

---

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Lost in Translation? Unpacking Paul Bowles' Approach to Morocco's Literary Gems through a Case Study of *For Bread Alone*

Ahmed Boukranaa<sup>1</sup> ✉ and Kiber Sandy<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>The Department of English, Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Fes, Morocco

**Corresponding Author:** Ahmed Boukranaa, **E-mail:** Boukranaahmed@gmail.com

---

| ABSTRACT

This study aims to scrutinise the method of translations that Paul Bowles opted for while rendering Moroccan literary texts. The researcher adopted Mouhamed Choukri's autobiographical novel *Al Khubz Al Hafi* (2000) and its English translation *For Bread Alone* (2002) as an example. This research takes Peter Newmark's communicative and semantic translation as a theoretical background to approach the target text. The research examines the translator's rendering of the source text's form, meaning, and culture and whether they were rendered semantically or communicatively. The researcher read both the source text and its translation, then nominated 24 sentences and their English translation. The selected sentences stand as examples for many more in the novel. After selecting the sentence, the translation method adopted by Bowles is determined. The study's results suggest that communicative translation was employed more frequently. The analysis reveals that the translator opted for communicative translation to clarify culturally bound terminology or omit certain features linked to the source text that the translator designated as unnecessary to the target reader. The results showed that employing communicative translation led to an awkward translation and mistranslation. The translator resorted to semantic translation to maintain the feature of faithfulness. However, due to cultural and linguistic barriers, the translator could not produce a clear translated message. This research shows that communicative translation cannot reflect the implicit message of the source text, while semantic translation must always be associated with footnotes or glossaries.

| KEYWORDS

Communicative translation, cultural bound concepts, *For Bread Alone*, literary translation, semantic translation.

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

**ACCEPTED:** 01 April 2024

**PUBLISHED:** 16 April 2024

**DOI:** 10.32996/ijtis.2024.4.2.2

---

### 1. Introduction

Translation studies is intrinsically multilingual and interdisciplinary in that they comprise a range of languages, different types of cultural studies, linguistics, philosophy and communication studies (Munday, 2001). However, all the scholars who participated in the launching of translation studies as an academic discipline agree on defining the act of translation as the process and the practice of rendering a message of a source language to a target language in a satisfactory way as accurate as possible (Bouziane, 2015), knowing that all theories of translation confirm that it is impossible to achieve a completely accurate translation. Peter Newmark's standpoint on translation is similar to that of other theorists. He maintains that it is impossible to achieve a translated version of a source text that is genuinely faithful to the original text. Newmark (1981) developed his translation theory and divided it into two methods: semantic and communicative translation. The first deals with the source text's meaning, semantic features, and stylistics, while the second deals with the message, its effect on the target culture, and how it affects the target reader.

As the translator of Mohammed Choukri's autobiography, Paul Bowles has employed both Newmark's methods while translating *Al Khubz Al Hafi* (2000). Bowles has produced a translation of Choukri's autobiography that is smooth, decipherable, artistically and stylistically genuine to some extent and for a targeted and knowledgeable reader, not a lay-reader; however, as he admits his

translation is not literal or a faithful one, Bowles (2002) maintains that the original text is written in classical Arabic a language that he does not master and hence asks the writer of the original text (Mohammed Choukri) to clarify the literary work for him in Moroccan Arabic, this alone lead to differences between the source and the target text.

Several studies have scrutinised literary works such as Paul Bowles's translation of Mohammed Choukri to discover how translators render culturally bound terms, stylistics, messages and their effects on the readers. An outstanding study was carried out by Bouziane (2015), who studied cultural equivalence in Paul Bowles *For Bread Alone* (2002) using Nida's theory of translation (1964). However, the novel has never been approached using Newmark's theory. Selecting the translation of this novel as the subject matter of this study is fuelled by several factors, among which is the fact that this literary work was blacklisted in Morocco until 2000, which means that the work has yet to be studied in depth. Furthermore, the novel carries various culturally bound expressions, stylistic features, taboo messages, and events that can affect the readers of both the target and source text in many ways and at different levels.

## 2. Purpose of the study

This paper investigates Paul Bowles' rendering of Moroccan taboo messages and events, culturally bound expression, and stylistic features. It also examines whether Bowles used semantic, communicative, or both translations. Furthermore, the paper endeavours to reveal which of Newmark's translation methods efficiently attain a translated version of Moroccan literary works that is faithful to the original.

## 3. Peter Newmark's semantic and communicative translation.

Peter Newmark developed his translation theory in his two influential publications, *Approaches to Translation* (1981) and *A Textbook of Translation* (1988). Newmark distinguishes between two significant methods of translation: communicative and semantic translation. Newmark categorises texts into 1. Vocative, 2. Expressive, 3. Informative texts. Each one of the methods of translation described and developed by Newmark targets a particular aim of translation. Semantic translation emphasises faithfulness to the source text and targets the achievement of equivalence of form and language since the focus is on semantic content, while the communicative translation targets to achieve the same effect on the target reader similar to the source text's readers, in this sense, the focus is on translating the meaning rather than the form or the language of the source text. Furthermore, Newmark advocates for communicative translation in vocative and informative texts, while semantic translation can be applied to expressive texts.

Newmark's significant contribution to translation theory is introducing semantic and communicative translation. Both methods are similar to Nida's (1964) dynamic and formal translation; dynamic translation was later replaced by functional translation (Nida & Taber, 1969). In this sense, Newmark has departed from Nida's theory of equivalence and correspondence in translation, which is receptor-oriented; another theory of translation that is similar to Newmark's' theory is Julian House's covert and overt translation. All three theories are the same, though the aims of the translation determine some differences. The three theories document the continuity of the classical debate between "sense-for-sense" and "word-for-word" translation "during the 1960s and 1970s; they were informed by the ascendancy and sheer proliferation of linguistics-oriented approaches in translation research" (Venuti, 2012, p. 136) To say more, the introduction of the terms equivalence/correspondence into translation theory and studies lead to the appearance of what Venuti (2012) termed as Pragmatic translation (communicative, covert, functional) and formal translation (semantic, overt).

On the one hand, pragmatic equivalence in translation focuses on rendering the source text by respecting the target culture and readers' standards as if the translator obscures the reality that the text is a translation using André Lefevere's (1992) clarification. In this case, the translated text is a refraction or a rewritten text with nothing to do with the original. Formal equivalence, conversely, obeys the standards of the source culture and linguistic features by closely respecting the form, language, and culture of the source text; this form of translation aims to show the target readers that they are reading a translation.

However, Newmark maintains that achieving equivalence is an illusion that is impossible to achieve as there will always be "the conflict of loyalties, the gap between emphasis on the source and target language will always remain as the overriding problem in translation theory and practice" (Newmark, 1981, p. 38). He proposes semantic and communicative translation to approach the target and the source text. According to Newmark (1981), communicative translation endeavours to generate an effect on the target readers similar to that of the source text on its original readers and culture. Semantic translation is applied when the translator prefers to stay closer to the source text by rendering its semantic and syntactic structures as much as the second language allows (Munday, 2001), which means that the aim here is translating the contextual meaning of the source text (Newmark, 1981). Although there are many similarities between Peter Newmark's theory and Eugene Nida's, Newmark attempts to remote his theory from advocating for an equivalent effect; he maintains that the issue of effect "is inoperant if the text is out of TL space and time" (Newmark, 1981, p. 69 as cited in Munday, 2001, p. 44).

Newmark maintains that semantic and communicative translation concepts are his significant input to translation theory (Newmark, 1981). He proposes that texts' functions can be organised into informative, expressive, and vocative functions and develops the previously stated translation methods to approach those text types. The table below highlights the dissimilarities between both concepts:

<b>Communicative translation</b>	<b>Semantic translation</b>
Target reader-centred	Source text-centred
Sacrifices features of the original text to achieve an intended effect on the reader.	Preserve features of the original text, respect the integrity of the clauses and word order position, and focus on semantics and syntactic characteristics.
Read smoothly, use the target reader's daily language to achieve a domesticating effect, and respect the target language and culture register.	It is brief in length but includes many linguistic details, and the language is complicated.
Although the semantic features are sacrificed, the translated text may be better than the original because the translator enhanced it.	The source text is considered superior because it sacrifices the text's message.
It is considered natural and part of the target culture as it respects its characteristics.	This type of translation is awkward as it is considered foreign in the target culture.
The translator is free to enhance the source text in terms of style; the translator can also explain obscurities and clarify words, phrases, and events.	The translator is handcuffed because he cannot enhance the source of the text.
The translator tends to focus on the meaning in paragraphs and sentences.	The translator focuses on the smallest text segments like words, phrases, collocations and clauses.
The translator is a craftsman	The translator is an artist
The translator aims to achieve a particular effect by translating the message of the source text.	The translator cares for the meaning

**Table 1. Characteristics of communicative and semantic translation**

The table reveals the dissimilarities between Newmark's semantic and communicative translation. Communicative translation focuses on the text's message. It aims to achieve a particular effect on the target readers. At the same time, semantic translation cares more about the stylistics of the source text and targets the rendering of its semantic content. As the above table has shown, the two forms of translation share some common grounds, which means they can be utilised to translate the same text. To put it differently, the translator can use both methods to render the same text to achieve a balanced translation in the sense that one method can render the text's style, and the other can translate the message of the source text.

