

## The Cognitive Stylistic Translator

Ghazala, H. S.

Department of English, College of Social Sciences  
Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah Al-Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia

### Abstract

Translation theory is never dogmatized. It is a dynamic and ever changing process. It is expected to respond positively to new developments in the studies of language and style. Cognitive stylistics is one of the major new developments in the study of style. It is based on viewing and analyzing style as a cognitive process of mind that goes beyond the boundaries of surface meaning to unearth the truth behind it. This process draws heavily on the cultural, social, political, and ideological conceptualization of style and meaning. The cognitive process of translating is claimed here to have been influenced by contemporary cognitive stylistic approaches that view meaning as the product of style as mind. This paper investigates the updated cognitive properties, responsibilities, practices and other characteristics to be assumed by the cognitive stylistic translator in the light of these new cognitive approaches to meaning and style in terms of mind. Accordingly, the cognitive translator is urged to approach the translation of the texts' styles and meaning cognitively to respond creatively to the explorations of cognitive stylistic theory and applications. This will make them uncover buried truths and meanings that cannot be discovered otherwise. Toward the end of the paper, a relativity theory of cognitive stylistic translation is put forward. This theory is flexible enough to respond effectively to all cognitive potentials of meaning and style. Further, it accommodates more than one cognitive version of translation by means of applying two suggested methods of translation to the same text: direct (or style-based); and indirect (non-style-based). This means that more freedom of choice of possible versions of translation is available to translators and readers to pick up.

*Keywords:* cognitive, stylistic, style, translator, translation theory, translation method, style-based translation

**Cite as:** Ghazala, H. S. (2018). The Cognitive Stylistic Translator. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 2 (1). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol2no1.1>

## 1. Introduction

Cognitive stylistic translation is claimed to be a style-based translation. It derives from the contemporary cognitive stylistic studies that view meaning as based on the concept of style as mind. Hence, this cognitive stylistic approach to translation has no relevance to Newmark's cognitive translation which is a translation procedure of pre-translation analysis of the grammar and words of source language (SL) texts (1981, pp. 40-42).

Translation is viewed here as a reflection of the diverse features and functions of the style of the source and target texts from different points of view of the author, the translator, the target text reader and the target language style. Translation is, thus, claimed to be triggered and directed by style.

As to style, it is viewed as a matter of choice made by writers from the major language components of grammar, words and sounds in particular. It is received and perceived by readers in the context of the text and their own socio-cultural, ideological and mental (or cognitive) context. Stylistics is the approach to the analysis of texts that undertakes the substantiation of this concept of style in practical terms.

Several questions about style, translation, and the relationship between the two and the translator demand to be answered in this paper, which also provides a theoretical backcloth for applications which might be done on the topic. Some questions concern the relationship of style to translation; cognitive stylistics and translation; the writer's style and translation; the reader's style and translation; the translator's style and translation; stylistic choices and translation; and stylistic creativity and translation. The paper ends with an enterprise put forward to be applied on the basis on the concept of relativity of meaning in translation, aiming at a freer cognitive stylistic approach in practice by suggesting simultaneous acceptable translations of the same style: direct and indirect.

## 2. The Relevance of Style to Translation: Stylistic Choices and Translation

Oddly enough, and until recently, the topic of style has received but a cursory attention by the majority of good translation books. When a mention is done or implied, it refers to style on passing in a general, ambiguous and conventional way as a reference to a way of expression. For example, Landers, who assigns just over two pages for "style in translation", says: "style, after all, can be defined as a characteristic mode of expression..." (2001, 90). Or a reference is made to some writers' style as, for instance, terse, lofty, baroque, elaborate, poor, complicated, simple, etc. without substantiating what these exactly mean with respect to the different features of language used by those writers. However, some translation theorists, like Newmark, have shown more interest in style, providing few details about it in general terms. He hints very briefly at text styles, and stylistic scales, with an occasional reference to the term throughout the book (1988/1995, p. 13-14). Snell-Hornby has notably shown serious interest in the concept of style, by what she calls "the factor of style" in translation, pointing out the significance of style and translation in translation (1988, pp. 119-22, and 1995, p. 119).

Before this work, and in his paper on 'Stylistic Translation' published in FIT Newsletter, 1995, Ghazala for the first time has provided a detailed practical study of the stylistic problems of

translation (English-Arabic) (see also Ghazala, 2008, 2011, 2012 and 2016). It was not until 2006 that a whole brilliant work on the strong links between style, contemporary cognitive stylistics and translation had appeared in English, by Boase-Beier, with the title *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*, which is quoted frequently in this work.

Translation is viewed as an act of stylistic interpretation based on the consideration of the different types of stylistic features of language and their effects and implications in the source text from a cognitive point of view, which the translator should take into account when he/she translates into the target text. In this sense, the styles, texts and contexts of both source language (SL) and the target language (TL) have to be in focus. Both the source text (ST) author and the target text (TT) reader have to be borne in mind by the translator. In turn, the translator has a share of responsibility of reading carefully to carry what he/she understands from the source text into the target text socio-culturally, ideologically and/or cognitively. How this is done is indicated in a good number of examples throughout this article.

Before we proceed in our argument on whose style is to apply in translation, we may discuss the major contemporary theories that are thought to have an impact on the process and style of translation.

### **3. Contemporary Translation Studies and Cognitive Stylistics: A Cognitive Process of Translation**

Cognitive Stylistics is based on Cognitive Linguistic Theory. All the models, techniques and strategies suggested for carrying out cognitive stylistic analyses of texts, literary texts in particular are cognitive demonstrations of conceptualizing, structuralizing, socializing, culturalizing, ideologizing, politicising or feminising interpretations of texts. This huge literature of contemporary cognitive stylistics has both revolutionized and evolutionized stylistic studies.

A great cognitive turn has been in action in contemporary stylistics. In effect, and as Boase-Beier rightly argues, “There is a cognitive turn in translation studies” (2003 and 2006, p. 71). This shift is described by Crane and Richardson as “the major interdisciplinary initiative” of recent years (1999, p. 23) (in Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 71)

As Boase-Beier (2006, p. 72) argues, cognitive approaches are attractive for they are promising with respect to the provision of insight into the nature and effects of the difference, both in translation and stylistics, as both are developing new cognitive approaches. They view style as a reflection of mind and as a matter of choice in a way other aspects of language are not. These stylistic choices involve cognitive processes that require mind and suggest influence of mind more strongly than those aspects of language use where there is no choice.

Indeed, contemporary cognitive stylistics explores the concept of mind style, or ‘style as mind’ in ways which are highly significant for contemporary translation studies. Boase-Beier (2006, p. 71) points out what she considers as the main issues in cognitive stylistics that are relevant to translation (the last three are mine):

(a) Meaning is more than the words on the page. Although, as Newmark (1988) says, all we have on the page are words, a world of words, we do not understand them in isolation, but in context and combination with each other. One way to explain how meaning is more than words is to consider what words imply, connote, insinuate or emanate of functions, effects, assumptions, inferences or implicatures in the reader's mind. How, then, do we translate these implications, functions and implicatures, and allow for inferences and assumptions?

