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Abstract
The purpose of this study is to investigate to what extent a failure to understand the pragmatic and cultural dimensions of implicature may lead translators to render Arabic utterances involving implicated meanings into English inappropriately.

The data of the study consists of a questionnaire distributed among 20 M.A translation students at Yarmouk University. The questionnaire includes chosen Arabic cultural utterances involving implied meaning within their context. These utterances were selected from Jaradat’s Jordanian short story “Habilat Bishra”. The students were asked to provide suitable translations to these utterances.

The findings of the study show that the subjects in many cases opted for literal translation or avoidance in rendering problematic utterances with implicature. It was clear that the subjects’ failure in grasping the intended meaning of these utterances due to their lack of pragmalinguistic competence as well as socio-religious cultural knowledge of either the (SL) or (TL).

1.1. Introduction
The concept of equivalence has remained controversial and opinions vary radically about its exact meaning among both Arab and English scholars. In general, translation is a process of transferring meaning from one language into another. It aims at finding equivalent units of the source language terms in the target language. However, most scholars believe that it could be challenging or even impossible to find these equivalents.

Newmark (1981) refers to translation as “a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language”. This indicates that to convey a natural message needs to render the same effect of the source language (SL) expressions in the target language (TL).

Translation from Arabic into English involves cultural and pragmatic problems which refer to the fact that both Arabic and English belong to different language families and have different cultures as well. Many writers (e.g. Nida and Reyburn 1981; Bochner 1982; Hall and Freedle 1975) point that communication across cultures involves problems of meaning that mostly arise from differences of culture. In most cases, translators find it difficult to bridge the cultural gap in rendering some Arabic utterances that include implicature naturally into English without distorting the meaning.
Baker (1992) classifies many problems related to equivalence at different levels. She begins at the level of words and phrases, and then continues with the grammatical, textual and pragmatic equivalences.

In fact the effects of the SL message should be the same on the TL audience as translation seeks to capture the content as well as the effect of the SL text in the TL. This is not always an easy job to achieve mainly when it comes to utterances that involve intended implicit meaning. Such problems arise from the fact that implicature always goes beyond the literal meaning expressed by the actual linguistic expressions and it is understood by what is hidden or implicated by the utterance.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The study attempts to shed light on:

a. The pragmatic areas of difficulty that presents obstacles to translating Arabic colloquial expressions into English.

b. To identify the cultural problems that encounter the translators during translating Arabic literary texts that include implicatures into English.

c. To show how implicatures can be translated and attempt to bridge the gap between what is said and what is implicated.

d. To suggest certain strategies for translating implicature that help in preserving the naturalness and smoothness of the TL text.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Unfortunately, translations between Arabic and English are problematic due to cultural, linguistic and stylistic remoteness of these two languages. Both Arabic and English belong to different language families; therefore, translators may opt for unequivocal English expressions for the Arabic ones or vice versa. Translation problems are often made worse when translators encounter cultural utterances containing implicatures. These problems can be in part attributed to the fact that the translator has insufficient or no knowledge of the source culture. The more a translator is aware of the cultural differences among the different languages, the better translation s/he will create. Moreover, they can be attributed to the translators’ lack of pragmatic knowledge that includes the ability to determine the relationship between the prepositional content (i.e. pragmatic function) of any utterance.

The present study attempts to answer the following questions: What are the pragmatic areas of difficulty that present obstacles to translating Arabic utterances containing cultural and implicated dimensions into English? How should translators deal with such a problem? And finally, what are the strategies and techniques that the translator should use in order to render Arabic implicature into English without distorting the message?

1.4 Methodology

The present study is divided into two parts: theoretical and practical. The theoretical part is covered by the survey of literature, while the practical one is handled through a questionnaire. Thus, the following procedures are utilized:

1.4.1 The Sample

In order to highlight the magnitude of the problem under discussion, a questionnaire will be distributed among 20 M.A students of translation at Yarmouk University. The sample will be native speakers of Arabic and they all hold a B.A degree in English language and literature. Thus, all of them are expected to have a good command of both English and Arabic.

1.4.2 Data of the Study

The data of the study will be taken from Ahmad Jaradat’s short story “Habilat Bishra” (1992) and its translation into English “Bishra’s ‘Idiot Savant’” by Shunnaq (1998).

