

Tanta University
Faculty Of Arts
Deptment Of English



Macbeth in Arabic Translation
A cultural Comparative Approach

By

Nesreen Jasmin Hussein

Mohammed Said Negm

Gamal Hegazy

This paper provides a comparative analysis that maps out the various translation strategies employed by each translator to render the linguistic, cultural, and, therefore, the aesthetic context of the source text into the target text. As will be seen, Jabra, Amin and Mutran employ various sets of strategies to create a transparent text where the structures are as close as possible to those used by the target reader when using Modern Standard Arabic. On a structural level, the three translators tend to adhere to the sentence structure of the target language. Since Jabra's, Mutran's and Amin's translation strategies depend on the type of the culture-specific item, this study argues that functional equivalence, literal translation, and domestication, or neutralization, are more or less the most common translation strategies employed by the three translators. These strategies are meant to achieve the linguistic, or the formal equivalence, maintaining the communicative function of the source text rather than preserving its cultural identity.

Many of the figurative and dialectic expressions, idioms and collocations are translated employing strategies of literal translation and domestication into a non-figurative language. Therefore, many of the cultural-specific items in the source text become void of their aesthetic and cultural impact. Shakespeare's opening scene reads as follows:

First Witch: When shall we three meet again?

In thunder, lightning, or in rain?

Second Witch: When the hurly-burly's done,

When the battle's lost, and won.

Third Witch: That will be ere the set of sun.

First Witch: Where the place?

Second Witch: Upon the heath.

Third Witch: There to meet with Macbeth.

First Witch:

I come, Graymalkin.

(Shakespeare & Braunmuller 102)

Jabra translates this scene as follows:

ساحرة 1: متي نلتقي ثانية نحن الثالث

في رعود وبروق وأمطار كاللهات؟

ساحرة 2: حين يكف الهرج والمرج رعبا

ويمسي القتال خسرانا وكسبا.

ساحرة 3: ذلك قبل مغيب الشمس حاصل.

ساحرة 1: أما المكان؟

ساحرة 2: ففي القفراء مائل.

ساحرة 3: حيث نلتقي بمكبث.

ساحرة 1: قطني الشهباء، لبيك!

(53)

Amin translates the scene as follows:

الساحرة الأولى: متي نلتقي نحن الثالثة مرة أخرى؟ عند قصف الرعد، البرق أم هطول المطار؟

الساحرة الثانية: حين تنتهي المعمة وتسفر المعركة عن هزيمة وانتصار.

الساحرة الثالثة: سيكون ذلك قبل غروب الشمس وانقضاء النهار.

الساحرة الأولى: وأين؟

الساحرة الثانية: في المرج يكون اللقاء.

الساحرة الثالثة: حيث نقابل مكبث.

الساحرة الأولى: إني قادمة ابتها القطة جريمالكين.

(25)

Because Mutran translated his text from French, his opening scene differs from that of Jabra and Amin. However, the two samples above show clearly Jabra's and Amin's attempts to follow distinctively Shakespeare's poetic lines. Jabra, being a poet himself, tends to use short

rhymed lines as possible. Jabra even added the Arabic simile “تاهلاك” and the noun “ابعر” to keep the lines rhymed. In the light of Nida’s conception of “Formal Equivalence,” explained before, Jabra is much more concerned to achieve the same poetic effect on the Arabic reader, as does the original text. In other words, he translates verse into verse. Moreover, although Jabra’s extra words add more to the dramatic effect of the scene after the hard battle, they represent Jabra’s understanding of the process of translation, a process in which the translator allows himself to interfere with and modify the original text.

Jabra’s cultural identity may be clearer in his translation of the word “Graymalkin” in Shakespeare’s text. This word is a cat’s name in the English culture. It is connected with witches and their evil deeds. Cats and other animals such as toads in the English culture may also represent incarnation of a demon or a disguised witch (Shakespeare & Braunmuller 103). Obviously, this cultural aspect does not exist as it is in the Arabic culture. Therefore, Jabra transferred the proper noun “Graymalkin” into the adjectival phrase “ءابهشلا يتطق”. On the other hand, Amin’s lines tend to be a little longer than Jabra’s. Although the lines are also rhymed, they are not as light as Jabra’s lines. However, Amin seems to be much more conservative with the original text. While he does not add extra elements that do not exist in the original text, his choice of words tends to deliver the dramatic effect as possible. The word “عمعلا” seems to be a clear example. As such, his translation shows commitment and faithfulness to the source text in its aesthetic and structural character. Therefore, it is worth re-mentioning that some linguistic elements are highly rooted in the source culture. A culture-specific item is “any object, idea or action that exists in the source culture but not in the target culture, or any such object, idea or action that exists differently in the target culture in usage, frequency or characteristics” (Deconinck et al. 183).

Culture-specific items then refer to various domains such as fauna, flora, food, work, clothing, religion, among others. It is worth mentioning that this study agrees with many cultural translation theorists that cross-culture-translation inevitably results in cultural losses, especially when dealing with two distant cultures. Therefore, there are some problematic structures, idiomatic and culture-specific expressions that seem beyond translation by any strategies but literal translation and domestication strategies, which is seen distinctively in the three Arabic translations. The three Arabic translations are then “communicative” in nature, to use Newmark’s term. By “communicative” translation, Newmark refers to the translation that is targeted to communicate the content of the source so that the target reader does not encounter it as a “foreignized” text. The following excerpts also illustrate this point.

First Witch: Where hast thou been, sister?

Second Witch: Killing swine.

Third Witch: Sister, where thou?

First Witch: A sailor’s wife had chestnuts in her lap

And munched, and munched, and munched. ‘Give me’, quoth I.

‘Aroint thee, witch’, the rump-fed runnion cries.