(b) Reading is a cognitive process. At the same time, it is an integral part of the translator's task. So how do translators read? How do they arrive at an interpretation?

(c) With all the freedom, involvement and mental state experience of reading and reader, how do we ensure when translating that the reader of our translation also experiences a change in mental state? And how do these changes have something in common with those we ourselves have experienced? If the translation fails to capture such cognitive mental state, will the target text have less effect on a reader's mind?

(d) What does cognitive stylistics have to say about the differences between literary and non-literary texts? Does literary writing draw on different formal characteristics, or does it provide a different reading experience from non-literary writing? If so, what features guarantee it a different reading experience? If literature demands more effort and gives greater returns, how should the translation of literature ensure that this also applies to the target text?

(e) If reading a text for translation means inferring an author, assuming a meaning, finding something we can act upon, can we accept that we are merely acting as though we knew what the author meant? Can we strike a balance between a sense of our ultimate ignorance with the need to act?

(f) Meaning is not encoded in the text, so it cannot be decoded, but constructed in terms of the cognitive context of the reader. This context contains shared, communal elements as much as individual elements. The question here is how to construct meaning cognitively.

(g) The relationship between the constructed meaning and the outside world is not measurable in terms of true and false in the light of information collected from texts, especially literary texts, against the world.

(h) These cognitive insights into style in translation suggest that the process of reading a source text does not necessarily involve analysing all minute details of style and content.

(i) Cognitive stylistics looks at texts as discourses composed of acts of communication. How can we apply this to translation as an act of cognitive stylistic interpretation?

(j) Viewing translation as a cognitive stylistic act of interpretation, how will it be looked at from the target reader's viewpoint?

(k) In the light of our understanding of cognitive approaches to style as processes of searching for the truth, how can a cognitive stylistic approach to translation unearth the realities of the text's meanings?

Contemporary cognitive translation corpus might change the mind in more than one way by introducing us to thoughts and feelings we have not experienced before. Studies of the style of

translated texts view it as the result of choice driven by cognitive, mental state (see Dahlgren, 2005). These translations contain not only the author's, but also the translator's choices (Malmkjær, 2004. Both are in Boase-Beier, 2006). One way of approaching these different choices is to compare corpora of texts, source text and translation, as Baker suggests (2000). Another way suggested by Boase-Beier is to see the translator as assuming a particular translating persona, based on an interaction of his/her own view, or cognitive state, with that of an inferred author. She proposes two possible translations for the same poem by Morgenstern, 'Two Donkeys' from German into English, which represent two different but possible views held by two different translators of the voice of the informed author. Her suggestion is based on her understanding of style as a representation of a cognitive state when the text is not about a true state of affairs, i.e. fictional (Boase-Beier, 2006, Chapter Five).

Adopting a cognitive view, some translation theorists have distinguished two cognitive types of features of texts: 'universal' and 'cultural' (or particular. See below) (see Semino, 1997; Gutt, 2000, 2005; Kiparsky, 1987; Boase-Beier, 2004, 2006). Universal features encompass a general knowledge of the world and many aspects of style and literariness of language, including ambiguity and metaphor. They are taken here in the sense that they are universal styles of all live languages, not in terms of their cultural connotations. These universals are claimed by cognitivists to be easier to translate than their cultural counterparts. However, only some of them, particularly those relating to common knowledge and many non-literary texts, can be easier to translate, but certainly not metaphor and ambiguity, which are ingrained with cultural connotations.

A cognitive stylistic translation suggests that readers view style as a representation and reflection of mind, so they attempt to comprehend that mind in reading in order to recreate it in translation. What is beyond the source text, how translators arrive to it, and how they construct it in translation would depend highly on the mind. Style has long been seen as a manifestation of mental processes, characteristics or states, which explains what is meant by the concept of style as choice. The major difference between a traditional and modern view of style as mind is that it used to mean the author's mind in the past, whereas now it means both the reader's mind and the author's mind, but priority is given to the reader's mind. Thus, the source text, especially a literary text, is approached by the reader as expressing attitudes, feelings, emotions, ideologies and states of mind. So does the translator. The prerequisite for that is we have to arrive at a certain interpretation, for which there should be reasonable evidence from inside as well as outside the source text.

I would argue that a cognitive stylistic approach to translation stresses the dependability and profundity of translation process perhaps in an unprecedented way. A cognitive process of translation is the same as the cognitive process of stylistic analysis. It is a mental process that involves the interpretation of the text's linguistic features of all types in two contexts of theirs: (i) textual context, and (ii) socio-cultural, attitudinal, ideological and perhaps political context. This is done with the background realization that the text is a communicative act which involves characters/persons, events, processes of different types, actions, actors, behaviour, behaviors, goals, phenomena, sensors, verbiage, identified, identifier, etc. These are the components of the influential cognitive stylistic model of analysis of TRANSIVITY. A good translation into Arabic should keep these transitivity roles in accordance with the TL grammar and word order.

Thus, a cognitive stylistic translation based on cognitive, mental and conceptualized processing of structural elements of the source text can be enlightening in translation, though not arbitrarily. A cognitive processing like this is administered by the translator as a reader before anything else, with an implied author behind the scene. The term ‘implied author’ is used here not in the sense of disregarding the author, but rather as a recognition of his/her inevitable presence in the reader’s mind, however indirectly. This opens the way for the next three points about the writer’s, reader’s and translator’s styles and translation respectively.

#### **4. The Writer’s Style and Translation**

It goes without saying that authors have their own intentions and stylistic choices. Yet, these intentions and choices are made in the author’s mental, social, cultural and ideological environment, which might not apply to readers/translators who may have a completely different environment. Therefore, the authorial intention and style is author-specific not reader/translator-specific. Although the author’s stylistic choices are substantiated in his/her text, his/her intentions are not, and are only assumed by readers/translators. Common examples of uncertain intentions are styles of ambiguity, metaphorical expressions, connotations, irony, insinuations, cultural expressions, political implications and ideological and attitudinal words and phrases. Perhaps the most salient of all are the effects and functions of these and other stylistic choices and features. Therefore, the reader/translator has a contribution to the meaning and interpretation of texts. Much space has then been granted to him/her in contemporary stylistic and translation studies.

#### **5 The Reader’s Style and Translation**

Readers have their rights to read and interpret the text in their own terms of mind, culture, social and religious conventions, ideology, personal experience and background common knowledge of the world. They have the freedom to understand and construct the writer’s stylistic choices in that large context of theirs, keeping an eye on the author’s choices and assumed intentions, however indirectly. Perhaps a better way to read foreign texts is to read them in terms of the reader’s cultural and ideological environment and background. Like the author, the reader has a mind, a different mind from that of the author and, thus, may approach the latter’s stylistic choices of language structures in different ways with different cognitive perspective and attitude.