1.4.3 Data Analysis
The questionnaire which will be administered to M.A students at Yarmouk University will include Arabic utterances containing cultural and pragmatic problems. It will also include personal questions that seek to elicit the cultural background of the subjects as well as their efficiency of translation.

The subjects’ translations will be analyzed according to the level of their adequacy and the translation strategies students adopt. Then the outcomes of the subjects’ will be compared with the translation.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The results, recommendations and suggestions come up from this study will typologize the problems that translators face in translating Arabic implicature into English. It also sheds light on the importance of conveying the implicated meaning of utterances that mean more than what is literally said. Moreover, it is expected to help translators and student translators to be aware of the Jordanian culture that would help them to understand the contexts better and render them naturally into English.

2 Review of Related Literature

There are different approaches concerning the concept of equivalence raised by many linguists. Nida (1964) represents the “equivalent effect” that is considered as a significant issue concerning equivalence in translation studies. He emphasizes that identical equivalents do not exist between different languages. Newmark(1988) refers to “equivalent effect” as the same effect on readership of the original. In this context, Nida distinguishes equivalence as formal and dynamic that is the same as Newmark’s distinction as semantic (close to Nida’s formal equivalence) and communicative (close to Nida’s dynamic equivalence).

Nida and Taber(1982) have devoted a great deal about equivalence in their book. They wrote, “Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style”, i.e. whether the target text has the same effect on TT readers as that of ST on its readers or not. Accordingly they put forward their famous notions of dynamic equivalence and formal correspondence. They favor the dynamic equivalence that seeks the thought-for-thought translation rather than word-for-word. It preserves the meaning of the original text in the TL as it captures the same effects of the SLT in the TL.

This type of equivalence is, in fact, what Wierzbicka (1991) called “pragmatic equivalence” and what Gutt (1991) refers to as functional equivalence guarantees better communication as the translator pays a great effort to meet the target readers’ functionally as “compulsory charity in Islam when the income conditions are met” in order to preserve the same effects the term includes on the TL reader.

Pragmatic equivalence overlaps cultural translation where the cultural norms or contexts influence heavily the translation process and product. Bassent (2007) was in favor of changing and sometimes of dramatic altering of the grammatical structure and sacrificing in order to create a resemblance between the original effect and its counterpart.

2.1 Pragmatics and Semantics

Baker (1990) defines pragmatics as: “the study of meaning not as generated by the linguistic system, but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation”. According to this definition Baker distinguishes between the semantic meaning of an utterance: “that is generated by the linguistic system” and the intended meaning the speaker wants to convey by using a particular utterance in a particular situation.

Translation aims at conveying meanings or meanings of a given linguistic discourse from one language to another rather than the words or grammatical structures of the original. The meaning of a given word or set of words is best understood as the contribution that word or phrase can make to the meaning or function of the whole sentence or linguistic utterance where that word or phrase occurs. Thus, the addressee is not after the surface or literal meaning of the utterance (semantic meaning) he might be after the implicit or the hidden meaning of the utterance (pragmatic meaning).

Yule(1996) defines pragmatics as “the study of the relationship between linguistic users of these forms”. Stalnaker’s definition is more explicit (Hatim and Mason 1991):
Pragmatics is the study of the purposes for which sentences are used in the real world conditions under which a sentence may be appropriately used as an utterance.

Leech (1983) differentiates between semantics and pragmatics by saying that semantics is rule-governed and its analysis is basically formal, whereas pragmatics is principle controlled and its analysis is functional, i.e., for what it is used in language or for what function.

So semantics refers to the abstract meaning, i.e., what the word or even the sentence means in dictionaries while pragmatics is concerned with meaning in use or meaning in context.

2.2 The Role of the Context

It has been repeatedly emphasized by linguists that the functions of language should be performed within a context. The term context is both social and interpersonal. It is social in the sense that context encompasses the internal organization of a society, its intentions, internal differences, sub-groupings, and so on. Therefore, the study of language in a social context consists of the study of the linguistic material produced within the structure of the society. It focuses on the way in which particular characteristics of the society affect the structure of change and variation of the language spoken, and, conversely, to the way in which different attitudes about its variation affect the internal dimensions and forces of the recipient community.