Her husband's to Aleppo gone, master o’th’Tiger:

But in a sieve I’ll thither sail,

And like a rat without a tail,

I’ll do, I’ll do, and I’ll do.

Second Witch: I’ll give thee a wind.

First Witch: Thou’rt kind.

Third Witch: And I another.

I myself have all the other,

First Witch:

And the very ports they blow,

All the quarters that they know

I'th' shipman's card.

I'll drain him dry as hay:

Sleep shall neither night nor day

Hang upon his penthouse lid;

He shall live a man forbid.

Weary sennights nine times nine,

Shall he dwindle, peak, and pine.

Though his bark cannot be lost,

Yet it shall be tempest-tossed.

Look what I have. (108 -112)

Mutran translates the scene as follows:

الأولى: من أين مجيئك يا أختي؟

الثانية: كنت أفت ل خنازير .

الثالثة: وأنت يا أختي؟

الأولى: كانت امرأة مالح تحمل فيحضرها كستناء، وتقصم، تقضم، تقضم، فسألته شيئاً منه فطردتني قائلة «! اعزبي يا ساحرة

» «إن زوجها قد سافر الي « حلب » ليكون رُباناً بدجلة، سأركب الغريال مُقلعةً إليه، وسأعمل سحري كمايُعملُ الفأر نابه،

قرضاً، قرضاً، قرضاً. الثانية: وهبتك ريحاً عاتية.

الأولى: لك الشكر .

الثالثة: وأنا أمنحك ريحاً ثانية.

الأولى: أما سائر الرياح فهن لي، كما أن لي مراسي السفن وسائر الأماكن المرسومة في خرائط البحار. سأدعه جافاً كالتين، ال
يعلق النوم ليالٍ وال نهاراً بأهداب جفنيه، حياته حياة الطريد المحروم يظل يضعف وينحف، ويذوب تسعة أسابيع مكررة. تسع
مرات يأبى القدر أن تغرق سفينته، ولكنها تستمر عرضة لأمواج بال انقطاع، انظري ما بيدي؟ (9)

Jabra translates the same scene as follows:

ساحرة ١ : أين كنت يا أختاه ؟
ساحرة ٢ : أقتل الخنازير.
ساحرة ٣ : وأنت يا أختاه ؟
ساحرة ١ : لقيت زوجة بحار والكستاء في حجرها
وهي تمضع، وتمضع، وتمضع.
«أعطيني» قلت لها .
«انقلعي، يا ساحرة !»
صاحت الحيزيون المدلل،
زوجها إلى حلب قد سافر، وهو ريان «النمر»
لكنتني في غريالٍ سأبحر إلى مركبه،
وكجرذون بلا ذيل
سأفعل، وأفعل، وأفعل... (٩)
ساحرة ٢ : سأعطيك ربحاً واحدة (١٠).
ساحرة ١ : لك شكري.
ساحرة ٢ : ومني واحدة.
ساحرة ١ : أنا لديّ الأخريات،
والموانئ التي تهب منها وعليها،
والأماكن التي تعرفها
في خرائط البحارة كلها .
جفاف القشُّ ساجفُّه
من رأسه حتى قدميه،
والنومُ لن يعلق حتى بالهدب من عينيه
في حلقة الليل أو وضع النهار .
ملمونا سيحيا، بل طريد اللعنات .
ولسبع ليالٍ، مضروبة بتسع تسع مرات،
سيصاب بالضمور، والنحول، والهزال (١١)،
ولئن عجزتُ عن إفقاده سفينته،
جعلتها ألعوبة للزوابع المزمجرات.
انظرا ما عندي.

(57)

Amin translates the same scene as follows

الساحرة الأولى : أين كنتِ يا أختاه ؟

الساحرة الثانية : أقتل الخنازير .

الساحرة الثالثة : وأنتِ يا أختاه أين كنت ؟

الساحرة الأولى : قابلتُ زوجة بحارٍ في حجرٍ ثوبها كستناء ، وهي تقضم وتقضم وتقضم . . قلت لها : « أعطني » ، فصرخت المرأة السمينة : « أغربى عن وجهي أيتها الساحرة ! » . . وقد أبحر زوجها على ظهر سفينة « النمر » قاصداً حلب ، غير أنى سأبعه مبحرة في منخل ، وفي صورة فأر لا ذيل له ، فأقضم خشب سفينته وأقضم وأقضم .

الساحرة الثانية : سأزودك بريح قوية .

الساحرة الأولى : وحسناتفعلين .

الساحرة الثالثة : وسأزودك بأخرى .

الساحرة الأولى : أما سائر الرياح فعندى ، بل وتحت سيطرتي الموانئ التي تهب الرياح منها فتصدّ السفن عنها ، أيًا كانت الجهة من الجهات

المرسومة في بوصلة البحار . . سيجعل الظمأ حلقة في جفاف الهشيم ، وسأحرمه من النوم ليلاً ونهاراً فلن يداعب أبداً جفنيه . ستطارده اللعنة مدى الحياة . . وسأرهقه لعدة أسابيع ، تسعة أسابيع مضروبة في تسعة ، حتى ينحل جسمه ويهن عظمه . ورغم أن مركبه لن تغرق ، فإن الرياح ستقاذفها . . أنظرن ما عندي .

(29)

Although the three translations transfer the same content of the source text, linguistic and idiomatic expressions differ in each translation. Mutran's and Amin's translations are more concerned with the communicative meaning of the source text. This is obvious in translating the phrase "I'll do" which is translated into the verb phrase "مضقاً" in Amin's translation and "اضرق" in Mutran's while it is translated literally in Jabra's translation into "للعفأس". Jabra's translation keeps the original reference impeded by the verb "do." Instead of fixing its meaning as "مضقي" or "امضق", the verb is translated by means of "formal" equivalence letting the target reader to infer

the referentiality of the verb. In Mutran's and Amin's translations, the target reader is much more helped by means of interpretation and paraphrasing. Therefore, they decided that the verb "do" refers to the verb which a rat does while eating. Moreover, Amin and Mutran translate the verb "munch" into "مضقت" while Jabra translates it into "غضمت". These linguistic differences, although do not affect the general communicative message of the source text, indicate the cultural perspective of each translator and his interpretation of the overall textual structure.

As such, some sort of linguistic loss is inevitable when translating between two languages belonging to distant cultures. This implied loss seems to maintain most of the characteristics that Newmark, in his *About Translation* (1991), assigns for that kind of text in which translation strategies are adopted to transfer the content, the message. In this sense, this study claims that the three translations are mostly "communicative" in nature. As put by Newmark, a "communicative" translation is mostly "reader-centered" since it neutralizes the target text for its target readers (10). A "communicative" translation also "adapts and makes the thought and cultural content of original more accessible to the reader" (11). In other words, it is "more natural, smoother, simpler, clearer, more direct, more conventional. Conforming to a particular register of language" (12). The following examples further support this claim. In these examples, the three translators distinctively deal with linguistic expressions that are highly rooted in culture. Therefore, they resort to simplification, alteration or omission and paraphrasing.

ALL The weird sisters, hand in hand,
Posters of the sea and land,
Thus do go, about, about,
Thrice to thine, and thrice to mine,
And thrice again, to make up nine.

Peace, the charm's wound up.

...

So withered and so wild in their attire,
That look not like th'inhabitants o'th'earth,
And yet are on't? - Live you, or are you aught
That man may question? You seem to understand me,
By each at once her choppy finger laying
Upon her skinny lips; you should be women,
And yet your beards forbid me to interpret
That you are so. (112)

Jabra translates these lines as follows:

كلهن معا :
أخوات القدر المسرعات
عبر الأراضي والبحار يدرن كذا هي حلقات يدا بيد
لك ثلاث، ولي ثلاث (١٢)
وأخرى ثلاث تتلث الثلاث...
كفى الفارقية استوت ا
يدخل مكبث وبانكوو
يومما دميمة وجميلاً كهذا ما رأيت قط. مكبث :
ما المسافة إلى فورس ؟ ما هؤلاء بانكوو :
الذوايات المشعّات بلبوسهن،
لا يشبهن أهل الأرض،
ولكنهن عليها؟ أحياء أنتن ؟ أو كائنات
يجوز للإنس سؤالكن ؟ (١٣) يبدو أنك تفهمني،
إذ تضع كل منكن أصبعها المشققة
على شفّتها الجلديتين، لا بد أنك نساء
ولكن لحاكن تمنعني عن تأويلكن كذلك.

(59)

As obvious, Jabra translates the phrase “The weird sisters” into “تاوخأ ردقلا” which indicates his tendency to neutralize the source cultural context into another supposedly equivalent context in the target culture. Shakespeare’s use of the word “weird” simply has some denotations and connotations. They have unfamiliar appearance since they have beards just like men. It also suggests and indicates the supernatural aspect of these sisters or strange women. They furthermore suggest the mysterious nature of Macbeth’s future. That is, their speeches are simply prophecies. Jabra’s translation employs the phrase “ردقلا تاوخأ” to simply equate the figurative and mythical context of the source expression. However, they do not connote neither the strange appearance of the “weird sisters” nor the prophetic nature of their speech. Thus, Jabra’s translation tends to adaptation, domestication, and neutralization as translation strategies that adapt to the original context. This is also apparent in his translation of the phrase “the charm’s wound up” into “تيفر لاف توتسا” in which the original word “charm” is replaced by a religiously-oriented word “تيفر” which connotes a different meaning in the target culture.

Therefore, Jabra’s translation suffers from some kind of cultural loss, that is, the cultural context in the source text, which refers to elements of superpower, magic, and prophetic speech, differs from that of the target text. The kind of linguistic and cultural losses here could be called “modified loss” (Al-Masry 85). Cultural loss occurs when the target language/culture has equivalent idiomatic expressions similar to that of the source language/culture. Modified loss, as the term indicates, affects the cultural structure of the source text. In other words, it modifies the cultural context but preserves the linguistic and communicative aspects of the text. Amin’s translation is similar to that of Jabra’s. Amin translates the same lines as follows:

الجميع : نحن أخوات القدر ، اليد في اليد ، نذرع البحر والأرض ، وندور
هكذا وندور ، ثلاث خطوات في اتجاهك ، وثلاث خطوات في
اتجاهي ، وثلاث خطوات أخرى توصل العدد إلى تسعة . صه !
هكذا اكتملت التعويذة .

(يدخل مكبث وبانكو)

مكبث : لم أر في حياتي يوماً في قبح هذا اليوم وروعته .

بانكو : كم المسافة في تقديرهم إلى فوريس ؟ (يلاحظ وجود الساحرات)
مَن هؤلاء النسوة الذابلات غريبات الزيّ ؟ مظهرهن يوحي بأنهن
لسن من أهل هذه الأرض ، ومع ذلك فهنّ عليها . (يتوجه
بحديثه إلى الساحرات) أحياء أنتن ، وهل بوسع المرء أن
يحادثكن ؟ يبدو أنكن تفهمنني إذ أراكن ترفعن أصابعكن الغليظة
إلى شغاهكن النحيلة . . هيتكن هيئة النساء ، غير أن لحي
وجوهكن تحول دون تصديق ذلك .

(30)

Like Jabra, Amin translates “weird sisters” into “ردقلا تاوخأ” applying the same translation strategies to maintain the mythical and supernatural effect of the source text. However, unlike Jabra, Amin translates the phrase “posters of the sea and land” into “ضراواو رحبلا عرذن” which preserves the linguistic meaning of the original which indicates moving quickly through seas and lands. However, Amin chooses the word “تذيوعت” as an equivalent to the word “charm.” As such, Amin’s translation seems more faithful to the source context than Jabra’s who transferred the context through adaptation, neutralization, and domestication. However, Mutran translates the phrase “The weird sisters” into “تارحاسلا” by which he seems to be much more preserving to the source text since this Arabic word connotes superpower and mythical character. Mutran translates the previous excerpt as follows:

(الثلاث الساحرات متماسكات وراقصات.)

(يدخل مكبث وبنكو.)

مكبث: لم يمر بي يوم أروع من هذا اليوم هولاً وجمالاً.
بنكو: كم المسافة بين هذا المكان وبين فوريس؟ ما هذه الخلائق الغثاء العجاف،
باليات الجلود والأطمار، غريبات الحركات والأطوار، إنها ليست بإنسيات وإن مشت على
الأرض، ألك حياة؟ أتجيبين السائلين؟ كأنني بك وقد وضعت أصابعك الجافيات على
شفاhek الجافات تدركين ما أقول، ما أشبهك بالنسوة، لولا هذه اللحي.

(10)

As obvious, Mutran's translation seems to be more elliptic than Amin's and Jabra's. Again, this is because Mutran's translated Macbeth from a French text.

As such, literal translation, formal equivalence, and domestication strategies neutralize the text for its reader. The three translations distinctively seem to be mostly concerned with the message, the content, of the source text. Here, cultural loss only stands out if the text is translated back into standard Arabic. In other words, translating literary and metaphoric language is at best preserved if the message is transferred literally. That is, losing the cultural aspect in culturally idiomatic expressions are inevitable. In this sense, Jabra's, Amin's and Mutran's translations are much understood in light of Even-Zohar's theory of translation which conceives of literature as a whole. In his mapping of the Polysystem Theory in his *Papers in Historical Poetics* (1978), Even-Zohar argues that it is more convenient to take all sorts of literary and semi-literary texts as a polysystem. As he puts it:

. . . the code of translated literature may be enriched and become more flexible .
. . not only is the socio-literary status of translation dependent upon its position
within the polysystem but . . . phenomenon whose nature and borders are given
once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relations within a certain
cultural system. (27)

For Even-Zohar, the internal relations among systems are constrained by the larger socio-cultural system. In other words, the literary polysystem is influenced by other socio-cultural co-systems, such as politics, religion, and socio-economics (Gambier & Doorslaer 337). This justifies the different linguistic structures employed by each translator to transfer the same source text. That is, the three translations in this study represent three different interpretations of the same source text which is due to the cultural difference of each translator. Even-Zohar's functionalist model offers a flexible framework for the study of translation, especially the translation of literature. It rejects determining in advance what a translation is or should be (Makaryk 53). Nor does it determine to what extent a translation has to correspond to the original text. Therefore, Jabra, Amin and Mutran often resort to omission and paraphrasing to deal with problematic linguistic structures, especially those which are culture-specific. For the polysystem theory, a translation is assessed in terms of its success in innovating or preserving the literary, and therefore, cultural system.

As seen in the excerpts above, all of the Arabic translations more or less succeed in preserving the literary and cultural systems of the source text. As such, literary translation occupies a unique position since it functions as an in-between ground for two cultures. It has the potential to demonstrate characteristics of the source culture, as well as that of the target culture.

Mediating two cultures by means of translation is also obvious in the following excerpts:

MACBETH Stay, you imperfect speakers. Tell me more.

By Finel's death, I know I am Thane of Glamis,

But how of Cawdor? The Thane of Cawdor lives

A prosperous gentleman, and to be king

Stands not within the prospect of belief,

No more than to be Cawdor. Say from whence

You owe this strange intelligence, or why

Upon this blasted heath you stop our way

With such prophetic greeting? Speak, I charge you. (114)

Jabra's translation tends to be linguistically oriented. That is, it is faithful to the linguistic structures of the source text. He translates the previous lines as follows:

مكبت :
مكانكّن، يا ناقصات النطق ! أخبرني بالمزيد
أنا أعلم أنني الآن، بموت ساينل، أمير غلامس،
ولكن كيف أمسيّت أميرَ كودر؟ أميرُ كودر في
قيد الحياة.
سيد متعم (11). وأن أجعل في منظور الصدق
صيرورتي ملكاً، بعيداً بُعد كوني أميرَ كودر،
من أين لكن هذا العلمُ الغريب ؟ ولماذا
توقفن سيرنا في هذه الفلاة الممطرة بالصواعق
بهذه التحيات النبوية ؟ تكلمن ! أمركن !

(60)

Jabra's translation employs a hermeneutic approach of translation in which he interprets the source text and renders his interpretation within the linguistic structure of the target text. However, his translation seems more or less verbose. This is obvious in his “ روظنم يف لعجاً ناو ” “ردوك ريمأ ينوك دعب ديعب، اكلم يتروريص قدصلا ”. Mutran translates the same lines as follows:

مكبت: البّثي آيتها النواطق بغير إفصاح عما في ضمير المقادير، وزيديني بياناً.
أعلم أنني بموت أبي قد أصبحت غطريف « جلاميس»، ولكن كيف أستطيع أن أكون
غطريف «كودور» في حين أن صاحب هذا المنصب والملقب به ما زال حياً، في إقبال من
دهره. فأما أن أصير ملكاً فذلك أبعد احتمال، وليس ما تنتهي إليه عقيدتي. أبيني إذن،
من أين استنزلت تلك الأقوال المستغربة؟ ولماذا عرضت لي في هذه الأرض التي تطرقها
الرياح، تُحييني بأمثال هذه النبوءات؟ إنني لأتقدم إليك أن تجيبي.

(11)

Mutran also tends to adopt a hermeneutic approach. He translates the phrase “imperfect speakers” into “ريداقلا ريمض يف امع حاصفا ريبغ قطاونلا” by which he adds extra linguistic structures by means of paraphrasing in order to maintain the textual coherence of the target text. As such, metaphoric language is elusive in translation since they are open to interpretation. The hermeneutic approach is also apparent in interpreting the word “prosperous.” While Jabra translates it literally as “معنتم”, Mutran translates it as “هرهد نم لابقا يف” which is translated in terms of age or health.

Amin translates the same lines as follows:

مكبث : مهلا أيتها الناطقات بالحديث الغامض وهاتنّ المزيد . . أنا أعلم أن موت
سينل⁽¹⁾ قد جعلنى سيد جلامس . . ولكن ماذا عن كودور ؟ فسيد
كودور لا يزال حيا واسع الرزق . أما عن العرش فإن نيله مستبعد شأن نيلى
لقب سيد كودور . . فمن أين جاءتكن هذه الأفكار الغريبة ؟ ولماذا
تعترضن طريقنا فى هذا المرج المهجور لتحيننا بمثل هذه النبوءات ؟
تكلّمن ! آمركن بالكلام .

(32)

Amin’s translation is much more concentrated and direct. His interpretation of the word “prosperous” attests to its formal meaning indicating wealth.

As such, the three pieces of translation tend to adhere to the receiving cultural norms foregrounding naturalness of expression and style at the expense of preserving the linguistic information in the source text. As put by Nida, in his *Contexts in Translating* (2002), in a successful translation “biculturalism is even more important than bilingualism since words only have meanings in terms of the cultures in which they function” (82). Moreover, it is obvious that conveying the communicative aspect of the text is much easier than preserving its cultural identity. Nord, in his, *Translating as a purposeful activity: functionalist approaches* (2014), perfectly refers

to this issue explaining that “cultural gaps between the source language and the target language have always turned to be a hard nut for translators to crack” (34).

Therefore, cultural translation involves the translation of linguistic items with regard to the wider sphere of culture. Therefore, the translator should consider not only meaning equivalents, but he also should go deep into higher semantic and contextual levels. As put by Lefevere, in his essay “Translation: Its Genealogy in the West” (1990), “language is not the problem” but the “cultural elements that are not immediately clear, or seen as completely misplaced in what would be the target culture version of the text to be translated” (26). However, it is also important to refer to the relativity of the notion of “cultural loss” since, as Bassnett has emphasized, the “exact reproduction [of the source text] is impossible, since the worlds in which the original text and its translations are produced are inevitably different worlds” (1). In this regard, Evan-Zohar further highlights the intricate nature of the process of translation in terms of culture. As he points out, translation is not “a phenomenon whose nature and borders are given once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relations within a certain cultural system” (qtd. in Eysteinnsson & Weissbort 434). The following excerpts are a case in point:

2.2 *Enter* LADY [MACBETH]

LADY MACBETH That which hath made them drunk, hath made
me bold;

What hath quenched them, hath given me fire.

[*An owl shrieks*]

Hark, peace!

It was the owl that shrieked, the fatal bellman

Which gives the stern'st good-night. He is about it.

The doors are open, and the surfeited grooms

Do mock their charge with snores. I have drugged their
possets,

That death and nature do contend about them,

Whether they live, or die.

Enter MACBETH [*with two bloody daggers*]

MACBETH

Who's there? What ho?

(142)

In translating this excerpt, each translator interprets its structure differently. They also differ in their chosen vocabulary which reflects the fact that their translations are mainly reader-centered and communicative in nature. That is, the three translations seek to transfer the verbal signs of the source text preserving its supposedly intended meaning. Jabra translates these lines as follows:

ليدي مكبث : ذاك الذي أسكرهما، جرّاني،
والذي أطفأهما أجاج النار فيّ، سمعاً لا صمت لا
اليومة هي التي نعبت، قارعة الناقوس للمحكومين
بالموت،
قارئة أرهب السلام^(٧)... إنه مشغول بها.
الأبواب مُشَرَّعة، والخادمان المتخمان
يهزّان من مسؤوليتهما بالشخير : في شرابهما
دسست مخدرا،
حتى لبيتانغ الموت والطبيعة حولهما.
أفي عداد الأحياء هما أم الأموات.

(82)

Jabra's translation attempts to keep the poetic character of the source text present in the target text. It also interferes with translation by means of interpretation. This is obvious in Jabra's translation of the phrase "Which gives the stern'st good-night. He is about it" into "بهرأ قنراق ملاسلا". As such, Jabra dissolves the idiomatic expression into its extra-linguistic elements. In other words, this linguistic structure has a cultural aspect. At the time of the play, those who are condemned to death were to be visited by "bellmen" at the night of their execution as the last good night because they will be executed in the morning. Here, the sound of the owl, which is the sound of ill-omen, is compared to the sound of the bell. Jabra then does not translate the idiomatic expression literally. However, he resorts to the "dynamic" equivalence to preserve both the linguistic and cultural aspects of the source structure. In terms of what theorist Sanchez addresses

as the “cultural” equivalence, Jabra’s translation cannot achieve the “cultural” equivalence since this “last goodnight” does not exist in the Arabic culture. Therefore, Jabra tended to preserve the linguistic and cultural significance of the source text which leads to inevitable misalignment in the semiotic aspect of the target text.

The target reader has to know about this cultural information to grasp the analogy between the owl’s shrieking sound and the sound of the bell. That is why Jabra provides his translation with footnotes to explain these extra-linguistic elements facilitating the process of experiencing the source culture. However, Jabra’s translation here is somewhat ambiguous. In the phrase “لوغشم هنا اهب”، it is not clear what is meant by this use of pronouns. this ambiguity is due to the literal translation. That is, instead of transferring the communicative or verbal message of the source text, Jabra transfers the source structure literally and linguistically. This is not the case in Mutan’s and Amin’s translations in which they seem to grasp the fact that “he” in this context refers to the man hired by lady Macbeth to poison the guards and kill the king. Mutran’s translation, on the other hand, is much more leaning to a hermeneutic approach of translation in terms of the linguistic and semantic structures of the source text. He translates the same lines as follows:

لادي مكبت: الذي أسكرهم شجعني، والذي أقدهم أنهضني. أصفوا، أصفوا، هذا
نعيب البوم، هذا نعيق الساحر المشئوم، يُمسي نواً هذا الليل بالثبور والويل. (تشير
إلى مكبت) هو الآن يعمل عمله. الأبواب مفتحة. والعسس يغطون في سبات مكتظين إلى
الخلوق بخمرة تُثقل ما مزجتها به من المذهل، فهم أحياء وليسوا بأحياء.

(23)

Mutan’s translation seems to fail to grasp the extralinguistic element of the source idiomatic expression. He translates the phrase “the fatal bellman” as “مؤشماً رحاسلاً قيعن” which does not correlate with the original cultural context since the “bellman” is just a guard who visits the

condemned in their last night before their death in the morning. However, he also approaches the idiomatic expressions of the source text differently. Mutran translates the idiomatic expression “That death and nature do contend about them, / Whether they live, or die” into “وسيلو ءايحاً مهف ” by which Mutran’s translation preserves the linguistic meaning but not the same verbal signs. This is also clear in his translation of the phrase “What hath quenched them, hath given me fire” into “ينضهنأ مهدهعأ يذلاو” which does not follow the same verbal sign of the original but preserves the communicative aspect of the text.

That is, it transfers the linguistic message of the original without necessarily adhering to formal equivalence. in this sense, Mutran’s translation here prefers applying the notion of “dynamic” equivalence. Amin translates these lines as follows:

ليدى مكبث : الشراب الذى أسكرهما قد زاد من جرأتى . والسائل الذى أخدهما قد
شخذ همتى . . صه ا ما هذا ؟ لا . . مجرد صياح بومة . صياح
كناقوس الموت بالليل ينذر بحلول الأجل . . هو الآن يرتكب
فعلته . . الأبواب مفتوحة ، والحارسان المخموران يسخران من
مهمتهما بالشخير . قد دسست مخدرا فى كأسيهما ، فما عاد بوسع
امرئ أن يقطع بها إذا كانا فى عداد الموتى أم فى عداد الأحياء . .
(52)

In this translation, Amin employs his interpretation to overcome any ambiguity that might stem from the use of pronouns in the source text. He translates “what quenched them” into “لناسلا امهدمخأ يذلا ” by which he refers to the drink in which the hired man by lady Macbeth put the poison. Also, in his translation of the analogous expression “It was the owl that shrieked, the fatal bellman” into “لجلا لولحب رذنى ليللاب توملا سوقانك” which preserves the linguistic and communicative message of the source. The following examples further illustrate this point:

FIRST WITCH Thrice the brindled cat hath mewed.

SECOND WITCH Thrice and once the hedge-pig whined.

THIRD WITCH Harpier cries, "Tis time, 'tis time.'

FIRSTWITCH

Round about the cauldron go;
In the poisoned entrails throw.
Toad, that under cold stone
Days and nights has thirty-one
Sweltered venom sleeping got,
Boil thou first i'th'charmèd pot.

ALL Double, double toil and trouble;
Fire burn, and cauldron bubble.

SECOND WITCH

Fillet of a fenny snake,
In the cauldron boil and bake:
Eye of newt, and toe of frog,
Wool of bat, and tongue of dog,
Adder's fork, and blind-worm's sting,
Lizard's leg, and howlet's wing,
For a charm of powerful trouble,
Like a hell-broth, boil and bubble. (190)

This excerpt demonstrates the poetic and metaphoric language of Shakespeare which represents a difficult task in translation. Each translator distinctively attempts to grasp the poetic

character of the original. Both Amin and Jabra employ a poetic language that parallels the source text. However, they both use different linguistic structures. Amin's translation is as follows:

الساحرة الأولى : سمعتُ مواء القطة المقلّمة ثلاث مرات .
الساحرة الثانية : وسمعتُ عويل القنفذ ثلاث مرات ومرة .
الساحرة الثالثة : وسمعت المرأة المجنّحة تصيح أن الوقت قد حان .
الساحرة الأولى : فلننذر حول القدر ، ونلقى في جوفها المسموم ما عندنا : ضغدع
طين قضى في النوم واحدًا وثلاثين يومًا بلياليها تحت حجارة باردة ،
ونخرج منه السمُّ عرقًا . ليكن أول ما نغليه في القدر المسحورة .
الجميع : ضاعفن العمل ، ضاعفن الجهود
ولتُفَرِّقِدُنَا ، فوق الوقود
الساحرة الثانية : وفي القدر نسلق ونخبز شريحة من لحم ثعبان الطين ، مع عين
لسمندل الماء ، وإصبع ضفدع ، وصوف وطواط ، ولسان كلب ،
ولسان حية مشقوق ، وإبرة العظاية العمياء ، ورجل سحلية ،
وجناح بومة صغيرة . فتلك تعويذة قوية التأثير ، نغليها غليان
حساء الشيطان في الجحيم .

(93)

Amin and Jabra translate the name of the animal “hedge-pig” differently. Although this does not affect the overall meaning of the source text, it does confirm this study's argument that the individual cultural identity of each translator affects the choice of lexicons and syntax by each translator. The two poetic lines by Amin show his faithful attitude toward the nature of the source text. Amin translates Shakespeare's poetic language into equivalent poetic lines that rhyme together. However, the poetic lines in Amin's translation maintains the communicative message of the source. In other words, it is not a word-for-word translation, however, it is a translation that maintains both the “dynamic” and “cultural” equivalences. Jabra translates the same lines as follows:

ثلاثا ماءات القطة المخططة .	ساحرة ١ :
ثلاثا، ومرة أن الخنزير .	ساحرة ٢ :
البوم يصيح: آن الأوان، آن الأوان (١) .	ساحرة ٣ :
دوروا حول القدر دوروا وارموا الحشى المسموم فيها، هاتي علجومة قد رقدت تحت الحجر واحداً وثلاثين يوماً بلياليها تتصفد بالزعاف، واجعليها في الحلة المسحورة، فيها ستغور الآن حالاً وتمور .	ساحرة ١ :
معا: يا كدح، يا ويل، يا ثبور، لهلي يا نارنا، قدرنا سوف تفور . شرحة من أفعى أسنة في الحانة فؤورها، صوف خشاف، عين زحاف عؤورها، وأصبع من ضفدع آمنة، لسان كلب، ومن حلق ثعبان شطيرة، وزباني من دودة حسيرة، ومن عظمة رجلها تلك الكبيرة، وجناح بويمة من السواهي لرقية تدهو الدواهي في حساء من جهنم يرغو وبثور .	ساحرة ٢ :

(117)

As obvious, both Amin and Jabra use different vocabulary that does not necessarily parallel that of the source text. However, it maintains the same verbal message. These translations just put the target reader as their main interest. As Anthony Pym emphasizes, the role of the translator is intercultural. In his *Translation and text transfer: An essay on the principles of intercultural communication* (1992), Pym describes translators as intermediary or in-between cultures. He also views culture as a constantly moving and changing entity or “a fact of frontier” (14). That is, it takes place at the intersection of cultures. Therefore, translation is “substantially conditioned by cultural discrepancies. But cultural diversity is only one side of the coin; the other side comprises the universal categories of culture” (Sakellario 566). Then, a translator of literary texts has to study as much about literature, in both source and target cultures, as those who translate technical or non-literary texts study science theories (Lefevere 30). Hatim and Mason also underline the cultural aspect of translation. They extend their account to include the individual cultural identity of the translator.

In other words, they explain that the difference in the cultural background of translators is one of the most influential factors that lead to variations in translating the same text. That is, different translations exist for the same text. Hatim and Mason argue that

The translator has not only a bilingual ability but also a bi-cultural vision.

Translators mediate between cultures (including ideologies, moral systems and socio-political structures), seeking to overcome those incompatibilities which stand in the way of transfer of meaning. What has value as a sign in one culture community may be devoid of significance in another and it is the translator who is uniquely placed to identify the disparity and seek to resolve it. (224)

In short, the three translations of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* tend to adhere to the cultural, stylistic, and linguistic norms of the receiving culture. In so doing, they depend mostly on neutralizing the cultural information impeded in the source text. As have been analyzed, the most dominant translation strategies applied by the three translators are literal translation, functional or formal equivalence, neutralization, paraphrasing, omission, and domestication strategies. As Venuti explains, in the second chapter, domestication characterizes a type of translation in which the translator adopts a normative and transparent style in order to minimize the foreignness or the strangeness of the source text for target-culture readers. The aesthetic impact of the target text upon its readers differs greatly from that of the source text upon its readers. It is worth mentioning that this study perceives the concept of "cultural loss" as a label for the inevitable inequivalent items between two distant cultures, such as Arabic and English. Therefore, the label does not necessarily connote a negative judgment on the three translations.

The three translations, then, all contribute to the scholarly interest in the Shakespearean metaphoric language in general and consequently in the acquaintance with the main sources and

tools of literary referencing as well as the wide critical credit of translating Shakespeare into Arabic within the framework of accuracy, cultural sensitivity and the linguistic and literary excellence shown in their attentiveness to the component of imagery. The translators, Khalil Mutran, Jabra Ibrahim Jabra, and Husayn Ahmed Amin, all have certain commonalities in approaching *Macbeth*. As have been seen in the text analysis, they all tend to favor a target-reader-oriented approach in translating *Macbeth*. That is, they use various translation strategies, such as literal translation, paraphrasing, omission, domestication, and “formal” equivalence, to fit the target text into the cultural context of the Arabic reader. Therefore, the three translations have resorted to altering the source text on both a linguistic and a cultural level. This does not mean that the three translations have failed in achieving the cultural equivalent of the source text. However, their translation strategies favored the linguistic approach of translation as a result of a tendency of faithfulness to the source text.

As such, the linguistic and textual approaches to translation are not sufficient in covering all aspects of the process of translation (Károly 10). However, these approaches tend to claim a scientific endeavor in order to arrive at an “objective” theory of translation. Therefore, linguists based their theories largely on the notion of “equivalence” (Tabakowska 1). In this regard, the process of translation is seen as a transfer of linguistic data, a transcoding process between two different linguistic systems (Shreve & Angelone 86). Hence, these linguistic approaches privileged “langue” or the written system of language over “parole” or language in actual use (Kenny 4). In other words, linguistic approaches seem to have tended to establish objective and, therefore, scientific criteria for translation, depending on the assumption that different linguistic systems have common universals. However, these linguistic approaches are not completely

reliable in rendering other non-linguistic aspects, or extra-linguistic features, such as cultural, semiotic, social, and historical aspects (Palumbo 123).

Opponents of these linguistic-oriented approaches claim that the linguistic system of a language is not separated from the wider cultural context. Language is seen as a product of culture, which reflects the different dimensions of that culture. In literary translation, the cultural aspect of translation is much more significant since any literary text necessarily reflects many aspects and features of the culture to which it belongs. Some of these features are highly culture-specific. This means that the translator's strategies in translating such culture-specific features are required to maintain the same content, rhetorical significance, and form, among other aspects of the literary text. However, some of these features are difficult and even sometimes impossible to render in the target culture, hence the problem of untranslatability. In this sense, the process of translation is seen as a transference of culture, rather than merely its linguistic system. It then follows that the translator's task is not simply transferring objective or universal linguistic data or equivalent units from the source text into the target text. Rather, the translator mediates between two cultures (Trosborg 48).

Conclusion

As a literary text, *Macbeth* represents a difficult task in translation. This is simply because imagery and metaphor are deeply rooted in the cultural context of a language. Rendering the same cultural equivalent is not always possible. The three translators employ specific translation strategies, such as literal translation, domestication, paraphrasing, omission, and formal equivalence. Generally, linguistic and cultural differences always exist among languages. In translation, these differences gain much more significance if the target and source languages belong to distant cultures, as is the case between Arabic and English. Such linguistic and cultural

differences, consequently, affect the process of translation since they govern the translator's choice of words and structures to reach the most possible linguist, semantic, textual and cultural equivalent.

Jabra, Mutran, and Amin often resort to literal translation, domestication, and paraphrasing. Yet, Jabra is generally credited with his accurate translation of Shakespeare into Arabic employing the adaptation strategies to emphasize the form as well as the content of the source text. Mutran and Amin have also achieved an accurate representation of the form and content, as well as the aesthetic function, of the source text. They attempted to transfer the images of the source text and to render the specific details beyond expressions as creatively and as coherently as possible. Unlike Jabra, Mutran and Amin have shown some more flexibility in rendering the cultural and metaphoric items of the source text taking into account their appropriateness to the target culture and target readers.

Works Cited

- Allen, Roger. *Essays in Arabic Literary Biography: Teil 3.*, 2010.
- Alsaai, Hayan J. *A Critical Assessment of the Translations of Shakespeare into Arabic: A Close Examination of the Translations of Three Tragedies; Othello, Julius Caesar and Macbeth - and One Comedy; the Merchant of Venice.*, 1997
- Amin, Husayn Ahmed. Translator. *Macbeth*. By William Shakespeare, Dar Alshorouk, 1994.
- Jabra, Jabra Ibrahim. Translator. *Macbeth*. By William Shakespeare, National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters, 2008.
- Baker, Mona. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation*. Routledge, 1998.
- Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere. *Translation, History and Culture*. Cassell, 1996.
- Catford, John C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press, 1967.
- El-Farahaty, Hanem. *Arabic-English-Arabic Legal Translation*. Routledge, 2015.
- Faiq, Said. *Arabic Translation Across Discourses*. 2019.
- Faris, Ali Abdul Hameed, and Rasha Ali Sahu. "The Translation of English Collocations into Arabic: Problems and Solutions." *Journal of the College of Arts. University of Basra*, no. 64, 2013, pp. 51–66.
- Farghal, Mohammed, and Ali Almana. *Contextualizing Translation Theories: Aspects of Arabic-English Interlingual Communication*. 2015.
- Fawcett, Peter D. *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*. Routledge, 2014.
- Ghazala, Hasan Said. *Varieties of English Simplified: A Textbook for Advanced University Students of English*. ELGA, 1994.
- Ghazoul, Ferial J. "The Arabization of Othello." *Comparative Literature*. 50.1 (1998): 1.
- Hassan, Bahaa-eddin A. *Between English and Arabic*. 2014.

- Lahlali, El M. *Advanced English-Arabic Translation: A Practical Guide*. Edinburgh University Press, 2014.
- Menacere, K. (1995) "Translating Arabic into English: Basic Considerations in *Word Order*," *Meta*, XL, 4, pp. 606-612
- Mutran, Khalil. Translator. *Macbeth*. By William Shakespeare, Hindawi Foundation for Education and Culture, 2016.
- Newmark, Peter. *About Translation (multilingual Matters)*. Multilingual Matters, 1991.
- Nida, Eugene A, and Charles R. Taber. *The Practical Theory and Practice of Translation*. E. J. Brill, 1969.
- Sanchez, Maria T. *The Problems of Literary Translation: A Study of the Theory and Practice of Translation from English into Spanish*. P. Lang, 2009.
- Sapir, Edward. *Culture, Language, and Personality*. University of California Press, 1970.
- Schäffner, Christina. *Translation and Norms*. Multilingual Matters, 1999.
- Séguinot, Candace. *The Translation Process*. Toronto: H. G. Publications, School of Translation, York University, 1989.
- Schaffner, Christina, and Uwe Wieseemann. *Annotated Texts for Translation: English-German: Functionalist Approaches Illustrated*. Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Shakespeare, William, and A. R. Braunmuller. *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999.
- Shakespeare, William, and Nicholas Brooke. *The Tragedy of Macbeth*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Viaggio, Sergio. *A General Theory of Interlingual Mediation*. Frank & Timme, 2006.
- Zaki, Amel A. *Shakespeare in Arabic*. Ann Arbor, Mich. Univ. Microfilms Internat, 1978.



جامعة طنطا

كلية الآداب

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية

مسرحية ماكبث في الترجمة العربية

منهج ثقافى مقارن

الطالبة

نسرين جاسم حسين

محمد سعيد نجم

جمال حجازى