

Translating the event-structure concepts from Saudi Arabic into English: A cognitive linguistic approach¹

D.Mohammed I. Alghbban^(*)

المستخلص

تشمل مفاهيم بُنية-الأحداث، باعتبارها استعارات مجسدة، الحالات والتغيرات والأفعال والأسباب والأغراض والصعوبات والوسائل، التي يتم تصويرها مجازاً للتعبير عن مفاهيم مثل الفضاء والحركة والقوة (لاكوف، ١٩٩٣). البحث الحالي هو دراسة قائمة على مجموعة البيانات لهذه المفاهيم بين اللهجة العربية السعودية واللغة الإنجليزية. وتسلط الدراسة الضوء على رؤى مثل التجسيد في الدراسات المجازية، ومفاهيم الخصوصية الثقافية، والعموميات الشائعة في البيئات البشرية في دراسات الترجمة، مع إشارة خاصة إلى طريقي فينوتي (٢٠٠٤) وهما طريقة التدجين وطريقة التغريب. وقد كشفت نتائج الدراسة أن ترجمة مفاهيم بُنية الحدث: أولاً، تستلزم توفير ما يمكن أن أسميه مبدئياً طريقة الأرضية-المشتركة بين طريقة التدجين وطريقة التغريب للتعامل مع حالات التشابه الثقافي بين اللهجة العربية السعودية واللغة الإنجليزية. ثانياً، تتطلب طريقة التغريب التمييز بين ترجمات مفهومة وترجمات غير مفهومة، بحيث تكون الترجمات غير المفهومة هي فقط التي تحتاج في النهاية إلى تطبيق طريقة التدجين لضمان وصول جمهور الثقافة المستهدف لفهم أعمق. ثالثاً، أظهرت الدراسة أنه لا يوجد مكافئ للمستعار منه

¹ I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer for comments that greatly improved the quality of the study. However, responsibility for the contents are incumbent on the researcher.

* - Associate Professor, Department of European and Eastern Languages, College of Languages and Sciences, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia .

في مفاهيم الفضاء والحركة والقوة للتعامل مع مفاهيم بُنية الأحداث بين اللهجة السعودية واللغة الإنجليزية.

Abstract

As embodied metaphors, event-structure concepts include states, changes, actions, causes, purposes, and difficulties, which have been found to be conceptualized in terms of space, motion, and force (Lakoff, 1993). The current research is a data-driven study of these concepts between Saudi Arabic and English. The study brings to bear insights such as embodiment from metaphor studies, culture-specific concepts, and universals of human environments onto translation studies, with particular reference to Venuti's (2004) twin pair of domesticating method and foreignizing method. The findings of the study reveal that the translation of the collected event-structure concepts (i) necessitates the provision of what I would tentatively call a *middle-ground method* in between the domesticating method and the foreignizing method to take care of cases of cultural sameness between Saudi Arabic and English, (ii) requires differentiating the foreignizing method into *intelligible* and *unintelligible* translations, with only the *unintelligible* translations eventually needing the application of the domesticating method to ensure fluency for the target culture audience, and (iii) shows that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the source domains of space, motion, and force to deal with the event-structure concepts across Saudi Arabic and English.

Keywords: Event-structure concepts, containers, domestication, force, foreignization, middle-ground, motion, space, translation.

1. Introduction

Concern with "significant life events" (Gibbs, 1994, p. 153) has preoccupied linguists from different persuasions. In syntax, Vendler (1957) offered a classification of events as a function of time into activities, accomplishments, achievements, and states. In lexical semantics, Pustejovsky (1991) bent events to the decomposition of an event into its sub-events (p. 37). In cognitive grammar, Langaker (1987) designates an event as "a cognitive occurrence" that "leaves some kind of neurochemical trace that facilitates recurrence" (p. 100). In cognitive semantics, events are called event-structure concepts (ESCs), whereby "states, changes, processes, actions, causes, purposes, and means, are characterized cognitively via metaphor in terms of space, motion, and force" (Lakoff, 1993: p. 220).

Lakoff & Johnson (1999) call ESCs "fundamentally human concepts" [...] that "emerge from everyday bodily experience," with metaphor as a "significant way, constitutive of all event-structure concepts" (p. 171). As Lakoff & Johnson (1999) point out, "the cognitive mechanism we use is cross-domain conceptual mapping" (p. 71). Lakoff & Johnson (1999) suggest that these cognitive mechanisms are motivated experientially, whereby "our pervasive experience of motion through space is the basis for a vast metaphor system by which we understand events, causes, and purposive actions" (p. 194).

Lakoff & Johnson (1999) isolated two major event-structure metaphors (ESMs), namely, the LOCATION EVENT-STRUCTURE METAPHOR and the OBJECT EVENT-STRUCTURE METAPHOR, which make use of the primary metaphors CAUSES ARE FORCES and CHANGES ARE MOVEMENTS:

THE LOCATION EVENT-STRUCTURE METAPHOR

States Are Locations (interiors of bounded regions in space)
 Changes Are Movements (into or out of bounded regions)
 Causes Are Forces
 Causation Is Forced Movement (from one location to another)
 Actions Are Self-propelled Movements
 Purposes Are Destinations
 Means Are Paths (to destinations)
 Difficulties Are Impediments To Motion
 Freedom Of Action Is The Lack Of Impediments to Motion
 External Events Are Large, Moving Objects (that exert force)
 Long-term, Purposeful Activities Are Journeys (p. 179)

THE OBJECT EVENT-STRUCTURE METAPHOR

Attributes Are Possessions
 Changes Are Movements of Possessions (acquisitions or losses)
 Causation Is Transfer Of Possessions (giving or taking)
 Purposes Are Desired Objects
 Achieving A Purpose Is Acquiring A Desired Object
 Achieving A Purpose Is Getting Something To Eat
 Trying To achieve A Purpose Is Hunting
 Trying To achieve A Purpose Is Fishing
 Trying To achieve A Purpose Is Agriculture (p. 198)

The two ESMs differ in that one conceptualizes events as locations, the other as objects.