The interpersonal context usually takes priority over the social context in such sub disciplines as pragmatics, discourse analysis, conversation(al) analysis, etc. These disciplines are not devoted to understanding the interaction of the linguistic structure of the society. The focus is rather on the individuals involved in the interaction. These individuals are the speaker and the hearer, or the reader and the writer. The interpersonal context, here, is essential to the understanding of the exchanged utterances or texts. Such a context usually includes statements rooted in psychology, such as intentions, beliefs, and rationality.

Thus, the context plays a great role in helping the translator to determine the speaker’s right intended meaning by means of depending on the situation in which the utterance takes place. Lyons (1977) emphasizes that the text has a clear beginning and end, it also has some internal coherence and unity. This means that the context is helpful to the translator to understand the pragmatic meaning of an utterance in a particular situation in the SL and convey it naturally into the TL.

2.3 The Notion of Implicature and Grice’s Maxims

Implicature is one of the most complicated parts within pragmatics. It is the act of meaning, implying or suggesting one thing by saying something else. Therefore, the meaning resides at some level, in the context of utterance. Lyons (1977) defines implicature as: “It rests, upon a distinction between what is actually said and what is implied (but not entailed) in saying what is said”.

Lyons definition shows that the utterance includes the linguistic reality related to the words that make up utterance and the intended meaning the speaker wants to convey from the utterance. For example a sentence like ‘It is cold here’ represent either a semantic meaning that can be understood literally or an implied meaning that can be figured out with reference to the context of the utterance. Therefore, the linguistic items, the context of the utterance and the principle of co-operation can produce the implied meaning (the heating should be turned up). Thus, implicature is the gap between what is literally said (linguistic entity) and what is conveyed (not said).

Speakers usually do not express what they mean explicitly, in some situations they may say something and mean something else, or even the opposite. Implicature helps people to understand the meaning the speaker tends to imply, that is to say more than what is literally expressed by the conventional sense of the linguistic expressions uttered. In this sense Pratt(1977) says: “without implicature it would take us a long time, indeed, to say anything at all”.

The theory of implicature in essence was developed by Grice(1975) in an attempt to explain how people use language. Grice emphasizes that any discourse does not normally consist of disconnected remarks; However, they are cooperative efforts that enable the people participating in that discourse or talk to recognize the common purpose of that talk. Such a purpose, argues Grice, may be definite or so indefinite. On this account, Grice formulates the following general principle that is known among linguists as Cooperative Principle (CP):
“make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”

(ibid : 45)

Underlying this (CP), there are four basic rational maxims serving as guidelines to conduct the conversation. The participants in a speech event either observe those maxims or flout one or more of them. The present study is concerned with how does flouting these maxims may lead to communication breakdown among the speaker and the listener as well as the writer and the reader. In order to better account for the exploitations of these maxims, consider the following:

1. Quality : This maxim might be flouted in the following utterance
   A: X is a fine friend (Grice 1975:51)
   In the above utterance if X is known to A and his addressee that he/she made something bad to A, then A is flouting the maxim of quality, i.e, he is not telling the truth. In this case, the hearer needs to work hard to know what does the speaker want to convey ironically. In other words, he has to understand the implicature inhabited in the utterance which is “A believes that X is not a real but a rotten friend”.

2. Quantity : This maxim might be flouted in the following exchange between A and B (Levinson 1983:111):
   A: War is war
   B: If he does it, he does it.
   The previous examples convey a meaning that exceeds their literal sense or what is literally meant. Their communicative import is related to the pragmatic implications in flouting the maxim of quantity. Thus, In (A) one might implicate that it might be: terrible things always happen in wars” or the nature of wars is very bad.

3. Relevance : The following example illustrates the exploitation of this maxim:
   A: Where are my glasses?
   B: I am going out tonight.
   From B’s reply, it is clear that B changes the topic completely. He/She may know where the glasses are but indirectly he does not want to confess or to tell A about their place.

