Linguistic and Stylistic Features of Children›s Fairy Tales and Fables: A Translation from English to Arabic

السمات اللغوية والأسلوبية لقصص الأطفال الخيالية والخرافات: الترجمة من الإنجليزية إلى العربية

أ.د. حيدر جبر غبن(*)

Prof. Haydar Jabr Koban, Ph.D.

haydar.j@albayan.edu.iq

المستخلص

لطالمــا اعتُبرت ترجمة أدب الأطفال مجالًا هامشــيًا في دراســات الترجمة نظرًا للاعتقاد الســائد بأهميته المحدودة مقارنة بالأدب العام. تستكشف هذه الدراسة السمات اللغوية والأسلوبية لأدب الأطفال، مع التركيز على ترجمة القصص الخيالية والخرافات من الإنجليزية إلى العربية. كما تناقش التحديات الفريـدة التي تواجه المترجم عند التعامـل مع هذا النوع الأدبي، خاصة في ظل وجود جمهور مزدوج يتمثل في القرّاء الصغار والوسـطاء البالغين. تعتمد الدراســة على نظريات أوتينن وشــافيت وفينوتي، حيث تســلط الضوء على تأثير اســتراتيجيات التوطين والتغريب في تشــكيل النصوص المترجمة بما يتماشــى مع التوقعات الثقافية والاجتماعية. علاوة على ذلك، تدمج الدراســة التحليل الأســلوبي لتقييم كيفيـة تأثيــر التغيــرات اللغوية على ســهولة القراءة والمعنــى والتعبير الفني. ومن خلال استكشــاف التحـولات المعجمية والنحوية والبلاغية، تؤكد الدراســة على دور المترجم فـي الموازنة بين القواعد اللغويـة والإبداع الأدبي. يسـهم هـذا البحث في تقديم فهم أعمق لاسـتراتيجيات الترجمة والاختيارات الأسلوبية، ومدى تأثيرها على تلقي أدب الأطفال في العالم العربي.

الكلمات المفتاحية :أدب الأطفال، التوطين، التغريب، التكيف اللغوي، الأسلوبية، الترجمة.

(*)جامعة البيان/ كلية التربية/ قسم اللغة الإنجليزية.

Abstract

Translating children's literature has traditionally been seen as a marginal field within translation studies due to the perceived lesser importance of children's literature. This study explores children's literature's linguistic and stylistic features, particularly the translation of fairy tales and fables from English into Arabic. It examines the unique challenges posed by translating for children, considering the dual audience of young readers and adult mediators. Drawing on theories from Oittinen, Shavit, and Venuti, the study highlights the influence of domestication and foreignization in shaping translated texts to align with cultural and societal expectations. Additionally, the research integrates stylistic analysis to assess how language variations impact readability, meaning, and artistic expression. The study underscores the translator's role in mediating between linguistic norms and literary creativity by investigating lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical shifts. Ultimately, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of how translation strategies and stylistic choices influence the reception of children's literature in the Arab world.

Keywords: children's literature, domestication, foreignization, linguistic adaptation, stylistics, translation.

Introduction

Though often considered a simple and insignificant matter, writing and translating for children are governed by numerous constraints, which usually vary from culture to culture. The situation is also problematic because a children's book must simultaneously appeal to both the genuine reader - the child - and the background authority- the adult   (Oittinen: 2000, 42).

According to Shavit (1986: 112), translation for children is directed by the following two principles, which can be either complementary or contradictory: adjusting the ST in order to make it appropriate or useful for the child and adjusting the plot, characterization, and language to the child's ability to read and comprehend, in accordance with the society's notion of what is good for the child and what the child can read and understand.

Unlike contemporary translators of adult books, the translator of children's

literature can grant him\herself the liberty to handle the text due to the peripheral position of children's literature within the literary polysystem. That is, the translator is permitted to manipulate the text in various ways by changing, enlarging, or abridging it or by deleting or adding to it (Oittinen : 2000, 13-15).