The ESCs have been shown to map events on space, motion, and force in English (Lakoff & Turner, 1989; Gibbs, 1994; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999), Hungarian (Kövecses, 2005), Chinese (Yu, 1998), Arabic (Aldokhayel, 2009), and perhaps many other languages. In his analysis, Aldokhayel (2009) argues that “the abstract concepts of STATES, CHANGES, PROCESSES, ACTIONS, CAUSES, PURPOSES, MEANS, and DIFFICULTIES are found to be conceptualized in Arabic and English in the same way, namely, in terms of the concrete, image-schematic concepts of space, motion, and force” (p. 132). Such a universal inclination may suggest that their translation is also unlikely to be problematic. However, as Hanks & Severi (2014) suggested, translating “designates the exchange not only of words, but also of values, theories, and artifacts from one culture to another” (p. 8). The current study asks whether the translation of the ESCs between Saudi Arabic (SA) and English is as straightforward, and whether culture does not interfere in the translation process.

To do this, the current study offers to answer three research questions:

1. How much of the translation of the ESCs between SA and English can be accounted for by the middle-ground method (to be proposed in this study), or Venuti’s domesticating method and foreignizing method?
2. In what cases do ESCs cease being ESCs in the translation between SA and English?
3. Does the translation of the ESCs between SA and English build on any variable other than those of space, motion, and force, and how much does translation depart from those variables, if any?

The structure of the article is as follows. Section one offers a review of the literature on event-structure concepts. Section two spells out the methods followed. Section three addresses the theme of the research, which is translating the event-structure concepts from Saudi Arabic into English. The last section is the discussion.

2. Review of the Literature

In this review, three foci deserve mention, namely, (i) the metaphoric rendering of the ESCs, (ii) the issue of dialects in translation, and (iii) translation methods.

With regard to the first focus, it was Lakoff & Johnson (1999) that have systematized work on ESCs, and gave prominence to them as a serious research endeavor in cognitive linguistics. Peña Cervel (2004) was one of the few to have pointed out that ESCs have an image-schematic basis such as the image schema of SPACE/OBJECT with *states* and *changes*, FORCE with *causes*, SOURCE-PATH-GOAL with *purposes*, etc. The ESCs have been documented for English (Lakoff & Turner, 1989; Gibbs, 1994; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999), Hungarian (Kövecses, 2005), and Chinese (Yu, 1998). In Arabic, except for Aldokhayel (2009), the ESCs have hardly been addressed. All these studies concluded that the ESCs exist in their respective languages, and that the mappings come from However, none of the previous researchers has addressed the ESCs in translation.

There is innumerable research on metaphor *per se* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Gibbs, 1994; Kövecses, 2002). Likewise, research on metaphor translating has been growing steadily in light of the cognitive insights offered by Mandelblit (1995), Schaffner (2004), Maalej (2008), Shuttleworth (2014), Alghbaban & Maalej (2023). Even though the ESCs are metaphor-based (Lakoff and Turner, 1989; Gibbs, 1994; Yu, 1998; Lakoff and Johnson, 1999; Peña Cervel, 2004; Kövecses, 2005; Aldokhayel, 2009), there is scant research on the translation of the ESCs. A google search for the issue only yielded Roush (2018), who addressed the translation of ESCs between English and American Sign Language. The current research seeks to fill this gap.

The scarcity of research on the translation of the ESCs might be explained by at least two factors. First, research on metaphor translation is dominated by studies on emotions (Maalej, 2004, 2007; Kövecses, 2005; Safarnejad et al, 2014; Hanić et al, 2016), politics (Al-Harrasi, 2001; Al-Zou'bi & Kanakri, 2020; Ramadan et al, 2020), literature (Maalej, 2008; Burmakovaa & Marugina, 2014), science (Ashuja'al et al, 2019), religion (Al-Sowaidi & Banda, 2021), etc. Second, the universal status of ESCs may have discouraged many researchers from undertaking their translation, perhaps thinking that this universal status will yield identical translations across cultures. The current study, however, will show that both linguistic and cultural diversity may coexist with the embodiment of the ESCs, which might have consequences for translating them.

The second focus is the issue of dialects. It may be wondered why translate metaphors in dialect and not the standard. The dialects of Arabic are the mother tongues of Arabs, who learn Modern Standard Arabic at school, and use it as a lingua franca when their dialects are not mutually intelligible.

Saudi Arabia counts one of the largest student community studying abroad, particularly in the US, Canada, Britain, etc. Especially at the beginning of their stay in these countries, Saudi students are likely to emulate their own dialect to express human concepts such as the ESCs in the presence of foreign friends and educators. Such a strategy may impede efficient communication. It is only later that this trend is reversed in favor of more fluent communication. With the upsurge nowadays of tourism in Saudi Arabia, there is need to translate such human concepts to foreign tourists in hotels, tourist resorts, and other places.

SA and English are two remotely distant language varieties. Translating from SA into English is expected to occasion translational difficulties, especially when the translator is not a native of either variety. Working on metaphor in audio-visual translation, Al-Adwan & Al-Jabri (2023) pointed out that student translators at Hamad Bin Khalifa University, who spoke different dialects of Arabic, found it difficult to understand the Syrian dialect metaphors in order to translate them into English (p. 102).