This approach would make reading more realistic, truthful and interesting indeed. Reading is taking place here from the reader’s point of view, and how he/she is acting and reacting to the complex of cultures represented in the text. As Fowler argues, style is not just a question of different ways of saying or expressing the same thing (in Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 53). Stylistic choices “reflect a speaker’s (subjective) choice of a given conceptualization”, and are a reflection of different content rather than different expression (see also Leech and Short, 1981). Because stylistic choice is optional to speakers, or writers, it is telling about the person who uses this particular choice. A choice is made from those structures that mind universally makes available for language users. Such a cognitive view of style as mind has left the door wide open for different readings and different interpretations of the speaker’s choices – or concepts – by different readers in different cultural and ideological settings.

As to the translator, he/she is after all a reader, a careful and informed reader, who also has his/her own style and stylistic choices, mind, socio-cultural background, ideology, experience and knowledge of the world. More recently, Simeoni talks of “the social environment of translation” (2007). Most writers of Pierre and Kar’s Collection of Articles (2007) view translation as a social, political, cultural and ethical act, which leaves the original other than what it was. That is, they transform it. Obviously, we do not expect the translator/reader to neutralize himself/herself at reading and then translating a text. He/she reads the source text with the aim of constructing what he/she perceives as the text’s meaning - rather than reconstruct the author’s meaning - to construct it this time in the target text.

The translator/reader has his/her personal style of reading which preferably draws on cognitive stylistic principles and models in the processing of the source text. However, to Venuti (1995), translation is no longer a “domestication” in the sense of assimilating the original text to the norms, values and expectations of the target culture. Rather, translation is a “foreignization”, maintaining a certain distance from such norms, values and expectations, (see also Venuti, 1992, 1998a, 2000, in Pierre and Kar (eds.), 2007, p. 3. See also Boase-Beier, 2006, 68). Traditionally, within translation studies, the process of translation has been described in terms of gain and loss, and betrayal, thus, minimizing translation to a mere reproduction, or reflection of an effect, an intention, or a message. Now the process of translation itself has been receiving the greater amount of focus in the cognitive studies of translation. It is a process of interaction in a new context, a new reading, a new writing from a cognitive/mental perspective of style. To many contemporary translation theorists, translation is a form of writing (see Boase-Beier, 2006). This might imply, among other things, that the translator is a writer.

### **6. The Translator’s Style and Translation: Translator as Writer**

“We write what we read” (Chaudhuri, 2007) is a corollary of the reader-response theory. This theory is derived from the ‘Reception Theory’, and ‘Reader Response Criticism’ which focus on the TEXT-READER relationship, and the reader’s activities in the interpretation of texts. The reader has accordingly been granted an imperial position in the interpretation of texts. His responses to the language of the text determine to a great extent its interpretation and meanings, irrespective of the writer’s intentions. Again, the writer has been dethroned to be succeeded by the reader as the master of the process of reading and interpretation (see especially Iser, 1971f, 1974; Boase-Beier, 2006). Today the reader is thought of as activating a textual process that the author has initiated. The author is a reader before he/she is a writer, having read earlier texts. Pronouncing the ‘death of the author’, Barthes (1977), views writing as a liberation of language in a free transpersonal space. Within this space, the text changes its contours as it passes from writer to reader. The dissemination of the text is an endless series of trans-lationese, carrying across-transpositions in more senses than one: an overall change of context, but also a reconstitution of elements. Thus, to Barthes and his followers, the text a reader reads is not the text that the writer wrote (Chaudhuri, 2007, in Pierre & Kar, 2007, 87).

The author’s intentions are more assumed than reassured today, and the reader has the greater attention as the constructor of the text’s meaning and interpretation. As argued above, the translator is after all a reader who has his/her own style and stylistic choices in the process of constructing the target text. In every translation, there is always a ‘translator’s voice’. There have

been studies which examined the elements of the translator's style in the target text, described by Baker (2000) as some kind of thumb-print expressed in a variety of linguistic and non-linguistic features. The presence of the translator's personal style in the target text is ascribed to the translator's preservation of the stylistic nuances of the style of the source text.

Malmkjær uses the term "translational stylistics" to describe those studies concerned with the recreation of the translator's choices made in the translated text, the target text (2004). Translational stylistics is a special type of stylistics that views the target text in its relation to the source text. However, stylistic differences between, say, two translations of the same text are evidence for different interpretations on the part of the two translators of the cognitive state incorporated in the text.

So far, the focus has been on the translator's style and stylistic choices in the target text. Before that, and as a preliminary to this stage, the translator makes his/her choices from those made by the writer of the source text. Certainly the choices of the two are more likely not identical. Boase-Beier makes the point that a translated text is seen by translators to be co-authored (my emphasis) due to the translator's world knowledge and view being influenced by that of the source text (2003). The new proposition of 'co-authoring' in translation studies is perhaps borrowed from recent literary studies which view the reader as a co-author of the text. By analogy, the same applies to the translator. Both the translator and the author's voices co-exist in the translated text. Varela suggests a kind of interaction taking place between the translator's voice and other voices already present in the source text (2004. See Boase-Beier, 2006). Among the translation theorists who have attended to the stylistics of the translated text is Venuti, who has pointed to an interaction between the visible presence of the translator in the target text and the presence of the author of the source text (2000). If the target text is co-authored, the translator's voice will be yet another voice to be added to those voices in the source text, what Varela assimilates to a kind of 'heteroglossia' in the translated text more than the source text (Boase-Beier, 2006).

The other point of interest in this connection is the factors that influence the translator's stylistic choices and state of mind. Like any reader, the translator has his/her own style, choices, likes, dislikes, social, cultural, religious, mental, ideological, political and attitudinal background, personal experience and knowledge and view of the world. These factors can also be exhibited by the author through his/her text. When a kind of clash between, say, the translator's cultural, religious or ideological attitudes and those of the writer through the source text, a great deal of influence may occur, which will be reflected in the target text. Of course, it is not a straightforward process to assess these influences on the part of the translator. Baker declares that it is not easy to determine the influencing factors, such as the influence of the source language, and the cultural and ideological attitudes of the translator (2000). Boase-Beier also finds it difficult to elaborate these influences, and that any elaboration about them would be speculative in nature (2003a).

Yet, I claim that there are two factors which might be used as tester guidelines to partly trace these influencing factors. The first is the translator's (frequent) use of footnotes, endnotes, or glossaries to illustrate the points (cultural, religious, ideological or even political) that reflect his/her objection to them for some reason. Another way is, if possible, to compare the source text with the target text to see what the translator has left out, modified, cut short, euphemized, or

paraphrased. That said, it must be admitted that the second procedure is not available to readers, only to critics, researchers and translation revisers. Schleiermacher's view is that translation involves one direction movement, either of the reader towards the writer, or of the writer towards the reader (in Schulte and Biguenet, 1992, p. 42).