**4. Procedure**

The current research is a comparative analysis of Mohammed Choukri's *الخبز الحافي*, which was rendered into English by Paul Bowles. To scrutinise the methods of translation used by Bowles to render the source text, three actions were taken:

1. The researcher selected twenty-four Arabic expressions (sentences, phrases, words) and their English renderings. The expressions nominated comprise culturally bound terms and symbols, dialectical and religious terminology, and stylistic features.
2. The researcher specified which of Newmark's methods (semantic or communicative) were used to render the expressions. Semantic translation occurs when the translator aims to preserve the source text's form and content by keeping its terms as they are through foreignisation, literal translation, or transliteration. Communicative translation is adopted when the translator feels the need to clarify the message of the source text to achieve an equivalent effect on the target reader; this method is achieved through adaptation, free translation, domestication, and omission.
3. Bowles' success in rendering the selected expression is analysed and discussed. Furthermore, recommended renderings for expressions that failed to achieve equivalent effect and meaning were given.

## 5. Results

5.1. Methods of translation used in Bowles rendering of *For Bread Alone*

Sentence number	Arabic version (the source language)	English Version (the target language)	Method of translation
1	ركلني حتى تعبت رجلاه و تبلل سروالي ص.10	he went on kicking me until his leg was tired. p.8	communicative
2	مزابيل المدينة احسن من مزابيل حيننا. زبل النصارى حسن من زبل المسلمين ص.10	The garbage in the middle of town is a lot better than it is here, he said. Nazarene garbage is the best. p.8	Semantic
3	اولي وجهي قبلة المشرق. حيث اري امي تولي وجهها وتصلى قلت جهرا "بسم الله الله اكبر" هكذا رايت الكبار يفعلون. دبحتها حتى انفصل راسها. ص.11	I turn towards the east, as my mother always does when she is about to pray. I said: <i>Bismillah. Allahou akbar</i> . And I kill it as I have seen grownups do it. p.9	semantic
4	اختفيت منتظرا نهاية المعركة. لا احد يمر. اصوات ذلك الليل بعيدة و قريبة منى السماء. ص.12	I hid and waited for the end of the battle. The voices of the night, far away and near. For the first time I realise that I can hear better at night than by day. I looked up at the sky. p.10	communicative
5	مصباح الله شاهدة على جريمة ابي. الناس نامون. مصباح الله يظهر و يختفي. ص.12	Allah has turned on the lights. p.10	Communicative
6	وجدت لذي في ان اراها والاتراني. قلت لها: اقابى دانيتا. ص.12	It gave me great pleasure to see her, knowing that she could not see me. A little god. After a while, I said: Here I am. p.10	communicative
7	وجدت هناك البقول الذي وصفته لى امي. ص.14	I found big clumps of rosemary growing there among the graves. p.13	communicative
8	كفالك لتاكل نفسك (اشفاش). اتشد اخفتش) ص.18	Omitted	None
9	الريفي خداع و الجبلي نية ص.19	The treacherous Riffian and the gullible Djibli. p.15	semantic
10	توادعتا. قالت لى امي: بست السيدة لويزة طانعا (بس يد للالويزة ( ص.24	They said goodbye to one another. Kiss Lalla el Ouiza's hand, my mother told me. p.18	semantic
11	انهما يحبان بعضهما. اللعنة على حبهما لحم يصفق. تقو؟ انها تكذب لن اصدقها بعد اليوم. ص.26	They like each other. I hate their love. Flesh clapping. Pfou! She tells lies. I'll never believe her again. p. 20	Semantic

12	ذهبت الى الحمام العمومي. تزينت و سوكت فيها و كحلت عينيها. ص.26	she went to the <i>hammam</i> . Later, I found her making up her face. p.19	communicative
13	كنت قد سمعت انا من يرى جنيا و يغرز المكين في الارض يبقى الجنى محبوسا في مكانه. ص.38	Like everyone else, I knew that if you see a <i>djinn</i> , you must pierce the earth with a steel blade where you stand. p.29	communicative
14	امشي امامي يا هذا الخواف. امشي لتاكل امك. ص.53	Go on ahead, you coward, damn you! p. 38	communicative
15	بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم. أعوذ بالله من اولاد هذا الزمان. ص.74	<i>Bismillah rahman er rahim!</i> Preserve me from the young ones of today! p. 50	semantic
16	كنا في مقهى التشاطو. خسرت اخر قلس في لعبة العيطة. ص. 117	We were in the Café Chato, and I had just lost my last centimo playing <i>aaita</i> . p. 77	semantic
17	ضحك الكبداني هازنا، اخذ من السبسي اللذي عمرته له. ص. 119	El Kebdani laughed sarcastically, and took the <i>sebsi</i> I had filled for him. p. 78	Semantic
18	صعدت امرأة جبيلية فوق صندوق خشبي و أخذت تزغرد. ص. 121	A Djibliya woman in a straw hat climbed up onto a wooden crate and began to scream: <i>Youyouyouyouyouyouyouyou!</i> p. 79	communicative
19	كان قد حدثني عنه و عن عمله معه حمالا للبيضات المهرية. ص. 128	El Kebdani had often spoken about Qaabil and how he had worked for him as a <i>cargado</i> . p.83	Communicative
20	لابسة زكدونا رقيقا مخططا بالابيض و الاسود و اللون الذهبي. ص. 130	She wore a lightweight, black and white striped <i>zigdoun</i> . p.85	semantic
21	بشري مستلقية على المطربة. في يدها سبسي لابسة قفطان احمر مزوق باسلاك ذهبية فوقه نفين شفاف. ص. 130	Bouchra was stretched out on the divan in a red and gold brocade caftan with a gauzy <i>dfin</i> over it. p.85	Semantic
22	انه مثل الكلب ينيح و لا يعرض. ص. 133	A dog that barks. p.87	communicative
23	اف. مصيبة... هل حدث شئ جديد. ص. 148	The news is bad. Terrible! What? <i>Kheir, insha'Allah!</i> p. 97	Communicative
24	اين تظنهم اخذوا الفتيات؟ الى كوسساريا السوق الداخلي. ص. 187	Where do you think they've taken the girls? I said. The Zoco Chico police station. Where else would they take them? p. 125	Communicative

Table 2. Methods of translation Bowles *For Bread Alone*.

## 6. Discussion

### 6.1. Communicative translation and the awkward rendering of source text

Bowles's use of the communicative translation obscures the meaning and makes it even more awkward in some instances in the novel. Bowles's failure to use communicative translation effectively to render the source text results from excessive reliance on addition, alteration and omission. The translation under scrutiny is of an autobiography, which means that every piece of information is essential for the story's plot flow. Also, this information is part of someone's life, and removing it may deny the target reader from knowing pertinent details about the life of the original text's writer and how his life and personality were shaped.

Sentence 1 introduces the reader to the protagonist as a child and his relationship with his father, which was not a relation of love and respect but of hatred and violence. Bowles decided to omit part of that sentence; the part that the translator decided to remove is the one that suggests that the protagonist, who is the writer of the source text, has a rough childhood that includes no pity. The sentence that includes the violent kicking of the child by the father also includes a culturally bound term that hints at the extent of violence, which is 'urinating, تبول سروالي'; culturally speaking, this expression is used to suggest that the act of violence is extreme. A more suggestive translation would be (he went on kicking me until I wet my pants, and his leg was tired).

Similarly to sentence 1, sentences 6, 8, 12, 14, and 22 in the table have been omitted entirely or partly. Some of these sentences include culturally bound terms, imagery and stylistic features that the translator removed. For example, sentence 6, among many others in the novel, includes the Moroccan Riffian, an Amazigh dialect spoken in north Morocco. Bowles took the freedom to remove all Riffian expressions in the novel either because he does not speak the dialect or because he believes it will have no effect on his target readers. However, using communicative translation to omit such culturally bound terms denies the readers the right to know the background of the original author first and second does not reflect the cultural context of the literary work. Furthermore, different dialects in a literary work enhance the translation style and faithfulness and provide the target reader with a unique experience. The translator could provide a translation such as (I found pleasure in seeing her knowing that she was unable to see me. After a while, I said, Aqabi danieta, I am here. )

Bowles employed omission when he could not find an equivalent for the Arabic word in English or the Moroccan Riffian dialect, as he could not speak it. However, omitting such novel segments may deny the target reader the opportunity to experience another culture through its linguistic components, images, and symbolism. Sentence 8 is one of many instances in which Bowles omitted content that has historical weight. "اشفاش. اتشد اخفش) كفاك لتاكل نفسك 18ص." it is not only culturally bound linguistically speaking, but it also has an implicit historical meaning that Bowles as foreign translator cannot understand; therefore, he used his authority as a translator and decided to omit it. The sentence includes Moroccan Riffian with its Arabic translation, which literally means "Stop eating if you are still hungry, eat yourself". Sentence 8 hints at a historical period in Morocco in general and the Northern Riffian regions in particular; at that period, hunger spread in Morocco and was associated with the Spanish war against the Riff. Hence, the Riffian dialect is employed together with implicit hints at hunger. Sentence 8 is impossible to be translated semantically since the result will be an awkward translation, as it is clear from the literal translation above. However, it can be translated communicatively by providing the target reader with hints at the hunger and war and providing footnotes to indicate the source of the hunger in the country. Below is an alternative translation and an example of a footnote:

**Alternative translation:** (ashfash. Atichd ekhifinish) enough eating rotten food. People are hungry everywhere.

**Footnote:** During the colonial period, Morocco witnessed a period of famine caused by drought and the Spanish war against the Riff (the country's northern region).

The use of communicative translation resulted in omitting many culturally bound terms and habits in the target text, reflecting the distinctiveness of the source context and culture. Sentence 12 is a women-centred one that depicts a tradition that Moroccan women practice each time they return from the public steam bath or hammam. The tradition is to use Moroccan natural beauty products. They use (*siwak*) to clean and prettify their teeth, and for their eyes, they use (*Kuhl*) to purify and beautify them. Bowles omitted these two distinctive features of Moroccan culture using communicative translation, resulting in an obscure translation that does not satisfy the target readers' curiosity. Semantic translation in this context would be a better choice, as shown in the suggested alternative translation: (she went to the hammam. Later on, I found her beautifying her teeth with the siwak and doing the same to her eyes with the Kuhl).

A further example of omission is sentence 14, where the translator could not translate the meaning semantically and opted for communicative translation and omission. The sentence includes a swear word in Moroccan Arabic, "لتاكل امك", that Bowles could not understand or thought that its translation in the target culture would be meaningless or awkward. The literal meaning of this swear word is exactly (*eat your mother*) and in other places in the novel (*eat your mother's heart*), "كل قلب امك". However, linking the swear word to its cultural context makes it apparent that its meaning semantically speaking is (sad be your mother/may your mother become sad). However, even this translation will be awkward in the English rendition of the novel. Hence a more relevant translation at the communicative level will be: (walk beside me, you coward, damn your mother!)

At the stylistic level, most images and the metaphors employed by Mohammed Choukri, the novel's original author, were rendered using communicative translation. Explanation was utilised to render metaphors, which led to the disappearance of those stylistic features. Partial omission was also used to render metaphors, as suggested by sentence 22, which was partially omitted, leading to a translated version with no metaphors of the source text. The translator could translate the whole metaphor without affecting the meaning, such as (he is a dog that barks but does not bite; he keeps saying things he cannot do).

In Bowles's translation of Choukri's autobiography, communicative translation is based on omission and is practised through addition, alteration, and sometimes mistranslation. Sentences 4 and 5 in the table represent two instances in which the translator tried to produce the stylistic and the form of the source text by rendering the images and the metaphor of the source text with the help of explanation. However, the result was a translation that did not reflect the implicit meaning of the original and failed to achieve an equivalent effect as the source sentence. For example, in sentence 4, the suggested meaning in the source sentence is grief, loneliness and the inability of Choukri to defend his mother. At the same time, the translation is a form of a romantic scene. Bowles's explanation and additions in the sentence ruined the scene's imagery, disrupting the source sentence's stylistic and form. Bowles aimed at a semantic translation of the sentence. However, the unnecessary additions led to a communicative translation that failed to deliver the message to the target reader. For sentence 4, a communicative image that says the implicit meaning would be a better choice, as translating metaphors and images from Arabic to English is rare. An alternative translation could be (unable to interfere or defend the powerless, I went outside waiting for the fight to end. Alone on a dark night, only my parents' screams were heard).

The failure to render the metaphor in the source text into the target text is much more apparent in sentence 5. The translator failed to render the metaphor and deliver the meaning and form, leading to an awkward translation that may confuse the target reader instead of creating an effect equivalent to the source text. In sentence 5, Choukri elaborates on his weakness and suggests that nobody can help him (الناس نائمون) apart from god in the form of the stars (مصايح الله) in the sky. However, Bowles mistranslated the message and the metaphor, producing a sentence that is out of context. The alternative translation tries to produce the message of the source sentence and not the metaphors: (people are sleeping, but Allah's (god's) stars bear witness to my father's crime. The stars may disappear for a while, but they always come back).

Excessive usage of communicative translation has led to various mistranslations. Some of the mistranslations are related to culturally bound terms and habits, and others have to do with additions and alterations that fail to deliver the meaning of the source text. Sentence 7 is an instance in which alteration failed to communicate a cultural food habit to the target reader. The translator rendered the word "البقول" as "rosemary" while rosemary was used in the source text in a different context; in the context of sentence 7, the nearest equivalent word for "البقول" to achieve a successful alteration is (spinach), Moroccan food culture classifies rosemary as a spice, not food. In contrast, Moroccan spinach is not a prestigious dish but more of a food for the poor classes. The original writer used the word "البقول" (spinach) to suggest how poor his family was. A more adequate translation for sentence 7 would be (I found spinach that my mother described for me growing among the graves). Sentence 13 is a more apparent mistranslation; the translator has missed the point behind the use of a cultural superstition, leading to another awkward translation that does not communicate any message to the target reader. The superstition has to do with "djinn" and how one can protect oneself from them; however, the translation missed the point and provided an obscure translation. Hence, Bowles has failed to render another cultural phenomenon; a more suggestive translation of sentence 13 would be (I have heard that if you come across a djinn, you need to pierce the earth with a knife; this will make the djinn freeze and protect you from their attack).

A further communicative translation that fails to render the cultural meaning of the source text and achieves an equivalent effect on the target reader is suggested by sentence 18. The translator fails to find equivalent words or expressions for the voices of the chanting that Moroccan women produce at times of celebration, which is mentioned in the source text as "تزعرد" in the target culture; there is no equivalent word; hence the translator used "Youyouyouyouyouyouyou!" to deliver the experience to the target readers however, the mistranslation here is when he said that "began to scream", the voices that women produce is not screaming but it is chanting. An alternative translation for that sentence would be: (A Djibliya woman (woman from the north of Morocco) climbed onto a wooden crate and began chanting: Youyouyouyouyouyouyou!)

Sentence 19 is another example where Bowles uses alteration. However, the alteration uses a Spanish word to communicate an equivalent meaning. Bowles uses the word "cargado" to render the phrase "حمالا للبضائع المهربية" Bowles opted for an equivalent word that the target reader is acquainted with, especially the American readers, knowing the job of the "cargado" is practised in the US-Mexico borders as they carry goods and products illegally. Furthermore, the northern regions of Morocco were colonised by Spain at that time, which makes the use of the word "cargado" a perfect choice, although Bowles's choice of this word seems to be accurate at the denotative level; however, at the connotative meaning they are not the same since the cargadors in US and Mexico are more organised and wealthy they are more of an organisation of an organised crime, in Morocco during colonialism, they are just simple jobs practised by poor people in order to help their families. Bowles succeeded this time in providing an equivalent word. However, he failed to communicate the authentic message to the target readers. To communicate the message successfully, Bowles could use a footnote to explain to the reader the difference between the cargadors in America and the ones in Morocco by shedding light on the Spanish colonialism of Morocco. A suggested footnote can be that (a cargado in Morocco during colonialism was an individual who carried goods from the French-colonised regions of Morocco to the Spanish-colonised regions of Morocco; the job of a cargado during that time was a survival job).

Bowles sometimes plays the role of a writer rather than a translator, significantly when he adds phrases and expressions that do not exist in the original text. Bowles's additions to the source text either have no use and add no meaning or fail to reflect the source text's culture, history and message. Sentence 23 is an example of many others in the novel in which Bowles attempts to use source language expressions as a way of foreignisation and preserving the touch of the source culture to remind the target reader that they are reading a translation; however, due to his position as a translator and a foreigner, he has failed in employing those expressions. In sentence 23, Bowles failed in the communicative translation and foreignisation. The expression "اف. مصيبة..." was translated as "The news is bad. Terrible!" this form and manner of expression is never used in Moroccan Arabic. The word "اف" does not exist in English, so an equivalent expression in English should replace it. Hence, it would make sense if Bowles used alternation instead of paraphrasing.

Furthermore, Bowles adds to the conversation the phrase "Kheir, insha'Allah!" in Arabic, it is "خير انشاء الله" This expression is nowhere to be found in the source text. However, it is an addition by Bowles aiming at foreignising the text by preserving some of the features of the source culture. However, the translator failed to use the Arabic expression as it is used in social contexts in the source culture, not in political contexts such as the one in this conversation. Hence, a more coherent translation of this conversation could be (oh God! It is a catastrophe... / what happened? ).

An awkward translation is the one that Bowles opted for in sentence 24. Bowles translated the phrase "الى كومساريا السوق الداخلي" as "The Zoco Chico police station. Where else would they take them?" Bowles opted to use the Spanish name of the police station instead of semantically translating the source text to preserve its form, meaning, and culture, or he could translate it communicatively by using an alternation. However, Bowles chose to use the language of the coloniser, which is an act that does not reflect the cultural context of the source text but the one of the foreign power dominating it; furthermore, Choukri, as the writer of the source text, could have used the Spanish name of the police station but he has chosen to use the Arabic name as a way of cultural resistance to the hegemony of the coloniser, Bowles did not translate the message faithfully while using the Spanish. An alternative translation for this conversation could be:

**The alternative translation:** Where do you think they've taken the girls? I said.

They have taken them to the Old Market's police station.

### 6.2. Semantic translation and the faithful translator

Semantic translation occurs less frequently in the novel than communicative translation. Bowles mainly employed two techniques while semantically translating the novel. The first technique Bowles employs is word-for-word translation, also called literal translation, while the second technique is transliteration. Both techniques aim to preserve the style, form and message of the source text; the purpose of using both techniques is to stay close to the source text and render it faithfully; however, both strategies may be less accepted by the target reader as sometimes the translation is unclear and does not respect the rules of the target culture and context which will make it strange and vague.

Sentence 2 is an example of a literal translation that succeeded partially in rendering the meaning of the source text. The translator remained faithful to the source text by literally translating its message, which is evident from the length of the target sentence compared to the source sentence, which is almost equal. However, the translator is to be questioned about the usage of the word "Nazarene", which he took as an equivalent to the word "النصارى" in Moroccan Arabic; "النصارى" does not mean "Nazarene" or Christian but as suggested in a footnote in the source text, it means any White and Western person who is not Moroccan whether he/she is European or American regardless of his religion. At the same time, Bowles's translation hints at religion as a factor. Hence, to be faithful to the source text, it is advisable to replace the word "Nazarene" with words such as (Westerners, white foreigners, or White people.)

Literal translation is known to be the most faithful form of translation; however, the aim of literal translation of idioms may not be fulfilled. In sentence 9, Bowles literally translates an idiomatic expression more relevant at the political rather than the social level. The proverb "الرئيفي خداع و الجبلي نية" has a historical background linked to politics and war against the Spanish coloniser and the extent of loyalty of Moroccan people from different backgrounds to the authority. The target reader may not know the historical background of the idiomatic expression; in fact, the target readers may not know what it means "Riffian, الرئيفي" and "Djibli, الجبلي". Hence, for this sentence, the translator has to include either a footnote or explain the necessary terminology in the glossary and proofread the translation of the expression by giving a political tone; a more balanced translation would be (The disloyal Riffian and the trusting Djibli.)

Sentence 11 is an example of a successful literal translation, though it includes a mistranslated word. "تقور" is a culturally bound swear word in Moroccan context that Bowles mistranslated as "Pfout". It seems that Bowles, while literally and transliterally rendering the source text, did not consider his target readers. In translation studies, while translating culturally bound terms, the translator has to use equivalent terminology in the target language or use the word as it is as a form of foreignisation but enhance and clarify



it using footnotes and the glossary; Bowles did not manage to employ any of these strategies. The word "تقو" in Moroccan Arabic is equivalent to the word (damn it) in colloquial English; it would make much sense if the equivalent word were used between parenthesis or in the glossary as it is mentioned in the source text more than once.

Bowles provided two literary translations for two sentences that include culturally bound terms. Sentences 20 and 21 include words that are associated with the Moroccan cultural dress code, which are "zigdoun", "caftan", and "dfin". All three words were transliterated while their context was literary translated; in both sentences, the translator provided a balanced and coherent translation. Furthermore, the translator clarified the three words in the glossary, facilitating the reading process for the target readers while staying faithful to the source text by reflecting its cultural components in the rendering.

Another example of semantic translation is in sentence 3, achieved through transliteration. As a strategy in translation, transliteration does not adhere to any language system, neither the target system nor the source system, because of the way it renders the source text, which the translator mostly achieves by providing the reader with the phonetic pronunciation of the words and not their meaning. Hence, transliteration does not reflect the cultural and literal meaning of the words in the source context and creates a sense of confusion for the target reader. The phrase "بِسْمِ اللَّهِ، اللَّهُ أَكْبَرُ" in sentence 3 is transliterated as "Bismillah. Allahou akbar". The target reader knows that this phrase is associated with Muslims and Islam. However, they may not know its meaning, implications and when and why it is said, primarily since Bowles does not explain it to the target readers in the footnotes or the glossary. It becomes obvious then that transliteration is a partial solution to achieve faithfulness to the source text. For this sentence, the translator can either translate the phrase or explain its usage.

Although Bowles used semantic translation to remain faithful and close to the source text, its employment had some pitfalls. Bowles failed to render the source text using transliteration in a manner that considers the culture and context of the text. In sentence 10, Bowles does not consider explaining to the target reader the culturally bound term used by the writer of the original text. Bowles transliterally renders the word "لاللويزة" as "Lalla el Ouiza". This type of translation is an awkward translation of a personal noun of a person who is not Moroccan and not Muslim but holds the title of a Moroccan lady, which is "Lalla", in Morocco that title is held only by a woman who is respected and admired by society. "لويزة" a Spanish woman who holds a Moroccan title, the target reader may not know the meaning of the title "Lalla" and may confuse the name "لاللويزة" "Lalla el Ouiza" for a Moroccan woman. Thus, it would be more practical and less confusing to use an equivalent terminology to render the sentence; the equivalent terminology can be Spanish in the form of (Donna Louiza) or English as in (Lady Louiza).

Bowles used transliteration to stay faithful to the original text. However, excessively employing such techniques may confuse the target reader if an explanation and clarification in the target language does not accompany the transliterated expression. Sentences 15 and 16 are examples of semantic translation in the form of transliteration. In sentence 15, though the expression "بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ, Bismillah rahman er rahim" is associated by Western readers with Muslim cultures still, the target readers may need an explanation of its meaning, especially the cultural meaning not the religious one knowing that in the Moroccan culture that expression is mostly said when someone witnesses something strange, considered to be unnatural or culturally unacceptable; furthermore, the second part of the statement seems to be literally translated and provide inaccurate rendering of source expression. A more balanced translation has to explain the first part of the statement and then render the meaning of the second part while keeping its form, such as (Bismillah rahman er rahim! May god protect me from these youngsters).

Transliteration as a form of semantic translation may create more problems while attempting to remain faithful to the source text. In sentence 16, the expression "خسرت اخر فلس في لعبة العيطة" is translated as "I had just lost my last centimo playing aaita". This expression includes first the word "فلس" which is translated as "centimo", Bowles choose to employ foreignisation while rendering this word since he replaced an Arabic word with a Spanish one which is unnatural for the target readers and unfaithful for the source text since the translator employed the language of the coloniser instead of either using the source word with an explanation or just employing the target language equivalent which is (cent). Second, the word "العيطة, aaita" is transliterated from the source language with no explanation; for the source culture, the meaning of the word is evident since the word is a culturally bound one and it hints at a card game that men play in cafes, however, for the target readers they may not know what does it mean, knowing that there is a genre of music in Morocco that holds the same name. Hence, the translator had to include some explanation for the culturally bound term if it was necessary to keep in touch with foreignisation to make the target reader feel and live the experience of the source culture. An alternative translation for this sentence would be (We were in the Café Chato, and I had just lost my last fil (cent) playing aaita, a card game).

## **7. Conclusion**

Communicative translation was a dominant strategy in Bowles's rendering of *For Bread alone*. This form of translation tries to favour the target language and readers while rendering foreign messages. Using this strategy enabled Bowles to approximately transfer the correct meaning of the messages in Choukri's autobiographical novel; however, it did not aid in rendering culturally bound terms, habits, metaphors and other expressions linked to stylistic features of the Arabic literature. The communicative

translation that Bowles exerted was characterised by the excessive employment of omission, alteration, and sometimes mistranslation; all of these led to an imbalanced and inaccurate rendering of the source text to the target readers.

Bowles uses less frequent semantic translation and needs to produce a translation that effectively reflects the source text's characteristics. The translator's exaggerated usage of transliteration and literal translation to stay close to the target text and remain faithful led to the production of an awkward target text. The awkwardness of the target text is apparent in the translated text while using transliteration, which provides phonetic pronunciation of Moroccan cultural bound terms whether they were in Arabic or Riffian; such form of translation has to be associated with footnotes or clarifications in a glossary. Bowles also used literal translation. However, there was always the barrier of culture that made the process of rendering the original message incomplete due to Bowles's inability to speak all Moroccan dialects, particularly the Riffian, the mother tongue of the author of the original text. The inability to translate the text literally in a successful manner results from translating the explicit meaning of the text rather than its implicit message, which is always associated with culture, religion, history, stylistics and other characteristics of the literary text.

All in all, Bowles attempted to produce a proper translation for the target readers. However, his translation has some characteristics that make it impossible for a layperson to read. His translation needs clarifications, footnotes, and a comprehensive glossary, meaning that only a reader who has experienced Moroccan culture in the real world can read his translation. Furthermore, Bowles does not speak Standard Arabic, the primary language of the source text, nor does he speak the Riffian, the original author's mother tongue; Bowles only speaks Moroccan colloquial Arabic. All these facts make it impossible for him to produce a translation of the source text that can have an effect on the target readers that is equivalent to the effect that the source text has on its readers.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7026-8787>

## References

- [1] Bouziane, K. (2015). Cultural Equivalence in the Translations of Paul Bowles - The Case of: *For Bread Alone* (2006). *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* Special Issue on Translation No.4.
- [2] Bowles, P. (2002). *For Bread alone*. London: Telegram books.
- [3] Choukri, M. (2000). *Al khubz al hafi*. London: Dar Al Saki.
- [4] Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge
- [5] Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Oxon: Routledge.
- [6] Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall
- [7] Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- [8] Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill
- [9] Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to the principles and procedures involved in Bible translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- [10] Venuti, L. (Ed.). (2012). *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge