما وراء الخطاب هذه يؤدي إلى انجاز ترجمة غير وافية. كما تفترض الدراسة امكانية تطبيق صيغ ما وراء الخطاب العربية عند الترجمة الى اللغة الإنجليزية.

ان الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو تحديد عناصر ما وراء الخطاب في اللغة التي تتم الترجمة منها (اللغة المصدر) وترجماتها في اللغة التي تتم الترجمة اليها (اللغة الهدف). ولأجل معرفة مدى نجاح المترجمين في إدارة الوظائف اللغوية والبلاغية لعناصر ماوراء الخطاب المستخدمة في (اللغة المصدر). ان المقتطفات المعتمدة كنص مصدر في هذه الدراسة مأخوذة من رواية بعنوان "اللص والكلاب" كتبها نجيب محفوظ (1964) وترجمها إلى الإنجليزية لو جاسيك وبدوي (1984) وإلياس (1975). وتعتمد هذه الدراسة نموذج يوجين نايدا (1964)للبت بشأن كفاءة عمليات نقل ما وراء الخطاب الى النص الهدف. وتستنتج الدراسة أن اللغة الإنجليزية تستخدم عناصر ما وراء الخطاب كما تستخدمها اللغة العربية، رغم أن نظام تصنيف ما وراء الخطاب في هاتين اللغتين مختلف إلى حد ما.

كشفت نتائج هذه الدراسة، وحسب مقاييس ما وراء الخطاب النصية والشخصية عن عدد من عمليات النقل غير الكفوءة. وكشفت أيضًا أن نموذج يوجين نيدا قابل للتطبيق على الجنس الأدبي. لقد أثبتت الخاتمة صحة فرضية الدراسة الحالية واقترحت بعض التوصيات والمقترحات لمزيد من الدراسات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: مفهوم التكافؤ في الترجمة، ترجمة النصوص الأدبية، العالم يوجين نايدا، النتائج العامة.

1. Data Collection and Discussion

The aim of this study is to examine and explain the categories and subcategories of metadiscourse items found in the study's corpus, as well as their translations. In this study, the model of Nida (1964) is adopted. It is necessary to clarify the nature of translation and equivalence before proceeding with the discussion and analysis. Determining a method for segmenting the text into units is one of the most important tasks in text analysis.

The Data of this study is based on the Arabic novel, "The Thief and The Dogs" that is written by Naguib Mahfouz in 1961 and translated into English by three different translators: Adel Ata Elyas in (1973) and both Trevor Le Gassick and M. M. Badawi together in (1984). The most significant criterion for analysis in this study, however, is determining whether linguistic items are instances of metadiscourse or propositional content. The elements that do not refer to subject and predicate "المسند والمسند اليه", i.e., (theme and rheme) are considered to be metadiscourse items. Furthermore, decisions are made based on the item's purpose in a certain setting. As a result, the study is more of a functional analysis than a linguistic one, because the research corpus is analyzed using a functional method. It is to be noted that English differs from Arabic in the sense that the former is "analytic" while the latter is "synthetic" which had no effect in the analysis.

The exclusion and inclusion of metadiscourse elements appears to be still controversial. Moreover, one method proposed here is to investigate each linguistic items in terms of neglec or topic, which serves as "announcing the topic rather than offering new information about the chosen subject matter" (Turner, 1973:315; Lautamatti, 1978:72), and rheme or predicate, which adds new information about the theme. This recognition of theme and rheme made it simpler for us to recognize Lautamatti's (1978) topical and non-topical issues, as well as the metadiscourse in the texts, in certain cases.

* طالب ماجستير / قسم الترجمة / كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل
** استاذ / قسم الترجمة / كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل

2. Concept of Equivalence in Translation

Leonardi (2000) categorizes the ideas that relate to the idea of equivalence in translation studies into three groups. The translator academics who prefer a linguistic approach to translation and disregard the reality that translation is not merely limited to language issues fall into the first type. The second group of theorists' views translation equivalence as the transmission of the message from the source culture to the target culture in an effort to address the shortcomings of the first category. As a result, they emphasize pragmatic and functional translation. Scholars like Baker, who appear to be in the center and view translation equivalence as a convenience that translators have become used to, rather than as a theory of translation, form the third category in this classification. This classification may lead one to the conclusion that there cannot be a single definition of equivalent; rather, there must be a typology of equivalence, which will be covered in the next section. But first, we'll look at some of the popular definitions of equivalence in the realm of translation studies.

Equivalence is simply defined as "a word used by numerous writers to characterize the type and breadth of links which exist between SL and TL texts or smaller linguistic units" in the Dictionary of Translation Studies. As a result, synonymy within a single language and equivalence are similar in certain ways (Mark and Cowie 1997:49). Equivalence, according to Vinay and Darbelnet (1995:342), refers to reproducing the identical circumstances as in the original by utilizing alternative phrasing. In this way the stylistic impact of the SL can be transferred into TT most effectively, with much less risk of meaning loss than with other methods of translation. Jacobson's (1959:232) definition of equivalence has been cited in number of writings related to equivalence.