More recently, in the light of reader-response theory, relevance theory and text worlds theory (see Gavins, 2000, 2005 and 2007; Black, 2006 and others), the translator's approach to the processing of the source text in terms of cognitive stylistics has led some writers on translation, like Mackenzie, Sperber and Wilson and others, to view the translator as a WRITER. According to them, the translator is the writer of the translation who is initially responsible for the style of the translated text to which readers of the translation respond and from which he/she creates meaning. Thus, the translator has the role of a writer who instigates discovery in the reader (Mackenzie, 2002. See also Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 51). For Sperber and Wilson and other proponents of text worlds theories, the text, apart from imposing some structure on the reader's experience, has no restrictions on the meanings which are possible for the reader (hence, the translator) to construct (1995). The burden in those theories is on the reader (or translator) to construct meaning under the guidance of the text (see also Iser, 1979). Besides that, the author can be responsible only for certain guidance offered to readers/translators; the rest is the latter's responsibility in the process of reading and constructing meaning in the target text. This point of the translator's responsibilities is assigned a separate section below.

Now, can a translator be called a writer or a creator? Can he/she be a writer or a creator in the same way as the source text's writer and creator? In reply, I would say, yes, the translator is a writer and a creator, but a writer and creator of translation, not in the same way as the original writer and creator of the source text. The translator is the writer and creator of the translation in two senses: first, without a translator, a target text does not exist; secondly, the translator is the constructor of the translated text out of the source text. He/she is not merely reproducing, reconstructing, or recreating the author's meaning of the original into the target text; he/she is the constructor of the meaning of the source text in terms of the cognitive stylistic approach outlined earlier. He/she reads and understands the original on its and its author's terms and conditions, to interpret it, or construct it on his/her terms and conditions of background knowledge, culture, ideology, experience, conventions, etc.

What I may term the translation writer is a creator of a new translated text in the target language, which means a new addition to the corpus of the target knowledge. A reconstructing, reproducing and recreating translator is neither a writer nor a creator; he/she is just a translator in the traditional sense of the job of translators, as 'copyists' or 'mimics' of the meaning of the source text into the target text as closely as possible. Well, this job is not disgraceful and is by no means easy or straightforward, and has to be one of the options available to the translator in certain situations. Yet it is not the kind of job that gives the translator due respect. We all know that some names have become figures in the field of writing and translation just because they have been good translators of famous works. Their reputation is on par with that of the authors of the source texts.

The promotion of the translator of today to a translation writer should not confuse things. The translator as a writer and creator of translation is different from the writer of the source text.

The source text writer is the original creator of the work, whatever interpretation or meaning we might conclude from that work. The translator, on the other hand, is a writer and creator of a translated text in the target language that is not entirely a creation of his/her own, but a creation that draws heavily on somebody else's original creation in the source text. This begs the question: what are the responsibilities of the translator toward the SL text, its writer, the TL readership, the SL and TL styles, etc. involved in the cognitive process of translating? This is the point in order now.

### **7. The Translator's Responsibilities**

The translator's responsibility is not to intended here in the sense of reliability (meeting the user's needs; translating the texts the user needs translated, in the way the user wants them translated, by the user's deadline, or professionalism (professional pride, professional integrity, professional self-esteem, reliability, involvement in the profession and ethics of the profession (see Robinson, 1997/2007, p. 24)). The translator's reliability, professionalism, efficiency, experience and competence are postulated when the term is used here. The responsibilities intended are the duties the translator feels in relation to the author of the source text, the source text style and meaning, the target text style and meaning, and the target readership.

The translator's responsibilities toward the source text author, to start with, are several. The translator has always to have in the back of his/her neck that the text he/she translates has an author, without who it would not have come into life. Dryden speaks of the need to pay attention not only to the spirit of language, but also of the original author (in Robinson, 2002, p. 233). Thus, the spirit of the author is present in his/her text, and should not be proclaimed dead, as Barthes did (1977). Perhaps the author's intentions are not accessible to the translator, but they can be assumed by him/her. In addition, the translator is supposed to check the historical, sociocultural, ideological and perhaps religious surroundings of the author and his/her time in history. This is sometimes crucial to the understanding and interpretation of some texts, especially classics. Further, the author's style and stylistic choices have to be attended to carefully by the translator for their usefulness in the stylistic analysis and interpretation of the source text. As to the author's biography, I suppose it is optional for the translator to acquaint himself/herself with it.

The source text has equally some conditions to be considered by the translator. It is important that the type and subtypes of text be attended to by the translator for, say, a novel may not be approached like a poem in terms of style, layout, analytic strategies, and conventions of reading. The translator has a major responsibility to make a close reading of the source text and detailed analysis of its style from a cognitive stylistic perspective as demonstrated above. The stylistic choices of the writer, which are found to be significant by the translator, have to be understood in the textual as well as cognitive context of the text. Perhaps putting the text into the context of similar texts, or intertextuality, might be required for specific types of text (see also Snell-Hornby, 1988/1995; Bose-Beier, 2006 and others).

Also, the translator has to take into account whether a text is literary or non-literary for the major differences in style between the two types, a distinction that has its repercussions on the analysis and interpretation of that text. The styles of the language of the text (formal, colloquial,

etc.) have to receive a good deal of attention by the translator for their important impact on the meaning and, hence, the translation of the text.

For the part of the target text, the translator's responsibilities are numerous. The target text's norms and rules of the structures of different types and different styles have to be given priority by the translator over those of the source text (unless foregrounded). The grammatical structures of sentences, clauses, sentence types and word order are chief among the styles to be observed by the translator in the grammar of the target language text. Similarly, lexical structures of word combinations (i.e. collocations, associations and frames), special and fixed phrases (like idioms, proverbs, stylistic formulas, stereotypes, clichés, compounds, etc.), rhetorical figures (especially metaphors), semantic rules of selection restrictions, etc. Sound patterns and prosodic features are also to be attended to in the target text which might have different phonological patterns and features. The same applies to language styles (or tones) of formality and simplicity/complexity of language grammatical and lexical structures in particular. These should also be target-language oriented, as its norms of written and spoken discourse might not be identical with those of the source text.

More responsibilities are laid on the translator's burden with respect to the Target Text Readership. MacKenzie rightly argues that the translator, both as a reader and a communicator, attempts in the target text to make stylistic choices that presumably create effects on the target-text readers, which would reflect the potential effects of the source text on its readership (2002). This view has been voiced by several translation theorists like Newmark, who has suggested his two methods of translation, 'semantic translation' and 'communicative translation', the second of which is based on producing the same effect on the target readership as that produced by the source text on its readers (what can be termed as 'affective translation') (1981, 1988/1995). The important point for the translator is to produce an effect in as much amount as the target text language may allow.

Another critical responsibility of the translator's is to attend to the target reader's cultural, religious and perhaps ideological and political milieu. This becomes urgent, particularly when the source expression or meaning could be insulting (e.g. swear, taboo and blasphemous words and expressions).

Furthermore, the translator is responsible for transforming the source text meaning into the target text in the style, which is most convenient to the target language conventions. It follows from this that he/she has to be familiar with the target language style regarding intricacies and complexities of grammar, words and sounds in particular. Also, the translator is responsible for correcting the flagrant mistakes that might occur in the source text, such as dates, proper names of persons, cities, countries, titles of books, titles of important people, figures and numbers, and the like (see also Newmark, 1988: Chapter 17, especially pp. 204-5).

More so, the translator has to distinguish the stylistic differences between the two languages, the source and the target, to be able to draw comparisons between the two styles when necessary. He/she then opts for the more appropriate style for the target readers, which might be

generally target-language biased, unless the style of the source text is unavailable in the target-text style, or is meant on purpose to be deviant for its stylistic significance.

Above all, the translator has unpronounced moral responsibilities toward the target readers who trust him/her as trustworthy, credible, honest, informed, experienced, transparent, competent, conscientious and unpretentious. The translator should not wipe clear of “ethical slates”, to use Pym’s term. He rightly argues that, “to the extent that translators are creative, they are also responsible and thus subject to moral judgement” (in Beylard-Ozeroff, 1998, p. 124). Indeed, the translator is not and should not be a pretender. He/she is doing a real, hard and noble job. He/she is not acting or pretending to be somebody else when translating in such a really daunting cognitive way of processing and translating the style of the source text.

Whatever Robinson may mean by claiming that translators and interpreters “have something of the actor in them, the mimic, the impersonator...” (2007, pp. 22-23), morally speaking, I find it not fair to look at them as actors and impersonators. They should not pretend to be somebody else or do a job they do not believe in or feel serious about. Had the translators been actors and pretenders, the readers of both texts, source and target, would not have believed them, for pretense is deception. In effect, things will be disastrous for the whole discipline as a field of study and a profession.

To me, the translator is no more an actor and a pretender than, say, a teacher might be, who is a teacher at school or university, a father and a husband at home, a political party member, a Manchester United football fan, a social club member and/or a taxi driver. The translator is a specialist who works among people, with people and for people. He/she works hard and unearths the truth at translating the meanings of texts and their styles cognitively into the target language, taking into account all the considerations suggested above.

The next issue to consider is the relation of style to creativity in translation from a cognitive point of view.

### **8. Stylistics as the Source of Creativity in Translation: A Cognitive Perspective**

Among the common, naïve claims to creativity in translation is that any translator, as Pym declares ironically, “can put two texts side by side, observe the differences, and call the result creativity” (in Beylard-Ozeroff et al., 1998). Creativity is usually postulated, but it might be useful to substantiate one or two points about it. The term is not taken here to mean ‘creation’ in the sense of ‘creating something out of nothing’; nor to mean ‘re-creation’ in the sense of reproduction of the source text’s implied meaning in the target language. Pym's term, “translative creativity” is intended to mean creating a new translated text that is constructed by the translator in stylistic cognitive terms set forth above (in Beylard-Ozeroff et al., 1998). Describing what is governed by rules and what is creative in the translator’s work, Newmark (1995 and 1998) argues that translation is continuously hovering between rule (or cognitive science) and intuition. It is a balancing act, a juggling twice with five changing factors: languages, cultures, traditions, readerships, and settings; and five universal factors that keep it steady: reality, logic, morality, aesthetics and pure language.

The corpus on creativity is huge and, for the purposes of this paper (which is not about creativity), a definition or two can be cited here. Mednick (1962) defines it as the ability to form new combinations, whereas Gentzels and Jackson (1962) define it as the ability to join commonly independent and different elements. As a process, Taylor (1956) and May (1959) describe it as that which gives a new product, and brings something new into existence. To Parnes (1972), it is a behaviour which produces something unique and valuable (all in Gran, 1998).

Looking at translation as a sociolinguistic activity concerned with the uses of language and the values associated with such uses, Nida sees creativity as any sociolinguistic feature of language. It revolts against traditional renderings of texts of different types, including religious, legal and classic texts (e.g. Greek drama) (1998). He considers changes of style, grammar, cultural expressions, compensations for losses and adjustments of any kind to the original to conform to the socio-cultural values and connotations of the translator's time. Nida is, in principle, against translation as imitation. He argues of the supremacy of dynamic functional translation, a translation that changes constantly with the changes of time, societies, cultures and connotations. It is with this dynamic change that creativity lies. However, Nida (1998) points out some sociolinguistic constraints which are factors that influence the style of translating a text creatively: the register of language that is appropriate for the intended audience; the expectations of the intended audience as to the kind of translation that should be made; distinctive sociolinguistic features of the source text; and the medium in which the translated text is to be used.

Gran (1998), on the other hand, suggests creative strategies based on the development of cognitive linguistics during the acquisition of translation/interpretation skills. He points out five cognitive linguistic-based creative strategies for training translators and interpreters: (i) comprehension and analysis of the source text (i.e. grasping the functional components of the source discourse); (ii) abstracting and compressing the incoming discourse (i.e. the translator's cognitive/mental and rigorous ability to subdivide the source discourse into concepts, a process similar to verbalization); (iii) reproduction of the discourse in the target language; (iv) didactic implications (i.e. creative reformulation techniques including paraphrasing, semantic abstraction, shared knowledge and elaboration of personal strategies of maintaining textual cohesion); and (v) acceleration and partial automation of the interpreting process (based mainly on implicit, internalized memory; implicit competence and explicit knowledge (see Paradis, 1994; Feo, 1993; Viaggio (1992b). In Gran, 1998).

Like Nida, Newmark views creativity as opposed to imitation, as "creativity in translation starts where imitation stops" (1993, p. 40). He also argues that the wider the choices, the more creativity is required. On the other hand, dynamic equivalence which roots up the sub-text, the hidden agenda, or 're-creation', is pre-eminently target-text oriented and more creative than formal, or literal equivalence (1988/95, p. 76). Newmark views creative translation as a matter of a play of words and a 'peculiar' stylistic/linguistic combination of lexical and grammatical choices and structures. He cites the following examples (taken from Patrick Creagh's translation of Claudio Magris' *Danubio* into English (see Newmark, 1988):

Non-creative  
- 'a true passion'

Creative  
'a downright passion'

-‘becoming a rhetoric, even though tortured’	‘turning into rhetoric, however lacerated that rhetoric might be’
-‘a mine of hatred’	‘a time-bomb of hatred’
-‘of snow’	‘snow fresh’
-‘absolute night’	‘night in its most absolute sense’
-‘the prose of the world’	‘the humdrum world’

Newmark lists what he describes as the most obvious occasions for the need for creativity, declaring that the list is not exhaustive, but useful (p. 40):

- (a) Cultural words that are specific to one community: objects or activities with connotations (‘koa’ for furniture).
- (b) Transcultural words with similar referents and different connotations in the target language (e.g. staples like bread, rice, tea, sugar, drink, etc.)
- (c) Concept words with different emphases in different communities (obedience, liberation, freedom fighters, terrorism, liberalism, democracy, etc.).
- (d) Peculiar syntactic structures.
- (e) Cultural metaphors, idioms, proverbs, puns and neologisms.
- (f) Significant phonaesthetic effects (e.g. bauble, pullulate).
- (g) Words of quality with no one-to-one equivalent in the target language.
- (h) Words as images and prosodic features (e.g. in poetry, stories, novels and sagas).

