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Abstract

This study deals with the problems in translating Muqabala (opposition) in Arabic literary texts. Muqabala term is a style depends on the principle of establishing an opposition between words, meanings, or ideas in order to achieve rhetorical goals and intellectual values. The present study aims at exploring muqabala in Arabic, showing its translatability into English, and specifying some problems that may arise in translation process. It is hypothesized that translating muqabala faces some kind of difficulty since the concept of muqabala does not exist in English. Thus, the linguistic and cross cultural differences may differ substantially in Arabic from English. It is also hypothesized that translating Muqabala is a possible process, although it does not exist in English. The study concludes that muqabala has an important role in language use and most translators succeeded in producing the opposition between the words or expressions in one way or another. It is hoped to be useful for researchers interested in Arabic literature as well as teachers and students of literary translation.
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Muqabala Definition

Linguistically, the origin of muqabala is confrontation 'مواجهة' between two things, the first one is opposed to the second (Ibn Mandhoor, 1994:16/16).

AL-Askari (1989:307) defines muqabala as the combination of two things or more, then they are opposed to their antonyms. Ateeq(1974:76) explains that Muqabala means that the speaker mentions in the first part two or more compatible meanings, which have no antithetical relation, and followed by their antonyms respectively in the second part.

Muqabala is one of the semantic embellishments in the tropes (trope) science. Trope is one of the branches of rhetoric science that is concerned with the
verbal and semantic embellishments of literary texts. In muqabala, two or more compatible meanings are used firstly, then followed by their antonyms. (Al-Jarim & Ameen, 1999:281), as in the following example:

عدو عاقل خير من صديق جاهل

A wise man is better than an ignorant friend

In this example, muqabala is expressed by using two compatible words in meaning in the first part عدو عاقل 'wise man' and followed by their antonyms in the second part صديق جاهل 'ignorant friend'.

The rhetoricians see that the use of muqabala is a technical request in order to achieve the aesthetic value. The poet tries to combine the antonyms in meaning, which gives beauty to the expressions, provides an artistic suitability, creates consistency and harmony between the words, phrases, and images. Therefore, it is an essential element of poetry and indispensable feature (Al-Sahili, 1996:228).

Muqabala demonstrates that the dominant character of Arabic language is not similarity and unity, but contrast between the ideas and meanings and it expresses the poet interactions between the reality and his own vision of things (Abd Al-Mutalib, 1995:147).

**Difference between Muqabala and Tibaq in Arabic**

In muqabala (opposition), the speaker uses two or more compatible meanings, then they are followed by their antonyms respectively, as mentioned previously. However, Tibaq (antithesis) is the combination of two words with an internal relation of oppositeness (قضاد) (Matloob, 1982:43).

Scholars differ about the concepts of Muqabala and Tibaq, because of the convergence between them.

The first rhetoricians group, including Al-Qazwini (n. d. :341), sees Tibaq as a more general concept than muqabala. To justify this view, they state that tibaq is the origin and muqabala is a branch of it, since tibaq effect is more clearly in the meaning of oppositeness and its ability to enrich the literary texts.
The second rhetoricians group, which represents the opinion of majority, believes that muqabala is the most general and comprehensive concept and it is the origin and tibaq is a branch of it. Therefore, it is considered an independent type of trope (Fayood, 1998:152).

Ateeq (1974:85) shows the difference between them in two points: the words number used in each of them and the relationship between the words. Tibaq is based only on one word and its antonym, e.g.

He is the One Who created you so that one of you may be a disbeliever, another of you is still a believer. God is Obeserver of of anything you do.

(Irving, 2003:556)

In this Aya, Tibaq is held between a word and its antonym, which expresses antithetical relation كافر (disbeliever) and مؤمن (believer) (Al-Dulaimi, 2013:32).

While Muqabala depends on two, three, four, or five words and their antonyms respectively, e.g.

And We have made the night as a covering (though its darkness) And We have made the day for livelihood.(Hilali and Khan (1996:582))

In this Aya, Muqabala is held between two words and their antonyms, which expresses the antithetical relationship between these words lexically.

Muqabala can be based on antithetical and non-antithetical relationships, as in the following example:

I die if he turns his face from me

And my heart rejoices when he returns to contact
In this verse line, Muqabala is expressed by non-antonymous words, in that اموت, بب بصد بوجهه (die, turn his face) are opposed to يفرح, برع للوصل (rejoice, turn to contact) but not to their antonyms يعيش, يُقبل (live, come back), which express antithetical relationship.