4. Manner : To show how this maxim is violated, consider the following example:
   Mary got pregnant, last month she was married.
   This utterance violates the sub-maxim of manner “be orderly”, mainly in the Arab world since women are supposed to get married first then get pregnant.
   According to Leech (1983), the (CP) is not sufficient to explain the relation between sense and force. He says the (CP) cannot explain “why people are often so indirect in conveying what they mean, and what is the relation between sense and force when non-declarative types of sentence are considered” (ibid: 80). So he presents the politeness principle (PP) to go hand in hand with the (CP) in interpreting messages and to rescue the (CP) from serious troubles. To illustrate his point Leech presents the following example:
   A: We’ll all miss Bill and Agatha, won’t we?
   B: Well, we’ll all miss Bill.
   In this exchange of talk B is violating the maxim of quantity by responding to one part of A’s opinion and intentionally ignoring the other part. The implicature here is that “B is of the opinion that we will not all miss Agatha” (ibid: 84). This implicature is obtained not only on the basis of the (CP). B could have added “but not Agatha” in order to be faithful to the (CP) maxim. But in order to be polite he used the (PP) beside the (CP) maxims. Leech concludes that “B could have been more informative, but only at the cost of being more impolite to a third party: that B therefore suppressed the desired information in order to uphold the (PP).”
2.4 Arabic Literature on Implicature

Implicature is one of the rhetorical devices used in Arabic mainly in the Holly Quran. It is called “Al-Talwih”. In reference to this phenomenon, Alzarkashi (1972) says: “التلوين لأن المتكلم بلوح ما يريد …" (It is also called implicature since the speaker insinuates to the hearer what he intends to convey.)

Also, AL Tibi (1991) refers to it as: “خفاء هو ما يشار به إلى المطلوب من بعد خفاء “ (Alluding to the intended meaning indirectly) i.e., by means of implicature.

It is important to emphasize that Arab rhetoricians have dealt with implicature as a figurative language. Al-Jurjani (d. 471 A.H.) and Al-Suyuti (d. 911 A.H.) argue that the Arabs have over depended on implicature to achieve the intended purpose of their speech in an elegant way. Sometimes they used the implication in speech as a sign of linguistic creativity and elegance. In the past, people underestimated the person who expresses himself directly.

In addition, Aziz (1998) argues that pragmatic meaning (that includes implicature) is closely associated with culture, a natural equivalent for this meaning needs shift in cultures that must be accepted to a reasonable degree. However, the translation of some creative works requires conveying the source language taste can be achieved by preserving the cultural elements.

3 Findings and Discussions

There are various types of translation equivalence which are limited in this study to the textual and pragmatic ones. In general, it is problematic to have an equivalent relation with the source text to render it naturally in the target language. This is due to the fact that translators sometimes cannot convey the same effects of the SL utterances in the TL. Nababan (2008) mentions that these problems emerge due to two main reasons. One of these reasons is that a translator cannot produce but a subjective interpretation of the source text. The other is that a translator cannot by all means determine how the audience responded to the source text when it was first produced. This is the main reason why exact equivalence in translation is unrealistic.

According to Nababan (2008), problems of equivalence occur at various levels, from word to textual and pragmatic levels due to socio-cultural and textual differences between the source text and the target text. Such problems are interrelated with one another. The meaning of the term is culturally bound that can only be understood through its context of use. Due to these differences between the source text and the target text, translators should use their own strategies to compensate in the target text the inevitable loss of the source text and thus produce an accepted and natural version.

Newmark (1988) says that cultural words are easy to detect and they cannot be translated literally since literal translation may distort the meaning, however, a descriptive – functional translation may provide an appropriate translation.

Due to the fact that cultural aspects are very helpful in understanding the message, the reader tries to discuss the cultural domains that would be problematic for the translators in translating fiction, mainly if the work includes a local touch or atmosphere.

“Habilat Bishra”, the case study for this research, is a north Jordanian short story that is rich in local images and expressions which convey the intended meaning of the original author. It is natural to north Jordanian Arabic speakers to use such utterances; the meanings of these utterances are known to them and they are easy to comprehend. However, these utterances are problematic to be translated into English. The questionnaire of this study was meant to examine the difficulties that translation students faced in translating Arabic cultural expressions into English as well as the translation strategies used to deal with such difficulties.