We may conclude from this account of creativity in translation that, in principle, creativity is a major issue in translation studies and practice. The extent of its frequency depends mainly on the type of text, register, purposes of the translation and the demands and type of the intended audience of the target text. In abstract, legal technical and the majority of non-literary texts (advertising is an exception), creativity is not a big issue and is not sought by target readers. This does not mean that the translation of these texts cannot be creative, but its frequency is rather low. However, in literary texts in particular and creative writings in general, creativity is the core of translation. A non-creative translation of literature is thought to be dim and poor, and might not be recognized as a good translation. However, the concept of creativity may be approached differently in cognitive stylistic translation.

In cognitive stylistic translation, meaning is conceptualized and ‘constructed’, rather than reproduced or recreated in the translated text. In this sense, meaning is ‘created’ from the stylistic choices made in the source text with the translator’s target cultural, social and ideological considerations of the stylistic choices to be made in the translated text. These reflect, or more specifically ‘create’, the stylistic functions and effects of the original in the target context. Thus, the whole cognitive stylistic translation is ‘creative’ in principle. The construction of stylistic effects and implications of the source text’s stylistic choices in the target language is a creative process from start to end. It is mainly the construction or creation of the interpretation of these choices in the target text, through target-oriented stylistic structures and effects.

Probably close to the cognitive stylistic approach to creativity in translation argued for here are the following concepts: Dryden's reference to style as the 'genius' of the text (1680, in Schulte and Biguenet, 1992), Pope's 'spirit' and 'fire' of the text (in Levevere, 1992), Nida's dynamic functional equivalence (1964 and 1998, and Nida and Taber, 1969), Fillmore's frames, scenes and deverbilization (1985), Newmark's recreation of subtext (1988/1995 and 1993), Gran's cognitive interpretive process of abstracting the text's implicit concepts (1998), Maalej's 'Cognitive Translation Hypothesis' based on Johnson's cognitive metaphor framework (2008) and Gorgis' 'Diachrony Hypothesis', one of the principal tenets of the Cognitive Theory of Metaphor (2008).

The view held in this paper is that all aspects of creativity in translation, whether particular or universal, are stylistic, based on cognitive stylistic theory of meaning and interpretation. A long time ago, Jakobson, the godfather of Cognitive Stylistics, argued that the translation of poetry in particular is not possible (1960). However, 'creative transposition' is possible thanks to the Universality of "cognitive experience" of certain universal properties of poetry of sound features and effects, stylistic figures of metaphor, stylistic figures of metaphor and metonymy, iconicity and ambiguity in particular (see also McCully, 1998; Goldsworthy, 1998); van Peer, 1993; Miner, 1990, and others). These have the nature of universal stylistic principles (Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 14); 'semantic primitives' (simple and core words) (Goddard and Wierzbica, 1994); and semantic features, described by Catford as 'common features of situation substance' (1965, p. 50) ((see also Ghazala, 2011, 2013 and 2016 for further argument).

However, I would argue that creativity in cognitive stylistic translation includes not only universal but also particular features of style. It is a creativity of concepts in the context of the cognitive aspects of style outlined above in this paper. Stylistic choices of the source text are all contextualized and conceptualized into the stylistic choices of the target text. Hence, in cognitive stylistic translation, creativity does matter and is postulated by cognitive translators in every single construction and conceptualization they suggest in the target text. Thus, what may be termed 'cognitive creativity' is potentially implied in the effects and functions of the stylistic choices of the source text and how they are constructed, or created, by the translator in the target text's terms and culture. This applies not only to stylistic universality but also to cultural relativity as stressed by Venuti (1995, p. 20). Relativity of translation is a major issue that needs attending to in the following sub-unit, although from a new cognitive translational perspective.

#### 8. Relativity of Translation: Toward a Freer Cognitive Stylistic Translational Practice: Direct and Indirect Translation

In contemporary stylistic approaches to the analysis and translation of texts, it might be more accurate to think of meaning as the result of the cognitive interpretive process of their styles. It is not assumed that all readers/translators will come to share the same view of all aspects of a text's meaning (see also Weber, 1996). However, a general consensus is likely, but not compulsory.

The language-thought link is related in origin to Sapir (1949) and Whorf (1956) and their hypothesis. Whorf's Hypothesis has come to be known as Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis. It is concerned with classifying the details of particular languages. It partly consists of (i) Linguistic Determinism;

and (ii) Linguistic Relativity. According to linguistic determinism, language determines thought. However, linguistic relativity states that language encodes different distinctions (see Jakobson, 1960; Crystal, 1987; Malmkjær, 2005; and Boase-Beier, 2006, and Munday (2016) for further details). Sapir and Whorf maintain that each language involves two interplaying types of aspects: the particular, cultural-specific aspects as a unique way of viewing the world, and the universal aspects which languages may share.

Some translation theorists conclude that the particular, cultural specific relative aspect of language is untranslatable (see Hyde, 1993). However, many of them, including Hyde, Lecercle (1990) and Venuti (1998), do not deny that different languages embody different kinds of thinking, which is not a barrier to translation if pragmatic and contextual factors are taken into account. Ethnocentricity of both relativity and determinism is rejected for they are not completely opposed. It is a fact, as Schopenhauer argues, that one thinks in a different way in every language, for one adopts the particular mindset of that language (in Schulte and Biguenet, 1992; Robinson, 2002).

Further, even in the same language we may think differently through language, a claim that might be made clearer by experiencing writing the same thing, a letter - not to say a chapter in a book - twice on separate occasions. Most likely, there will be stylistic differences between the two versions, but perhaps not major differences. This is stressed by Ervin (1964), who suggests that even bilingual speakers demonstrate different personalities when using each of their languages. The way one fits one's thoughts into available linguistic forms means that, by changing linguistic form, one's thoughts might change (Slobin, 1987. See Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 23).

It seems that these views are good for translation as a middle ground between too great a relativity (or particularity) and an overemphasized determinism (or universality). Proponents of both parties tend to see translation, especially of literary texts, as a way of both recognizing the cultural boundedness of language and of being free from it. Therefore, some translation theorists see the language of translated texts as a separate language that is different from untranslated texts, what Frawley describes as a 'third code' (1984). Duff describes it as a "Third Language" (1981), whereas Bayely describes it as a "new" language (1992). Slobin suggests the term 'thinking for translation' for it (i.e. translation) has a special language of its own (1987). Venuti has suggested the term an 'independent form of writing' for the translated text (2000). Hamburger (1994), on the other hand, has developed a style of translation that has some source text terms as a kind of flavour, an additive to the target text "to come to terms with the otherness of language" by way of enriching one's own language through the act of translation, and to move the translation toward the original source language, as Benjamin and Pannwitz suggest (in Schulte and Biguenet, 1992, p. 8).