**Muqabala types**

There are many types of Muqabala According to verbal, meaning, and number. Al-Hamawi (2004:122/1) explains two types of Muqabala:

1. Antithetical Muqabala:

It shows oppositeness meaning, which is achieved by using two or more non-contradictory words opposed to their lexical antonyms in meaning. This antithetical type can be divided according to the words number into the following:

1. Binary Antithetical opposition: it consists of two antonymous pairs, e.g.

لا تخرجوا من عز الطاعة إلى ذل المعصية

Do not depart the honor of obedience to the humiliation of disobedience.

Muqabala is held by using two antonymous pairs, e.g.

It can be noted that Muqabala is held by using two words opposed to their lexical antonyms عز الطاعة vs. ذل المعصية

(honor of obedience) vs. (humiliation of disobedience)

(Al-Jarm&Aneen:1999,288)

2. Triple antithetical opposition: it consists of three antonymous pairs(Fayood, 1998:154) , e. g.

يا أمة كان فيف الجور يُسقطها دهراً فاصبح حسن العدل يُرضيها

Oh nation, the ugliness of in just made it angry
For ever so goodness of justice became satisfying it

The poet uses Muqabala between three words opposed to their lexical antonyms (ugliness of injustice vs. goodness of justice satisfying).

3. Quadruple antithetical opposition: it consists of four antonymous pairs (Al-Hamawi, 2004:131). The following Aya is a good example:

\[
\text{فَسَن يَسِيرُهُ بِسَنَابِلِ (٨) وَكَذَّبَ (٧) وَأَمَّا مَنْ لِلْعُسْرَى (٦) فَسَن يَسِيرُهُ بِسَنَابِلِ (٥) وَصَدَّقَ (٤) (٦)} \]

So he who gives (in charity) and fears (God). And (in all sincerity) Testifies to the best, We will indeed make smooth for him. The path to Bliss. But he who is A greedy miser And thinks himself Self-sufficient, And gives the lie To the best, We will indeed Make smooth for him The Path to Misery. (Ali, 1989)

Al-Hamawi explains that Muqabala is held by opposing the following four expressions to their antonyms

\[
\text{أعطى، إتقى، صدق، للسمرى} \quad \text{vs. بجل، استغنى، كُنَّب، للعسْرِ} 
\]

(Give, fear God, testifies, path to Bliss) vs. (good miser, self-sufficient, give the lie, path to misery).

4. Quintuple antithetical opposition: it has five antonymous pairs, e.g., Al-imam Ali says:

\[
\text{من يُطَعُ الله ورسوله فقد فاز فوزاً عظيماً، ونال ثواباً كريماً، ومن يعص الله ورسوله فقد خسر حُسْرَاً مبيناً،} \\
\text{واستحق عذاباً اليماً.} 
\]

(Al Mu'atazli, 2005:167/7)
Whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has won a great victory and received a generous reward, and whoever disobeys Allah has lost a clear loss and deserved a painful torture.

In this example, Muqabala is between five words opposed to their lexical antonyms


(observe, won, victory, reward, generous) vs. (disobey, lost, loss, torture, painful).

6. Hexa antithetical opposition contains six antonymous pairs. This type is the less common type (Fayood, 1998:154), e. g.


On a slave 's head an honor crown graces him,

In a noble' s foot a humiliation a shackle disgraces him

In this example, Muqabala is expressed by using six words opposed to their antonyms


2. non-antithetical (contextual) opposition

Al-Tarabulsi (1981,102) calls this type compound contextual Muqabala, since the relationship between the opposing pair meaning is not due to their linguistic situation or their antonymous meaning, but rather due to the poet's style only. The poet creates a contextual contrast, which is not subject to the common lexicon as much as responding to his own talent in artistic creativity. Thus, in this type, lexicon is less effective in creating this type, as well as in directing the options of contextual contrast. The following is a good example


1326
You mastered all speech leaving nothing said,

Be it bad insult or good praise

In this verse line, شتمتا (insult) is opposed to مديحا (praise), i.e. there is no antithetical relation between them. The poet opposed شتمتا to مديحا on the basis of its being a satire feature (Al-Askri, 1989:343).

**Literary Translation**

Ilyas (1989:67-75) explains that the form acquires a significant importance as does content in literary works. If the translator of a certain literary work focuses on the content as a priority, he will do harm to the text. For example, poetry translator is justified in altering the text in order to conform with the source language stylistic and idiomatic norms. Therefore, the target language becomes aesthetically appealing and satisfactory.

Aziz (1997:14) shows that the translators of literary works confirm the equivalence of aesthetic value between source language text and target language text.

Thus, the literary translation is not an easy task, given the difficulty in rendering both the form and content in target language in order to convey the pleasure of aesthetic factor appropriately.

**Data Analysis and Discussion**

Depending on the previous explanation, six literary texts in Arabic along with four renditions (by lecturers who are teaching literary translation at the Department of translation) of each have been analyzed. The analysis is made within the framework of rhetoric and it is carried out by using comprehensive tables, which are analysis of SLT and TLT. One text is selected for each type of antithetical opposition and two for non-antithetical opposition.

The analysis is based on Newmark's model (1988) since this method is more accurate than others as far as the form is concerned. Semantic translation attempts to render the exact meaning of the original; it has a source language bias and the loyalty is to the source text. Communicative translation has a target language bias;
it is free and idiomatic and it emphasizes the force of the message. The aim is to assess the translators strategies and to suggest new rendition whenever necessary.

SLT (1)

كلمة المجموعات خير من صفو الفرقة

(Cited in Al-Jarim&Ameen, 1966:285)

SLT (1) Analysis

In this saying, Muqabala is held between two antonymous pairs: كررالجمتع بصفو الفرقة

(Al-Jarim&Ameen, 1966 :150)

TLTs

1. Unity is strength and dispersion is weakness.
2. The bitterness of unity is better of the calmness of division.
3. Distress in togetherness is better than delight in disunion.
4. Better group turbidity than division serenity.

Table (1): SLT1 and TLTS Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT (1) Muqabala</th>
<th>Muqabala Type</th>
<th>TLT No.</th>
<th>Muqabala Equivalents</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نكر ب المجموعات وصفو الفرقة</td>
<td>Binar</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Unity, strength Depression, weakness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bitterness, unity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

It is clear that translators 2,3, and 4 have managed to provide closer and perfect renditions of SLT Muqabala. Conversely, translator 1 has rendered the message content of SLT effectively but not as identical in form since he has changed the first word and its antonym of muqabala كدر صفو into 'strength vs. weaknesses'.

On the whole, the artistically employment of antithetical opposition of two antonymous pairs is managed in translations 1,3, and 4. Regarding translation 1, attention is paid to content of the message rather than to form.

SLT(2)

فإذا حاردوا اذلوا عززوا وإذا سالموا اعززوا ذللا

(Al-Buhturi, cited in Al-Jarim&Ameen, 1966 :286)

SLT(2) Analysis

Al-Buhturi used antithetical Muqabala between three antonymous pairs حاردوا اذلوا عززوا (fight, humiliate, honorable) vs.سالموا اعززوا ذللا (make peace, appreciate, humble)(Al-Jarim&Ameen, 1966 :150).

TLTs

1. In war they humiliate the enemy,
And in peace they empower the week.
2. If they fight, they humiliate a noble one,
If they were in peace, they honored a base one

3. In war, the mightiest they put to disgrace,

In peace, the humblest take to highest place

4. They are gallant when they fight,

And great when they right.

Table (2): SLT2 and TLTS Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT (2) Muqabala Type</th>
<th>TLT No.</th>
<th>Muqabala Equivalents</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triple antithetical</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>In war, humiliate, enemy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In peace, empower, weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fight, humiliate, noble</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make peace, honored, base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In war, mightiest, disgrace</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In peace, humblest, take to highest place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gallant, fight, ….</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great, right, ….</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Although translator 1 has tried to maintain the antithetical meaning of the first two words and their antonyms, the third word 'enemy' is opposed inappropriately to 'weak', which has no antithetical relationship. It can be noted that the antonymous verbs and حتردواب and ستلمواب are rendered into a prepositional phrases. Translator 2 has managed the production of a stylistically well organized TLT muqabala through rendering the antonymous relation between the three words 'fight, humiliate, noble vs. make peace, honored, base'. With respect to translator 3, he has managed to convey the exact sense of SLT antithetical muqabala and used the inversion of word order to achieve a rhymed rendering by successive repetition of the consonants /st/ and the syllable /eis/in 'mightiest, disgrace vs. humblest, place' in order to convey the phonological impact effectively. Translator
4 has produced a more free TLT since he has underestimated its aesthetic aspect of using muqabala in order to rhyme between the words 'fight and right'.

Obviously, the sense of muqabala is expressed appropriately by translators 2 and 3. For translators 1 and 4, they have failed to produce the rhetorical device of muqabala.

SLT (3)

وفاصخرةكمببةكم بيةاه وبنتدضببشربعاكمبدهمته

(Jareer cited in Al-Jarim&Ameen, 1966:285)

SLT(3) Analysis

In this verse line, Jareer used antithetical muqabala of four antonymous pairs, by opposing (قابضشرعنكشمال، good, to you, right vs. قابضشرهنميمين، evil, from you, left) (Akawi, 2007:656).

TLTs

1. He provides all good with right hand,
   And prevents all evil with his left.
2. His right hand extends to good deeds,
   While his left shuns from evil.
3. His right hand with all good unto you extends,
   His left against all evil defends
4. He offers good in his right hand,
And holds evil away in his left hand.

Table (3): SLT3 and TLTS Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT (3) Muqabala Muqabala Type</th>
<th>TLT No.</th>
<th>Muqabala Equivalents</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quadruple antithetical</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Provide, all god, ..., right hand</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevent, all evil, ..., left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Right hand, extend, ..., good deeds</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left hand, shun, ..., evil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Right hand, all good, unto you, extend</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left, all evil, you, defend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Offer, good, ..., right hand</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold, evil, ..., left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Translators 1 and 4 have rendered the antithetical relationship of the words appropriately except antonyms (3) are neglected in their translations of muqabala. It is clear that the first antonymous adjectives in SL تدسط vs. قتدضب are rendered into antonymous verbs 'provide vs. prevent' and 'offer vs. hold' respectively by translators 1 and 4. Translator 3 has opposed successfully 'right hand, all good, unto you, extend' to 'left, all evil, defend, you', showing the antithetical relationship between the four pairs in part one and two of muqabala and he has used inversion in order to rhyme between 'extends vs. defends'. Although, translator 2 has opposed properly 'right hand, good deeds' to left hand, evil ', the antonymous relationship is not conveyed between' extend and shun' because shun means to ignore in TL.

In brief, although translations 1, 2, and 4 have used semantic method to some extent, the antithetical meaning of the four antonymous pairs of muqabala are not
expressed accurately. Translation 3 has managed to employ the same rhetorical meaning of using muqabala in TL.

**SLT (4)**

سِبْحَانَ اللَّهِ مَالِقَّرِبِ الحَيِّ مِنِ الْمَيْتِ لِلْحَقَّ يِهِ وَأَبَدَّ الْمَيْتِ مِنَ الْحَيِّ لِلْحَاقِ بِهِ.

(Al-Mu'atizli, 2005:196/7)

**SLT (4) Analysis**

Al-Imam Ali means that the living is not far from the dead, rather he is following him at any time. He expresses this idea by using antithetical muqabala consists of five antonymous pairs (close, living, dead, joining, to him vs. far, dead, living, discontinuity) (Al-Zubaydi, 2007:198).

SLT (4) Analysis Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT (4) Muqabala Type</th>
<th>Muqabala Equivalents</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quintuple</td>
<td>Living, closes, dead, and, and, Dead, furthest, living,</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How close, living, dead, joining, with him</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far away, dead, living, disconnected, from him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How close, living, dead, catch up, with him</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How distant, dead, living, parted, him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How close, alive, dead, catch, him</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How far, dead, alive, break off, him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

It is obvious that translators 2, 3, and 4 have managed to approach the intended meaning of using antithetical muqabala by showing its aesthetic aspect since the five antonymous pairs are rendered effectively in TLTs. With respect to translator 1, although he has rendered the antonymous relationship of 'living, closest, dead vs. dead furthest, living', he has disregard antonyms (3 and 4).

Renditions 2, 3, and 4 are representatives of the five antonymous pairs of SL muqabala. For rendition 1, it is inappropriate because the antonyms 3 and 4 are not conveyed.

**SLT(5)**

لبنس مفاريح عند نوبتهم ولا مجازيع إن هم نكروا

(Al-Ruqayat, 1995:56)
SLT(5) Analysis

In this verse line, there is a compound contextual muqabala between non antonyms. The poet opposed فرح to جزع (happiness vs. impatience). In Arabic, what opposed فرح is حزن antonymous (happiness vs. sadness), yet the poet used muqabala between فرح and جزع (happiness vs. impatience) in order to enrich the text with different intellectual value and achieve rhyme (Ibn Mandhur, 1994:270).

TLTs

1. When in victory, they never extreme joyful,
And when in loss, they never panic.
2. They show no rapture as they were triumphant,
And show no impatience at ordeal.
3. Over rejoiced are not when victory they achieve,
Anguished never are how strongly they grieve.
4. Neither happy when they act,
Nor grieved when they get hurt.

Table (5): SLT5 and TLTS Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT (5) Muqabala</th>
<th>Muqabala Type</th>
<th>TLT No.</th>
<th>Muqabala Equivalents</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Joyful Panic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

It is evident that renditions 1, 2, and 3 are inappropriate because the translators are unaware of the nuances between مفةةترعح and مجةةتزع meanings. Thus, the translators have rendered inadequately مجةتزع into 'panic, grieve, and grieved' respectively in order to express antonymous relationship with their opposed ones, which is not the intended meaning of the contextual SL muqabala between the two words. Translator 2 has conveyed the meaning of the two adjectives into two nouns, which is a different part of speech, 'rapture vs. impatience'. Therefor, he is faithful to the SLT by selecting more appropriate equivalent.

Briefly, all renditions except 2 have not yielded the use of this rhetorical tool of the contextual muqabala in TL.

SLT (6)

تجاوز قدر المدح حتى كانه باحسن ما يثنى عليه يعاب

(Al-Mutanabi, 1983:200)

SLT(6) Analysis

In this verse line, the poet used compound contextual muqabala, by opposing الالمةيح vs. العيب، which is not based on antithetical relationship
between them. In Arabic, the antonym of مِحَّ (grace) is الذَّمُ (disgrace), yet the poet opposed the word مِحَّ to the word عِيْب (which expresses an aspect of الذَّم) internationally to create an unexpected aesthetic image for the reader (Al-Barqooqi, 1986:290).

**TLTs**

1. Praising could be damaging to this man,
   Any words of praise would fall short of describing his virtues.

2. He was beyond the limit of praise to the degree,
   All words of compliment are impotent to express his figure.

3. Above extolment measures elevated is he,
   As though blemished would be he.

4. He exceeded the praise until,
   As if the best of it is a disgrace.

**Table (6): SLT6 and TLTS Analyses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT (6) Muqabala</th>
<th>Muqabala Type</th>
<th>TLT No.</th>
<th>Muqabala Equivalents</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مِحَّ vs. عِيْب</td>
<td>Non-antithetical contextual</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Praising Fall short</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Praise Impotent</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Extolment Blemished</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Praise Disgrace</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**
The contextual relationship of muqabala is held by opposing the noun meaning مدح to the verb meaning يُعاب. Translators 1 and 2 have faced a problem in translating the meaning of the verb يُعاب. Thus, they have reinforced the content meaning by using the verb 'fall short' and the adjective 'impotent' respectively, which did not show a clear opposition for the image form. Although translator 4 have rendered the verb يُعاب into a noun 'disgrace', is appropriate rendering. Translator 3 has produced the closest equivalence in that SL sense of muqabala is as strong as that of TL by opposing between the two words 'extolment vs. blemished, as well as using subject and verb inversion to maintain a rhyme scheme and to achieve emphasis.

In short, translators 1 and 2 have not shown accurately the contextual rhetorical aspect of muqabala. On the contrary, translator 4 has produced appropriate rendition and translator 3 has produced the most appropriate one.

Findings

Evidently, each translator has adopted a certain strategy. Translator 1 has followed the strategy of conveying the content with least attention to the writer's intention. Translators 2 and 3 have adopted the strategy of conveying the form of the SLT in order to reproduce the aesthetic element in TLT. For translator 4, has adopted the strategy of matching between the form and content to some extent in order to achieve effective translation.

Conclusion

Muqabala means creating opposition either between two, three, four, or five antonymous words or between two non-antonymous words contextually.

It is clear that that the semantic meaning of the words in muqabala is of great significance. Therefore, the translators sacrifice force of the message to achieve the stylistic effect of muqabala since the stylist effect reinforces the information contents in literary texts. Thus, the semantic translation is probably more suitable than other types to show the SL aesthetic value.
The study concludes that priority should be given to the style of muqabala which is essential to the message and has a considerable impact on the receiver. Translating muqabala is a possible process even if it does not exist in English.
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