3.1 Culture – Specific Terms

From the answers in the translation test, it was found that culture is a considerable barrier for the subjects. This is related to the fact that Arabic and English are culturally different. The cultural barrier mainly lies in capturing the spirit and the flavor of the source text which cannot be achieved unless the translator finds appropriate equivalents in the target language. However, sometimes the term is culture
specific and this makes the problem even more complicated. Such gap constitutes an obstacle for transmitting some expressions and even ideas from one language into another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural expressions</th>
<th>Shunnaq’s translations</th>
<th>Adequate translations by the subjects</th>
<th>Inadequate translations by the subjects</th>
<th>Untranslatable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>يزفونه</td>
<td>Chanting the words on the rhythm of empty tin cans</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شدققه</td>
<td>Sides of his mouth</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أيام العز</td>
<td>The good old days</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سفق الله</td>
<td>Those were the days</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يوم لك ويوم عليك</td>
<td>Win a few and lose a few</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قنبور</td>
<td>Qanbour.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عقال</td>
<td>؟qual</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see from table 1, the phrase يوم لك ويوم عليك was the most problematic to the subjects, it was rendered incorrectly by 75%. This idiom is used in the Arab culture to indicate that life does not give us all what we want or there is not anyone who has only good or bad days all his life long. Life does not stay the same all the time; Everyone has good and bad days.

By that, we can notice that this idiom violates the quantity maxim as what is meant is more than what is said. Seventy five of the respondents rendered this idiom into English literally, i.e. “a day for you and a day against you”, “a day in your favor, another is upon you”. However, literal translation does not convey the natural effect of the SL expressions in the TL, thus, the audience of the TL will not get what is literally wanted by the SL text.

Ten percent of the respondents have translated it functionally into “life is not stable”, but also this rendition is not enough as it does not convey the inner meaning of the phrase that is conveyed rhetorically.

Avoidance was the most common strategy that the subjects tend to use in rendering the term “؟QUAL”. Perhaps this is because they did not find appropriate equivalents, or because they are not familiar with such a term that is so common in the Jordanian villages. Seventy percent rendered it functionally as ‘lamp’ or ‘electricity’. Nevertheless, both do not convey the natural aspects of the term that is a small kerosene lamp used by the Jordanian villagers before electricity was introduced. While 30% considered it untranslatable concept.

Paraphrasing is another translation strategy the subjects opted for in translating “عقل” that is a very popular type of clothing some Arabs put on their head over الكوفية. Fifty five percent of the respondents have transliterated / ؟qual / in the TL and considered it as an international item that does not need any clarification, whereas 25% of them described it as ‘head cover’ that does not convey the real meaning of / ؟qual / and 20% of them did not translate this term and consider it untranslatable.

زف was another problematic term to the subjects. It is used in Arab society with reference to the wedding ceremony. It is used with a positive connotation to show happiness for the bride and/or the groom as well as to announce that this couple is married now; either by walking behind them, or by driving cars with musical instruments until they reach their wedding house.

However, زف is also used to indicate a negative connotation as the author uses it in this short story to describe the children behavior toward Bishra Idiot. It is used in reference to the act of punishing a person for doing something wrong. The villagers used to follow the person who behaved against the morals and announce he did such and such. They make a scandal show for this person by following him and hitting on empty cans to produce ugly sounds and make fun of him by chanting the words of “Bishra’s Idiot”. Thus, it is clear that “زف” violates the maxim of quality as what is said is not what is meant.
By investigating the subjects’ translations, the researcher has found that this term is translated inadequately by 65% they render it by conveying its positive connotation i.e. “celebrating him”, “singing for him”, walking behind him as if he was a groom”.

The idiom ايام العز was difficult for the students to render it appropriately. It is used in this story to describe the good life in the past, which is not available any more. Only 30% of the respondents were able to give an acceptable equivalent for this idiom whereas 60% were not. They have rendered it as ‘dignity’ ‘prosperity’ ‘glory’ ‘richness’ without paying attention to its pragmatic function. 10% of the respondents considered it untranslatable.

In addition, the Arabic well known idiom سقا الله was not easy for the students to translate. It is used to indicate longing for the old days and hoping to come back. This idiom violates the quality maxim since it does not indicate what is said. It also violates the quantity maxim since its meaning is more than what is said.