That said, in view of the cognitive approaches to translation, the notion of translation as a 'third code' may not be quite so practical. It might push translators toward artificiality and overuse of source-text biased words and expressions. More importantly, the translated text would be looked at as inferior to the source text. A third serious reason is that a translation that is neither source-language nor target-language biased runs the danger of being a non-identity and, hence, anonymous, and non-recognized language. After all, a cognitive stylistic translation is a target-text style-orientation, and has no concern with a third code translation. The cognitive, context-based concept of style and stylistic choices are not really enthusiastic about polarity between relativity

and determinism of language and thought. Cognitively, all aspects and choices of style of the source text, whether relative or deterministic, particular or universal, are translatable in terms of the cognitive stylistic approach to translation which constructs meaning in target text environment argued for earlier.

I extend the concept of relativity of translation to encapsulate the relative nature of the meaning transported into the target text, as opposed to one absolute, perfect and invariable meaning of the source text. In cognitive studies, and as pointed out above, meaning is constructed mainly on the basis of the conceptualization of the stylistic choices of the source text and their effects. My cognitive enterprise draws profoundly on the views of some translation theorists like Hyde, Lecercle, Venuti, Boase-Beier and others who accept that different languages embody different kinds of thinking (see above). This is not a barrier to translation if pragmatic and contextual factors are taken into account (which is what cognitive approaches to language and translation do). More so, one thinks in a different way in every language, for one adopts the particular mindset of that language. This ‘think-in-a-different-way’ proposition is what I exactly promote here through the adoption of Nord’s (1997), Gutt’s (2000) and Boase-Beier’s (2004a, 2004b and 2006) two types of translation, Direct Translation and Indirect Translation.

### **9. Relative Methods of Cognitive Translation: Direct and Indirect Translations**

Like direct quotation, DIRECT TRANSLATION attempts to preserve not just what the source text said, but also how it said it (Gutt, 2000). He argues that the stylistic characteristics of texts are linguistic features which are not universal. Further, their formal qualities are not as important as what they stand for as clues that guide readers to the interpretation intended by discourse. He calls them “communication clues”, which are preserved in direct translation appropriate for literary translation, where faithfulness is both for content as much as style. He suggests that direct translation focuses on recreating the relationship between features of style as ‘communicative clues’ and the meanings to which these clues point. This is clearly a cognitive stylistic translation practice. In this sense, direct translation is an interpretive activity which retains what features of style might mean at the overall context of the text, not only their formal shape. Therefore, Gutt declares that direct translation is more difficult for the reader to process, yet it is rewarding for it provides more cognitive and emotional effects (ibid.).

INDIRECT TRANSLATION, on the other hand, is to Gutt an interlingual interpretive use, that only interpretively, and not actually, resembles the source text (thus, indirect translation is not to be confused with Landers’ (2001) and Toury’s (1995) indirect translation, which refers to a translation from another translation (such as the translation of The Holy Koran into French from an English translation of it, not directly from the Arabic original)). His distinction between the two types of translation is based on the degree and manner of resemblance. To Boase-Beier, direct translation is specifically concerned with the style of the source text. She takes it to mean that “stylistic features demand engagement with the text” (2006, p. 46). On the other hand, Nord’s distinction between the two types of translation is based on function. Her views direct translation as documentary translation, which is source-text oriented, aiming at showing it more clearly; whereas indirect translation is instrumental translation, which establishes a functional communication between the source-text author and the target-text reader (1997). However, both Nord and Gutt suggest that some translations aim at giving readers a clearer picture of what is

happening in the source text than do others (see also House's distinction of overt from covert translation (1981)). However, they have not meant either actual linguistic resemblance or formal equivalence. Boase-Beier rightly concludes that Nord's documentary translation (i.e. direct translation) will be instrumental translation (i.e. indirect translation) whenever it retains relationships between meanings and the potential for effects, rather than forms (2006, p. 59). She is also right to argue that this distinction between direct and indirect translation does not correlate with the literary/non-literary distinction, if we want to do justice to the style of translation activity of non-literary texts. The distinction is rather more a question of degree than an absolute opposition (ibid.).

I side with Boase-Beier's argument in that these distinctions between direct and indirect translation cannot be taken as a hard-and-fast dichotomy. They are best seen as "scalar, rather than polar opposites", having varying degrees of focus on form and effect on the source text or the target text (Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 58). A translation can be more direct than indirect, or have more concern with effect than form, or vice versa, but few translations might be wholly this or that. There are varying degrees of function and form, then, which is what I exactly mean by my suggestion of RELATIVITY OF TRANSLATION. I do not mean to say that both relative types of translation, direct and indirect, can be dealt with on equal terms with respect to stylistic insights and interpretation, in relation to the translation, intended readers and purpose of translation in the target language. Both types can be treated as possible and acceptable versions in the target language, one with more concern in style in cognitive terms, another with more concern in meeting the intended audience's demands and the purpose of translation.

I propose two possible translations for one and the same poem by way of representing two different, but possible, views held by two different translators of the voice of the informed author. Like Boase-Beier, 2006, Chapter Five), my suggestion is based on my understanding of style as a representation of a cognitive state when the text is not about a true state of affairs, i.e. fictional. The two types of translation, which are taken to be two possible variations and differences in the style of the translated text, are not intended as two identical or opposite versions of translation to be judged as either correct or incorrect. The best judgement perhaps is in terms of a grading scale of good, acceptable and possible translation, or of more convenient or less convenient to the occasion (or purpose) and to the target readership. By this, and due to the fact that any translation can only be relative and never absolute with respect to meaning and style, I would like to leave the door open for a further non-cognitive version of translation that might be plausible by many target readers for being satisfactory to them for various reasons.

## 10. Conclusions

This paper is a theoretical background for establishing solid grounds for the cognitive relationship between stylistics and translation. It argues for the close links between the two disciplines. It views translation as an activity that is ingrained in the style and stylistic choices made in the source text in which meaning resides. According to contemporary cognitive stylistics, these choices are made by the text's writer from the language structures of different types, with specific sociocultural, ideological and mental backgrounds. The translator has to transport the meaning and interpretation of these choices into the target text with his/her own sociocultural, ideological and mental background, taking into account the target readers' mental and other backgrounds. Thus, the

translator is a cognitive stylistic translator who is more of a creative writer of translation than a dull imitator or producer of the source text's meaning alleged to be intended by the writer.

This cognitive stylistic approach to translation is investigated through an intricate process of discussing a number of delicate and interconnected points and subunits. This in turn demonstrates the nature of this approach and how relevant translation is to cognitive stylistics. How cognitive stylistic translation is processed and meaning constructed in the target text is argued for with respect to the analysis of the source text's stylistic choices, and the interpretation, implications and effects they may have, and how they are constructed in the target text.

Having investigated the theoretical part of the relevance of translation to style and stylistics, this paper ends up with by putting forward a practical suggestion of Direct and Indirect Translations. It approaches translation from a non-cognitive and cognitive stylistic point of view, based on viewing stylistic translation as a relative activity in practice that rejects to be absolute, or deterministic. Accordingly, it leaves the way open for more than one acceptable version of cognitive, style-centred and non-cognitive content-centred relative translation of the same text at the same time, however with variations.

