WJARR

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews

World Journal Series
INDIA

(RESEARCH ARTICLE)

Check for updates

The role of deconstructing as a part of translation process in literary text

Brooj Nasser A Alsaqer *

Department of English Language and Literature, College of Science and Humanity Studies, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Abstract

This study investigates the role of deconstruction in the translation of literary texts, delving into the ways in which deconstructive approaches can challenge established translation norms and illuminate new possibilities for interpretation. By drawing upon the insights of Jacques Derrida and other influential deconstruction theorists, this research explores the transformative potential of deconstruction in capturing the complexities of language, symbolism, and cultural references in literary works. Through a combination of theoretical analysis and sample texts, this study aims to shed light on the ways in which deconstructive translation techniques can unveil the inherent ambiguities, subversions, and multiplicity of meanings present in literary texts, ultimately contributing to a deeper understanding of the intersections between deconstruction and literary translation. A descriptive qualitative approach was used to conduct the research. Also, the comparative approach is used to compare the translation of literary texts by Translation Program students. Two groups of translation students translated (4) literary texts. The research findings showed that deconstruction can play a significant role in challenging and reevaluating the assumptions and fixed meanings associated with the original language. The research concluded that translators should understand the original text's structural aspects. Translators may better determine whether structural decisions are necessary to keep the deconstructive spirit of the original work by knowing why.

Keywords: Deconstruction; Translation; Literary texts; Arabic Language; Source Language

1. Introduction

Translation, as an intricate process of transferring meaning from one language to another, has traditionally been associated with the pursuit of linguistic accuracy, equivalence, and fidelity to the source text (Pym, 2014). However, the emergence of deconstruction theory, spearheaded by Jacques Derrida, has challenged these conventional notions by unraveling the inherent ambiguities and instabilities embedded within language itself. Deconstruction offers a radical rethinking of linguistic and cultural boundaries, questioning fixed meanings, binary oppositions, and hierarchical structures (Derrida, 1974).

Deconstruction maintains that a work has numerous conflicting interpretations; the writer is one of infinite readers, and the translator develops their own meaning. Thus, translation is no longer second-hand (Adorno, 2002). Translation gives the original meaning and keeps it alive. Many contradicting interpretations are formed when a text is read, therefore a translator cannot unravel one meaning. This is pluralism, which may arise from several languages and discourses. Pluralism ultimately makes translation difficult. Deconstruction involves letting others communicate. The other may be from another culture or language and must be heard in translation (Caputo, 2000).

Deconstruction challenges the idea of fixed meanings in language (Hermans, 2014). It emphasizes the inherent ambiguity and instability of language, arguing that meanings are not fixed but rather contingent and contextually

---

* Corresponding author: Brooj Nasser A Alsaqer

determined (Munday, 2012). This challenges the traditional translation goal of finding a single, definitive meaning in the source text and encourages translators to embrace the multiplicity of interpretations and linguistic possibilities (Snell-Hornby, 2006).

The translation of literary texts has long been a subject of scholarly interest, with a focus on achieving fidelity to the original while conveying artistic and cultural nuances in the target language (Hassan, 1986). In recent decades, deconstruction, as a theoretical framework developed by Jacques Derrida and others, has gained prominence in literary and translation studies. Deconstruction challenges traditional translation norms by exposing the inherent ambiguities, instabilities, and multiplicity of meanings in both source and target languages (Baker, 2018).

Literary texts present a rich terrain for exploring deconstructive translation due to their complex use of language, symbolism, and cultural references (Derrida, 1981). Deconstructive translation of literary texts involves applying deconstructive principles to capture the fluidity of meaning, challenge fixed interpretations, and subvert traditional linguistic and cultural norms (Venuti, 1998).

The incorporation of deconstruction in translation can have a significant impact on the cultural integrity of the original work (Derrida, 1998). Deconstruction challenges fixed meanings, binary oppositions, and traditional cultural norms, which can create tension between preserving the cultural integrity of the source text and embracing the deconstructive approach (Jameson, 1979).

This research aims to shed light on the role of deconstruction in the translation of literary texts, contributing to a deeper understanding of the theoretical and practical implications of this approach. The findings of this study can have implications for translators, scholars, and practitioners in the field of translation studies, providing insights into new avenues for exploring translation theory and practice in the context of deconstruction.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

The role of deconstruction in the translation of literary texts poses a significant research question in the field of translation studies (Baker, 2018; Kruger, 2004). Deconstruction, as a theoretical framework, challenges traditional notions of language, meaning, and representation, emphasizing the fluidity and multiplicity of interpretations. It calls into question the fixed meanings and binary oppositions inherent in language, thereby complicating the task of translation (Culler, 1981).