It is noticed that most of the students failed to translate this idiom appropriately. 55% of them rendered it into “May God repeat those days”. This gives evidence that some of our students are not competent even in Arabic. 25% of the respondents have given acceptable translations as ‘May the old days come back’. However 20% of the students have not translated it and considered it as untranslatable.

شدقيه was the least problematic term to the subjects. It is used by Arabs to indicate the wideness of the mouth. In the past, this term was used for the camel lips that are big. Jaradat uses this term with a negative connotation to show that “Bishra Idiot” has a big, ugly, and thick mouth. 60% of the subjects rendered شدقيه into acceptable equivalents such as ‘corners of his mouth’, ‘sides of his mouth’.

However, such rendering does not convey the inner meaning of the term as it is intended by the author. The rest of the subjects (40%) have translated it into ‘his lips’.

3.2 Colloquial Terms

Arabic and English are linguistically different; Arabic is a semitic language while English is an Indo-European language. These terms are universal among the users of any language. Such expressions include unrelated words to the subject being described; However, it can be understood easily by the speakers who belong to the same culture. Such terms do not follow a certain grammatical or lexical rule that make them difficult to translate.

“Habilat Bishra”, includes many colloquial terms used by people in north Jordan. These terms can be easily understood by the Jordanians without referring to dictionaries since they are used a lot in the villagers’ daily life.

The following table shows the results of the respondents’ renditions regarding colloquial terms translation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic problematic expressions</th>
<th>Shunnaq translations</th>
<th>Adequate translations by the subjects</th>
<th>In adequate translations by the subjects</th>
<th>No translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طنبوژ عزه</td>
<td>Glory days</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ملح وذاب</td>
<td>Vanished into the air</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بتراب المصاري</td>
<td>Dirt- cheap</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ولا ما يحزنون</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يا هملاكي</td>
<td>Ah! Too many to remember</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لويل يا مسهل</td>
<td>Where are you headed, I wish you God’s speed</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the table that the subjects encounter problems in translating the colloquial expressions mainly those that are culture specific since they are missing in the target language.

For example, the term طنبوژ عزه is a common colloquial expression used by the Jordanian villagers to indicate one’s good conditions. It is clear that most of the students have rendered it inadequately since 60% of them have referred it to the Youth days and that is not exactly meant by the author.
It seems that common idioms are easy to be translated. For instance, "ملح وذاب" has been translated by 80% of the subjects as it is a universal term.

However, even though "بتراب المصاري" is a universal term in the Arabic culture, only 10% of the respondents translated it adequately. 75% could not render the rhetorical image of the term as found in the source text. Most of them translated it into “little money” or “very cheap”. Regardless the functional equivalence of this term in the English culture is “dirt cheap” or “almost free”.

The Jordanians use the idiom "ولا ما يحزنون" to negate the existence of something. Jaradat uses this term to assure that Yousef felt lonely as he does not have any body left. This term is missing in the English culture. It is translated by 55% of the respondents into “nothing” that although it does not convey the same aesthetic effect of the source text, it is a good choice since it is used to assure the negation in the target language. 15% of them misunderstand the original idiom and give inadequate translation of it such as “don’t worry”.

3.3 Metaphorical expressions

Literary contexts are rich in metaphorical expressions that must be translated into natural equivalents in the TL to convey the same function. These expressions mean more than what is said thus they cannot be translated literally as literal translation does not convey the aesthetic aspects and implicatures that encapsulated within such figurative terms. Such terms will be problematic for the translators due to the fact that each language has its own figurative expressions.

The following table shows some metaphorical utterances used in Jaradat’s short story and the results of the respondents’ translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic expressions</th>
<th>Shunnaq’s translations</th>
<th>Adequate translations given by the subjects</th>
<th>Inadequate translations given by the subjects</th>
<th>No translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>يلعن اللي بزركوا</td>
<td>Damned bastards</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أولاد الفاعله التاركه</td>
<td>Bastards</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عنيك على يد رائع يا يوسف</td>
<td>Not translated</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كان يوم اسود من الفطران</td>
<td>It was blacker than tar</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اكلته الضباع ومعاطم صارت مكاحل</td>
<td>He’d been eaten by Hyena and nothing was left of him but dry bones</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see from the table the metaphorical expression "یلعن اللي بزركوا" was the most difficult to be translated by the subjects. The use of the verb "بزركوا " seems nonsense since it is used with seeds in land agriculture rather than child-making process. However, the verb implies that the author means “the fathers of those children” that is a very common expression used to curse the fathers of people we are angry at, but it does not exist in the English culture.