Domestication and foreignization are two translation strategies that provide both linguistic and cultural guidance. They are termed by the American translation theorist Venuti (Munday 2001: 146). According to Venuti, the former refers to - an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, brings the author back home, while the latter is - an ethnodeviant pressure on those cultural values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad (Venuti 1995: 20).

Translating for children in the Arab world has been for a long time excluded from foreign literature due to the assumption that it would hurt the children and spread undesired concepts among them. Yet, despite the worry voiced by critics and educationalists, the number of children's books translated into Arabic is steadily increasing. Indeed, the bookshelf of Arabic children's literature comprises books that are labeled as international children's classics, such as Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Charles Perrault's *Cinderella*, Rudyard Kipling's *The Jungle Book*, most Hans Christian Andersen's stories, some of Gianni Rodari's tales, Mark Twain's *Tom Sawyer*, Tove Jansson's *Moomin tales*, all *The Grimm bothers' stories*, some of Edith Nesbit's tales and many other books which belong to the same genres (Mdallel:2003: 6).

Stylistics As a Tool for Literary and Linguistic Evaluation

Most dictionaries define Stylistics as simply "the study of style" (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Longman Students' Dictionary), which is obviously unsatisfying. Besides, it broadens the term "style, "which needs much elaboration in its own right.

"Style" is defined in Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics (1985: 277) as follows: "Style is a variation on a person's speech or writing. Style usually varies from casual to formal according to the type of situation, the person or persons addressed, the location, the topic discussed, etc".

Leech (1983: 12) describes style as a way language is used, confirming that it "consists of choices made from the repertoire of the language." He also adds that there may be multiple styles within the same work; authors create their own special kind of language (ibid).

Another definition is provided by Simpson (2004:9): "The effective use of language, especially in prose, whether to make statements or to rouse emotions. It involves first of all the power to put fact with clarity and brevity".

Consequently, style may be regarded as a choice of linguistic means, a deviation from the norms of language use, a recurrent feature of linguistic forms, and a comparison. Basically, style can be viewed as the variation in language use or the varying forms of linguistic performance by speakers and writers. Alo (1998:1) states that the critical point is that "The verbal style includes all the devices of language that are used to achieve communication goals in speech and writing…".

Though it is not an easy task to stipulate a fixed definition of stylistics, since it has been the subject of controversy among linguistic scholars and literary critics, many attempts have been made to give an outline definition:

Leech and Short's account of stylistics goes as follows:

"stylistics, simply defined as the (linguistic) study of style, is rarely undertaken for its own sake, simply as an exercise in describing what use is made of language. We normally study style because we want to explain something, and in general, literary stylistics has, implicitly or explicitly, the goal of explaining the relation between language and artistic function. The motivating questions are not so much what as why and how. From the linguist's angle, it is 'Why does the author here choose this form of expression? "(Leech & Short, 1981: 11)

Collins English Dictionary provides a more intricate definition of stylistics as "a branch of linguistics concerned with the study of characteristic choices in the use of language, especially literary language, as regards sound, form or vocabulary, made by different individuals or social groups in different situations of use".

Simpson's contribution (2004: 2) enlightens stylistics' textual and functional significance as "…a method of textual interpretation in which primacy

of place is assigned to language". He declares, "The text's functional significance as discourse acts as a gateway to its interpretation". The whole process of interpretation is inseparable in practice.

Widdowson (cited in Bilal, 2012: 435) defines stylistics "as the study of literary discourse from linguistic orientation". Thus, the representation of features treatise exploits linguistic tools to create the intended effect.

These features, either literary or linguistic, are called "facts" by Riffaterre (cited in Ghazala, 2011: 15), who distinguishes between "stylistic facts" and "linguistic facts". Stylistic facts must have a specific character; otherwise, they cannot be distinguished from linguistic facts.

Crystal and Davy (1969: 10) highlight some aims of stylistics:

"Stylistics is used to analyze language habit with the main purpose of identifying from the general linguistic features, common to English as used on every conceived occasion, these features which are restricted to some kinds of social context. To explain where possible why such features have been used as opposing other alternatives and classify these features into categories based upon a view of their functions in the social context."

Stylistics covers a wide range of varieties of language and styles that contribute to creating different texts with all shapes and forms, whether spoken or written, monologue or dialogue, etc. Thus, its main concern is to study the language of literature or how particular authors use distinctive writing patterns. In other words, stylistics can be used as a technique that defines what an author has done (linguistically or non-linguistically) in his use of language. (Crystal, 1992: 34).

What style and stylistic variation revolve around is how language content may be presented in various linguistic forms. Thus, it operates at all linguistic levels, including phonological, lexical, and syntactic. Accordingly, style may be seen as the way how linguistic choices deviate from the norms of language use and whether they are recurrent features of linguistic structure.

There has been an old and continuous debate between the adherents of the linguistic-oriented school of studying language and those of the literary-oriented school, where the latter has accused the scholars of language in their analyses of literary texts as being "cold" and "too scientific". On the other

hand, the linguists have accused their literary colleagues of all the vagueness and subjectivity that may be assigned to language analysis. (Lakoff, 1972:130)

Nowhere is this disagreement more clearly seen than in the clash between Bateson and Fowler;

"....there has been a running dispute between literary critics and linguists on the question of whether it is appropriate to apply linguistic methods -that is to say, methods derived from the discipline of linguistics- to the study of literature. There has been almost universal confidence among the linguists that this activity is entirely justified; and almost universal resistance by the critics, who have regarded the exercise with almost moral indignation." (Fowler, 1988:81)

Another manifestation of this controversy can be realized in the monist and the dualist perspectives on the nature of literary language. "The dualist holds that there can be different ways of conveying the same content. The monist holds that this is a mistake and that any alteration of form entails a change of content" (Murphy, 2011: 50). As a representative of the dualist position, Murphy (ibid) calls on the work of Ohmann to explore the basic monist idea that "there are different ways of saying the same thing":

1. When dinner was over, the senator made a speech.
2. A speech was made by the senator after dinner.
3. The senator made a postprandial oration.

The central problem in these sample sentences is that the differences may be considered grammatical rather than lexical. Nonetheless, "the basic logical content of a sentence can be represented as a (set of) elementary propositions, which, together with their inter-relations, constitute its 'deep structure' or 'semantic representation'" (Leech & Short, 1981: 19). In contrast, the monist position asserts that paraphrase is not possible: "the dualist's notion of paraphrase rests on the assumption that there is some basic sense that can be preserved in different renderings. This possibility is not likely to be challenged in workday uses of language. But in literature, particularly in poetry, paraphrase becomes problematic" (ibid)

Concerning linguistic differences, the main problems reside in the obligatory grammatical and lexical forms. Jakobson (cited in Venuti, 2000:116) expounds on the nature of linguistic meaning by pointing out that "Languages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey". The contents of "what they must convey" refer to the obligatory grammatical and lexical forms, which, according to Jakobson (ibid), occur at the level of gender (e.g. *house /beit/* being masculine in Arabic, feminine in Romance languages; however, it has no gender in English), the level of aspect (e.g. in Russian, the verb morphology varies according to whether the action has been completed or not), and the level of semantic field

According to Hallidayan's (1971) perception, if there is a particular effect or value, then this would be a sign of a formal feature. This concept clarifies "how language functions in texts and the nexus between language and what it is used for, or to achieve" (Fowler, 1988: 4).

With the aid of lexical items, the writer can express thoughts and emotions and manifest them in images that give literature its peculiar expressive beauty. In this regard, writers depend on lexical items and their connotative implications to convey their intended meanings. The writer's choices affect both the intended meaning and the aesthetic beauty the receptor seeks. Hence, writers, particularly poets, cautiously choose their lexical items to achieve the ultimate goal of conveying meaning with an aesthetic impact in a way that fulfills the nexus between meaning and imaginativeness in language use.

The stylistic analysis exploits not only interpretation but also tangible data to explain the relation between language used in a text and its artistic function (Leech, 2007: 3; Simpson, 2004: 22).

In the words of Chapman (1983: 135) "Stylistics studies the language adopted to meet peculiarities of situations, attitudes, and relationships in specific linguistic acts".

Linguistic Analysis of Style

The concept of the linguistic level is taken to be the main foundation of modern linguistic theory, where each level - phrase structure, morphemics, phonemics - constitutes a device for describing a different kind of structure that represents utterances in different ways.

Stylistics involves a set of branches of language study. Stylistics investigates language features on multiple levels of language, and what is more important is that these levels are interconnected.

Leech and Short (1981:61-65) regard language levels as levels of stylistic analysis, and they categorize them as follows:

A. **Lexical Categories**	B.**Grammatical Categories**	C. **Figures of Speech**	A.**Context and Cohesion**
1. General	1. Sentence types	1. Grammatical and lexical schemes	1. Cohesion
2. Nouns	2. Sentence complexity	2. Phonological schemes	2. Context
3. Verbs	3. Clause types	3. Tropes	
	4. Clause structure		
	5. Noun phrases		
	6. Verb phrases		
	7. Other phrase types		
	8. Word classes		
	9. General		

Table (4.1) Linguistic Levels of Stylistic Analysis

Crystal (1992: 34) defines stylistics as "the study of aesthetic use of language in all linguistic domains". In this definition, stylistics is showcased as the survey of the beauty in the use of language in all the scopes of linguistics.

Thus, every style analysis seeks the artistic principles that drive an author's to make certain linguistic choices. Leech and Short provide a hugely

useful practical model of analysis and checklist of potential stylistic markers. This model is considered the "most influential framework for the analysis of speech and thought representation in narrative fiction" (Simpson, 2004: 30). It covers all lexical categories, grammatical categories, figures of speech, cohesion, and context. Semantic categories are subsumed under lexical categories.

Lexical categories, for example, include inquiries regarding simplicity, formality, descriptiveness, emotionality, generality, idiomatic use, and associated semantic fields.

Grammatical categories, on the other hand, include sentence types, sentence complexity, clause types, clause structure, noun phrases, verb phrases, and other phrase types, etc.

The third major point on Leech and Short's checklist is figures of speech, which include foregrounded features, grammatical and lexical schemes, and phonological schemes.

The final set of categories is context and cohesion; where they define this set by the following questions:

"(1) Cohesion, on the other side, implies questions like: Does the text include contrastive, logical or other links and connectors between sentences (conjunctions or adverbials)? Does cohesion rely on implicit connections of meaning? What kind of use is made of pronoun reference, substitute forms, repetition, or ellipsis?

(2) context, Does the writer address the reader directly or through the words and thoughts of a character? What linguistic clues are there of the addressor-addressee relationship? What attitude does the author imply towards his subject? How is a character's words and thoughts done - directly (direct speech), or indirectly (indirect speech, or free indirect speech)?" (Leech & Short, 1981 : 64)

Arabic Stylistics

Ghazala (2011:34-37) will be quoted to account for Arabic stylistic theories where he first denies the existence of such a term and considers it as quite alien to classical Arabic studies of language and literature, and assigns its roots to rhetoric and rhetorical studies, which began during the second century AH.

Abdul-Raof considers rhetoric as "the flesh and blood of the Arabic language "

Arabic rhetoric is a characterization of Arabic written and spoken discourse. It is concerned with the compatibility of a given text, which can be a single lexical item, a proposition, or a text of any length, with its surrounding context provided that eloquence criteria are adhered to. Rhetoric, therefore, establishes the bridge between text and context, on the one hand, and opens the channels of communication between the communicator and his or her addressee. (Abdul-Raof, 2006 :23-24)

Rhetorics consists of three sciences: (a) eloquence, (b) semantics, and (c) figures of speech. It was originally triggered to be in the service of the Holy Koran (Ghazala, 2011:34). Abdul-Raof coincides with this view and adds discoursal aspects to this classification by stating that Arabic rhetoric is concerned with effective discourse, which is revealed in the following criteria:

1- The selection of eloquent lexical items.

2 -Well-formedness of the proposition.

3 -The selection of an appropriate style that appeals to the psychological and

ideological state of the audience.

4 -The employment of an effective introduction and conclusion.

5 -The production of a psychologically influential discourse on the text

Receivers (Abdul-Raof, 2006: 24).

Good style should be aesthetic and effective, based on a good choice of words, well-constructed grammatical structures and meanings, and powerful influence through symmetrical, consistent, and systematic sentences (Al-Jahidh in Ghazala, 2011: 36).

Traditionally speaking, the sole aim of rhetoric was to investigate the language and style of the Holy Koran. Many studies have been conducted to compare the language of the Holy Koran and that of the men of wisdom to demonstrate the uniqueness of the language of the Koran. Ultimately, it was drawn to cover the language of the Prophet's Tradition, the literary language of poetry and prose, and the language of orators and rhetoricians. Stylistics did not exist then, for the so-called Arabic stylistics started late in the twentieth century, following Western stylistics' steps. Arabs were not familiar with stylistics then, and they only knew rhetoric as the sovereign term currently used by writers. The relation between the two terms was often considered vague and overlapping since they both deal with grammatical structures and networks of texts' meaning, the writer's choices, and their implementation to achieve the intended effect through demonstrating how the words, phrases, and grammatical structures reveal the communicative connection between the text and the receptor (ibid:).

However, although Arabic stylistics did not exist as an independent field of study in traditional studies of the Arabic language, it was implied in a number of rhetorical studies with different rhetorical terminology. Thus, it is considered as a superordinate field of which rhetoric constitutes a major part (ibid).

Stylistic and Linguistic Features of Fairy Tales and Fables

All fairy tales and fables share a similar narrative content, which is depicted as involving magical or marvelous events, incorporating fantasy, confrontation and resolution of a problem, and a happy ending which is regarded as a definitive feature (Rixon,2002:37).

Fairy Tales and Fables fall under the short story genre with the sub-genre of a folktale/fairy tale. The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Narrative Theory defines a fairy tale as a hybrid narrative genre consisting of folkloric and literary elements (Haase, 2005: xvi). On the other hand, Fables are short moral

tales, in verse or prose, "in which human situations and behaviour are depicted through (chiefly) beasts and birds, or gods or inanimate objects. Human qualities are projected onto animals according to certain conventions (e.g., malicious craftiness for the fox). Fables are ironic and realistic in tone, often satirical, their themes usually reflecting on the commonsense ethics of ordinary life" (Childs and Fowler, 2006:82).

According to Toolan (cited in Hermans, 1999: 376), a narrative aims to describe events that are related to each other where some changes occur. These changes fall in chronological order, which is called the narrative structure, in which certain elements are presented to the readers to fulfill the narrative communicative effect. In Toolan's theory, the narrative structure of a text consists of six elements namely:

"a. An abstract, consisting of how the author introduces the story and arouses the reader's attention

b. An orientation, consisting of sentences that describe the participants, time and place of the events

c. Complicating action, consisting of sentences that mention the significant events of the story in sequence

d. Evaluation, consisting of comments to the events or things that do not directly deal with the events but more to the context of the events . A resolution, consisting of the answer to the question 'so what finally happened?'

f. A coda, consisting of the moral lesson of the story." (ibid)

Essentially, Propp (1968:77) claims that the structure of a folktale can be adequately described by a sequence of functions, some of which may be absent. Function is understood as an act of a character, defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of the action.

Hasse (2008:75) indicates that the observations cited may be briefly formulated in the following manner:

1. Functions of characters serve as stable, constant elements in a tale, independent of how and by whom they are fulfiled. They constitute the fundamental components of a tale.

2. The number of functions known to the fairy tale is limited.

3. The sequence of functions is always identical.

4. All fairy tales are of one type in regard to their structure.

Devi (2012: 13) sets his main focus on the analysis of the types of sentences. Those that express a single idea (simple sentences) are not common in children's literature, although they are present to some extent. The compound sentence is the most common type of sentence that can be noticed in children's literature. Books of the children, as the case in English, generally do not welcome complicated compound sentences. Words generally fall into two main categories– static words and dynamic words. Static words, as the name implies, slow down the flow of an action in the book (ibid). The two major word classes considered static words are nouns and adjectives. They are static because they do not develop any action; they are designated to describe qualities, people, places, etc.

Dynamic words are the ones responsible for developing and amplifying an action. The verb is the main word class that attains this function. Therefore, the text can be attributed as descriptive if it contains more nouns and adjectives than verbs, and vice versa. The text is more function-focused if there are more verbs than nouns. Children rely heavily on imitating the sounds they hear around them to create their vocabularies. Therefore, onomatopoeia is abundantly presented in children's literature as a device to involve the children in the events and the story's imagery. Thus, the word class "interjections" represents a fundamental requirement of the style of this genre. (Rixon, 2008:37).

Linguistic Features

Within folklore, two distinct types of structural analysis can be traced. The first one is what Propp's identifies as the "exemplar par excellence", in which describing the linear sequence of elements is taken as a basis for describing the structure of a folkloristic text. Thus, the structure of the tale is portrayed in the same sequence of the constituent elements (Propp, 1968: 2). According to Lévi-Strauss (1955: 430), the term "syntagmatic" structural analysis may be attributed to this linear sequential structural analysis following the syntactic terminology of the language. Other than the linear sequential structural analysis in folklore, there is another type of structural analysis in which the "given" order is subject to regrouping according to the analytic schema. Therefore, this type of structural analysis is based on the underlining of folklore, i.e., the principle of opposition.

Again, syntax terminology can be adopted by terming the patterns or organization in this second type of structural analysis as "paradigmatic". The pioneer of paradigmatic structural analysis is Lévi-Strauss. He presented a paradigmatic model as early as 1955, well before the English translation of Propp's work. The hypothetical paradigmatic matrix is typically one in which polar oppositions such as life/ death and male/female are mediated.

Those two types of structural analysis vary in their approach the text. The linear sequential structure basically deals with the surface analysis of the content, whereas the paradigmatic structure covers the latent content; hence, it is the more important latent content. Thus, folklore text analysis may be considered as the process of seeing through the superficial linear structure to the rue underlying paradigmatic pattern of organization (ibid: 432). Most folklorists fail to recognize the differences between syntagmatic and paradigmatic analyses and tend to regard both Propp and Lévi-Strauss as adherents of a similar approach (Propp, 1968: 2-3). However, the most apparent difference between the two approaches is that the syntagmatic approach can be replicated as a pattern and tends to be both empirical and inductive. On the other hand, paradigmatic analyses are mostly unique for each case and tend to be speculative and deductive. One of the manifestations of these differences is realized in evaluating the context, to which Propp has not paid much attention, leading

his syntagmatic approach to explore the structure of the text alone in isolation from its social and cultural context. Yet, Propp's Morphology of the Folktale is important because it isolates a significant level of analysis for fairy tales. (ibid:30-45)

Lakoff (1972:139) sheds some light on this issue by stating :

"I shall endeavor to show that any adequate theory of the structure of fairy tales must share many formal properties with the transformational linguistic theory that has so far been proposed by Noam Chomsky and his coworkers. Such a result would be of psychological interest, for it would indicate that an adequate model for the hearer and speaker of the sentences of a language could also be used to describe, at least in part, the human ability to produce and understand discourses. This might ultimately show that the human mind an extremely efficient device which uses essentially the same mechanism for constructing and understanding complicated discourses as it uses for con-structing and understanding individual sentences."

Leech and Short (198: 21) herald that the demands of style should be considered in any theory required for literary translation. For the translation to succeed, the TL's appropriate stylistic devices must be preserved from the carefully selected equivalences. Hasse (2008:271) points out that in the translation of a literary figure, there is a concept that goes beyond the transference of meaning, which is the transference of form of meaning, which can be recognized only through conscious and deliberate planning and design.

Stylistics and Translation

Translation is an artistic communication between the receptor and the translator through the latter's careful selection of words in a way that fulfills the goal of this communication process. Translation is a communicative act, and literary translation is especially artistic. "Literature is both the condition and the place of artistic communication between senders and addressees, or the public" (Bassnett, 2002: 83). This type of communication process requires the translator to first read, comprehend, and interpret the ST, then to

transfer it in a different language. Thus, the translator's choices from various possibilities constitute the process's fundamental constituent. The choices or selections of the translator interlock with his other choices in a process that follows what Levy calls the model of *game theory* in which "Translating can be compared with a game with complete information, like chess, where every next move takes account of all previous moves" (Hermans, 1999: 376-377). As an example of the selection, Levý explains how the German word *Bursche* can be rendered in a variety of equivalents and that the translator's task is to select the most appropriate equivalent that corresponds to the original meaning, style, register, etc., from a set of terms such as *boy*, *fellow*, *chap*, *youngster*, *lad*, and *guy*. The translators' selections differentiate each one as using a peculiar style or "fingerprints".

This contrasts with the notion that the translator cannot have and should not have his own style. Baker sheds light on this issue, stating: "We may well want to question the feasibility of these assumptions, given that it is as impossible to produce a stretch of language in a totally impersonal way as it is to handle an object without leaving one's fingerprints on it" (Baker, 2000: 244). Likewise, Hermans argues that "That other voice (i.e. the translator's voice) is there in the text itself, in every word of it" (Hermans, 1999: 377). Baker (2000: 258) then explores the "motivation" attributed to individual translators – "the cultural and ideological positioning of the translator or of translators in general, or about the cognitive processes and mechanisms that contribute to shaping our translational behaviour". Simply put, the translator's individual experience and identity can lead to a different translation style.

As an illustration of these cultural and ideological positioning, Venuti (2000) shows how translations by different translators are depicted with the translator's own ideology and cultural background. He established his findings by investigating different stylistic features of two English translations of Camus's novel *L'Étranger* (1942): His research shows that the translation by an American translator has a more "American quality", compared with the version by a British translator, which is considered a "Britannic rendering".

Hatim and Mason, while researching the same novel, conclude that there

are more passive shifts in the TT than in the original text, hence increasing the unintended passivity of the protagonist. Yet, they regard these shifts that lead to the change of modality as a result of the translator's understanding of the novel's overall reading, which may hint at the translator's passive attitude toward the protagonist (Munday, 2001: 99-100).

Boase-Beier (2006:1) presents a list of the effects of style on translation and translation studies in at least three ways:

"Firstly, in the actual process of translation, the way the style of the ST is viewed will affect the translator's reading of the text.

Secondly, because the recreative process in the TT will also be influenced by the sorts of choices the translator makes, and style is the outcome of choice (as opposed to those aspects of language which are not open to option), the translator's own style will become part of the TT.

*And, thirdly, the sense of what style is will affect not only what the translator does but how the critic of translation interprets what the translator has do*ne."

Boase-Beier points out that the translator is both a receptor and a producer of style when he comprehends the ST style and recreates it in the TT style. Whatever notion the translator holds of style would naturally affect the translation criticism. Thus, the ST style impacts the readers, including the translator, who reflects his understanding of the ST style on the TT-style he adopts in creating his/her translation. (ibid).

As a follower of the paradigmatic structural analysis approach, Boase-Beier stresses the importance of the context in understanding the meaning of both the ST receptor (including the translator) and the TT receptor. Therefore, her main concern is the gap that exists between the ST style and the comprehension of the TT-style caused by the TT readers' *cognitive state*. She attributes *cognitive state* as a governing factor of style. The *cognitive state* is closely related to the context: the historical, sociological, and cultural issues. (ibid)

It is only appropriate here to cite two studies that were implemented in 1998 and 2010. The first is a contrastive study titled *"Stylistics in Arabic and*

English Translated Literary Texts: A Contrastive Study" and the second is a corpus of fairy tales and ESL texts. The results show clearly the following :

The vast resemblance between fairy tales and ESL texts, even to the extent of hypothesizing that they were written for the same audience.

The resemblance between the Arabic and English literary texts in the general portion of specific to generic vocabulary is compatible with all human languages.

These results illuminate the need for full attention to be paid to fables and fairy tales as didactic as well as entertaining material and the need to develop adequate methods of translating fairy tales to accomplish both ends. Hatim and Munday (2004: 76-81) give the best justification for this endeavour by declaring that "Identifying the register of a source text can be considered one of the prerequisites for successful translation, and "If translation aims to preserve function, then an analysis of style will go some way towards ensuring it does so." (ibid: 290).

Bibliography

Abdul-Raof, H. (2006). *Arabic Rhetoric: A pragmatic analysis.* New York: Routledge

Andersen, H. C. (2010). *Andersen's Fairy Tales*. (J. H. Stickney, Ed.) Project Gutenberg's *Hans Andersen's Fairy Tales*. Retrieved October 20, 2012, from http://www.gutenberg.org/

Baker, M (1992). *In Other Words*. *A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge

Baker, M., & Sadanha, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies* (3rd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Bilal, H. A. (2012). *Stylistic Analysis of The Voice*. International Journal of Linguistics. 4, 3: 433-442.

Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Translation and Style: A Brief Introduction*. Lan-

guage and Literature. 10, 9-13.

Chapman, R (1983) *Linguistics and Literature: An Introduction to Litera* *Stylistics* .London: Edward Arnold.

Childs, P., & Fowler, R. (2006). *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms*. NewYo Routledge.

Devi, P. B. (2012). *Content Analysis. A method of Social Science Research*. Media As 18,1: 1-20.

Ghazala, H. (2006). *Translation as Problems and Solutions: A Coursebook for Univers Students and Translators*, (7th ed.). Beirut: Dr wa Maktabat Al-Hill.

Haase, D. (ed) (2008). *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Folktales and Fairy Tales*. L don: Greenwood Press.

Hatim B., I. Mason. *(1990). Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.

Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. Lond Routledge.

Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-Oriented Approac es Explained*. Meta: Translators' Journal, 45, 2: 376-377

Lakoff, G. P. (1972). *Structural Complexity in Fairy Tales*. The Study of Man, 1: 128-1.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Leech, G. (2007). *Style in Fiction Revisited: the Beginning of Great Expectations*. U Lancaster University.

Leech, G., & Short, M. (1981). *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Transaltion Studies: Theroies and Applications*. Lond and New York: Routledge.

Munday, J. (Ed.). (2009). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London a New York: Routledge.

Murphy, P. T. (2011). *Levels of Style in Narrative Fiction.* Situation, 5: 48-68.

Oittinen, R. (2000). *Translating for Children*. New York and London: Garland.

Propp, V. (1968). *Morphology of the Folk Tale*. California: University of California.

Pym, A. (1991). *Christiane Nord. Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Method, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. TTR : Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction, 6, 2: 184-190.

Pym, A (1992): *Koller's Äquivalenz Revisited*. The Translator, 3, 1: 71-79.

Rixon, A. (2008). *The Fairy Tale - A Form of Organizational Inquiry.* AI Practitioner: 35-39.

Shavit, Z. (1981). *Translation of Children's Literature as a Function of its Position in the Literary Polysystem.* Poetics Today, 2, 4: 171-179.

Shavit, Z. (1986). *Poetics of Children's Literature*. Athens and London: The University Of Georgia Press.

Shavit, Z. (2006). *Translation of Children's Literature*. In Lathey's (Ed.) *The Translation of Children's Literature: A Reader*. Toronto: Buffalo.

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.

Snell- Hornby, M. (1988).*Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amesterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Snell- Hornby, M. (1995). *Translation in Intercultural Communication*. Prague: EST Congress.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2000). *Strategies of Translation*. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L., & Baker, M. (Eds.). (2004). *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.