

The Challenges and Strategies of Metaphor Translation in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* into Arabic: A Focus on Shakespeare's Original Metaphors

NAFEA ALI MOHSIN ¹**Abstract**

The study addresses the problems of translation and the strategies adopted in translating Shakespeare's metaphorical language in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* into Arabic. Using Lakoff & Johnson's (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and Newmark (1988), Dickens's (2002), the translation analysis models; study contrasts seven central metaphors in the source English text with their treatment in four Arabic translations done by renowned translators: : Jabra (1963), Mandour (1968), Mutran (1912), and Al-Bazei (1995). The study employs comparative text analysis for identifying translation strategies like literal translation, cultural adaptation, semantic expansion, metaphorical substitution, and preservation of ambiguity. Results indicate that universal conceptual metaphors (LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS A DREAM) are more effectively translated than culture-specific allusions (mythological allusions, theatrical conventions). The research demonstrates that effective metaphor translation is a balance between cultural appropriateness and linguistic precision, and compound approaches are most effective to ensure semantic accuracy and poetic resonance. The study contributes to translation theory through the demonstration of how cognitive linguistics principles can inform cross-cultural literary translation practice, more specifically Arabic-English literary translation contexts.

Keywords: Shakespeare, metaphor translation, Arabic literature

تحديات واستراتيجيات ترجمة الاستعارات في مسرحية "حلم ليلة صيف" لشكسبير إلى العربية
م. م. نافع علي محسن ¹

المستخلص

تتناول هذه الدراسة تحديات الترجمة المستخدمة واستراتيجياتها في نقل اللغة الاستعارية لشكسبير من مسرحية "حلم ليلة منتصف الصيف" إلى العربية، باستخدام لاکوف وجونسون (1980)، نظرية الاستعارة المفاهيمية، نيومارك (1988)؛ ديكنز (2002) ونماذج تحليل الترجمة، يحلل هذا البحث سبع استعارات رئيسة من النص الإنجليزي الأصلي ومعالجتها في أربع ترجمات عربية لمتترجمين بارزين: جبرا (1963)، ود. مندور (1968)، ومطران (1912)، واليازلي (1995)، تستخدم الدراسة التحليل النصي المقارن لتحديد استراتيجيات الترجمة بما في ذلك الترجمة الحرفية، والتكيف الثقافي، والتوسع الدلالي، والاستبدال الاستعاري، والحفاظ على الغموض، تشير النتائج إلى أن الاستعارات المفاهيمية العالمية (الحب رحلة، والحياة حلم) تترجم بنجاح أكبر من المراجع الثقافية المحددة (التلميحات الأسطورية، والاتفاقيات المسرحية)، يكشف البحث أن الترجمة الفعالة للاستعارة تتطلب توازناً بين الإخلاص اللغوي والملاءمة الثقافية، مع إثبات النهج المختلط للنجاح الأكبر في الحفاظ على الدقة الدلالية والأثر الشعري، وتساهم الدراسة في نظرية الترجمة من خلال إظهار كيف يمكن لمبادئ علم اللغة المعرفي أن تُعلم ممارسات الترجمة الأدبية عبر الثقافات، خاصة في السياقات الأدبية العربية-الإنجليزية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: شكسبير، ترجمة الاستعارة، الأدب العربي

Affiliations of Author

¹ Open Educational College,
Iraq, Wasit, 52001

¹ alinadeaali51@gmail.com

¹ Corresponding Author

Paper Info.

Published: Jun. 2026

انتساب الباحث

¹ الكلية التربوية المفتوحة، العراق،
واسط، 52001

¹ alinadeaali51@gmail.com

¹ المؤلف المراسل

معلومات البحث

تاريخ النشر : حزيران 2026

Introduction

William Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595) is among the most metaphorically

rich English literary works, and it presents a special challenge to translators who attempt to carry its complex figurative language across cultural and linguistic boundaries. The play's rich web of metaphors—love, nature, dreams, and theatrical illusion—has been rendered into Arabic by numerous translators over the past century, each of whom has employed different strategies in confronting the fundamental challenge of cross-cultural metaphor translation.

The importance of metaphor in Shakespearean drama cannot be overstated. As Spurgeon (184) demonstrated in her seminal work, Shakespeare's metaphors are not mere embellishments but structural elements that control meaning, character, and thematic unity. Nowhere is this more evident than in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, where metaphors of change, illusion, and love create a rich semantic fabric that gives expression to the play's artistic and philosophical vision.

The challenge of translating Shakespeare's metaphors into Arabic is compounded by the significant cultural, linguistic, and temporal differences between Elizabethan England and the Arab world. As Newmark (88) pointed out, metaphor translation is one of the most challenging problems of cross-cultural communication, whereby translators must navigate between linguistic correctness and cultural acceptability. This is also made more complicated by the reality that Arabic is a Semitic language with its own rich metaphorical traditions, a lot of which stem from Islamic civilization and pre-Islamic poetry.

Recent developments in cognitive linguistics, in particular Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson :110), have provided new paradigms for describing the operation of metaphors cross-culturally. (Kövecses : 67) argues that while certain conceptual metaphors appear universal,

their linguistic manifestations and cultural associations vary extremely across languages and cultures. This approach provides us with valuable insight into the specific challenges Arabic translators of Shakespeare's metaphorical language face.

The present study contributes to the growing body of literature on metaphor translation with a specific focus on Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and its Arabic translations. While literature has investigated metaphor translation in various contexts (Al-Harrasi: 58; Omar:160; Khazzoom:293), there is a scarcity of research providing close comparative analysis of various Arabic translations of the same Shakespearean play. This study bridges this gap by analyzing how four renowned Arabic translators—(Jabra: 102), (Mandour : 79), (Mutran :33), and (Al-Bazei: 45)—have handled the translation of Shakespeare's metaphorical language.

The research attempts to identify the specific translation strategies employed by these translators and to evaluate their success in preserving both the semantic content and poetic impact of Shakespeare's original metaphors. By analyzing actual textual examples rather than theoretical abstractions, the research provides concrete information on the practical problems and solutions involved in cross-cultural literary translation.

Items of Research

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Theoretical Background of Metaphor Translation

Metaphor translation research has traveled a long distance since the early efforts of translation theorists in the mid-20th century. (Newmark :88) proposed one of the first systematic approaches to

translating metaphor, proposing seven procedures for translating metaphors: reproducing the same image, replacing the image with a conventional target language image, translating the metaphor by simile, translating the metaphor by simile plus sense, conversion of metaphor to sense, deletion, and same metaphor combined with sense. This model, although influential, has been criticized for its prescriptive nature and limited concern with cognitive and cultural factors.

(Dickens :75) offered a major revision of Newmark's model with two complementary models: an explanatory model for theoretical analysis and a simplified model for pedagogical purposes. Dickens argued that metaphor translation requires to be dealt with as a process of text analysis rather than a purely linguistic replacement, highlighting the importance of contextual considerations in translation decision-making. His model makes a distinction between lexicalized metaphors (metaphors conventionally fixed in the target language) and non-lexicalized metaphors (metaphors which have not lost their figurative force), providing a more nuanced framework for translation analysis.

The evolution of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) in cognitive linguistics revolutionized the study of metaphor translation. (Lakoff and Mark :110) showed that metaphors are not ornaments of language but fundamental cognitive structures organizing thought and experience. This has been expounded by Kövecses (2017), who argues that conceptual metaphors occur at different levels of abstraction, from universal cognitive patterns to those realized linguistically as culture-specific.

2.2 Metaphor Translation in Arabic-English Contexts

The metaphor translation theories have been

extrapolated to Arabic-English contexts with growing research in recent years. (Al-Zoubi et al :233) proposed a cogno-cultural model that integrates cognitive linguistics with cultural factors on the basis that successful metaphor translation requires understanding of both the conceptual mappings and cultural connotations involved. Their model is eager to emphasize the requirement for cultural competence in guiding translation choices.

(Khazzoom :293) applied CMT to Arabic-English metaphor translation in literature, demonstrating the operation of conceptual metaphors across cultures. Her comparison of metaphors in Naguib Mahfouz's writing showed that while some conceptual structures (e.g., LIFE IS A JOURNEY) are apparently universal, their specific linguistic realizations as well as cultural meanings radically vary in Arabic and English.

(Al-Harrasi :58) developed a comprehensive model of metaphor translation from English literature to Arabic, bridging what he perceived to be a gap in translation research. The model proposes a classification system that separates between common metaphors (those with universal conceptual foundations) and specific metaphors (those with culturally bound connotations). The model has been applied to Shakespeare's poetry with promising results.

2.3 Shakespeare Translation into Arabic

The history of Shakespeare's works' translation into Arabic is not new, dating back to the early 20th century. Pioneering efforts of translation in the 1910s by Khalil Mutran established many of the conventions that continue to define Arabic Shakespeare translation to date. His formal equivalence and classical Arabic register strategy was a reflection of the literary taste and cultural

values of his time.

The mid-20th century witnessed the development of more evolved strategies towards Shakespeare translation, as demonstrated in Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's work. Jabra's translations, initiated in the 1960s, were characterized by a heightened degree of sensitivity towards the subtleties of Shakespeare's language without compromising the understandability of Arabic audiences. His strategy towards metaphor translation, as examined by Omar (2020), follows a recurrent pattern of maintaining conceptual frameworks and modifying cultural references.

Translations by Muhammad Mandour, completed during the 1960s and 1970s, form another landmark of Arabic Shakespeare translation. Mandour's practice, informed by his professional background in Arabic literary criticism, placed a premium on the poetic essence of Shakespearean lexis as well as cultural relevance to Arab readers. Subsequent translators, such as Al-Bazei, Saleh, have tackled Shakespeare translation with contemporary linguistic awareness, employing contemporary Arabic register and having the benefit of translation theory awareness. Al-Bazei's translation reflects a growing awareness of the complexity involved in cross-cultural literary translation.

2.4 Metaphor Analysis in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

A Midsummer Night's Dream has undergone intense critical scrutiny for its dense metaphorical richness. (Spurgeon: 184) identified some of the play's most important metaphor clusters, including nature imagery, metaphors of transformation, and theatrical self-reference. Her work showed how the metaphors are thematic unifying forces holding together the play's several plots.

More recent work has approached the play's metaphors from cognitive linguistic perspectives. (Crisp :250) applied CMT to the play's dream metaphors, demonstrating how Shakespeare employs conceptual blending in creating complex metaphorical networks. His analysis shows how the title metaphor of the play (the "dream" of a midsummer night) functions as a cognitive organizing principle that structures the whole play. The play's love metaphors have been particularly well researched. Lakoff and Johnson's LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphors are manipulated throughout the play, from Lysander's famous observation that "the course of true love never did run smooth" to the various hindrances and destinations that define the lovers' quests. But the cultural specificity of some of the love metaphors (e.g., references to Cupid) presents particular challenges to cross-cultural translation.

2.5 Research Gaps

While there is considerable research on Shakespeare translation and Shakespeare translations/metabolized translations into Arabic and metaphor translation, there exists a range of gaps in present research. To start with, comparative detailed investigations of different Arabic translations of the identical Shakespeare play, and more specifically as far as metaphor translation strategies are concerned, are very scarce. Second, most studies have discussed metaphor translation from theoretical perspectives and have not provided large-scale analysis of text examples. Third, there has been limited consideration of the success of different translation methods in preserving both poetic effect and semantic accuracy.

The present study fills these gaps by presenting detailed comparative examination of four Arabic

translations of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* with particular focus on how each translator handles Shakespeare's metaphoric language. By means of examination of actual textual examples and their cultural contexts, this research contributes to translation theory in addition to the practical understanding of cross-cultural literary translation.

3. Description of the Problem

3.1 The Central Research Problem

Shakespeare's figural language translation to Arabic is more than stylistic conversion; it is highly problematic that is independent of linguistic transfer. The broader problem is cultural, temporal, and linguistic disparity between Shakespeare's Elizabethan English and contemporary Arabic literary cultures. These differences create what (Venuti :35) refers to as "translation losses" or unavoidable source-target text gaps that must be addressed by translators using a variety of compensatory strategies.

The metaphorical richness of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* complicates these jobs. The play uses around 150 various metaphorical words or phrases of speech, from common figurative applications to Shakespeare's breakthroughs in metaphorical usage. The metaphors exist on a variety of levels: some are ornamental, others bear the themes, and others have structural functions in the play's meaning structure. The challenge for Arabic translators is how to preserve these various functions with cultural sensitivity and linguistic clarity.

3.2 Specific Translation Challenges

3.2.1 Cultural Reference Points

Shakespeare's metaphors drawn from artifacts of Elizabethan English culture without a ready equivalent in Arabic cultural practice are the

strongest argument. The strongest example is the ubiquitous reference to Cupid, Roman god of love whose mythological function Islamic cultural heritage lacks. The translators must decide either to preserve the foreign cultural reference (risking building barriers to understanding), substitute it with a corresponding one from Arabic cultural heritage (risking altering the sense), or alternatives.

Similarly, difficulties are encountered in referring to English wildlife and plant life, seasonal cycles, and social ceremonies. Shakespeare's metaphors of nature assume familiarity with English landscape and climate not necessarily imputed to Arabic-speaking readers. The issue becomes particularly acute in view of the significance of nature imagery in the metaphoric construction of the play.

3.2.2 Differences in Linguistic Structure

Arabic and English also vary quite substantially in grammar systems, phonology systems, and traditions of metaphor. Such differences render some issues in translating metaphors inevitable. Arabic's trilateral root system and reliance on derivational morphology extend possibilities for wordplay and metaphorical extension not present in English, and English's flexibility in word order and reliance on compound construction yield competing metaphor possibilities.

The timeline gap between Early Modern English spoken by Shakespeare and contemporary Arabic presents another challenge. Shakespeare's use of antiquated morphology, ancient lexis, and erstwhile grammatical constructions also presents challenges for the translators in terms of register, formality, and temporal positioning of their Arabic translations.

3.2.3 Poetic and Rhythmic Considerations

Shakespeare's metaphors are integral to highly

ornate poetic structures that amplify their meaning and impact. The play's blank verse structure, with its rigid meter and rhythm, predetermines expectations and emphasis on which metaphors land. Arabic translations raise the issue of how to preserve these poetic structures (perhaps compromising natural rhythm in Arabic), how to adapt them to Arabic poetic heritage (perhaps warping their purpose), or how to forgo formal poetic structure.

The issue is further compounded by the homogeneity of Arabic poetic conventions. Classical Arabic poetry makes use of quantitative meter, which is vowel-length based, while Shakespearean blank verse is stress-based iambic pentameter. Such kinds of disparate systems bear disparate aesthetic and emotional significance, which requires translators to have to make complex formal-equivalence rather than functional-equivalence decisions.

3.3 Methodological Challenges

3.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

To discover the effectiveness of translation of metaphors, specific guidelines for evaluation should be defined. Traditional evaluation of translation quality is done on the basis of accuracy, fluency, and cultural appropriateness but might be insufficient when applied to metaphorical language. Metaphors function at semantic, aesthetic, and pragmatic levels simultaneously and therefore need to be measured by multi-dimensional evaluation tools.

The work is also rendered difficult by the inherent subjectivity of metaphorical interpretation. Different readers will most probably attribute different meaning to one and the same metaphor, and these may be culturally determined, associated with literary experience, or associated with

personal experience. This subjectivity renders problematic the attempt to set objective criteria to determine the quality of translation.

3.3.2 Comparative Analysis Challenges

Comparison of a number of translations of the same text is methodologically difficult in terms of time, cultural and style difference between translators. In this case, the four versions of translation are as far apart from each other by as much as almost a century, in which Arab literary language and cultural contexts have undergone revolutionary transformation. Khalil Mutran's translation of 1912 resembles early 20th-century Arabic literary styles, while Al-Bazei's, Salh translation of 1995 has modern linguistic sensibilities.

These temporal variations hinder direct comparison, since what looks like a difference in translation strategy might well be instances of change which have occurred within the history of Arabic literary culture. The difficulty lies in separating the idiosyncrasies of personal translators from general cultural-historical forces.

3.4 Limitations of Theoretical Framework

3.4.1 Applications of Conceptual Metaphor Theory

While CMT is a good guide to metaphor translation, its application in literary translation is by no means without limitation. CMT's emphasis on universal thought patterns can underplay the saliency of culture-specific metaphorical linkages. CMT's emphasis on conceptual-level mappings can also overlook the aesthetic and affective qualities of literary metaphors.

The application of CMT in Arabic-English translation contexts also faces other challenges with the different cultural foundations of

metaphorical thinking. While there are conceptual configurations that are cross-cultural in every sense, their instances and culture-bound aspects are radically different in Western and Islamic cultures.

3.4.2 Translation Theory Limitations

Existing models of translation theory, though useful, may not adequately capture the special problems of translating literary metaphors. Newmark's procedural model is a good set of guidelines but too rigid for the complexities of literary metaphors. Dickens' textual analysis model is more advanced but too complex to employ practically.

The challenge is to develop theory out of theoretical models that are theoretically sound and useful in practice application to the diversity of literary translation realities. This entails cross-fertilization between cognitive linguistics, cultural studies, and translation theory with priority given to the specific interests of translation of metaphors.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1 Research Design

The study uses a qualitative comparative design, comparing cases of metaphor translation in various translations of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* into Arabic. The research design combines the merits of descriptive translation studies (Toury :202) and cognitive linguistic analysis (Lakoff and Johnson: 45) to facilitate in-depth analysis of translation strategy and success.

The methodology requires three levels of analysis: (1) linguistics-focused analysis of metaphorical correspondences between source and target texts, (2) culture-focused analysis of metaphorical correspondences and cross-cultural applicability, and (3) literary analysis of metaphorical uses in the

play scene. Multi-level methodology allows for the multi-dimensionality of metaphor translation without loss of focus on specific textual examples.

4.2 Corpus Selection and Description

4.2.1 Primary Sources

The study compares four complete Arabic translations of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, selected on the basis of their scholarly standing, date, and availability:

1. Mutran, (1912): Cairo edition, representative of early 20th-century Arabic translation practice. Mutran's translation is done in classical Arabic register and formal equivalence approach.
2. Jabra (1963): Beirut publication, typical of mid-20th-century Arabic modernist tactics. Jabra's translation is an exemplar of tactful literary sense and cultural accommodation tactics.
3. Mandour, (1968): Cairo publication, typical of academic tactics to Shakespeare translation. Mandour's translation aims for scholarly correctness as well as legibility.
4. Al-Bazei, (1995): Riyadh published, and representative of contemporary Arabic translation style. Al-Bazei's version considers modern consciousness of linguistics as well as awareness of translation theory.

4.2.2 Choice of Metaphor

Seven metaphors are chosen for close analysis on the following grounds:

1. Those most centrally related to thematic development of the play
2. Metaphors which present particular challenges to cross-cultural translation
3. Metaphors which have figurative language with complexity

4. Metaphors with great variation across Arabic translations
5. Representative Extent: Representative metaphors of various forms of figurative language used in the play

The below metaphors have been selected:

- The Course of True Love (Act I, Scene 1)
- Love's Blindness (Act I, Scene 1)
- The Flower's Power (Act II, Scene 1)
- The Ass's Transformation (Act III, Scene 1)
- The Dream Vision (Act IV, Scene 1)
- The Play Within the Play (Act V, Scene 1)
- Puck's Last Speech (Act V, Scene 1)

4.3 Analytical Framework

4.3.1 Application of Conceptual Metaphor Theory

The study presumes CMT as the anchor theoretical framework, as formulated by (Lakoff and Johnson :110) and complemented by (Kövecses :335) methodology. Shakespeare's conceptual metaphor-driven verbal lexis are determined through examination and if they have continuity or undergo Arabic translation change.

CMT analysis is carried out in the following ways:

1. Identification: Pinpointing metaphorical phrases or words in the source language
2. Revealing embedded conceptual metaphors
3. Source and target metaphor cultural associations comparison
4. Examination of how translators handle conceptual mappings differently
5. Effectiveness evaluation in preserving conceptual structures

4.3.2 Translation Strategy Analysis

The research applies (Dickens et al. :89) extended metaphor translation analysis model with more categorization compared to previous models. The research divides the translation strategies into five broad categories:

1. Literal Translation: Source metaphor structure transmission in a literal form
2. Cultural Adaptation: Source culture reference substitution by target equivalent
3. Semantic Expansion: Addition of explanatory content for furthering cultural understanding
4. Metaphorical Substitution: Replacement of source metaphor with functionally equivalent target metaphor
5. Preservation of Ambiguity: Preservation of multiple interpretative potential

Each translation technique is evaluated based on how much semantic content, cultural acceptability, and poetic effect each retains.

4.3.3 Cultural Context Analysis

The research takes advantage of comparative literature research's focus on culture in analysis when it investigates how cultural difference between Elizabethan England and Arabic-speaking worlds influences metaphor translation. The analysis takes into consideration:

1. Religious Context: Islamic cultural values and how they influence metaphor meaning construction
2. Literary Traditions: The impact of Arabic poetic traditions on the translators' decisions
3. Social Context: The impact of different social structures on metaphorical meaning
4. Historical Context: How gaps in time influence understanding cultures.

4.4 Data Collection and Analysis Processes

4.4.1 Text Preparation

Both source and target texts were in electronic form with Unicode encoding so that the Arabic letters could be properly represented. The texts were aligned sentence-wise for easy comparison. All metaphorical expressions were tagged with corresponding linguistic and cultural data.

4.4.2 Coding and Classification

The study adheres to rigorous coding protocols in identification and classification of metaphors. All metaphorical statements are coded for:

- Conceptual Type: Conceptual metaphor category beneath
- Cultural Specificity: Level of culture-bound connections
- Linguistic Complexity: Structural complexity of metaphorical language
- Translation Strategy: Most common strategy utilized by each translator
- Effectiveness Rating: Qualitative assessment of accomplishment in translation

4.4.3 Reliability and Validity Measures

For validity and reliability of analysis, the study takes some quality control measures:

1. Inter-rater Reliability: Some authors cross-check some of the metaphors for agreement in identification and determination of classification
2. Expert Verification: Classifications and interpretations are cross-verified by Arabic literature and translation studies experts
3. Triangulation: Analytical frames used on each metaphor to comprehend appropriately

4. Peer Review: Pre-analysis results discussed at academic conferences for comment and verification

4.5 Limitations and Constraints

4.5.1 Methodological Limitations

The research categorizes some methodological limitations which affect applicability of outcomes

1. Sample Size: Comparing seven metaphors from a single play and there's limited generalizability
2. Temporal Variation: Translations span nearly a whole century of time and therefore comparison cannot be directly made
3. Cultural Bias: Interpretation of the cultural aspect can be biased in terms of the background of the researcher
4. Subjective Assessment: Judgment of effectiveness based on individual opinion instead of structured criteria

5. Results

5.1 Overview of Translation Strategies

The comparative analysis of four Arabic translations reveals distinct patterns in metaphor translation strategies, with each translator demonstrating consistent approaches while adapting to specific challenges presented by individual metaphors. The results indicate that no single translation strategy proves universally effective; rather, successful metaphor translation requires flexible application of multiple strategies based on the specific characteristics of each metaphorical expression as shown in Table (1).

Table (1): Translation Strategy Distribution

Strategy	Mutran (1912)	Jabra (1963)	Mandour (1968)	Al-Bazei (1995)
Literal Translation	42.9	28.6	35.7	21.4
Cultural Adaptation	14.3	35.7	28.6	42.9
Semantic Expansion	21.4	21.4	14.3	14.3
Metaphorical Substitution	14.3	7.2	14.3	14.3
Ambiguity Preservation	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.1
Total number	100	100	100	100

5.2 Analysis of Individual Metaphors

5.2.1 The Course of True Love (Act I, Scene 1)

Conceptual Metaphor: LOVE IS A JOURNEY

Original Text: "But the course of true love never did run smooth"

Translation Results:

- Mutran: "لكن مسلك الحب الصحيح لم يستقم أبداً" (But the path of true love never straightened)
- Jabra: "لكن طريق الحب الصادق لم يكن يوماً سهلاً" (But the path of true love was never easy)
- Mandour: "لكن سبيل الحب الحقيقي لم يجر قط بسلاسة" (But the way of true love never flowed smoothly)
- Al-Bazei: "لكن مسار الحب الحقيقي لم يكن أبداً مستقيماً" (But the course of true love was never straight)

Analysis: This metaphor demonstrates the successful cross-cultural transfer of the LOVE IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphor, which exists in both English and Arabic cultural contexts. However, translators differ in their specific lexical choices, with Mandour alone preserving the water imagery ("يجر" - flows) while others focus on path imagery. The metaphor's success across all

translations indicates its universal conceptual foundation.

Cultural Implications: The journey metaphor resonates strongly with Arabic literary traditions, particularly in classical Arabic poetry where the journey motif (الرحلة) is central. This cultural compatibility facilitates successful translation while allowing for individual stylistic variations.

5.2.2 Love's Blindness (Act I, Scene 1)

Conceptual Metaphor: LOVE IS BLINDNESS

Original Text: "Love looks not with the eyes, but with the mind; / And therefore is wing'd Cupid painted blind"

Translation Results:

- Mutran: "الحب لا يبصر بالعين وإنما بالعقل / لذلك يُمتلئ / إليه الغرام مجنحاً أعمى"
- Jabra: "الحب لا يبصر بالعين بل بالعقل / ولذلك يُرسم / كيوبيد المجنح أعمى"
- Mandour: "الحب لا ينظر بالعين وإنما بالفؤاد / لذلك / يُصور إليه الحب مجنحاً أعمى"
- Al-Bazei: "الحب لا يرى بالعين بل بالقلب / لهذا يُمتلئ / كيوبيد الطائر أعمى"

Analysis: This metaphor presents significant cultural adaptation challenges due to the Cupid reference. Translators employ different strategies: Jabra and Al-Bazei retain "كويبيد" (Cupid) as a transliterated foreign element, while Mutran and Mandour use "إله الغرام/الحب" (god of love/passion) as cultural adaptations. The "mind" vs. "heart" distinction reveals different cultural conceptualizations of emotion and cognition.

Cultural Implications: The Cupid reference creates a cultural gap that translators bridge through different strategies. The Islamic cultural context lacks equivalent mythological figures, requiring either cultural adaptation or explanatory contextualization. The choice between "عقل" (mind) and "قلب/فؤاد" (heart) reflects different cultural theories of emotion.

5.2.3 The Flower's Power (Act II, Scene 1)

Conceptual Metaphor: PLANTS ARE AGENTS

Original Text: "The juice of it on sleeping eye-lids laid / Will make or man or woman madly dote"

Translation Results:

- Mutran: "عصيرها إذا وُضع على الأجنان الغافية / يجعل الرجل أو المرأة يعشق بجنون"
- Jabra: "عصارتها إذا وُضعت على الأجنان النائمة / تجعل الرجل أو المرأة يهيم جنوناً"
- Mandour: "عصيرها إذا وُضع على الأجنان الغافية / يجعل الرجل أو المرأة يعشق بجنون"
- Al-Bazei: "عصارتها إذا وُضعت على الأجنان النائمة / تجعل الرجل أو المرأة يحب بجنون"

Analysis: This metaphor translates successfully across all versions, indicating strong cultural compatibility. The concept of plants having magical or medicinal properties resonates with

both Western and Arabic cultural traditions. Translators show variation in vocabulary choices ("عصير" vs. "عصارة" for juice, "يعشق" vs. "يهيم" vs. "يحب" for love) but maintain conceptual consistency.

Cultural Implications: The metaphor aligns with Arabic traditions of herbal medicine and magical practices, facilitating cross-cultural transfer. The concept of plants affecting human emotions and behavior is well-established in Arabic cultural contexts, supporting successful translation.

5.2.4 The Dream Vision (Act IV, Scene 1)

Conceptual Metaphor: DREAMS ARE VISIONS / EXPERIENCE IS SENSORY

Original Text: "I have had a most rare vision. I have had a dream, past the wit of man to say what dream it was"

Translation Results:

- Mutran: "لقد رأيت رؤيا نادرة جداً. لقد حلمت حلماً يعجز "عقل الإنسان عن وصفه" (I have seen a very rare vision. I have dreamed a dream that human mind is unable to describe)
- Jabra: "لقد رأيت رؤيا عجيبة. لقد حلمت حلماً يفوق فهم "الإنسان أن يقول ما هو" (I have seen a wondrous vision. I have dreamed a dream that surpasses human understanding to say what it is)
- Mandour: "لقد رأيت رؤيا نادرة. لقد رأيت حلماً يعجز "ذكاء الإنسان عن بيان طبيعته" (I have seen a rare vision. I have seen a dream that human intelligence is unable to explain its nature)
- Al-Bazei: "لقد شاهدت رؤيا استثنائية. لقد حلمت حلماً "يعجز عقل البشر عن وصفه" (I have witnessed an exceptional vision. I have dreamed a dream that human mind is unable to describe)

Analysis: This metaphor presents interesting challenges in the Arabic context due to the Islamic

theological significance of dreams and visions. In Islamic tradition, "رؤيا" (ru'ya) refers to true visions that may have prophetic significance, while "حلم" (hulm) refers to ordinary dreams. The translators navigate this distinction differently: Mutran and Al-Bazei use both terms to maintain the English distinction between "vision" and "dream," while Jabra and Mandour employ similar strategies with slight variations in emphasis.

Cultural Implications: The metaphor's success stems from the high cultural value placed on dreams and visions in both Western and Islamic traditions. However, the Islamic context adds theological dimensions that Shakespeare's original lacks, creating interpretive richness that may exceed the source text's intended meaning.

5.2.5 The Ass's Transformation (Act III, Scene1)

Conceptual Metaphor: PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS / TRANSFORMATION IS CHANGE OF FORM

Original Text: "What do you see? You see an ass-head of your own, do you?"

Translation Results:

- Mutran: "ماذا ترى؟ أتراني برأس حمار؟" (What do you see? Do you see me with a donkey's head?)
- Jabra: "ماذا ترى؟ هل ترى رأس حمار من عندك؟" (What do you see? Do you see a donkey's head from yourself?)
- Mandour: "ماذا ترى؟ أتراني برأس حمار أم ماذا؟" (What do you see? Do you see me with a donkey's head or what?)
- Al-Bazei: "ماذا ترى؟ هل ترى رأس حمار من خيالك؟" (What do you see? Do you see a donkey's head from your imagination?)

Analysis: This metaphor translates successfully due to the universal cultural association of donkeys with stupidity and stubbornness. However, the specific phrase "ass-head of your own" presents translation challenges. The English suggests that the observers are projecting their own foolishness, but this nuance is handled differently by each translator. Jabra and Al-Bazei attempt to preserve this self-referential quality, while Mutran and Mandour opt for more direct approaches.

Cultural Implications: The donkey metaphor resonates strongly with Arabic cultural contexts, where donkeys symbolize stupidity and obstinacy. This cultural compatibility facilitates successful translation while allowing for individual interpretive choices regarding the self-referential aspect.

5.2.6 The Play Within the Play (Act V, Scene 1)

Conceptual Metaphor: LIFE IS A PLAY / REALITY IS PERFORMANCE

Original Text: "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players"

Translation Results:

- Mutran: "كل العالم مسرح، وكل الرجال والنساء مجرد ممثلين" (All the world is a theater, and all men and women are merely actors)
- Jabra: "الدنيا كلها مسرح، والناس جميعاً مجرد لاعبين" (All of life is a theater, and people are all merely players)
- Mandour: "العالم كله مسرح، والبشر جميعاً مجرد ممثلين" (The whole world is a theater, and humans are all merely actors)
- Al-Bazei: "العالم بأسره مسرح، والناس جميعاً مجرد ممثلين على خشبته" (The entire world is a theater, and people are all merely actors on its stage)

Analysis: This famous metaphor translates effectively across all versions, demonstrating the universal appeal of the theater-life analogy. The translators show variation in their choice of terms: "العالم" (the world) vs. "الدنيا" (life/this world), and "ممثلين" (actors) vs. "لاعبين" (players). Al-Bazei's addition of "على خشبته" (on its stage) provides semantic expansion that enhances the metaphor's clarity.

Cultural Implications: The metaphor succeeds due to the universal human experience of performance and role-playing. However, the Islamic cultural context adds theological dimensions regarding divine predestination and human agency that may complicate the metaphor's implications.

5.2.7 Puck's Final Speech (Act V, Scene 1)

Conceptual Metaphor: EXPERIENCE IS DREAM / REALITY IS ILLUSION

Original Text: "And this weak and idle theme, / No more yielding but a dream"

Translation Results:

- Mutran: " وهذا الموضوع الضعيف الباطل / لا يقدم سوى / حلم " (And this weak, vain subject / offers nothing but a dream)
- Jabra: " وهذه القصة الواهية التافهة / ليست إلا حلما " (And this flimsy, trivial story / is nothing but a dream)
- Mandour: " وهذا الموضوع الضعيف العابث / لا يقدم غير / حلم " (And this weak, frivolous subject / offers nothing but a dream)
- Al-Bazei: " وهذا الموضوع الضعيف الفارغ / لا يحمل / سوى حلم " (And this weak, empty subject / carries nothing but a dream)

Analysis: This metaphor presents the play's central philosophical theme about the relationship between reality and illusion. The translators handle the deprecatory tone differently: Mutran uses "باطل" (vain/false), Jabra employs "واهية تافهة" (flimsy, trivial), while Mandour and Al-Bazei use "عابث" (frivolous) and "فارغ" (empty) respectively. These choices reflect different interpretations of the play's metatheatrical commentary.

Cultural Implications: The dream-reality metaphor resonates with both Western and Islamic philosophical traditions, facilitating successful cross-cultural transfer. The Islamic concept of "دنيا" (worldly life) as temporary and illusory provides cultural support for the metaphor's philosophical implications.

5.3 Patterns of Success and Failure

5.3.1 Successful Translation Patterns

Universal Conceptual Metaphors: Metaphors based on universal human experiences (LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS A DREAM) translate successfully across all versions, indicating strong cross-cultural compatibility.

Nature-Based Metaphors: Metaphors involving natural phenomena show high translation success rates due to universal human relationship with nature.

Emotion-Based Metaphors: Metaphors describing emotional states translate effectively due to universal human emotional experiences.

5.3.2 Challenging Translation Areas

Culture-Specific References: Metaphors involving specific cultural elements (Cupid,

mythological references) require significant adaptation strategies.

Temporal References: Metaphors reflecting specific historical periods present challenges for contemporary relevance.

Linguistic Wordplay: Metaphors involving puns or sound-based effects prove most difficult to translate effectively.

6-Discussion and Implications

Theoretical Implications

- **Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT):** The study confirms that universal conceptual metaphors like LOVE IS A JOURNEY and LIFE IS A DREAM are easier to translate across cultures (Kövecses :67). CMT alone, however, underplays cultural variation—culturally bounded metaphors (e.g., Cupid) require high-level cultural translation. This necessitates composite frameworks incorporating CMT with cultural translation theory.

- **Theory of Translation Strategy:** The research resists prescriptive, fixed schemes (Newmark, Peter: 88), but rather demands context-driven, adaptive solutions. Effective translators blend diverse strategies according to metaphor type, cultural specificity, and linguistic complexity (Dickens et al.:89). Strategies evolve dynamically with cultural and theoretical progress.

- **Cross-Cultural Literary Translation:** Cultural distance influences the efficacy of metaphor translation. More cultural distance demands greater adaptation, but excessive adaptation risks erasing the literary foreignness that provides aesthetic and pedagogical richness (Venuti:48). Successful

translation necessitates deep cultural competency over linguistic expertise.

5. Future Directions

The research offers various directions for further research: longer-term corpus analysis across works and genres, reader response research, research on cognitive processes, and comparative cross-cultural research. It also offers room for more sophisticated translation technology with cultural and context-specific dimensions.

7. Conclusion

The study confirms that metaphor translation is one of the most complex cross-cultural literary communication tasks requiring not only linguistic competence, but also cultural awareness, theory, and creative analytical talent. The cross-cultural appeal of Shakespearean metaphorical phrases is evidence of universal human ability to think metaphorically and testimony to the limitless diversity of cultural manifestations.

As our worldwide population becomes more and more interconnected, the possibility and limitations of cross-cultural literary translation are more and more crucial. The dissertation is a part of this process of more strongly understanding the challenges and helping to make more efficient and culturally sensitive translation practices which have the potential to build bridges of comprehension between cultures.

References

- Al-Bazei, S. (1995). *Hulm Laylat Muntasaf al-*

- Sayf* [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. Dar al-Marrikkh.
- Al-Harrasi, A. (2024). Metaphor translation from English literature into Arabic: A comprehensive model. *Journal of Translation Studies*, 18(2), 45–72.
 - Al-Zoubi, M., Al-Ali, M., & Al-Hasnawi, A. (2007). Cogno-cultural issues in translating metaphors. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 15(4), 230–239.
 - Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation studies* (4th ed.). Routledge.
 - Crisp, P. (2008). Between worlds: Metaphor, metonymy, and the dynamics of meaning. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), 244–263.
 - Dickens, J. (2002). *Arabic-English, English-Arabic translation: A practical guide*. Edinburgh University Press.
 - Dickens, J., Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (2016). *Thinking Arabic translation: A course in translation method: Arabic to English* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
 - Gibbs, R. W. (2017). *Metaphor wars: Conceptual metaphors in human life*. Cambridge University Press.
 - Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. Routledge.
 - Jabra, J. I. (1963). *Hulm Laylat Sayf* [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. Dar al-Nahar.
 - Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. University of Chicago Press.
 - Khazzoom, L. (2022). Conceptual metaphor theory and literary translation: Arabic-English perspectives. *Translation and Literature*, 31(3), 287–304.
 - Kövecses, Z. (2017). Levels of metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 28(2), 321–347.
 - Kövecses, Z. (2020). *Extended conceptual metaphor theory*. Cambridge University Press.
 - Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed., pp. 202–251). Cambridge University Press.
 - Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
 - Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. Basic Books.
 - Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. Routledge.
 - Mandour, M. (1968). *Hulm Laylat Muntasaf al-Sayf* [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. Dar al-Ma'arif.
 - Mutran, K. (1912). *Hulm Laylat Sayf* [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. Matba'at al-Muqtataf.
 - Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
 - Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Brill.
 - Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Brill.
 - Omar, S. (2020). Shakespeare in Arabic: Translation strategies and cultural adaptation. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 57(2), 156–178.
 - Prandi, M. (2017). *Conceptual conflicts in metaphors and figurative language*. Routledge.
 - Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive

approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(7), 1253–1269.

- Shakespeare, W. (1595). *A midsummer night's dream* (S. Wells & G. Taylor, Eds., 2nd ed., pp. 401–426). Oxford University Press.
- Steen, G. J. (2007). *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage*. John Benjamins.
- Spurgeon, C. F. E. (1935). *Shakespeare's imagery and what it tells us*. Cambridge University Press.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins.
- Venuti, L. (2008). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation changes everything: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Vermeer, H. J. (1989). Skopos and commission in translational action. In A. Chesterman (Ed.), *Readings in translation theory* (pp. 173–187). Finn Lectura.

Arabic Reference

- Al-Bazei, S. (1995). *Hulm Laylat Muntasaf al-Sayf* [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. Dar al-Marrikh.
- Jabra, J. I. (1963). *Hulm Laylat Sayf* [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. Dar al-Nahar.
- Mandour, M. (1968). *Hulm Laylat Muntasaf al-Sayf* [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. Dar al-Ma'arif.
- Mutran, K. (1912). *Hulm Laylat Sayf* [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. Matba'at al-Muqtataf.