3. Translation of Literary Texts

For most translators, translating literary texts is quite difficult. This research looks at a literary text and demonstrates the difficulties that are facing the translators in the process of translating the literary works. Bush (1998: 127) states that "Literary translation is the work of literary translators. That is a truism which has to serve as a starting point for a description of literary translation, an original subjective activity at the center of a complex network of social and cultural practices. The imaginative, intellectual and intuitive writing of the translator must not be lost to the disembodied abstraction which is often described as 'translation".

Moreover, while discussing the work of a literary translator, Lamberts (1998: 130) says that "a published translation is the fruit of a substantial creative effort by the translator, who is the key agent in the subjective activity and social practice of translation". Therefore, he mentions that the translators of literary texts are the ones who decide the way the translation is done and giving it the existence required, regardless of what the restrictions of the network of cultural and social factors are. While the authors mentioned above see literary translation more as a creative and subjective activity of the translators, Toury (1993: 12-13) underlines "aspect of equivalence between source text and target text in literary translation" and he considers this kind of translation as two different aspects:

i)   The translation of works in the original culture that are considered 'literary.'
ii)   The text's translation (any text) into a form that the recipient's culture accepts it as "literary."

In the first aspect, the text is regarded as a literary work in the original culture, and its rewriting is recognized as such. In this view, the emphasis is on the receiving end of the text, or the character of the text in terms of preferences, customs, and what is considered literary in the target culture, which is distinct from the source culture. To put it another way, the source text and the target text are from two distinct genres. It is rare, nevertheless, for what is typically considered as a literary text in one language to be recognized as such in another. As can be seen, literary translation meanings differ depending on the writers' focus. While some writers, such as Lambert, Newmark and Bush highlight the translator's subjective effort, others concentrate on the degree of similarity between the ST and TT.

4. Naguib Mahfouz

Naguib Mahfouz who is considered as one of the greatest Arab novelists, was born in 1911 and passed away in 2006. He wrote many literary works that gained wide fame around the world, as a result, a number of his works are translated into other languages and especially English by different translators. The Egyptian novelist was rewarded with the Nobel Prize for his famous novel "The Thief and The Dogs" which was first published in 1961, as well as other novels of him such as "Midaq Alley", "Adrift on the Nile", "Palace Walk"….etc. Due to the importance of this novel, "The Thief and The Dogs", has been translated into English by Trevor Le Gassick and M. M. Badawi together in 1984 and Adel Ata Elyas in 1973. The novel talks about a thief called Said Mahram "the protagonist", who finds out that his wife married to his friend upon his release from jail. Mahran seeks to get his revenge from his friend Elaish and his wife. In general, this novel was able to convey the pain and suffering of a Mahran who has been jailed and betrayed for many years.

5. Model Adopted

Eugene Nida's model of translation assessment is considered to be one of the valid models for assessing and analyzing literary genre. Translation, according to Nide (1964) is finding the closest natural equivalent for the source text in the target text. As it has been discussed in the previous chapter, Eugene Nida (1964), is one of the scholars who are interested in the concept of equivalence. According to Nida, the translator has challenges during the translation process, particularly due to variations in language systems and cultures between (SL) and (TL). (ibid) points out that the variety of translations is determined by three factors: The author's and translator's purpose, the nature of the message, and the type of audience. According to him, the translation's success is distinguished by four main requirements (Nida, 1964) which are:
 1.   Making sense,
 2.   The manner and spirit of the original text should be conveyed,
 3.   Having expression's easy and natural form, and
 4.   A similar response should be produced.
He distinguishes two primary translation orientations in which the translator tries to reach the nearest equivalent: formal equivalence, and dynamic equivalence.
1. Formal equivalence has a main function, which is used to reproduce several formal elements that consist of the following (ibid):
A. Grammatical units that might include translating nouns to nouns, maintaining all formal markers like punctuation marks, and avoiding breaking up phrases and sentences.

B. The representation of a given phrase in the source language by a comparable term in the target text is known as consistency in word use.

C. Reproducing the meaning in terms of the ST in such a manner that they are reproduced precisely in order for the reader to comprehend the local cultural elements that are employed to convey the meaning, rather than making idiomatic changes.

2. Dynamic equivalence depends on the equivalent effect, in which the nearest equivalent of the source language's message is reproduced by employing the receptor language. It is receptor-oriented, as opposed to source-message-oriented formal equivalence. Moreover, dynamic equivalence focuses on reaction equivalence rather than form equivalent. When the message and receptor of (TT) are the same as the message and receptor of (ST), then the dynamic equivalence is possible to be achieved. Naturalness is considered as a crucial element in dynamic equivalence translation, which includes two main fields of adaptation: lexicon and grammar (Nida:1964).