The last focus has to do with translation methods. Venuti (1995) defined translation as “the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with a text that will be intelligible to the target language reader” (p. 18). Such a definition leans towards fluent, intelligible translation to the target reader in a foreign language and culture. Following the German theologian and philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher, he distinguished two translation methods: (i) a domesticating method, which is “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home,” (ii) and a foreignizing method, which is “an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad” (p. 20). The foreignizing method serves the purposes of the source culture (SC), which is the Saudi one here, thus giving it prominence and offering the target culture (TC) readers a mouthful of the Saudi culture. The domesticating method will consist in offering a fluent translation to the TC audience, who would be “deprived of much information of great value about the SL culture” (Mason, 1982, p. 144). However realistic and empirical these methods are, there is need to make provision for cases where SA and English may share the same ESCs. When this is the case, a proposed “middle-ground method” will be said to apply.

3. Method

The Arabic dataset for the current study has been collected by the researcher as a native of SA from his own students as part of a course titled الثقافة المقارنة (Comparative Cultures) at the Hebrew program at King Saud University during the academic year 2018. The course was built on lessons along the ESCs of states, changes, actions, causes, purposes, and difficulties. The idea was to adopt English ESCs as a background on which data on SA has been collected. Expressions from English that were difficult for students to understand were explained to them in Hebrew or Arabic. Thus, in each lesson, data from SA were elicited from students through exposing them to the Anglo-Americans examples developed by Lakoff (1993) and Lakoff and Johnson (1999). The collected dataset was, then, submitted to fellow researchers, who were asked to supplement them or discard non-SA events. It should be pointed out that the ESCs dealt with in this study do not exhaust all the events in SA.

The current research is data-driven. Maass et al (2018) define data-driven research as “an exploratory approach that analyzes data to extract scientifically interesting insights” (p. 1253). Since data-driven studies are exploratory, the size of the dataset is likely to keep growing. What matters more than size is the existence or lack of it of linguistic metaphors in both languages that fit the conceptual metaphor(s) isolated for each ESC.

Theory-wise, the current study adopts the cognitive framework, namely, Lakoff and Johnson's (1999) view of the ESCs, which is based on their theory of metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), pairing it with Venuti's domesticating and foreignizing methods. The specificity of the cognitive paradigm is that it is empirical, i.e., its findings are based on genuine linguistic data from English while Venuti's framework will enable the researcher to confront SA and English data. The research method will be qualitative, using the findings of cognitive linguistics and the insights of Venuti's domesticating method and foreignizing method in translating the ESCs.

4. The ESCs at the cross-roads of translation studies and metaphor studies

According to Lakoff & Johnson (1999), events are said to "arise from human biology," and to be "metaphorical in significant, ineliminable ways" (p. 171). In the following sub-sections, the ESCs will be dealt with one-by-one, combining insights from metaphor and translation.

4.1. States

In psychological theory, states are oftentimes contrasted with traits. States are “residual (variable or fluctuating) components” of personality while traits are “enduring or stable components” (Geiser et al, 2017: p. 219). Thus, states are temporary situations that individuals experience in their life such as depression, safety, madness, etc. For instance, “He is in a deep depression,” is a state where the depressed individual is in a bounded region called depression. To anticipate, the variability of states attests to the existence of change of state as in “She is out of her depression.” In cognitive linguistics, Lakoff & Johnson (1999) suggest that states are containers at the expense of possessions, pointing out that “a word with a locative bounded region sense has a corresponding state sense” (p. 180). In reality, Lakoff & Johnson (1999) argue that events use a duality of patterning, which is reflected in the ESMs, STATES ARE LOCATIONS and STATES ARE POSSESSED OBJECTS.

There are two factors that may impact the translation of states from SA into English, namely, (i) the locative device, and (ii) the verb preceding the locative device. Regarding (i), SA includes eight locative devices while English has only four. SA shares with English the container device *في* (fi = in), the support one *على* (on), the proximal one *قريب* (close to), and the distant one *بعيد عن* (far from). However, SA possesses four other locatives that generate states. Such locatives include *تحت* (under), *وراه* (behind), *قدام* (in front of), and *من جنب* (on side). Such a variety of locatives may not only allow SA users more leeway for the construal of states, but also occasion translation problems as will be shown later on.

The locative *في* (in) introduces states such as *في غيبوبة* (in a coma), *في خطر* (in danger), *في فقر* (in poverty), *في مشكلة* (*in a problem), etc. in SA. With the exception of the latter example, what has applied here is the middle-ground method, yielding identical expressions as shown in the above-mentioned Arabic states and their English equivalent. Even though the asterisked example exists in English under possession (i.e., having a problem), translating it literally in terms of containers still makes sense to the TC audience. What seems to make this foreignizing method intelligible to the TC audience is actually their experience with and knowledge of containers.

However, the state *وراه ظهر* (literally, behind him a back), should make less sense to the TC audience. To process the literal meaning of this state, the TC audience have a deictic expression *وراه* (behind him), telling them that the individual talked about has a back located behind his or her own back. If

this literal translation is adopted, it verges on an unintelligible foreignizing method. In SA, "behind him a back" suggests that the back that supports one is located behind the self, with "behind" meaning "supporting, following or accompanying." Conceptually, support in SA is construed as the metonymic metaphor, HAVING A BACK BEHIND THE SELF IS HAVING SUPPORT. To make this intelligible, the domesticating method should apply, leading to "He has support." This method has the result of shifting the category of LOCATION as SUPPORT in SA into a possessed OBJECT state in English.

In SA, states can also be introduced by قدام (in front of) as in قدامك العافية (Health is in front of you). Although this literal translation is intelligible to the TC audience, it does not seem to be a conventional expression in English to conceptualize a wish for recovery as being in front of the addressee. More idiomatically, this state may be domesticated as I wish you plenty of health. However, the domesticating method occasions loss of state and loss of important cultural information in English translation. In English, the explicit speech act of wishing is rather done implicitly via a locative state in SA.