Only 5% of the subjects were able to convey the pragmatic taste of this expression and they have rendered it into “Damned bastards”, whereas 70% of them rendered it literally such as “God damned your fathers”. However, such translation is not natural in English and it does not convey the cultural aspect rooted in the SL utterance. Thus it will be misunderstood in the TL.

"أولاد الفاعله التاركه" is another example of implicature since the meaning is not direct in this utterance. Jaradat uses this expression to curse the children indirectly and politely. This term is related to sexual relationships that are highly euphemised in Arabian communities. It describes the sons of a woman who is involved in a taboo sexual relationship. It corresponds to “sons of a bitch”. Nevertheless in the English culture sex is not treated euphemistically. This utterance violates the quality maxim since what is literally said is not what is understood from this utterance.

40% of the subjects ignore the euphemism strategy the original author opted for. They have rendered it into “sons of a bitch”. It is clear that this translation does not preserve the euphemistic aspect that is used deliberately by the original author. While 30% of them translated it into “the bastards”, and 30% have considered it as untranslatable.
"أعتبك على ذراعك يا يوسف" is used to indicate that every kind of food is available and you have to depend on your own to serve yourself with the kinds and amount you like. 65% of the respondents have considered this utterance untranslatable as well as Al shunqaq (the translator of Jaradat’s short story). 30% translated it literally and in adequately as “blame your arm” or “depend on your arm”. Only 5% translated it into an adequate equivalence as “depend on yourself” or “help yourself”.

"كان يوم اسود من القطران" is a universal metaphor that is used to indicate the gloomy day. 65% of the respondents translated it literally as “It is more black that tar”. However, 25% translated it into “it was a bad day” or “it was an unfortunate day”. These renderings do not convey the rhetorical image of the utterance that violates the quantity maxim as its intended meaning is much more than what is literally said.

"عظامه صارت مكاحل" is a metaphorical cultural utterance that literally means “his bones are used now to put kohl in women’s eyes”. In the Arab culture it is used to indicate that this person has been dead for ages and his bones are very dry and old now. It may be problematic to convey the rhetorical image of such utterance into the target language. Only 30% of the respondents translated this utterance literally into “he is dead since ages” that can be acceptable. However, such equivalence does not convey the metaphorical meaning indicated by the Arabic utterance, whereas 40% of them translated it into “he is lost” or “he has disappeared” that are in adequate. 30% of the respondents did not translate the utterance.

Conclusions and recommendations
The primary concern of this study has been to investigate the main cultural and pragmatic problems that may encounter translators while translating Arabic cultural utterances including implicature into English.

The findings of this study have revealed that the student translators often render problematic utterances literally. They tried to preserve the semantic image of the Arabic utterances at the expense of their functional or ideational images. Therefore, literal translation ends with unnatural equivalences that are un intelligible to the English reader.

Moreover, it has been revealed that the respondents have failed in rendering culture-specific concepts appropriately due to the referential gap found between Arabic and English. They opt for either avoidance or literal rendering for some expressions such as idioms, religion, and clothes. Some students have paraphrased these terms and provided many details about them. However, none of them has used explanatory notes to clarify their renderings of these culture specific terms and the usage of such terms in the SL.

It is not an easy task to translate cultural utterances between Arabic and English since these two languages belong to different cultures. Thus it is important for the translator to be both bilingual as well as bicultural to convey a natural message in the TL.

In addition, the study has revealed that the main reason for the respondents’ failure to render cultural utterances with implicature appropriately may due to the fact that they were not familiar of the TL culture or even their own culture. Therefore, instructors must pay more attention to get students acquainted with these two cultures by selecting texts that enrich the students’ knowledge with the cultural usage. Also they must encourage students to read the local literature in depth that will help them to understand their culture properly and help them to overcome problems they may encounter in translating into other languages.

Furthermore, it is important for the M.A and PhD. Students to study pragmatics as a good source of real life situations to have better results in translating culture specific expressions naturally in the TL.

References: