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Abstract

This study comes as a response to the need for comparative assessment and evaluation studies of stylistic differences between English and Arabic in the field of literary translation in the Arab World. The main objective of this explanatory, analytical and comparative study was to investigate the translation of symbolism in William Golding’s *Lord Of The Flies* (LOTF). The rich cultural connotations behind the employment of symbols in literary works constitute a great challenge to the literary translator. There is a need to ascertain the appropriateness of the translated symbols in the Arabic versions of LOTF. Two Arabic translations, Darweesh and Qaseh (2004) and Hamid (2002), are compared in terms of conveying the original symbolic style of the hunting series in LOTF. This study attempts to provide a relevance-theoretic account for the translation of symbols between English and Arabic. Relevance Theory (RT), as a communication theory which builds on a pragmatics, provides a way out of the traditional emphasis on the concept of the translation equivalence. It concentrates on the contextual environment of both the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) in achieving successful communication.
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1. Introduction

Literary texts usually employ various techniques to achieve their aims rhetoric ally and aesthetically (Katan, 2015). For example, literary men use figurative language to reflect their perspectives, views and styles of writing aesthetically and more effectively (cf. Al-Masri, 2010; Munassar, 2005). Being rife with figurative language, literary works constitute a challenge for translators (Tymoczko, 2016). This is due to the fact that figurative literary language, by its implicit connotative nature, does not express meanings and ideas in a direct way. Connotative layers of implicit meanings and associations, in addition to denotative direct meanings, are always present in the literary genre (cf. Bassnett, 2011; Traps, 2009).

William Golding’s LOTF is a symbolic narrative that was published by Faber and Faber in 1954. Symbolism is a figure of speech that is employed by Golding in narrating LOTF. In addition to the semantic direct meanings of symbols, literary translators need to consider the implicit pragmatic and extra-lingual meanings and associations, which are usually dependent on cultural contexts, in the source language text (SLT) (cf. Zhonggang, 2006). In the present study, two Arabic translations, Darweesh and Qaseh (2004) and Hamid (2002), will be investigated in terms of conveying the original symbolic style in LOTF with regard to the series of hunting.

2. Background of the Study

Golding’s Nobel-prized masterpiece has been translated into various languages for its significant universal themes and its skilful narrating style (Chaima, 2015). Since its first publication in 1954, LOTF has been translated into Arabic 10 times. It is an important work of art for which Golding was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1983. In fact, Golding’s masterpiece mirrors his attitude towards the political situation in Europe during and after the period of World War II (Özçelik, 2015; Alnajm, 2015; Jeffares, 2002). LOTF reflects Golding’s deep interest in mankind (Manzoor, 2007). Golding believes that “The shape of society depends on the ethical nature of the individual and not on any political system however apparently logical or respectable” (Baker & Ziegler, 1988, p.16). He suggests that the welfare of people depends largely on the nature of every individual human being, which he believes to be evil. Calandra (1980) maintains that LOTF is symbolic by nature and that Golding has made a main contribution to man’s self-awareness. Danicic (2012) summarizes the events and the themes of the novel in the following quotation,

LOTF describes how a group of British schoolboys fails to manage their life after having been evacuated in a deserted island. The aeroplane that was trying to rescue them from the devastating results of the war in which their country was involved has been shot down. The fall of the plane from the sky symbolises the fall of man from the state of innocence and the failure of civilization (p. 198).
Symbolism is a figure of speech which indicates the use of symbols to represent ideas. Golding has employed symbolism in LOTF as a powerful mechanism in narrating social power relations (Gormez & Dag, 2015; Bruns, 2009). By the heavy employment of symbolism in his narrative, Golding intends to effectively, though in an implicit way, influence the people of his time through displaying social power relations allegorically (Wilson, 2015). By following this specific writing style, i.e. the use of symbols to represent objects, ideas or people, Golding intends to motivate people to think about the inner evil inside them (Peter, 1988).

A symbol could be a person, an object or an event which refers to an idea or situation in real life. Many critics consider various events in LOTF as being symbolic as Golding bestows symbolic implications to many of the scenes in his narrative. His choice of words and descriptions are employed symbolically to serve the theme of his narrative. In this study, the researcher is going to analyse two Arabic translations of these events in order to shed light on the methods used by the Arab translators to convey the implied symbolic meanings. The researcher is going to focus on the extent to which the Arab translators succeed or fail in providing the TL readers with appropriate relevant translations. Translating symbols from English into Arabic implies a cultural transference of connotative meanings and associations (Sebotsa, 2016; Rafieyan et al., 2015).

3. Translating Symbolism in Terms of Relevance Theory

The main assumption of RT is the belief that communication presumes relevance. In other words, the addresser assumes that his intentions are worth the addressee’s cognitive efforts and that utterances create expectations of their relevance. These exerted efforts always pursue relevance for the sake of achieving desirable contextual effects as the human cognition is geared to the maximisation of relevance (Wilson & Sperber, 2002). This cognitive, psychological process succeeds only if the two ends of this equation, the exerted cognitive efforts and the achieved contextual effects, are considered by the addressee/translator (Gutt, 2000; Pilkington, 2000).

RT is based on two principles of relevance, a cognitive principle and a communicative principle. The cognitive principle suggests that human cognition is geared to the maximisation of relevance. The communicative principle suggests that utterances create expectations of optimal relevance (Wilson & Sperber, 2002). In other words, expectations of relevance of an utterance shall guide the hearer to derive the most appropriate meaning as the search for relevance is a main feature of man’s cognition. Within the cognitive environment of the readers, the more contextual effects achieved the more relevant is an interpretation.

A relevance-theoretic based account of translation defines translation as a three-party interaction that includes the author, the translator and the target readers (Jing, 2010). When discovering the intentions of the author and then exploring the cognitive environment/context of SL and TL readers, the translator will be able to employ suitable methods and strategies in order to recreate the intended contextual effects of the original text. RT is concerned with familiarizing the readers in the TL with the intentions of the original author by introducing the original context of the ST for them. RT intensifies the importance of contextual information in terms of literary translation as a condition for achieving relevant translations (cf. Pegulescu, 2016). This task is usually accomplished by the translator/mediator through applying the direct or indirect translation strategies.

RT is significantly applicable in the fields of translation, stylistics and literary communication (Cruz, 2016). In terms of this theory, it can be said that the text of LOTF is said to be ostensive on the part of William Golding and inferential on the part of his audience (cf. Reza, 2016). According to RT, Gutt (2000), style in literary works can be translated properly by the application of two main approaches to translation: Direct and indirect translation (Pilkington, 2000). According to the first approach, we can say that the poetic language implied in the use of symbolism in LOTF indicates what Gutt refers to as weak implicatures (Huang, 2011). These implicit meanings constitute Gutt’s ‘communicative clues’. These clues will lead the reader in the TL to the intentions of the original author. The translator is the one who is responsible for securing the most relevant meanings for the TL audience (Gutt, 2000). Gutt (1991) points out that,

> A receptor language utterance is a direct translation of a source language utterance if and only if it purports to interpretively resemble the original completely in the context envisaged for the original (p. 163).

As to the quality of the translation, the yardstick is the TL readers’ achievement of the intended meaning of the original as introduced by the translator, rather than the rules of equivalency suggested by traditional theories of translation. This can be achieved by the translator if his aim is to consider both the SLT and TLT as two interpretations of the author’s thoughts. The interpretive resemblance between the SLT and TLT is important in making concrete comparisons between translation and original (Gutt, 1992). The extent of relevancy depends on the amount of the processing efforts and the achievement of the expected contextual effects (cf. Candria, 2011). Optimal relevance can be achieved by providing the TL audience with the most appropriate contextual effects without requiring them to exert any unnecessary cognitive processing efforts (cf. Shih, 2015).

4. The Hunting Series in LOTF

The hunting series in LOTF is considered an effective symbol for the bloody game of man’s history (Baker & Ziegler, 1988). Skillfully and symbolically, Golding describes how the hunts for food develop gradually into savagery. Dickson (1990) believes that through the series of hunts the boys are changing gradually into savages. According to Kelly (2011) the hunt represents violence and evil (Harris, 1970).

At the beginning of the novel, Golding describes the boys as being unable to kill an animal or even to see blood. They fail to kill a piglet in spite of the fact that it is an easy task for them since the pig is caught in creepers. Later, the boys
are able to plan for hunting and it becomes easier for them to hunt, kill and cut flesh. At the end of the narrative, the boys are described as savages as they are now ready to kill themselves. The hunt series here represents the darkness of man’s heart that leads him to eventually kill himself. Golding’s symbolic description of these events requires the translators’ consideration. Translators are required to convey Golding’s intention behind depicting the boys’ gradual degeneration symbolically. For achieving this aim they need to respect the original concise and subtle lexical choices of the author that represent his style of writing.

When the boys find a piglet “caught in a curtain of creepers” (LOTF, 51), Jack draws his knife and raises his arm in the air as a first step to attack the piglet. Golding says that after a while “the blade continued to flash at the end of a bony arm” (LOTF, 51). Skillfully, Golding describes both the weakness in Jack’s arm and the presence of evil in the flashing of the blade. Describing Jack’s arm as ‘bony’ indicates his weakness. Though, in describing the blade as flashing in Jack’s arm, Golding foreshadows evil. Moreover, the verb ‘continued’ implies that the blade, in Jack’s hand, stayed a relatively long time in the air, which is a clue that even Jack, the seemingly worst boy on the island, is not able to try to kill.

Soon after that, Golding provides the reason behind the boys’ failure in killing the piglet before it runs away. He states that “The pause was only long enough for them to understand what an enormity the downward stroke would be” (LOTF, 51). This statement indicates that the boys are still innocent and humane. Then, Golding intensifies his view by clarifying the reason behind Jack’s long waiting and inability to take the decision of killing by stating that, “They knew very well why he hadn’t: because of the enormity of the knife descending and cutting into living flesh; because of the unbearable blood.” (LOTF, 51).

In terms of the Arabic translations of these symbolic descriptions, the researcher believes that both translations fail to convey the appropriate implications and interpretations aimed by Golding’s intention. For the first sentence which indicates both evil and weakness, the Arab translators convey the meanings in the following way:

SLT: the blade continued to flash at the end of a bony arm.
AT1: ‘واستمر اللصل بالبوميس في نهاية الذراع الممتلئة’
TRL: the blade continued to flash at the end of the plump arm.
G: [wastamara] [alnasli] [bilwamed] [ti] [nihayati] [alshira-i] [almomtali’a]
AT2: ‘واستمر اللصل عند نهاية الذراع الضعيفة’
TRL: the flashing of the blade continued at the end of the meagre forearm.
G: [wastamara] [litima-o] [alnasli] [+inda] [nihayati] [alsai-id] [alhazila]

Darweesh and Qaseh implemented a literal translation procedure for securing the meaning of the above excerpt. The Arabic sentence ‘واستمر اللصل بالبوميس’ is a successful literal translation as it preserves the symbolic intensification of the flashing of the blade which foreshadows evil to come in the following scenes. The transposition strategy which is followed by Hamid secures the meaning intended in the original text as well. Both translations are relevant to the TL audience.

However, for conveying the meaning in the other half of the excerpt, Darweesh and Qaseh, mistakenly, employ a modulation strategy by using the adjective ‘الممتلئة’ [almomtali’a] which means ‘plump’ as an equivalent to the original word ‘bony’ which means ‘skinny’. They produce an irrelevant translation of the English adjective. A breakdown in communication occurs in this case as the Arab readers will not be able to elicit these symbolic nuances of meaning. Hamid’s choice of an Arabic equivalent adjective is said to be a relevant translation. The Arabic word ‘الضعيفة’ [alhazila] which means meagre conveys the original meaning.

Golding’s choice of the word ‘skinny’ to describe Jack’s arm aims at displaying the boy’s weakness and inability to take the decision for killing a piglet. This view can be concluded from the context. It tells us that much time passes while Jack is raising his hand. Golding uses the word ‘hiatus’ to describe this relatively extended period of time. The depression symbolically. For achieving this aim they need to respect the original concise and subtle lexical choices of the author that represent his style of writing.

SLT: the pause was only long enough for them to understand what an enormity the downward stroke would be.
AT1: ط nal الصممت بشكل كاف بالنسبة لهم كي بدركو هول ما ستلول فيه الجثة
TRL: the silence prolonged enough for them to understand the horror the stab will result in.
G: [tala] [alqamto] [bishaklin] [kaf] [bilnissati] [lahom] [kai] [yodrik] [ma] [sata’olo] [ilaih] [alta-nah]
AT2: كان فترة الصمت طويلة جدا بالنسبة لهم لبدركو مدى شاشة الرعب التي ستكون وهم يجهون نحو الأسفل
TRL: the period of silence was too long for them to understand the extent of the enormity of the blow that will occur while they are heading downwards.
G: [kana] [fatrato] [alqamti] [tawlatan] [jidan] [bilnissati] [lahom] [liyodrik] [ma] [shang-ati] [aljarbat] [alla] [satakonio] [wahom] [yattajihom] [nawha] [alasfal]

Darweesh and Qaseh’s interpretation and literal translation of the above sentence can be considered a successful one. They appropriately convey the intention of the original author which aims at explaining the reason behind the ‘hiatus’, i.e. the boys’ fear of the act of killing a living thing or seeing its blood. Following the literal translation procedure secures a relevant translation in the TL.

On the other hand, Although Hamid’s translation of the first excerpt can be considered more appropriate than the other translators’, as he successfully conveys Golding’s intention by using the word ‘skinny’, which implies the aimed weakness that the original author intends, as an equivalent for ‘skinny’, his interpretation of Golding’s explanation that follows cannot be considered an appropriate rendering of the original meaning. Hamid failed in construing the original
Golding describes Jack’s endeavor for hunting as follows, “He lowered his chin and stared at the traces as though he would force them to speak to him” (LOTF, 83):

SLT: He lowered his chin and stared at the traces as though he would force them to speak to him.

AT1: ‘اَلَّذِي رَأَسَ وَحَثَ فِي هَذِهِ الْأَئْتَارِ كَأَنَّهُ سَيْمِرْحَا عَلَى الْحَدَّثِ إِلَىَّ’

TRL: He bent his head and stared in these traces as if he is going to force them to speak to him.

G: [aḥna] [ra’ṣaḥo] [waḥaddaqa] [fi] [ḥathihi] [alṭaqar] [ka’naḥo] [sayajbiroba] [ila] [attahadothi] [ilaḥ]

AT2: ‘وَأُحِنَّى نَفْسِي وَرَدَتْ بَيْنَ الأَئْتَارِ وَكَأَنَّهُ وَكَأَنَّهُ أَلْحَدَّثَ إِلَىَّ’

TRL: he bent his chin and started following the traces as if he wants them to speak to him.

G: [wa’ḥa] [thaqaḥa] [wabada’a] [bita’qobi] [alathari] [waka’naḥo] [yoridoḥa] ‘[n]’ [tatadalatha] [ilaḥy]

Although Daweesh and Qaseh state that Jack’s ‘أَلْحِنَى رَأْسَه’ which means ‘he bent his head’, not his chin, their translation within the original context is an appropriate and successful one in comparison with Hamid’s translation. The reason behind their success is that they convey the detailed description which reflects Jack’s fascination with hunting. They translate ‘as though he would force them to speak to him’ as ‘وَكَأَنَّهُ سَيْمِرْحَا عَلَى الْحَدَّثِ إِلَىَّ’ which exactly reflects the meaningful intention of using the word ‘force’ by Golding. By translating Golding’s selection of the word ‘force’ into ‘يَرِيد’ which means ‘wants’, Hamid failed to convey the purposeful intention of using the original word. Moreover, as described by Golding, Jack does not move or follow the traces in this scene, as indicated by Hamid’s translation. Jack only stared at the traces while he was thinking of them. Accordingly, being irrelevant, Hamid’s transposition translation procedure caused a communication failure in the TL.

Then in describing Jack’s hair, Golding intends to mention how Jack’s hair becomes much longer compared to its length at the beginning of the narrative when the boys were dropped on the island. Golding describes Jack’s hair as follows, “His sandy hair, considerably longer than it had been when they dropped in, was lighter now” (LOTF, 84).

SLT: His sandy hair, considerably longer than it had been when they dropped in, was lighter now.

AT1: ‘عَشْرُهُ الْمَلْمَلِي أَطُولُ كُيْبَرُ مَا كَانَ لَهُ عِنْدَهَا نَزَّلَ عَلَى هِذِهِ الْجَزِيرَةِ وَصَارَ مَنْ كُنْفَ مُنْذَ ذِٰلِكْ’

TRL: his sandy hair much longer than it had been when they dropped in this island and its colour was lighter than before.

G: [shar-roho] [alamli] [aʿwalo] [kathir] [mima] [kant] [-alayhi] [-indama] [nazalo] [-ala] [haṭḥihi] [alajzirati] [wasara] [lawnoho] [aʾkshafal] [min] [thi] [qabl]

AT2: ‘وَقَامَ شَعرُهُ المَعْرِجُ، الَّذِي طَلَّ كَأَنَّهُ عِنْدَهَا وَقَعَوْا عَلَى هِذِهِ الْجَزِيرَةِ، خَفَفَ’

TRL: his dusty hair, which had become very long when they fell on this island, became lighter.

G: [waʾsba] [shar-roho] [almogharo] [alṭi] [ṭala] [kathir] [-indama] [waqaq] [-ala] [haṭṭihi] [alajzirati] [kaʃfan]

Daweesh and Qaseh’s literal translation can be considered relevant to the readers in the TL as it conveys the symbolic evil implication of the long hair, i.e. its length. Reflecting the original implications, their translation states how Jack’s hair becomes much longer than when they arrived at the island. Hamid, on the other hand, did not realize the symbolic importance of this comparison. Moreover, Hamid inaccurately mistranslated the word lighter which describes Jack’s hair colour as ‘خَفِيفَا’ which means ‘little in density’. Golding could not have meant that Jack’s red and tall hair, which is a symbol of evil, is little in density while Jack is becoming more and more degenerated. Accordingly, this latter translation, which follows a transposition translation procedure, is irrelevant to the readers in the TL.

In the same scene, Golding describes how Jack was looking for a clue to find a pig. He describes in detail how the droppings of a pig look like. In fact, this can also be considered a symbolic implication of the gradual degeneration of the boys, “The droppings were warm. They lay piled among turned earth. They were olive green, smooth, and they steamed a little” (LOTF, 85).

SLT: The droppings were warm. They lay piled among turned earth. They were olive green, smooth, and they steamed a little.

AT1: ‘ٍكَانَ الْرُوحُ دَاخِلًا وَنَقَعَ عَلَى هُمْ خَيْرَ الْأَضْرَامِ المُقْلِيَةِ بَلْوَٰنَ أَخْرَى زَيْتُوْنِي، يَنْصِبُوْنَ عَلَى هَذِهِ الْبَخْرَ’

TRL: the dung was warm and smooth and grouped above the turned earth in an olive green colour and a little steam was rising from it.
this statement as follows: “Almost at once Jack found the dung and scattered roots that told of pig” (LOTF, 249). The Arab translators translate to communicate the intention of the author who tries to describe Jack’s extreme degeneration. Golding states that At the beginning of this hunt, Jack is described as looking for the droppings of pigs. However, the Arab translators fail to convey Golding’s intention with regard to describing the droppings in detail to reflect the extent of the state of degeneration of the boys, and to display how Jack becomes an expert hunter. On the other hand, Hamid distracted the audience in the TL from the intended meaning and context of the original text. He misunderstood the original text and came out with irrelevant translation. Hamid could not realize that Golding was describing, in details, the colour of the pigs’ droppings and how they were steaming to emphasize the boys’ degeneration. Hamid, mistakenly, referred to the olive plant fruits instead. Such a translation is totally irrelevant for the readers in the TL. More cognitive efforts will be exerted by the readers in the TL for undesirable contextual cognitive effects. Hence, Hamid’s translation causes a total breakdown in communication in the TL.

In describing how Jack is becoming more and more skilful in hunting, Golding gives an explanation with regard to how Jack is preparing to hunt professionally by making masks which will conceal him and his hunters from the sight of the pigs. Jack thinks that he could not have the opportunity to hunt a pig because pigs see rather than smell him. He explains “They don't smell me. They see me, I think. Something pink, under the trees.” (LOTF, 111)

SLT: They don't smell me. They see me, I think. Something pink, under the trees.

AT1: ‘أنهم لا يشمون، بل يراون. هذا ما يعتقدون، شيء برتقالي تحت الأشجار.’

AT2: ‘إنها لا تشم، بل تراهن. هذا ما يعتقد، شيء برتقالي تحت الأشجار.’

Darweesh and Qaseh’s translation can be considered successful in spite of the fact that they did not translate, explicitly, one of the sentences in the extract above. Their translation, by following a transposition procedure, reflects Jack’s thinking as intended by Golding. On the other hand, Hamid failed to convey the meaning of Jack’s words as he mistranslates the last sentence. His last sentence means that Jack suddenly saw something under the trees, which is opposite to what Golding intended. Hamid’s translation causes a total breakdown in communication in the TL.

After the previous hunt attempt, the relationship between the two main characters, Ralph and Jack, is about to break up as Jack is totally indulged in hunting and does not give a hand in building the shelters or watching the signal fire, which are more important issues in Ralph’s opinion. Now, when Jack and his hunters succeed in killing a pig as they plan well for it, a gap between two camps led by Ralph and Jack starts to surface. The direct reason behind this divide is that a new issue arises in Ralph’s opinion. Now, evil starts to spread on the island and most of the boys are going to, gradually, lose their humanity and turn into savages.

In the next hunting attempt, which is an unplanned one, Ralph participates and hit a pig with his spear but fails to catch. In this scene, Jack is described as he loves the droppings of these animals (LOTF, 205), which implies the extent to which degeneration overwhelmed the boys.

After that, Jack split from Ralph’s group and make his own tribe. Many of the boys join him gradually. Now, he moves to the Castle Rock, a rocky place at the other end of the island, and make that location his tribe’s fort. But before accomplishing this goal, he planned for a new hunt. This hunt is actually the cruellest and most savage. The prey, this time, is a mother pig. This time, Jack offers the head of the sow as a gift for the beast. The boys make a party and dance in circles after the feast. Primitiveness and degeneration are spreading fast everywhere on the island. These actions show that the boys are now primitive, underdeveloped and cruel savages (cf. Firth, 2011). After this hunt, the boys become totally savages. They kill Simon and then Piggy. Evil is now everywhere on the island.

At the beginning of this hunt, Jack is described as he loves the droppings of pigs. However, the Arab translators fail to communicate the intention of the author who tries to describe Jack’s extreme degeneration. Golding states that “Almost at once Jack found the dung and scattered roots that told of pig” (LOTF, 249). The Arab translators translate this statement as follows:

SLT: Almost at once, Jack found the dung and scattered roots that told of pig
Ralph, their leader. The boys become real cruel inhumane savages. They act like primitive, barbarian and brutal people. The last hunt in the narrative is the cruellest one. This time, the boys are hunting a human being. They intend to kill

deprive the readers in the TL from the intention of the original author.

G: 

The Arab translators did not translate this word into Arabic. Darweesh and Qaseh used the word 'ﺣﻔﺮة' [kinzir], which means ‘hoofs’, instead. This makes their translations irrelevant to the Arab readers. Hamid, on the other hand, used the word 'دُنْع' [dung], which means ‘the droppings of animals’. This word, as mentioned earlier, is a symbol of degeneration. It is very important to refer to this word in the Arabic translation as Golding intends to use this very word, but not the word ‘droppings’ for example. He intends to let the reader feels the gradual moral degeneration of the boys, which is representing the actual people’s degeneration in the real world. The Arab translators did not translate this word into Arabic. Darweesh and Qaseh used the word ' حوافر' [hawafir], which means ‘hoofs’, instead. This makes their translations irrelevant to the Arab readers. Hamid, on the other hand, used the word 'مَعْطَى' [hafrah], which means 'hole' as a translation for the word ‘dung’. The procedure of modulation, being implemented wrongly by the Arab translators, has failed to secure relevant Arabic translations in the TL. It is worth noting that Golding named the remains of the pigs as ‘droppings’ in the scene preceding this one. Here, he uses the word ‘dung’ explicitly to refer to the same object, the droppings of animals.

Later, Golding describes Jack as wearing darkness, “He was happy and wore the damp darkness of the forest like his old clothes” (LOTF, 250). In fact, Golding is very careful in choosing his words. Clearly, he states that it was Jack who wore the darkness of the forest instead of his old clothes. Jack is described as being a source of evil throughout the night (ibid.). This implication indicates how savage and degenerated the boys become.

G: 

Darweesh and Qaseh realize Golding’s intention and described Jack as standing happily in the dark forest. Their literal translation secures relevance in the TL. On the other hand, Hamid’s translation, by following the transposition procedure, sounds less relevant as it adds some irrelevant meaning to the original text, which may distract the reader for undesirable contextual effects.

After that hunt, in a primitive ceremonial tribal behaviour, Jack offers the head of the pig to the unknown beast as a gift. Jack says, “This head is for the beast. It is a gift” (LOTF, 256). The Arab translators convey the meaning of this gift in two different ways. Darweesh and Qaseh translate the word gift as ‘Seats’ [qorban], an offering for religious purposes. This Arabic equivalence, which they have chosen depending on the context in the scene, seems irrelevant. Hamid use the literal translation of the English word ‘هدية’ [hadiyah]. Although the Arabic word ‘هدية’ has a religious implication as it refers to Adam and Eve’s gift for Allah, the researcher believes that, by using the word ‘gift’, the original author does not intend to imply this religious meaning. He only aims to cover the idea from the boy’s perspective. Accordingly, the literal translation of the word sounds more relevant for the audience in the TL.

The scene of killing the mother sow is symbolically a sexual one (Baker & Ziegler, 1988). The fact that the boys are killing a mother sow while she was taking care of her young piglets symbolises destroying the future. Golding describes the boys as being “wedded to her in lust” (LOTF, 252). Golding aims to symbolically refer to the Oedipadian wedding night (ibid.). This implication indicates how savage and degenerated the boys become.

The Arab translators cover the intention of the original author, partially, in their translations. Their audience cannot discover the sexual symbolic reference through the literal translations of the SLT:

G: 

Darweesh and Qaseh’s literal translation to the sexual implication of the expression wedded to her in lust into ‘ متضادين للعلاقة’ can be considered appropriate as it refers implicitly to the sexual desire aimed by the original text. This means that their translation is relevant to their audience in the TL. On the other hand, Hamid failed to refer to this connotative meaning in his translation. His translation ‘تشبه اللغة’ does not contain any sexual implication and, hence, deprive the readers in the TL from the intention of the original author.

The last hunt in the narrative is the cruellest one. This time, the boys are hunting a human being. They intend to kill Ralph, their leader. The boys become real cruel inhumane savages. They act like primitive, barbarian and brutal people.
They finally burn the whole island in order to find and kill Ralph. Fortunately, and ironically, he is saved by a naval officer, who is armed and involved in a real war in the world of adults. Golding is referring here to the impossibility of real relief, as man is according to him, evil by nature.

To sum up, the researcher has analysed the translations of the symbols employed in conveying the implications of the hunting series in LOTF. The analysis has been based on the principles and concepts of RT. The analyses of the Arabic translations of the symbols in this study prove the researcher’s hypothesis with regard to the possibility of breakdown in communication in terms of the Arabic translations. The Arab translators involved in this research have not succeeded, in many cases, to secure relevant translations or interpretations of the original symbols, as employed in the original text, for their readers in the TL. Their failure in maintaining symbolism in the TL makes their translations partially irrelevant for the readers in the TL in many cases. The Arab translators’ ignorance of the symbolic value of the novel, their commitment to the traditional theories and strategies of translation and their inability to realize the existence of some symbols in the original text are the main reasons behind the shortcomings in their translations.

The Arab translators have followed various translation procedures in order to convey the meanings of symbols in LOTF. It seems that they are not aware of the symbolic value of the narrative. In spite of this tendency, some of their translations are considered successful. Some of the traditional translation approaches and procedures followed by the Arab translators are likely to secure appropriate translation if the principles of RT are taken into consideration. Actually, Gutt declares that all translation procedures could work under the umbrella of RT. The most employed translation procedures implemented by the Arab translators are: literal translation, transposition, modulation, borrowing, calque, omission, equivalence and adaptation (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995).

5. Conclusion
A symbol in a literary work implies layers of meaning. The role of the translator according to RT is to reproduce these implicit meanings in the cognitive environment of the target reader. Recognizing the author’s intention of employing a symbol is very important for the achievement of successful communication. The relevance-theoretic concepts such as optimal relevance, cognitive environment, contextual effects and processing efforts are very important for the translator to arrive at the intentions of the author and to accomplish appropriate relevant translations.
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