One last example could be the state فلان من جنبها (literally, He [is] from her side). If this state is translated literally as He is from her side, in no way does it make sense to the TC audience. Neither is it a good guess to think that "her" refers to a lady. This literal rendering would trigger an utterly unintelligible foreignizing translation that would trigger miscommunication. To domesticate it, He is totally ignorant/He is beside the point can be suggested. Thus, what was a state in SA becomes a predicative construction in English. In SA, BEING IGNORANT IS BEING BESIDE THE TRUTH. In sum, STATES ARE LOCATIONS in SA is diversified, yielding not only STATES ARE CONTAINERS as in في غيبوبة (in a coma), but also STATES ARE BESIDE THE SPEAKER as in the state فلان من جنبها (He is from her side), STATES ARE BEHIND THE SPEAKER as in the state وراه ظهر (behind him a back), and STATES ARE IN FRONT OF THE SPEAKER as in the state قدامك العافية (Health is in front of you).

Being data-driven, this study suggests the application of another method, which stands in the middle-ground between Venuti's (2004) domesticating and foreignizing methods. For the purposes of this study, this option has been tentatively termed middle-ground method, i.e., it neither leans towards the target culture nor to the source culture. It will apply to cases where both languages and cultures adopt the same linguistic expression and conceptual structure. For instance, the existence of containers in expressing states such as في غيبوبة (in a coma), في خطر (in danger), في فقر (in poverty), etc. in SA and

English motivates cultural sharedness. Another provision should be made to differentiating the foreignizing method. There are cases of intelligible foreignization as in **قدامك العافية** (Health is in front of you) above, which may not need domestication in certain contexts or situations. However, extreme cases of foreignizing would be termed unintelligible foreignizing, which actually require the adoption of the domesticating method as in the state **فنان من جنبها**, whereby the literal expression He is from her side upon domestication becomes He is beside the point.

In addition to locative devices, the verb preceding them plays a role in SA states, with consequences for translation. Consider the following examples: (i) **دخل في ورطة** (literally, He entered into a real trouble), (ii) **راح في داهية** (literally, He went into loss), (iii) **حطني في حرج** (literally, He put me in embarrassment). Compared to English, which mostly makes use of verb "be" with states as containers, for lack of such a verb in Arabic in general, SA uses deictic or dynamic verbs. Indeed, the deictic verb **دخل** (entered) in (i) comes to reinforce the locative **في** (into), with the state profiled as motion into a container. In (ii), **في داهية** (into loss) cannot occur without its collocates **راح** (he went), which again uses motion conducive to the container. In (iii), **حطني** (he put me) has a causative meaning, whereby the embarrassed individual is caused by a third party to appear so vis-à-vis a second one.

These are all pieces of linguistic and cultural information that will evaporate in translation into English. Although all the glosses of states in English are intelligible, they are not what English readers would consider as idiomatic or fluent English, and would remain a product of an intelligible foreignizing method, conveying the spirit of the Saudi culture. To domesticate them, they have to be aligned with local linguistic norms, yielding respectively, (i) He is in real trouble, (ii) He is at a loss, and (iii) He (caused me to be) embarrassed me. It should be noted that (iii) shifts from a caused state to non-state causation in this tentative translation.

4.2. Changes

Changes are categories that alter the states we are in or have. They combine location and possession with motion, which occasions either a figure leaving a state, or motion of the ground in space. As Grady (1996) pointed out, "the metaphorical association between change and motion could arise from the fact that the motion of objects in our surroundings is a prototypical case of change in our environment" (p. 107). The difference between states and changes is that states are static, but changes are dynamic, which explains the use of "to be in/on" with states in English, and the use of

OUT with changes. This evokes the conceptual metaphor, CHANGES ARE MOVEMENTS.

Changes in SA are interstate movements. For instance, in راح مني الخوف (literally, *Fear went away from me*), the change involves the movement of the figure الخوف (fear) away from the speaker as a ground. This is governed by the conceptual metaphor CHANGES ARE MOVEMENTS AWAY FROM THE SPEAKER. However, أصحابي طلعوني من مشكلتي (literally, *My friends lifted me up out of my problem*), entails that conceptualizing change in SA involves motion of possessions in a vertical direction with a certain depth as encoded by the verb طلعوني (*lifted me up*). It is only logical that طلعوني (*lifted me up*) is used since the change is actually an emanation from the state, طحت في مشكلة (*I fell into a problem*).

This conceptualization of change can be captured by the conceptual metaphor, CHANGES ARE UPWARD MOVEMENTS OF POSSESSIONS. It should be noted that طلع من (*ascend from*) is not specific to changes, but is also used with physical motion as in طلع من الكلية (*He left college*), طلع من البيت (*He left home*), طلع من المطعم (*He left the restaurant*), etc. Saudis may not be aware that they are conceptually using LEAVING A LOCATION IS PERFORMING AN UPWARD MOTION, which may be a form of skewing of the Modern Standard Arabic verb as in طلعت الشمس (*The sun has arisen*). Thus, for lack of the copula "be" and preposition "out," SA uses deictic verbs such as طلع من (literally, ascend from), راح مني (literally, going away from me), etc., to encode motion away from the speaker and upward motion out of a container to conceptualize change of state, respectively.

It is very likely that upward motion of possessions as encoded by the verb طلعوني (*lifted me*), will be lost in translation into English. Clearly, though the literal translation, *My friends lifted me up out of my problem*, is quite intelligible to the TC audience, who can have a glimpse of the way Saudis conceptualize change, such a foreignizing translation of the change of state remains unidiomatic. A domesticating rendering would be more acceptable such as *My friends helped me with my problem*.

4.3. Actions

Popularly, actions are usually contrasted with speech, with actions as done rather than simply spoken about. Actions may require physical effort that, in turn, requires movement in space. In cognitive linguistics, “actions are seen as movements that an agent carries out under the agent’s own force” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999: p. 187), which is governed by the ESM, ACTIONS ARE SELF-PROPELLED MOVEMENTS. Thus, whatever happens to action actually originates in movement. The problems for translating actions reside in details. For lack of space, focus will be on the sub-metaphors SPEED OF ACTION IS SPEED OF MOVEMENT and SUSPENSION OF ACTION IS THE STOPPING OF MOVEMENT because they exemplify the way movements are profiled with speed or lack of it, and how lack of movement profiles the suspension of action in SA.

In SA, speed of action goes by three tempos, namely zero progress, slow progress, and quick progress. Zero progress is conceptualized as على حطة يدك (literally, *on the posture of your hand*). It simply tells the addressee that things have not changed from the time s/he left. The posture of the hand is actually a body part metonym for inertia. If the posture of the hand to profile zero progress is maintained as a literal translation for the TC audience, it would sound utterly unintelligible foreignization. To domesticate it, something like *We are not progressing* can be used in English, which obviously is not a metaphor, thus sacrificing the Saudi cultural flavor conveyed by the posture of the hand.

Slow progress is conceptualized as المشروع ماشي حبة حبة (literally, *The project is walking grain-by-grain*), whereby the smallness of the grain is mapped on the slowness of action. Conceptualizing action as proceeding "grain-by-grain" counts as a foreignizing translation, conveying Saudi cultural content to the TC audience. The domesticating method yields a tentative idiomatic but almost pragmatically equivalent expression such as *The project is progressing slowly*, which misses the agricultural dimension of the action in SA and renders the metaphor as a non-metaphor (Newmark, 1980). Slow progress is also construed as مربوط في ساقية (literally, *tied down*)²,

² This ESC is culture-specific. Being tied down refers to waterwheels that used to be implemented to pump water from wells. Animals such as camels, oxen, or donkeys were often attached to a central pivot of a wheel to turn it by walking slowly in a circular fashion in short tracks, causing the wheel to rotate, and eventually pumping water out of the well.

which also relies on agriculture but this time the domain of animals and water pumping. Slow and restricted movement of the tied animal is mapped onto human slow action. Like the grain-by-grain construal of slow progress, the tying down of animals ensures limited freedom of movement, and yields unintelligible foreignization. To domesticate it, it would take the same pragmatic rendering as the grain-by-grain construal as in *We are experiencing limited freedom of action to make progress in our project.*

Quick progress is construed through the domains of flying as in طائر للدوام (literally, *He is flying to work*), where speed is conveyed through unrestricted motion in the air. However, quick progress is mostly construed through the productive automobile domain, mapping various verbs of speed onto the speed of action. Like many other youths across the globe, Saudi youth are fascinated by cars and speeding, and experiencing cars has given them the opportunity to construe speed of action as swift car motion or movement. Such examples may include معشوق خامس (literally, *He shifted to fifth gear*), داعس (literally, *Pushing down on the gas pedal*), مكيم (literally, *Pushing too hard on the gas pedal so that the car had reached the highest possible speed in kilometers per hour*), ماسح طبلونه (literally, *Erasing his dashboard*), مشوت (literally, *a "whoosh," or "woosh" sound caused by the car speed when passing by objects at a high speed.*), حاطر رجل (literally, *He is setting his foot on the accelerator*), etc. It should be noted that these expressions may include slightly different meaning nuances as captured in the English glosses in round brackets. Used in the appropriate context, such expressions can be intelligible to the TC audience owing to their familiarity with cars and speeding. But out of context, they are simply literal expressions about speeding.

On the other hand, SUSPENSION OF ACTION IS THE STOPPING OF MOVEMENT includes the default expression وقفنا العمل (literally, *We stopped work*). However, suspension of action is mostly construed as قفلنا (literally, *We locked down*), سكرنا (literally, *We shut down*), شطبنا (literally, *We set the finish*), كمنسل (literally, *We cancelled*). With the exception of the default expression, all the other expressions lead to unintelligible foreignizing translations if translated literally to the TC audience. To domesticate them,

most of the aforementioned expressions can be rendered as *We stopped/halted work on the project.*

4.4. Causes

Lakoff & Johnson (1980) argue that causation is "one of the concepts most often used by people to organize their physical and cultural realities" (p. 69). Johnson (1987) contends that "causal interaction" with the environment "reveals that our daily reality is one massive series of forceful causal sequences" (p. 42). Johnson (1987) also claims that the image-schemata of force has "*a gestalt structure,*" which stands for an "organized, unified whole within our experience and understanding that manifests a repeatable pattern or structure" (p. 44).

Lakoff & Johnson (1999) isolate two classes of abstract or metaphoric causation. The first class is represented by conventional verbs such as *bring, throw, drive, pull, push, move, propel,* and *thrust*. These entail different kinds of forced motion. For instance, *bring* suggests that the forced movement is applied throughout a certain period of time; *throw* describes a situation in which a force is applied instantaneously in a very short time (pp. 184-85). *Drive, move, propel,* and *thrust* suggest that the forced movement is applied to a certain path throughout a certain period of time while *pull* and *push* describe forced motion applying to a certain path toward the deictic center and away from the deictic center, respectively. The other class of forced motion includes less conventional verbs such as *hurl, tear, fling,* and *drag* (p. 186). However, in Arabic causation is not limited to certain verbs but is tied to augmented verb templates such as (i) *fa33ala* as in *raqqaSa* (cause to dance) and (ii) *?af3ala* as in *?arjafa* (cause to tremble) (Alhamdan, Alenazi, & Maalej, 2018: p. 46). The *fa33ala* template, which has survived in the vernacular of various dialects of Arabic, doubles the voiced pharyngeal fricative for causation. Such differences will have implications for translating the ESCs of causation from SA into English.