#### About the Author:

**GHAZALA, HASAN SAID** is currently a Full Professor of Stylistics and Translation at the English Department, College of Social Sciences, Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah Al-Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia. He has so far published (25) books and (50) papers in the two areas of his specialism including 3 Dictionaries and 10-volumes Encyclopedia of Translation Textbooks.

#### References

- Baker, M. (2000). 'Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator'. *Target* 12(2): 241-266.
- Barthes, R. (1977). 'Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives', in Heath, S. (ed.), *Image, Music, Text: Selected Essays of Ronald Barthes*. London: Fontana, pp. 79-124.
- Beylard-Ozeroff, A. , Králová, J. and Moser-Mercer, B. (eds), (1998). *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Blakemore, D. (1992). *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Boase-Beier, J. (2003a). 'Mind Style Translated'. *Style* 37(3): pp. 253-65.
- Boase-Beier, J. (2003b). 'Style and Choice: Recreating Patterns in Translation'. *Studies in Cross-cultural Communication 1*: 1-28.
- Boase-Beier, J. (2004a). 'Saying What Someone Else Meant: Style Relevance and Translation'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2): 276-287.
- Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*, (St. Jerome Publishing. Manchester, UK & Kinderhook, USA.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, A. (1981). *The Third Language*. Pergamon Press.
- Fillmore, C. (1977). 'The Case for Case Reopened', in Cole, P. and Sadock (eds), *Syntax and*

- Semantics: Grammatical Relations, (New York: Academic Press), pp. 59-81).
- Frawley, W. (ed.) (1984). *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Psychological Perspectives*. London and Toronto: Associated University Press.
- Gavins, J. (2000). 'Absurd tricks with Bicycle Frames in the Text world of The Third Policeman', *Nottingham Linguistic Circular*, 15: 17-33.
- Gavins, J. (2005). 'Text World Theory in Literary Practice', in *Cognition and Literary Interpretation in Practice*, Petterson, B., Polvinen, M. and Veivo H. (eds), 89-104. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press.
- Gavins, J. (2007). *Text World Theory: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gavins, J. & Steen, G. (2003). *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ghazala, H. (1995). 'Stylistic Translation: English-Arabic', *FIT Newsletter*, XIV, Nos (1-2), 7-38.
- Ghazala, H. (2008). *Translation as Problems and Solutions: A Textbook for University Students and Trainee Translators*. Dar El Ilm Lilmalayin, Beirut, Lebanon.
- Ghazala, H. (2011). *Cognitive Stylistics and the Translator*. Sayyab Books: London.
- Ghazala, H. (2012). *Translating the Media and Political Idiom: A Textbook for University Students*. Konooz AlMarifa: Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
- Ghazala, H. (2013). *A Textbook of Literary Translation*. Konooz AlMarifa: Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
- Ghazala, H. (2016). *Stylistic Translation: A Textbook*. Konooz AlMarifa: Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
- Goddard, C., and Wierzbicka, A. (1994). *Semantics and Lexical Universals*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Goldsworthy, P. (1998). 'The Biology of Literature'. *PN Review*, 119: 31-44.
- Gorgis, D. (2008). 'English and Arabic Conceptual Metaphors of Anger: Implications for Translation' In *Sayyab Translation Journal (STJ)*, vol. 1, pp. 83-111.
- Gran, L. (1998). 'In-Training Development of Interpreting strategies and creativity', in *Beylard-Ozeroff, A., Králová, J. and Moser-Mercer, B. (eds), (1998). Translators' Strategies and Creativity*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- Gutt, E. (2000). *Translation and Relevance*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, (Manchester: St. Jerome).
- Gutt, E. (2005). 'On the Significance of the Cognitive Core of Translation'. *The Translator* 11, (1) 25-49.
- Hyde, G. (1993). 'The Whorf-Sapir Hypothesis and the Translation Muddle' In *Translation and Literature*, 2: 4-16.
- Iser, W. (1971f) 'Indeterminacy and the Reader's Response in Prose Fiction'. In *Hillis, M.J. (ed) Aspects of Narrative*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 1-45).
- Iser, W. (1974). *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Iser, W. (1979). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). 'Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics', in *Sebeok, T.A. (ed) Style in Language*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 350-93.

- Kiparsy, P. (1987). 'On Theory and Interpretation'. In Fabb, N. et al (eds.), pp. 185-98.
- Landers, C. (2001). *Literary Translation: A Practical Guide*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lecerle, J. (1990). *The Violence of Language: Interpretation as Pragmatics*. London: Balgrave.
- Lefeveré, A. (1992). *Translation Rewriting & The Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Maalej, Z. (2008). 'Translating Metaphor Between Unrelated Cultures: A Cognitive Pragmatic Perspective'. In *Sayyab Translation Journal (STJ)*, 1, 60-82.
- McCully, C. (1998). 'The Beautiful Lie: Towards Biology of Literature'. *PN Review*, 121: 22-24.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, (4<sup>th</sup> edn.). London & New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988/1995). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (1993). *Paragraphs on Translation*. Multilingual Matters Ltd: Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide.
- Newmark, P. (1998). *More Paragraphs on Translation*. Multilingual Matters Ltd: Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E. (1998). 'Translator's Creativity versus Sociolinguistic Constraints. In Beylard-Ozeroff, A., Králová, J. and Moser-Mercer, B. (eds), (1998). *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam / Philadelphia, pp. 127-36.
- Nida, E. and Taber, C. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. United Bible Society.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Pym, A. (1998). 'Lives of Henri Albert, Nietzschean Translator', in Beylard-Ozeroff, A., Králová, J. and Moser-Mercer, B. (eds), (1998) *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam / Philadelphia, pp. 117-25.
- Robinson, D. (1997/2007) *Becoming a Translator*. Routledge :London and New York.
- Robinson, D. (2002) *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Sapir, E. (1949). *Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality* (ed.). Mandekbaum, D. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schulte, R. and Biguenet, J (1992). *Theories of Translation: an Anthology of Essays From Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Simeoni, D. (2007). 'Translation and Society: The Emergence of a Conceptual Relationship', in St-Pierre, P. and Kar, P.(eds.), pp. 13-26.
- Slobin, D. I. (1987) 'Thinking for Speaking', *Proceedings of the 13<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 30: pp. 435-444.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988/1995). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986/1995). *Relevance Theory, Communication and*

- Cognition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- St-Pierre(2007). 'Introduction', in St-Pierre, P. and Kar, P. In Translation – Reflections, Refractions, Transformations. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, pp.1-10.
- St-Pierre, P. and Kar, P. (2007). In Translation – Reflections, Refractions, Transformations. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- Toury, G. (1980). Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- van Peer, W.(1993). 'Typographic Foregrounding', *Language and Literature*, 2, (1): 49-61.
- Venuti, L. (1992). Rethinking Translation. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (1995). The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (1996). 'Translation, Heterogeneity, *Linguistics*', *TTR*, 9, (1): 91-113
- Venuti, L. (1998). The Scandals of Translation. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (ed.) (2000/2004). The Translation Studies Reader. London and New York: Routledge.
- Whorf, B.L. (1956). Language, Thought and Reality, (ed.) J.B. Carroll. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.