(Ibid: p226) proposes three techniques in the translation process based on dynamic equivalence: alterations, subtractions, and additions. They can be used in a variety of situations:

1.The form of the message should be modified to make it be suitable for the TL,

2. Producing structures that are semantically equivalent,

3. Producing equivalents that are stylistically appropriate, and

4. Producing a communicative effect which is the same in (SL).

The translator's primary goal is to reproduce what has been delivered rather than to improve it, even if he is capable of doing so. The amount to which these changes are used is determined by the target audience (TL). If the reader knows little about the subject matter, for example, more modifications should be made in the translation. The following techniques are discussed in below.

1. **Additions:** Many additions are being used in various situations when they are required.
A. It is employed to clarify elliptic expressions; in this context, the ellipsis in one language might not be allowed in the other.
B. It is used to remove the lexical item's ambiguity in the (TL) in order to prevent making a misleading reference.
C. When required, it is used to change the linguistic category.
D. It is used to explain implicit components; some semantic elements that are used implicitly in the (SL) may need to be explained explicitly in the (TL).
E. It is used to add connections when they're needed, such as when translating from English to Arabic.
F. It is used to respond to rhetorical questions (Nida, 1964: p227).
2. **Subtractions:** It is recommended that the translator uses this procedure in four situations which are: the Conjunctions, specified references, Unnecessary repetition, and adverbs. Subtractions have no effect on the message's overall meaning. They may shift the status of some characteristics from explicit to implicit without impacting the information provided. The use of subtractions is supported by the possibility of achieving a high degree of correspondence (Nida, 1964: p231).
3. **Alterations**

Due to the differences between the (SL) and (TL) and semantic issues, these adjustments are used. The alterations can be divided into three categories (ibid,1964).

1.Changing caused by transliteration issues where the produced form has a different meaning in the receptor language,

2. Changing in word order, word class, and grammatical categories due to structural differences between (SL) and (TL),

3. Changing as a result of semantic issues, particularly with idiomatic expressions.

Footnotes are another correction technique, according to (ibid), and they serve two purposes:

1. To do the correction in language and cultural differences, such as clarifying contradicting conventions, identifying unfamiliar geographical or physical elements, providing weights and measures equivalents, explaining word play, adding information about proper names, and so on.

2. To provide extra information that helps to understand of the text's historical and cultural context.

6. **Textual Metadiscouse**

In this part, the main subcategories that shape textual metadiscourse in the (SL) text and their renditions in the (TL) texts, will be discuss and analyze. Based on the model suggested by (Fathy, 2018)

textual metadiscourse devices consist of the following items: text connective which includes additive, adversative, causal, and temporal connectives.

6.1 Text Connectives

As previously noted, the author uses connectives in literary texts to highlight the progress of the text's content and how the text's sections are related. When connectives are employed correctly by the author, they serve as reference points for translators as to the literary texts from the writer's perspective. These connectives reflect the semantic elements between propositions provided by the author. However, text connectives include the causal, adversative, additive, and temporal connectives.

7.1.1. Causal Connectives

The author of the present study uses causal connectives to link concepts that lend themselves to cause-effect and/or effect-cause interactions. Such connections help in the transmission of a more solid fact. Reason indicators and conclusion markers can also be used as causal metadiscourse techniques to highlight the statements' validity. Consider the following example:

Excerpt 1:

"وأنت لن تصدقني!

طبعا **لأنك** تعلم انك كاذب."

(Mahfouz, 1961: p55)

"But you don't believe me.

*Of course, I don't. **Ø** You know you're lying."*

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p23)

"I know you won't believe me. Of course,

*I won't, **because** you know that you are a lair."*

(Elyas, 1973: p88)

It is clear that the ST author utilizes the metadiscourse item "لأنك" to show the cause of the previous sentence which is the effect. TT1 opted for the dynamic equivalence (subtraction) which is considered to be an inappropriate rendition due to the igonrance of the metadiscourse causal item. On the other hand, TT2 is successful in rendering this metadiscourse item by opting for the appropriate rendition, which is the formal equivalence "because". Thus, opting for a formal equivalence in this example is the appropriate one. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-
TT2	Formal	----------	+

7.1.2. Adversative Connectives

Adversatives indicate how the ST author converges with or diverges from his fictitious readers; how he becomes involved in the debate for or against a certain subject, or how he refutes the opinions of assumed readers. As a result, such methods indicate that the text author is not only engaged in the debate, but also considers his reader's expectations. The examples below include some instances of proper translations of adversative connectives. Consider the following example:

Excerpt 2:

"ولم تنس وحدك يا عليش **ولكنها** نسيت ايضا."

(Mahfouz, 1961: p8-9)

*"You've forgotten, Ilish, and You're not the only one, **Ø** she's forgotten too."*

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p1)

*"It is not you only who has forgotten this Elaish; **Ø** she has forgotten too."*

(Elyas, 1973: p53)

The adversative's basic meaning is to come up with an expectedness. Thus, adversatives show contrasting an anticipated proposition. The above example represents unexpectedness. Consequently, both TTs ignored the rhetorical function of the above metadiscourse item "لكن" by opting for the dynamic equivalence (subtraction) which is considered as inappropriate rendition. In so doing, both TTs did not grasp the function of "لكن", however, it could be well presented by using the metadiscoursal item "but" as a concessive marker since the connecting device "but" represents an adversative. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-
TT2	Dynamic	Subtraction	-

7.1.3. Additive Connectives

Additive connectives are considered to be essential discourse markers that build a text. The functions of Arabic and English additive connectives differ in some contexts. Therefore, mis-rendering these discourse items could cause a problem in the target text. Because the authors of the English text assume that the reader will simply view the text's parts as a continuation of the previous one in the absence of adversatives and causals, they apply this form of connective in literary texts. Consider the following excerpts:

Excerpt 3:

"هذه الطرقات المثقلة بالشمس، وهذه السيارات المجنونة، والعابرون ....، والبيوت والدكاكين، **ولا** شفة تفتر عن ابتسامة."

(Mahfouz, 1961: p8)

*"The world--streets belabored by the sun, careening cars, crowds of people moving or still--returned. **Ø** No one smiled or seemed happy."*

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p1)

*"Straight ahead are the streets heavy with the sun, the honking cars, the pedestrians , the houses, and the stores. **Yet**, there is no smile on his face."*

(Elyas, 1973: p52)

In the above example, the underlined "و" functions as a metadiscourse device in the source text rather than a stylistic device. This is used to smoothen and naturalize the flow of Arabic. TT2, is unsuccessful in rendering this metadiscourse device by opting for the dynamic equivalence (alteration)

"yet" since this item does not function as a an additive metadiscourse item, it rather functions as an adversative. TT1 is unsuccessful in providing the most suitable equivalence for this item. TT1 ignored the ST author's metadiscourse item by opting for the dynamic equivalence (subtraction), which is also unsuccessful in finding the most appropriate equivalence for this metadiscourse device. In some cases, the translators are confused between the syntactic items and metadiscourse items. The proposed translation is "moreover" which emphasizes to what preceded it and it is used to smoothen the flow of discourse. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-
TT2	Dynamic	Alteration	-

7.1.4. Temporal Connectives

The temporal connectives indicate the order of the time of events, actions, or states. It is normal to see this sub-category of textual metadiscourse is used along the narrative discourse. Consider the following examples:

Excerpt 4:

"أتم الشيخ تمتمته **ثم** رفع رأسه عن وجه نحيل فائض الحيوية بين الاشراق تحف به لحية بيضاء كالهالة."

(Mahfouz, 1961: p22)

*"Having completed his recitation the Sheikh raised his head, **Ø** disclosing a face that was emaciated but radiant with overflowing validity; framed by a white beard like a halo and surmounted by a white skull cap that nestled in thick locks of hair showing silvery at his temples."*

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p6)

*"The Sheikh finished his prayers **and** raised his head. His face was thin, but full of life and vitality. He had a white beard which was like a halo enveloping his face."*

(Elyas, 1973: p65)

It is obvious that the connective item "ثم" suggests elapse of time; sequencing events in order of time is the main function of this item. The TT1, however, ignored this item. Consequently, dynamic equivalence (subtraction) is opted for by TT1 inappropriately. Despite opting for dynamic equivalence (alteration) "and" that indicates addition. TT2 is inappropriate in rendering this item. However, using the item "then" would have been better formal equivalence for the item "ثم" and indicates an appropriate translation as it captures the sequence of time and events. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-
TT2	Dynamic	Alteration	-

7. Interpersonal Metadiscourse

Under the umbrella of this section, we will explore and analyze interpersonal metadiscourse items which show the attitude of the author toward the subject matter. Interpersonal metadiscourse consists of

the following devices: circumlocution (hedges, certainty markers, bracketing, and rhetorical questions) as well as non-analogous and emotional appeals.

8.1. Circumlocution

The interpersonal metadiscourse category circumlocution "الإطناب" is seen as a rhetorical device. It is to convey the meaning in multiple words and sentences, for example, I met a man who was generous, gentle, kind, and polite. The terms following the word man are considered as circumlocution. It is one of the most important rhetorical devices in texts; therefore, it is a significant element of metadiscourse. As it consists of the certainty, hedges, bracketing, and non-analogous and emotional appeals.

8.1.1 Certainty Markers

The elements in this subcategory improve dedication to truthfulness by highlighting the text author's belief in the proposition's truth. The text author of literary discourse uses certainty to provide great force to the viewpoints and attitudes they assert. The text author strives to place emphasis and assessments on the material by applying various tactics of such markers. Such metadiscourse items, indeed, make a text evaluative, rather than neutral, since they unfold the text author's perspective on the subject addressed. Several certainty indicators are used in the (SL) texts. Some of them are rendered by the translators. This can be illustrated in the following example:

Excerpt 5:

"و<u>لاشك</u> انه خير أن انسى الماضي وابحث عن عمل حتى اهيئ للبنت مكانا طيباً في الوقت المناسب."

(Mahfouz, 1961: p20)

"***Ø*** *the best thing would be to forget the past and start looking for a job to provide a suitable home for the child when the time comes*".

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p5)

"***No doubt*** *it is better that I forget all about the past, and I have to start looking for a job in order to prepare a good place for the girl when the proper time comes,*"

(Elyas, 1973: p63)

The source text writer used the lexical item "لاشك" as a certainty metadiscourse. TT1, despite its function as a certain metadiscourse, has not captured this device appropriately by opting for dynamic equivalence (subtraction). Thus, deplete and weaken the author's attitude lead to confusion, that's why had it be better the TT1 opts for the certainty metadiscourse device to have the appropriate equivalence for this metadiscourse item. TT2, on the other hand, captured the intended metadiscourse item of the source text by opting for the formal equivalence "no doubt" which functions as a certain metadiscourse item. Consequently, both source text "لاشك" and TT2 "no doubt" share the same function which is the certainty metadiscourse. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-
TT2	Formal	----------	+

8.1.2 Hedges

As previously noted, the rhetorical function of hedging is used as a protective device, i.e., the author does not commit himself to what he/she says. In general, all forms of hedges are used in the ST to reduce the ST author's commitment to the validity of what he is saying; thus, he does not offer it as a "fact," but rather as something that may be true.

Some of the hedges are adequately represented by the TTs; however, some others are not. Consider the following example:

Excerpt 6:

‫''وقديماً ظننتما ان باب السجن لن ينفتح، ولعلكما تترقبان في حذر، ولن اقع في الفخ، ولكني سأنقض في الوقت المناسب كالقدر. ''‬

(Mahfouz, 1961: p8)

"For years you will have been thinking about this day, never imagining all the while, that the gates would ever actually open, Ø you'll be watching now, but I won't fall into the trap. At the right moment, instead, I'll strike like fate."

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p1)

"Both of you are worried about this day of retribution. You believed that the prison gates would remain shut forever. Ø You are carefully watching this day. I will not fall into your trap, but will, in due course, descend upon you like fate."

(Elyas, 1973: p52)

The ST author uses the metadiscourse item "لعلكما" to express hedging. Both TTs are unsuccessful in rendering this metadiscourse item since they opted for the dynamic equivalence (subtraction). However, this could be rendered into the metadiscourse item "perhaps". Thus, the formal equivalence is considered to be more appropriate than the dynamic equivalence used by both TTs. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-
TT2	Dynamic	Subtraction	-

8.1.3. Rhetorical Questions

Rhetorical questions are mainly used to lead the listener of the source language towards the speaker's intention. Thus, through the use of these rhetorical questions, the speaker may create a dialogue or uses some phrases that make an interaction between the source text author and his reader. In the following two examples, the metadiscourse items are not appropriately rendered by TT2, as shown below:

Excerpt 7:

‫'' ألا ينعم مجلسنا الآن بالطمأنينة؟ ''‬

(Mahfouz, 1961: p60)

"Aren't we enjoying peace and security. Ø "

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p25)

"Doesn't one feel secure here, right now?"

<div style="text-align: right">(Elyas, 1973: p93)</div>

It is clear that the ST author is so keen to interact with his audience by addressing them with the rhetorical questions. The example above represents a rhetorical question; however, TT2 inappropriately used formal equivalence which is the same syntactic function rather than rhetorical question. Using question mark at the end of the sentence and making a formal literal rendition means that the translator is after "WH-questions" and not rhetorical questions. By so doing, he is unable to capture the intended meaning of the ST-author. The author wants his reader to stop and think by using rhetorical questions and not ask to get an answer. TT1, on the other hand, inppropriately rendered this metadiscourse item into syntactic and semantic dynamic equivalence (subtraction). Thus, he was more successful in rendering this item. The proposed translation could be using the exclamation mark at the end of the excerpt. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-
TT2	Dynamic	Alteration	-

TT2, has not only inappropriately rendered this metadiscourse item this way, but he presented this item in some other places inappropriately too. It seems that TT2, unlike TT1, is not well-aware of the functional use of metadiscourse items in Arabic as he renders them in many instances inappropriately as he does in the following example too:

Excerpt 8:

<div style="text-align: right">'' <u>**ألا ترى**</u> إنني نافعة دائماً؟''</div>

(Mahfouz, 1961: p71)

*"<u>**Don't you think**</u> I'm always useful."*

<div style="text-align: right">(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p29)</div>

*"<u>**Don't you see**</u> that I'm always useful?"*

<div style="text-align: right">(Elyas, 1973: p99)</div>

In the above example, the rhetorical question is used to create a close relationship between the author and the audience as the author did in example (17). However, TT2 inappropriately rendered this metadiscourse item into a formal equivalence, ignoring, again, the intended meaning of the ST-author and where such rendition is considered to be a "WH" question and not a rhetorical question. TT1 seems to be more aware of this metadicourse item by opting for the dynamic equivalence (alteration); consequently, TT1 appropriately captures the intended meaning of the ST-author. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Alteration	+
TT2	Formal	----------	-

8.1.4 Bracketing

This category involves items that are used to provide the reader with elaboration, explanation, and comments on the propositions made by the writer to his reader. Appropriate and inappropriate renditions are found in the translations. Both TTs are able to come up with an appropriate rendition in some cases. Meanwhile, both TTs are also unable to come up with appropriate equivalence. Bracketing consists of the following devices: commentary, and attributors/narrator.

8.1.4.1. Commentary

Commentary metadiscourse items are basically used to provide the writer's comments on the propositions that come before it. As in the following example:

Excerpt 9:

"حكاية مؤسفة، أما ابنتك فمعذورة، **انـها لا تتذكرك**، وسوف تعرفك وتحبِك."

(Mahfouz, 1961: p40)

*"This is a sad story. But your daughter isn't to blame. **She can't remember you** now."*

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p18)

*"It is a sad story. As for your daughter, she is really to be excused **doesn't remember you**."*

(Elyas, 1973: p77)

It is clear that the underlined metadiscourse item that is used between the commas provides the writer's comment on the propositions that come before it. Restoring to the structural alteration by TT1 led to inappropriate rendition of the function of the ST. Therefore, dynamic equivalence (alteration) rendered by TT1 is unsuccessful. Meanwhile, TT2 successfully rendered it by opting for the formal equivalence by using the comma that preceded the proposition and showed the writers comment on the propositions provided above. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Alteration	-
TT2	Formal	----------	+

8.1.4.2 Attributors

The employment of attributors is another main aspect of interpersonal metadiscourse in literary discourse. The appropriate use of attributors provides evidence to their claims, making them more compelling. Attributors can also serve to indicate the ST author's knowledge with the background of the readers by referring to well-known ones, which is especially useful in literary discourse. In the following example, both TTs are able to render the narrative metadiscourse item:

Excerpt 10:

"**قالوا** انك الموت نفسه وان طلقتك لا تخيب."

(Mahfouz, 1961: p62)

*"Didn't it used to be **said** that he was Death Incarnate, that his shot never missed?"*

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p25)

"They have __said__ that you are death itself, and that your bullet always knows its way to the target."

(Elyas, 1973: p93)

The author, as seen above, used the subcategory of bracketing "attributor"/"narrator". In this context, the writer used قالوا "said" as a narrator item to inform his readers who said the proposition. Both TTs opted for the formal equivalence which is the appropriate rendition for this narrator item. However, in some other cases, they are unable to find the appropriate equivalence for this metaiscourse item, i.e., one of them would be at pain to find the appropriate equivalence. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Formal	----------	+
TT2	Formal	----------	+

8.2. Non-analogous and emotional appeals

This subcategory involves expressions, phrases and vocabularies that are related to the way of expressing emotional appeals such as wishing and wondering to reveal what the writer intends in conveying his/her thoughts towards the propositional content that can be found in the text. Thus, some metadiscourse items are employed by the writer to convey his emotions concerning some specific situations in the text. Not opting for an appropriate equivalence for these metadiscourse items have changed the propositional content of the source text's author. Non-analogous consists of wishing, exclamation, wondering, and vocative. Consider the following examples:

8.2.1. Wishing

This subcategory involves expressions of wishing. Its function is to reveal the emotional appeals that the ST author holds to the propositional content. Ignoring or mis-rendering the wishing expressions is considered to be inappropriate. Consider the following example:

Excerpt 11:

'' ولكن __هيهات__ ان يطيب العيش إلا بتصفية الحساب.''

(Mahfouz, 1961: p48)

"But __Ø__ unless I settle my account with them."

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p21)

"But __that's no way__; life isn't worth living until I do what I have to do."

(Elyas, 1973:84)

It is clear that the ST author employed the above metadiscourse item "هيهات" to reveal the attitude of the ST author towards the event contained in this proposition. ignoring the ST author's attitude and intentions leads to inappropriate rendition. TT1, by so doing, is considered to be inappropriate as he opted for the dynamic equivalence (subtraction). TT2, on the other hand, grasped the intended meaning of the ST by opting for the formal equivalence "that is no way". This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-
TT2	Formal	----------	+

8.2.2. Exclamation

Exclamation marks have also been deviated by the TTs. The TTs, in some cases, rendered these exclamation marks inappropriately, by not opting for the appropriate equivalence. Consider the following example:

Excerpt 12:

"ما اجمل الايام الماضية !"

(Mahfouz, 1961: p24)

"What wonderful days those were!"

(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p7)

"Those were the days."

(Elyas, 1973: p67)

Regarding exclamation, the source text in the above example implies the exclamation mark to convey an exclamation sentence to the reader. TT1 is successful in conveying the metadiscourse item of the ST by opting for the formal equivalent which is the same mark used in the ST. However, TT2 rendered this sentence into a statement rather than exclamation, and consequently, he failed to convey the intended meaning of the ST by opting for the dynamic equivalence (alteration). Due to the different functions that an exclamation and a statement sentence have, TT2 is considered to be inappropriate in opting for the dynamic equivalence. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Formal	----------	+
TT2	Dynamic	Alteration	-

8.2.3. Wondering

This subcategory of non-analogous and emotional appeals involves the way the that the ST author depicted some circumstances in the ST, thus, it is related to his emotional appeals. It is important to capture these metadiscourse items and render them appropriately. However, they are rendered inappropriately. Consider the following examples:

Excerpt 13:

"ولكن ما شكل سناء الآن؟"

(Mahfouz, 1961: p15)

"I wonder how Sana looks now."

<div align="right">(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p3)</div>

"But what does Sana look like now?"

<div align="right">(Elyas, 1973: p59)</div>

The source ST author has come up with many ideas that reflect the way "Saeed Mahran" depicted his daughter throughout the novel. He always wondered how his daughter looks like. Being in the prison has become the main reason for "Mahran" to depict this circumstance. While the ST author wants his readers to put their selves in Mahra's shoe and feel what he is going through, TT1 successfully renders the ST structure into an affirmative sentence and opting for the dynamic equivalence (Alteration). However, TT2 unsuccessfully rendered it into an interrogative sentence. Thus TT1's dynamic equivalence (alteration) is more appropriate than TT1's formal equivalence. This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Alteration	+
TT2	Formal	----------	-

8.2.4. Vocative

The vocative items in this subcategory include expressions of emotional appeals to reveal the propositional content of the source text to the audience. Consider the following example:

Excerpt 14:

<div align="right">"ترى كيف حالك يا شيخ علي الجنيدي يا سيد الاحياء؟"</div>

(Mahfouz, 1961: p21)

"He wondered how Ali al-Junaydi was Ø."

<div align="right">(Gassick & Badawi, 1984: p6)</div>

"I wondered how you are, Sheikh Ali al-Jinaidi, Ø the best of all living?"

<div align="right">(Elyas, 1973: p64)</div>

It is clear that the ST author applied the underlined vocative metadiscourse item, which functions as an emotional appeal, to praise and create a close relationship with the listener "Sheikh Al-Junaydi". ignoring the ST's emotional appeal and opting for the dynamic equivalence (subtraction) by both TTs have introduced inappropriate renditions. The ST author wants his readers to see the intimate and strong relationship between the Sheikh and Mahran, however, both TTs unsuccessfully rendered this relationship by ignored the metadiscourse item "يا". Thus, this metadiscourse item could have been better rendered if they have opted for the literary stylistic device "O". This can be illustrated in the following table:

TT1 & TT2 Renderings	Type of Equivalence	Technique	Appropriateness
TT1	Dynamic	Subtraction	-

| TT2 | Dynamic | Alteration | - |

3.7. General Findings

The below tables show that the translators of this novel "The Thief and The Dogs" have revealed many problematic areas that led to not having appropriate renditions for the categories that are investigated in this study as will be shown below:

No.	ST item	TT1 item	Function of TT1	Type of equivalence	App
1	لأنك	Ø	Causal	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-
2	لكنها	Ø	Adversative	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-
3	و	Ø	Additive	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-
4	ثم	Ø	Temporal	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-

Table 7: Textual Metadiscourse Appropriate and Inappropriate Renditions of TT1

No.	ST item	TT1 item	Function of TT2	Type of equivalence	App
1	لأنك	Because	Causal	Formal	+
2	لكنها	Ø	Adversative	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-
3	و	Yet	Additive	Dynamic (Alteration)	-
4	ثم	And	Temporal	Dynamic (Alteration)	-

Table 8: Textual Metadiscourse Appropriate and Inappropriate Renditions of TT2

The following two table show the interpersonal metadiscourse appropriate and inappropriate renditions of both TT1 and TT2:

No.	ST item	TT1 item	Function of TT1	Type of equivalence	App
1	لا شك	Ø	Certainty	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-
6	لعلكما	Ø	Hedges	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-
7	"الا ينعم مجلسنا الآن بالطمأنينة؟"	"Aren't we enjoying peace and security."	Rhetorical question	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-
8	"ألا ترى إنني نافعة دائماً؟"	"Don't you think I'm always useful."	Rhetorical question	Dynamic (Alteration)	+
9	انها لا تتذكرك	"She doesn't remember you"	Commentary	Dynamic (Alteration)	-
11	قالوا	Said	Attributors	Formal	+
13	هيهات	Ø	Wishing	Formal	+
14	"ما اجمل الايام الماضية!"	"What wonderful days those were!"	Exclamation	Formal	+
16	ولكن ما شكل سناء الان؟	"I wonder how Sana looks now."	Wondering	Dynamic (Alteration)	+
18	يا	Ø	Vocative	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-

Table 9: Interpersonal Metadiscourse Appropriate and Inappropriate Renditions of TT1

No.	ST item	TT1 item	Function of TT2	Type of equivalence	App
1	لا شك	No doubt	Certainty	Formal	+
6	لعلكما	You are	Hedges	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-
7	"الا ينعم مجلسنا الآن بالطمأنينة؟"	"Doesn't one feel secure here, right now?"	Rhetorical question	Dynamic (Alteration)	-
8	"ألا ترى إنني نافعة دائماً؟"	"Don't you see that I'm always useful"	Rhetorical question	Formal	+
9	انها لا تتذكرك،	"doesn't remember you"	Commentary	Formal	+
11	يقول	Said	Attributors	Formal	+
13	هيهات	"That's no way"	Wishing	Formal	+
14	ما اجمل الايام الماضية!	"Those were the days"	Exclamation	Dynamic (Alteration)	-
16	ولكن ما شكل سناء الان؟	"But what does Sana look like now?	Wondering	Formal	-
18	يا	Ø	Vocative	Dynamic(Subtraction)	-

Table 10: Interpersonal Metadiscourse Appropriate and Inappropriate Renditions of TT2

1. Both TTs rendered the categories and sub-categories of metadiscourse items inappropriately as in causal, adversative, additive, temporal, hedges, exclamation, and vocative.
2. TT1 rendered the metadiscourse items causal, temporal, certainty, commentary, attributors, wishing, and wondering inappropriately.
3. TT2 rendered the metadiscourse items adversative, additive, certainty, rhetorical questions, commentary, exclamation, and wondering inappropriately.
4. They were at pain in distinguishing between stylistic devices and propositional meaning of the ST as in attributors.
5. They have subtracted metadiscourse items that are used in the ST as in causal, adversative, additive, temporal, certainty, attributors, and wishing.
6. They have also altered the ST metadiscourse items into the TTs inappropriately as in . However, they have appropriately rendered these alterations as in certainty and rhetorical questions.

7. The percentage results of appropriateness and inappropriateness renditions of both TTs are well presented in the following tables.

Table 11:	Textual Metadiscourse Categories Inappropriate Percentage of TT1			
	Causal	Adversative	Additive	Temporal
	%100	%50	%50	%100
			Average	%75

Table 12:	Textual Metadiscourse Categories Inappropriate Percentage of TT2			
	Causal	**Adversative**	**Additive**	**Temporal**

	%50	%100	%100	%50
			Average	%75

Table 13: Interpersonal Metadiscourse Categories Inappropriate Percentage of TT1

Certain ty	Hedg es	Rhetorical Qs	Comment ary	Attribut ors	Wishi ng	Exclamati on	Wonderi ng	Vocativ e
%100	%100	%50	%50	%50	%100	%50	%0	%100
					Average		%66.6	

Table 14: Interpersonal Metadiscourse Categories Inappropriate Percentage of TT2

Certainty	Hedges	Rhetorical Qs	Commentary	Attributors	Wishing	Exclamation	Wondering	Vocative
%20	%100	%50	%50	%0	%0	%100	%100	%100
					Average		%57.7	

8. It is obvious that the inappropirate percentage of textual metadiscourse items of TT1 is higher than TT2. This means that TT2 was more aware of these items. However, TT2 was more aware in rendering the interpersonal metadiscourse items than TT1.

References

-Nida Eugene, A. (1964). **Towards a Science of Translation.** Pergamon Press: Oxford Press.

-Mahfouz, Naguib. (1961). **The Thief and The Dogs**. Egypt Library.

-Gassick, T. &M.M. Badawi. (1984). **The Thief and The Dogs.**

-Elyas, A. A. (1973). **A Thief in Search of his identity: A Critical Analysis with A Translation of The Novel.** University of Oklahoma.

-Lautamatti, L. (1978). **"Observations on the Development of the Topic in Simplified Discourse".** In: V. Kohonen & N. E. Enkvist (Eds.), Text linguistics, Cognitive Learning, and Language Teaching. Turku, Finland: University of Turku, pp.71-104.

-Leonardi, Vanessa. (2000). **Equivalence in Translation: Between Myth and Reality.** Translation Journal 4(4): 8942.

-Mark, Shuttleworth, and Moira Cowie. (1997). **Dictionary of Translation Studies.** Manchester: M239HH, UK.

-Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. (1995). **Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation.** John Benjamins Publishing.

-Jakobson, Roman (1959). **On Linguistic Aspects of Translation.** On Translation 3:30–39.