Like its English counterpart, SA employs the same ESMs for causation, namely, CAUSES ARE FORCES and CAUSATION IS A TRANSFER OF POSSESSIONS. Examples of forced action may include طير عقلي (*He made my mind fly*), خلاني أترك الشغل (*He made me quit my job*), الأستاذ حجّر لي (*The teacher precluded me from doing anything*), الترجمة فقّعت عيني (*Translation caused me to be exhausted*), etc. Causation as a transfer of possessions is not

as productive as causes are forces in SA. Examples of these may include ما السيول أخذت كل جابلي إلا وجع الراس (*He only brought me headaches*), أغراضي (*Inundations took all my belongings*). It should be noted that for both CAUSES ARE FORCES and CAUSATION IS A TRANSFER OF POSSESSIONS verbs of causation needn't all be made on the causative template as in غصبني على العشا (*He put pressure on me*) and غصبني على العشا (*He forced me to have dinner with him*).

To go back to translation, consider طير عقلي (*He made my mind fly*). This literal translation is a form of intelligible foreignization, where the TC audience can make sense of it even though the translation does not coincide with the linguistic expression that conveys the same meaning in English, namely, *He drove me mad*. Let's take an example of CAUSATION IS A TRANSFER OF POSSESSIONS: ما جابلي إلا وجع الراس (*He only brought me headaches*). As the previous example, this one follows the intelligible foreignizing method, where the TC audience can make sense of the meaning of translated causation even though SA uses جاب (*bring*) while English uses *give* as in *He gave me a headache*. As mentioned earlier, *bring* denotes forced motion that is applied throughout a period of time. This is the case in SA. In English, however, even though the cause as object is there, giving someone a headache does not take as much time because giving someone an object in our experience is more instantaneous.

In sum, the fact that the middle-ground method has been adopted by most of the translations of *causes* and only slightly as an intelligible foreignization method in this sub-section, owes much to the existence of the image schema of *force* and the prevalence of objects in human experience.

4.5. Purposes

Purposes are closely related to the actions that we perform as there is ideally a purpose behind each undertaken action. Both in English and SA, purposes come in two ESMs, namely PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS and PURPOSES ARE DESIRED OBJECTS. The former represents the JOURNEY metaphor, which has a SOURCE-PATH-GOAL image schematic structure. The latter conceives of purposes as objects. Both ESMs for purposes are diversified into many sub-metaphors that are represented in both languages and cultures by linguistic metaphors. For lack of space, only a few examples expressing PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS and

PURPOSES ARE DESIRED OBJECTS will be analyzed.

With regard to PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS, linguistic metaphors illustrating the SOURCE-PATH-GOAL will be analyzed for translation, namely, STARTING A PURPOSEFUL ACTION IS STARTING OUT ON A PATH and ACHIEVING A PURPOSE IS REACHING A DESTINATION. The former sub-metaphor represents SOURCE and PATH, and includes examples such as أنا في أول الطريق (*I am at the beginning of the road*), في النصف (*I am in the half*), على وشك (*I am nearly there*), في السكة (*in the path*), تو الناس (literally, Only one tick remains), etc. The latter sub-metaphor illustrates GOAL, and includes examples such as وصلنا لغايتنا (*We reached our goal*), وصل (*He arrived*), وصل إلى القمة (*He reached the top*), وصل للي (*He arrived to what he wanted*), حقق مرادي (*I materialized my aim*), etc.

Translation-wise, when an SA purpose expression transparently espouses one of the members of the SOURCE-PATH-GOAL image schemas as أنا في أول الطريق (*I am at the beginning of the road* → SOURCE), في السكة (*in the path* → PATH), and وصلنا لغايتنا (*We reached our goal* → GOAL), translation into English is greatly facilitated owing to the pervasiveness of the journey in human experience. Apart from some minor differences in linguistic expression such as *I am in the half* instead of *I am in the middle*, *I am in the path* instead of *I am on the path*, etc., the middle-ground method applies systematically. However, when a purpose expression starts using culture-specific expressions as in باقي تكة (literally, *Only one tick remains*) and تو

الناس (*now people*), translation into English by a non-Saudi becomes unwieldy, therefore verging on an unintelligible foreignizing method. While one tick (of a clock) suggests that realizing the purpose is close enough in time, the other example suggests that it is too early/too far in time.

However, with regard to PURPOSES ARE DESIRED OBJECTS, two sub-metaphors will be selected for translation, namely, TRYING TO ACHIEVE A PURPOSE IS HUNTING and TRYING TO ACHIEVE A PURPOSE IS AGRICULTURE. The former includes purposes such as يتصيد

الزبون (*He is hunting the customer*), يقنص الفرصة (*He is sniping at the opportunity*), يترصّد (*He is on the prowl*), مرنب (*to lie in wait for*), etc. The latter is represented by حصد أرباح المشروع (*He reaped the benefits of the project*), قطف ثمرة النجاح (*He is separating straw from grain*), يقش المحصول (*He gathered the fruit of success*), يحرث وراه (*He is ploughing behind him*), etc. So far, it has been suggested that translation is facilitated by the existence of image schemata as human embodied structures. However, image schemata are not the only factors that seem to facilitate translation from SA into English. Experience with objects together with hunting and agriculture is prevalent and even paramount in many human cultures. As is clear from the tentative translations between round brackets, the shared nature of cross-cultural experience is responsible for the application of the middle-ground method proposed in this article. Perhaps the only exception is مرنب (*literally, to be in the posture of a rabbit*), which is a participial adjective derived from أرنب (*rabbit*). When rabbits are caressed, they usually give a round body posture almost like a cat on the prowl for a prey. The suggestion here is that the individual seeking a purpose is keeping a low profile in wait for the best opportunity to make a leap. Obviously, translating this literally into English misses the point, and verges on an unintelligible foreignization translation.

In sum, the translation of purposes into English seems to be governed and facilitated by two factors. The first factor is the prevalence of the SOURCE-PATH-GOAL image schemata, which functions as a factor galvanizing cultures into a universal entity. Such an embodied schema admits the correlative middle-ground translation method. The second factor has to do with sharing human experiences as represented by the knowledge domains of hunting and agriculture. Very few exceptions of opaque or culture-specific linguistic expressions can be signaled here as requiring special translation care.

4.5. Difficulties

Difficulties are encountered when actions are being fulfilled. Since ACTIONS ARE MOVEMENTS, difficulties encountered in acting are impediments to motion as captured by the conceptual metaphor, DIFFICULTIES ARE IMPEDIMENTS TO MOVEMENT. For lack of space, only two sub-metaphors will be dealt with, namely, DIFFICULTIES

ARE BLOCKAGES TO ACTION and DIFFICULTIES ARE DUE TO THE FEATURES OF THE TERRAIN. Under DIFFICULTIES ARE BLOCKAGES TO ACTION, the following will be studied (i) انكالي (*He leisurely lay in my way to impede my progress*), (ii) استقعدلي (*He sat in my way to prevent me from progressing*), (iii) مدقر (*He was standing in my way to prevent me from continuing*). Under DIFFICULTIES ARE DUE TO THE FEATURES OF THE TERRAIN, the following examples will be studied: (i)

مغرز (stuck in the sand and spinning its wheels), (ii) غايص (*wheels stuck in the sand*), (iii) معلق (*hanging*), (iv) غاطس (*diving in deep water*), (v) مهنق (*stuck in a place so he can't move back or forward as when a vehicle gets stuck in mud or sand*). It is interesting to note that the blockage dimension of difficulties in SA embodies the human body as a source domain, and uses it as an obstacle to progress, However, that of the terrain draws on car driving as a source domain to conceptualize difficulties.

In translation, the blockage to action difficulties may pose different problems than those of the features of the terrain. Indeed, while the translation of the blockage examples are cases of intelligible foreignization to the TC audience, those of the features of the terrain send the TC audience on a search for context to understand them as difficulties. If their translation is kept literal, they would be read as cases of unintelligible foreignization to the TC audience, needing domestication. SA and English share the conceptual metaphor DIFFICULTIES ARE BLOCKAGES TO ACTION. SA may conceptualize this as استقعدلي، which simply states that there is blockage, with the individual performing it as sitting in the way of the one whose action is blocked, thus occasioning no action to counter the blockage or attempts to do something about it. However, English may express this as "get around the blockage," where the individual performing the blockage is avoided.

5. Discussion

This Discussion will address the fact that the three translation methods are actually motivated by biological matters such as embodied schemas and culture-specificity of linguistic expressions.

This applies to states and changes. Indeed, even when some states and changes do not share the same linguistic expressions across SA and English,

the foreignizing method seems to be intelligible to the TC audience because of the pervasiveness of containers in the conceptual system of this audience. The domesticating method applies when attempts at foreignizing translations turn out to be unintelligible to the TC audience. This unintelligibility owes much to the culture-specific uses of language as when, for instance, SA uses locative expressions such as in front of, behind, from her side, etc. that English does not have.

Unlike that for states and changes, the translation of actions from SA into English bumps into culture-specific linguistic expressions whose meaning cannot be arrived at without a proper context of use. Actions oftentimes required the domesticating method, which has sometimes led to the translation of metaphor with non-metaphor (Newmark, 1980). Culture-specific domains as used in SA to conceptualize actions included the animal, agriculture, and traffic/car domains. Even though these are universal, the Saudi culture gives them a specific twist.

Compared to states, changes, and actions, causation turned out to be more straightforward with translation. The translation of causation has been undemanding on the translator since both the middle-ground and the intelligible foreignizing methods applied owing to the existence of no real culture-specific expressions. The motivation for this intelligibility owes much to the image-schema of force, both physical and social, together with the pervasive existence of objects, experienced in all human environments as universal human concepts.

Similar to the translation of causation, the translation of purposes has been mediated by the image schema of JOURNEY, which, as a human universal, motivated the application of the middle-ground method. The translation of purposes has also accepted the intelligible foreignizing method as a strategy with universal domains such as hunting and agriculture. However, when SA starts using culture-specific expressions with purposes, the domesticating method has applied to make meaning transparent to the TC audience.

Difficulties in SA use the human body as a source domain to conceptualize difficulties. In this case, translation and communication are facilitated even if this type is linguistically alien to the TC audience. SA also used a source domain not used by the English culture to conceptualize difficulties, namely the traffic familiar domain.

6. Conclusion

The current paper has addressed a neglected area of cognitive linguistics, namely the ESCs, by translators. To address them, the paper made use of Venuti's (2004) twin pair of domesticating method and foreignizing method. It was found that there was need to make provisions for another method, tentatively called a middle-ground method that stands in between them. The adoption of any of the methods is not so much felt to be a matter of translation strategy as a matter of required spontaneity and fluency in both languages. Indeed, if/when SA and English share the same conceptual domain and linguistic expression, the middle-ground method applies. If not, an attempt is made to translate literally. If this attempt turns out to be intelligible to the TC audience, intelligible foreignization is enough to maintain communication. If the literal attempt fails, domestication is resorted to keep communication going.

As a reminder, the research questions will be repeated here to show that they have been addressed:

1. How much of the translation of the ESCs between SA and English can be accounted for by the middle-ground method (to be proposed in this study), or Venuti's domesticating method and foreignizing method?
2. In what cases do ESCs cease being ESCs in the translation between SA and English?
3. Does the translation of the ESCs between SA and English build on any variable other than those of space, motion, and force, and how much does translation depart from those variables, if any?

With regard to the first research question, though a statistical distribution of the three methods was beyond the scope of the current study, they are present in the translation of the ESCs between SA and English. The middle-ground method took in charge cases where the CONTAINER schema featured prominently in states and changes, which is accounted for by embodiment. This method also applied with cases of shared or universal experience across-cultures as with JOURNEY in purposes. The diversification of the foreignizing method into intelligible and unintelligible allowed for the acceptance of translations into English that were intelligible to the TC audience across the ESCs without being fluent or idiomatic. Such cases included negligible linguistic differences that did not impede cross-

linguistic communication. Concerning the second question, there are very few cases where an ESC is not translated as an ESC. A locative in SA may become a possessed object in English as in *وراه ظهر* becoming *he has support* in English. This concerns basically states and changes, and states in particular. In terms of the last question, there is no one-to-one correspondence between the domains of space, motion, and force in the translation of ESCs between SA and English.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was funded by the Literature, Publishing and Translation Commission, Ministry of Culture, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia under [155/2023] as part of the Arabic Observatory of Translation.

REFERENCES

- Al-Adwan, A., & H. Al-Jabri (2023). The dilemma of subtitling Arabic metaphors into English: Pedagogical and practical perspectives. *Ampersand*, 10, 100-108.
- Aldokhayel, R. (2009). *The event structure concepts: The case of Arabic*. VDM Verlag.
- Al-Ghabban, M., & Z. Maalej (2023). Cultural filtering of metaphor translating: A cognitive science perspective. *Arab World English Journal, AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies*, 7(1), 70-100.
- Alhamdan, B., O. Alenazi, & Z. A. Maalej (2018). Motion verbs in Modern Standard Arabic and their implications for Talmy's lexicalization patterns. *Language Sciences*, 69, 43–56.
- Al-Harrasi, A. (2001). *Metaphor in (Arabic-into-English) translation with specific reference to metaphorical concepts and expressions in political discourse*, (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Aston University, Great Britain.
- Al-Sowaidi, B. T., & Banda, M. F. (2021). Translating conceptual Qur'anic metaphor: A cogno-translational approach. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(1), 1-13.
- Al-Zou'bi, A. I., & Kanakri, M. (2020). The translatability of metaphor in political speeches from English into Arabic. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 7(3), 78-87.
- Ashuja'al, A. A., Almatari, S. M., & Alward, A. S. (2019). Exploring strategies of translating metaphor from English into Arabic concerning scientific texts. *International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies*, 26-38.
- Burmakovaa, E. A., & Marugina, N. I. (2014). Cognitive approach to metaphor translation in literary discourse. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 154, 527 – 533.
- Geiser, C., T. Götz, F. Preckel, & P. A. Freund (2017). States and traits: Theories, models, and assessment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 33(4), 219–223.
- Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grady, J. E. (1996). *Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of California, Berkeley

- Hanić, J., Pavlović, T., & Jahić, A. (2016). Translating emotion-related metaphors: A cognitive approach. *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)*, 4(2), 87-101. DOI: 10.1515/exell-2017-0008
- Hanks, W. F., & C. Severi (2014). Translating worlds: The epistemological space of translation. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 4(2): 1–16.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: OUP.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2 ed., pp. 202-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic concepts*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites* (Vol. 1). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Maalej, Z. (2008). Translating metaphor between unrelated cultures: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective. *Sayyab Translation Journal*, 1, 60-82.
- Maass, W., J. Parsons, S. Puro, V. C. Storey, C. Woo (2018). Data-driven meets theory-driven research in the era of big data: Opportunities and challenges for information systems research. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 19(12), 1253-1273.
- Mandelblit, N. (1995). The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory. In *Translation and meaning PART 3* (pp. 483-495). Maastricht: Universitaire Press.
- Mason, K. (1982). Metaphor and translation. *Babel*, 28,140-149.
- Newmark, P. (1980). The translation of metaphor. *Babel*, 16(2), 93-100.
- Peña Cervel, S. (2004). The image-schematic basis of the event structure concepts. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 2, 127-158.
- Pustejovsky, J. (1991). The syntax of event structure. *Cognition*, 41, 47-81.

- Ramadan, S., Abu Radwan, S. A., & Shuqair, H. (2020). Problems in translating metaphors in political campaign speeches. *Translation Studies*, 17(2), 257-278.
- Roush, D. R. (2018). *Event structure metaphors through the body: Translation from English to American Sign Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Safarnejad, F., Ho-Abdullah, I., & Mat Awal, N. (2014). Cultural basis of metaphors translation: Case of emotions in Persian and English. *Asian Social Science*, 10(7), 107-118.
- Schaffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1253-1269.
- Shuttleworth, M. (2014). Translation studies and metaphor studies: Possible paths of interaction between two well-established disciplines. In D. R. Miller & E. Monti (Eds.), *Tradurre figure / Translating figurative language* (pp. 53-65). Bologna: CeSLiC, 'Quaderni del CeSLiC, Atti di Convegni.'
- Vendler, Z. (1957). Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review*, 66(2), 143-160.
- Venuti, L. (1995/2004). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Yu, N. (1998). *The contemporary theory of metaphor: A perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.