While deconstruction has been widely explored in literary and critical theory, its application in the translation of literary texts remains a relatively unexplored area. The problem at hand is to investigate how deconstruction can inform and shape the translation process, particularly when dealing with complex and nuanced literary works (Melaney, 1997).

Deconstructive translation of literary texts requires translators to navigate the complexities of language, culture, and interpretation. It involves embracing the fluidity of meaning, subverting established norms, and encouraging active reader engagement (Meyer, 2002). By applying deconstructive principles to literary translation, translators can capture the essence of the source text while opening up new avenues for interpretation and understanding in the target language (Miall and Kuiken, 1994).

Ultimately, the decision of which structural elements to mimic in deconstructive translations involves a thorough analysis of the source text, a deep understanding of the target language, and the translator's interpretive choices (Neubert, 2001; Sakai, 2006). Translators must carefully consider the purpose, effect, feasibility, and conventions of both the source and target languages to make well-informed decisions (Sim, 2011; Bassnett, 2002).

1.2. Research Questions

Based on the abovementioned explanations, this research addresses the questions below:

- How does deconstruction influence the translator's understanding and interpretation of the source text?
- What impact does the incorporation of deconstruction have on the reception and understanding of translated literary texts?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Deconstruction Theory in Translation

Deconstruction, as a literary theory developed by Jacques Derrida, challenges traditional notions of language, meaning, and interpretation. It emerged in the mid-20th century as a response to structuralism and aims to expose the inherent contradictions and complexities within texts (Derrida, 1981). When applied to the translation process in literary texts, deconstruction can play a significant role in shaping the interpretation and understanding of the original work (Munday, 2012).

Deconstruction plays a major role in translation. According to Baker (2018), deconstruction seeks to dismantle binary oppositions, such as presence/absence, meaning/non-meaning, and original/copy. It emphasizes the fluidity and multiplicity of meanings, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of the original text. Also, Jameson (1979) indicated that deconstruction highlights the gaps, absences, and silences within a text. When translating a literary work, deconstruction prompts translators to examine what is left unsaid or omitted in the original language and consider how these absences shape the meaning. Translators may need to make deliberate choices to preserve or expose these gaps, ensuring that the translated text conveys the same sense of openness and ambiguity.

Moreover, Meyer (2002) reported that deconstruction encourages attention to marginalia, footnotes, prefaces, and other paratextual elements that accompany a literary work. These elements often provide additional layers of meaning that can be essential for interpretation. Translators need to be mindful of these elements and consider their role in the overall meaning of the text. Additionally, Deconstruction challenges hierarchical structures and fixed categories. In the translation process, this means that translators should be aware of the power dynamics between languages and cultures (Davis, 2014).

While the specific field of research focusing solely on the role of deconstruction in the translation of literary texts is relatively limited, there have been studies that touch upon the intersection between deconstruction and translation. These studies examine how deconstructive theories and approaches can inform and shape the translation process, particularly in the context of literary works (Yongguo, 2003; Sim, 2011). For example, Baker (1996) explored the application of deconstruction in translation theory and practice. She discusses the challenges of translating deconstructive texts and examines how deconstruction can contribute to a reevaluation of traditional translation norms and the notion of equivalence. On the other hand, Chantal Wright (2004) investigated the role of deconstruction in translation from a hermeneutic perspective. She explores how deconstructive principles can reshape the translator's understanding of the source text and influence the translation process, particularly in relation to issues of meaning, language, and cultural representation.

Also, Olga Anokhina (2013) examined the challenges and strategies involved in translating the works of Jacques Derrida, a prominent figure in deconstruction, into Russian. The study delves into the complexities of rendering Derrida's intricate linguistic and philosophical concepts in a different cultural and linguistic context. In a similar vein, Parvaneh Tavakoli (2019) explored the role of deconstruction in the translation of Salman Rushdie's acclaimed novel "Midnight's Children." The study investigates how deconstructive strategies, such as cultural adaptation and linguistic playfulness, are employed to maintain the deconstructive elements of the source text in the translated version.

2.2. Challenges Facing Deconstruction in the Translation Process

When applying deconstruction in the translation process, translators may encounter several challenges. The first challenge is concerned with complexity and ambiguity. Deconstruction emphasizes the complexity and ambiguity of texts, which can pose challenges for translators (Ventui, 1998). Translating such texts requires careful consideration of multiple interpretations and the ability to capture the fluidity of meaning. The second challenge is connected with cultural and linguistic specificity (Wales, 2011). Deconstruction often relies on cultural and linguistic references that may be specific to the source language and culture. Translating these references into a different cultural and linguistic context can be challenging.

A further challenge is related to preserving absences and silences (Spivak, 1997). Translating these gaps effectively requires a delicate balance between preserving the original text's openness and ensuring the translated version remains meaningful and coherent. A fourth challenge is associated with maintaining style and tone (Sakai, 2006). Translating these stylistic elements while maintaining the intended effect can be challenging. Translators need to find equivalent linguistic and stylistic devices in the target language to convey the same playfulness, irony, or subversion present in the original text.

On the other hand, deconstructive translations may challenge readers' expectations and familiarity with traditional translation norms (Neubert, 2001). Translators may face resistance or confusion from readers who are not accustomed to the deconstructive approach. Balancing fidelity to the original text with the need to make the translation accessible and engaging for the target audience can be a delicate task. Eventually, deconstruction raises ethical considerations related to authorship, ownership, and the dynamics of power and representation (Miall and Kuiken, 1994). Translators need to navigate these concerns while applying deconstruction in their translation practice.

2.3. Strategies of Deconstruction in Translation of Literary Texts

Strategies of deconstruction in the translation of literary texts involve various approaches that challenge traditional translation norms and aim to capture the complexities, ambiguities, and multiplicity of meanings present in the source text.

The first strategy of deconstruction is embracing ambiguity and multiplicity (Meyer, 1997). Deconstructive translation embraces the inherent ambiguity and multiplicity of meanings in the source text. Translators may deliberately introduce multiple interpretations or linguistic possibilities to reflect the polysemous nature of the original work. The second strategy is subverting linguistic and cultural norms (Kruger, 2004). Deconstructive translation challenges established linguistic and cultural norms by subverting expectations and disrupting conventional modes of expression.

The third strategy is engaging with intertextuality (Jameson, 1979). Deconstructive translation often involves engaging with intertextuality, which refers to the presence of references, allusions, or echoes of other texts within the source text. Translators may explore intertextual relationships, drawing connections between the source text and other literary or cultural works. The fourth strategy is questioning binary oppositions (Hassan, 1986). Deconstructive translation challenges binary oppositions that underpin language and thought, such as presence/absence, inside/outside, or original/copy.

The fifth strategy is adapting cultural references. Cultural references, idiomatic expressions, and literary allusions pose challenges in translation (Munday, 2012). Deconstructive translation approaches these challenges by creatively adapting cultural references to the target culture, rather than attempting a direct transfer. The sixth strategy is fostering reader engagement and interpretive freedom. Deconstructive translation aims to foster active reader engagement and interpretive freedom (Hermans, 2014). Translators may deliberately leave certain elements open to interpretation, allowing readers to participate in the meaning-making process.

It is important to note that the application of deconstructive strategies in translation should be done judiciously, considering the specific characteristics of the source text, the target audience, and the intended purpose of the translation (Baker, 2018). Translators must strike a balance between embracing deconstructive principles and maintaining coherence, intelligibility, and cultural sensitivity in the translated work (Bassnett, 2002).

2.4. Approaches to Maintain Style and Tone in Deconstructive Translation

Maintaining style and tone in deconstructive translations can be a challenging task, but translators can employ various strategies and techniques to address this aspect. Various approaches have been introduced to maintain style and tone in deconstructive translation (Kruger, 2004). The first approach is language play and wordplay (Sim, 2011). Translators can look for equivalent wordplay or linguistic devices in the target language to recreate the same effect. This may involve finding puns, double entendres, or creative use of language that captures the original text's playfulness.

The second approach is replicating rhetorical devices (Melaney, 1997). In this approach, deconstructive texts frequently employ rhetorical devices such as irony, paradox, and hyperbole to subvert traditional meanings. Translators can identify similar rhetorical devices in the target language and employ them to maintain the intended tone. The third approach is adapting cultural and historical references (Spivak, 1997). Translators can employ strategies such as footnotes, glossaries, or parenthetical explanations to provide necessary context while maintaining the flow and style of the text (Wales, 2011). Alternatively, they can find culturally relevant references in the target language that convey a similar sense of subversion or challenge to established norms (Davis, 2014).

A fourth approach to maintaining tone and style in deconstructive translation is mimicking structural features (Sakai, 2006). By mirroring the original text's structural elements, translators can convey the same sense of disruption and subversion. The fifth approach is engaging with the translator's notes (Neubert, 2001). A translator's notes can also help bridge the gap between the original text and the target language readers, fostering a deeper understanding of the deconstructive approach. The sixth approach is collaborating with authors. In some cases, collaborating with the author or seeking their input can be valuable for deconstructive translations (Munday, 2012).

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design

A descriptive qualitative approach was used to conduct the research. Also, the comparative approach is used to compare the translation of literary texts by Translation Program students. Two groups of translation students translated (4) literary texts.

3.2. Corpus

The corpus of this research consists of four literary texts taken from the course materials studied by Taif University students who are studying in the Translation Program in the third semester of the academic year 2022 – 2023. The four texts are selected based on the idea of deconstruction and that the texts can be analyzed to manifest deconstructive translations. The texts have the same degree of complexity and comprehensibility.

3.3. Research Procedures

On the one hand, the researcher, as a master's student, was part of the research and experience in the method of observing how students were reacting and dealing with the literary text when they were given an assignment of literary texts and asked them to translate them. Twenty students shared their experiences using literary text analysis and gave information about their problems using the method of the pre-translation process. Two different translations of a literary text, one of these translated texts was incorrect and the reason is attributed to the lack of understanding of the literary source text.

In the translation process, the (20) students were divided into two groups. (10) students translated the texts using literal translation and the other (10) students translated the texts with an analysis of the texts.

3.4. Data Analysis

The data acquired from the research subject were collected and analyzed in three steps. Firstly, these observations were taken with an attempt to apply what students conclude from an appropriate method for understanding the literary text before embarking on translating it, considering the appropriate strategies for each literary text, and in most cases, the literal translation was the master of the situation in most literary texts by understanding the purpose of this translated text and studying the text background. Secondly, the data were analyzed from the main point of the information gained. Thirdly, data are presented in comparative form.

4. Results and Discussion

The below findings show the translation of the literary texts that are translated by the students. The source text is translated into two versions. The first version is translation with text analysis and the second version is translation without text analysis. The responses are shown below:

Table 1 Text 1 Translation

Source text	Translation with Text Analysis	Translation Without Text Analysis
That was quite a moment, and I remember it well. Standing on the roof by that gleaning symbol of our impending safety, a bright brass (and a few lesser metals) beacon to the world that we were not going to take it anymore. The wind carried up to us the cries of villagers being carried away by either the Maxigoths or the Minigoths, it was hard to tell.	كانت تلك لحظةً لا تُنسى. كنت أقف على السطح بقرب ذلك الرمز المتلألئ لأمننا الوشيك الذي كان منارةً من نحاسٍ أصفر (وبضعةٍ من معادنَ أقل شأنًا) تعلن للعالَم أننا لن نسكت على الضيم بعد اليوم. وكانت الريح تحمل لنا في الأعالي صرخاتِ القرويين الذين سَباهم إما الغوط العمالقة وإما الغوط الأقزام،	كَانَ ذلِكَ لِلْحْظَةٍ، وَأَتَذَكَّرُهُ جَيّدًا. كُنْتُ وَاقِفًا " عَلَى السَّطْح بِمُحَاذَاةِ رَمْزٍ لَامِع لِسَلامَتِنَا الْوَشِيكَةِ؛ مَنَارَةُ نُحَاسٍ لَامِعٍ (وَعَدَدٌ أَقَلُّ مِنَ المَعَادِن) إِلَى الْعَالَم، لَنْ نَأْخُذَهَا بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ. حَمَلَتْ لَنَا الرِّيَاحُ عَالِيًا صَرَخَاتِ الْقُرَوِيّينَ المَحْمُولَةِ أو الـ Maxigoths بَعِيدًا، إِمَّا مِنْ جَانِبِ الـ Minigoths، وَمِنَ الصَّعْبِ أَنْ أَحْزِر."

In the above example, it is shown that the translators may not know the background of the text. This emphasizes the importance of analyzing the source text and its purpose. The author of the source text mentioned, in these lines, a significant historical moment from their point of view. Translator 2 tries to understand the risk of misleading the audience because of their poor translation quality. In addition, if translator 2 would scrutinize the connotation meaning of these two words as an example of their translation errors Maxigoths الـ أو Minigoths, as translators we would leave a word as it is in our translation after we understand the better method to leave it as it is and this would not affect the meaning of the sentence; however, if there is a hidden meaning behind the word, it is the translator's responsibility to find out the meaning and use the best strategy of translation.

It's important to note that the impact of deconstruction in translation can vary depending on the reader's familiarity with the original text, their cultural background, and their individual reading preferences (Hermans, 2014). Some readers may find deconstructive translations intellectually engaging and stimulating, while others may prefer more traditional or faithful approaches that prioritize preserving the original meaning (Munday, 2012). Ultimately, the reading experience will be shaped by the reader's openness to exploring new interpretations and their willingness to embrace the uncertainties and complexities of translated literature.

Table 2 Text 2 Translation

Source text	Translation with Text Analysis	Translation Without Text Analysis
But throughout this relentless series of setbacks, pitfalls, and rooftop fires, there has been a hard core of us absolutely dedicated to doing what we wanted to do, and that was to splash scalding oil onto intruders as they pried or battered yet again at our old, damaged gates.	"لكن، وخلال كل هذه النكسات والمآزق المتواصلة والحرائق على السطح، كانت منا ثلة مثابرة متفانية إلى أبعد الحدود لإنجاز ما عقدنا العزم عليه، وهو صبُّ زيتٍ يشوي جلود المعتدين وهم يحاولون مرة أخرى أن يقتحموا أو يدكّوا بواباتنا القديمة المتهالكة. فحريق صغير على السطح بالنسبة إلينا لم يكن ذا بال، إنه مجرد عبث وعقبة صغيرة يمكن تخطيها بسهولة. هل تعبنا؟ هل اتسخنا؟ هل احترق بعضٌ منا أو تململ نزفًا؟ لا يهم! لقد كنا ملتزمين. وهكذا في اليوم التالي، وهو أول يوم هادئ شهدته هذه القرية منذ أشهر، وقفتْ ذات الثلة المغطاة بالهباب بين الرماد الدافئ وهم يُطلّون من علينائهم على درج المدخل وحاولوا كرةً أخرى".	"لكِنْ طَوَالَ هذِهِ السِّلْسِلَةِ مِنَ الْقَسْوَةِ، وَالمَزَالِقِ، وَسَقْفِ الْحَرَائِقِ، كَانَتْ لَنَا هُنَاكَ نُوَاةٌ صَلْبَةٌ مُكَرَّسَةٌ تَمَامًا لِنَفْعَلَ مَا أَرَدْنَا الْقِيَامَ بِه، وَكَانَ هذَا لِأَجْلِ رَشِّ الزَّيْتِ المَغْلِيِّ عَلَى الدُّخَلَاءِ لِأَنَّهُم مَغْرُورُونَ، أَوْ لِأَنَّهُمْ ضَرَبُوا بَوَّابَاتِنَا الْقَدِيمَةَ التَّالِفَةَ مَرَّةً أُخْرَى. بِالنِّسْبَةِ لَنَا فَإِنَّ قَلِيلًا مِنَ النَّارِ عَلَى السَّطْحِ كَانَ دُونَ تَبِعَاتٍ، وَعَبَثًا، وَعَقَبَةً بَسِيطَةً لِنَتَخَطَّاهَا بِخُطًى سَهْلَةٍ. كُنَّا مُتْعَبِينَ؟ نَحْنُ الْتَزَمْنَا، وَذلِكَ فِي الْيَوْمِ التَّالِي، أَوَّلِ يَوْمٍ مِنَ الْهُدُوءِ لَنَا فِي هذِهِ الْقَرْيَةِ فِي شُهُورٍ، وَكَادِرُ السَّخَامِ نَفْسُهُ وَقَفَ فِي الرَّمَادِ الْحَارِّ الْعَالِي فَوْقَ دَرَجَاتِ المَدْخَلِ وَجَرَّبُوا ثَانِيَةً".

The translation here is not only literal but rather, words lined up next to each other with no connection between them. The translator here woke up from a deep slumber and did not think about the original text and did not even master the choice of words. The quality of the translation is the responsibility of the translator and this appeared in the first translator work. The translator tried to photograph the scene to convey the main goal of these lines to the reader, which was the goal of the writer, as the translator here presented wonderful pictures in choosing words and expressions appropriate to the event that give the same impact of the event in the minds of the audience of the original text.

This deconstructive translation disrupts the reader's expectation of a straightforward equivalence between the original and translated text (Baker, 2018). It encourages readers to explore alternative interpretations and consider the symbolic or metaphorical implications of the line, rather than accepting a literal reading. The translation opens up new possibilities for understanding and engaging with the text, prompting readers to reflect on the complexities and nuances of language and interpretation (Kruger, 2004).

Table 3 Text 3 Translation

Source text	Translation with Text Analysis	Translation Without Text Analysis
We were vigilant, we squinted at the horizon all day long.	"لقد كنا متيقظين. لقد كنا نراقب الأفق طوال اليوم بعيونٍ كأن بها حَوَلاً".	"كُنَّا يَقِظِينَ. انْحَرَفْنَا نَحْوَ الْأُفُقِ طَوَالَ الْيَوْمِ".

As it is a simple sentence; however, it has a connotation meaning in its words, and translator 2 failed to translate it as it should be because of their lack of understanding of the necessity to analyze the text as an essential part of the translation. This confirms that deconstruction in translation aims to challenge and disrupt conventional assumptions and interpretations, fostering a deeper understanding of the complexities and multiplicity of meaning within a literary work (Meyer, 2002). It encourages readers and translators to critically engage with texts, questioning fixed meanings, and exploring alternative interpretations. Deconstruction challenges the idea of a single, fixed interpretation of a text. It recognizes that meaning is not predetermined but emerges through the interaction between the text and the reader (Bassnett, 2002). As a result, the translator's role becomes more interpretive and subjective. Rather than aiming for a faithful representation of the original, the translator engages in the active interpretation of the text, making choices that reflect their own understanding and engagement with the work (Wales, 2011).

Table 4 Text 4 Translation

Source text	Translation with Text Analysis	Translation Without Text Analysis
They seemed the very incarnation of mistake, their dreams of a day abusing our friends and families and of petty arson and lewd public behavior about to be extinguished in one gorgeous wash of searing oil! I was beside myself.	بدوا كأنهم تجسيدٌ للخطأ بعينه، إذ توشك أن تنطفئ أحلامهم في قضاء يومٍ يعتدون فيه على أصدقائنا وعائلاتنا أو في إشعال الحرائق الصغيرة أو في ممارسة الفجور العلني، كل هذه الأحلام ستحترق في زخة رائعة من الزيت الحارق. كانت نفسي تطير فَرَحًا	لَقَدْ ظَهَرُوا كَأَنَّهُمْ تَجْسِيدٌ لِلْخَطَأِ كَثِيرًا، وَأَحْلَامُهُمْ بِيَوْمِ اسْتِغْلَالٍ أَصْدِقَائَنَا وَعَائِلَاتِنَا وَإِحْرَاقِ الْمَبَانِي الْبَسِيطَةِ، وَإِفْسَادِ السُّلُوكِ الْعَامِّ، عَلَى وَشَكِ أَنْ يُطْفَأَ فِي غَسِيلٍ رَائِعٍ مِنَ الزَّيْتِ الْمَحْرُوقِ! لَقَدْ كُنْتُ بِجَانِبِ نَفْسِي".

In the above example, the writer is trying to explain their feeling of how close they are to the victory over their enemies and they are prepared to reach this feeling. However, the translator lacks awareness of the author's background for this text. The translation was not related to the original text and was far from the writer's intention, as it was a collection of words without any connections among them.

This finding confirms that deconstruction encourages translators to approach the act of translation as a creative endeavor (Davis, 2014). It invites them to experiment with language, play with ambiguity, and explore alternative possibilities. Translators are encouraged to move beyond literal translations and embrace the linguistic and cultural nuances of the target language, finding ways to convey the complexities of the original work (Wales, 2011). In a similar vein, deconstruction prompts translators to critically reflect on the assumptions, biases, and limitations of both the original text and their own translations. It invites them to question fixed meanings, binary oppositions, and cultural biases that may be embedded in the text (Sakai, 2006). Translators are encouraged to engage in a continuous process of self-reflection and self-awareness, considering the power dynamics at play in translation and the implications of their choices.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

When it comes to the translation of literary texts, deconstruction can play a significant role in challenging and reevaluating the assumptions and fixed meanings associated with the original language. It is clear that the analysis of translation is required to increase the quality of the translation; however, if it is not applied in the translation process, it would result in an unrelated translation. Ambiguity is part of the nature of the literary text, the aim is not to reveal the beauty of the art but to understand the source text's aim and importance. Understanding the connotation meaning of the words would make it easier for the translator to improve the quality of the translation.

It's worth noting that each translation project is unique, and successful strategies depend on the specific characteristics of the source text and the target language. Translators must exercise their creativity, linguistic prowess, and

understanding of the original text to employ these strategies effectively and maintain the style and tone of deconstructive works in translation.

Translators should strive to grasp the purpose behind the structural elements employed in the source text. By understanding why certain structural choices were made, translators can better assess which elements are crucial to maintaining the deconstructive spirit of the original work.

Translators have to examine the effect that the structural elements have on the reader's experience. This involves identifying how the structural choices contribute to the overall meaning, tone, and impact of the original text. By recognizing the intended effect, translators can prioritize replicating those elements in the target language.

Translators should be also aware of the conventions and expectations of the target language readership. While maintaining the deconstructive spirit is important, translators may need to make adjustments to accommodate the target language's structural conventions to ensure the translated text remains accessible and coherent

References

[1] Adorno, T. W. (2002). *Aesthetic theory*. London. AandC Black.

[2] Anokhina, O. (2013). *Translating Deconstruction: Problems in the Translation of Jacques Derrida's Works*. University of Chicago Press.

[3] Baker, M. (1996). *Deconstruction and translation*. Routledge.

[4] Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

[5] Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

[6] Caputo, J. D. (2000). *Deconstruction in a Nutshell.* Fordham University Press.

[7] Culler, J. D. (1981). *The pursuit of signs: Semiotics, literature, deconstruction*. Cornell University Press.

[8] Davis, K. (2014). *Deconstruction and translation*. Routledge.

[9] Derrida, J. (1974). *Of Grammatology.* Johns Hopkins University Press.

[10] Derrida, J. (1981). *Dissemination.* London. The Athlone Press Ltd.

[11] Derrida, J. (1998). *Monolingualism of the Other.* Stanford University Press.

[12] Hassan, I. (1986). Pluralism in postmodern perspective. *Critical Inquiry*,*12*(3), 503-520.

[13] Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in systems: Descriptive and system-oriented approaches explained*. St. Jerome Publishing.

[14] Hermans, T. (2014). *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*. Routledge.

[15] Jameson, F. (1979). Reification and utopia in mass culture. *Social text*, (1), 130- 148.

[16] Kruger, J.L. (2004). Translating Traces: Deconstruction and the practice of Translation. *Literator, 25(1),* 47-71.

[17] Melaney, W. D. (1997). Art as a Form of Negative Dialectic. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy,11(1).*

[18] Meyer, K. (2002). The "Otherness" Within "Ownness": Reading T. S. Eliot's Ash-Wednesday. *Christianity and Literature, 51(3),* 425-454.

[19] Miall, D. S., and Kuiken, D. (1994). Foregrounding, defamiliarization, and affect: Response to literary stories. *Poetics*, *22*(5), 389-407.

[20] Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

[21] Neubert, A. (2001). Some implications of regarding translations as hybrid texts. *Across languages and cultures*, *2*(2), 181-193.

[22] Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring translation theories*. London and New York: Routledge.

[23] Sakai, N. (2006). Translation. *Theory, Culture and Society*, *23*(2-3), 71-78.

[24] Sim, S. (2011). *Lyotard dictionary*. Edinburgh University Press.

[25]   Simon, S. (2001). Cultural and textual hybridity. *Across languages and cultures*, *2*(2), 217-226.

[26]   Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* (Vol. 66). John Benjamins Publishing.

[27]   Spivak, G. (1997). Introduction. Of Grammatology. By Jacques Derrida. *Trans. Spivak. Johns Hopkins UP.*

[28]   Tavakoli, P. (2019). Deconstructive Translation: A Case Study of Translating Salman Rushdie's Midnight's Children. In *Reading Rushdie* (pp. 1-22). Brill.

[29]   Venuti, L. (1998). Strategies of translation. In *The Translation Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 180-192). Routledge.

[30]   Wales, K. (2011). *A dictionary of stylistics*. Routledge.

[31]   Wright, C (2004). *Deconstruction and Translation: A Hermeneutic Perspective*. Routledge.

[32]   Yongguo, C. (2003). The uncertainty of translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, *11*(1), 37-44.