



**Theoretical and Practical Problems
of Rendering the Clown's Discourse
in Shakespeare's Dramas into
Arabic**

Dr. Taher Mahmoud Elsayed Okasha

**Lecturer in Translation
Department of English
Faculty of Al Alsun - Aswan University**

DOI: 10.21608/QARTS.2023.185806.1585

مجلة كلية الآداب بقنا (دورية أكاديمية علمية محكمة)

مجلة كلية الآداب بقنا - جامعة جنوب الوادي - العدد 58 - يناير 2023

ISSN: 1110-614X الترقيم الدولي الموحد للنسخة المطبوعة

ISSN: 1110-709X الترقيم الدولي الموحد للنسخة الإلكترونية

موقع المجلة الإلكتروني: <https://qarts.journals.ekb.eg>

Theoretical and Practical Problems of Rendering the Clown's Discourse in Shakespeare's Dramas into Arabic

Abstract

This study explores and examines the historical, literary and translation theories that may help the translator reach the best solutions as far as rendering clown discourse in Shakespeare's plays into Arabic is concerned. It attempts to explore the net of relations between various disciplines that might form a stable basis of interrelated theories. Positivist historiography versus subjectivism and New Historicism are discussed as tools that lead to different understandings of the clown discourse. Bourdieusian social approaches to translation are also applied to eventually prove that translation depends on a theory of relations; if fully understood, the theory and practice of the translation career will foster, acquire more lands and build clearer borderlines. Analyses of different translations of clown discourse in Shakespeare prove that rendering clown discourse in Shakespeare needs revision from time to time to be reproduced in a new way agreeing with the clownish terminology of every age. Collecting the corpus of clowns in Shakespeare's dramas, tracing their characteristic and linguistic traits and how these traits must be reflected in translation is not only beneficial to the translation studies, but also to the historical and social research endeavors of England and the West at that time.

Keywords: translation, Shakespeare, Clown, trust theory and translation, translation theory

Theoretical and Practical Problems of Rendering the Clown's Discourse in Shakespeare's Dramas into Arabic

Within the mechanism of relations that governs the translation activities, this study explores and examines the historical, literary and translation theories that may help the translator reach the best solutions as far as rendering the clown discourse in Shakespeare's plays into Arabic is concerned. The social function of the clown at Shakespeare's time may differ from one age to another. An attempt is made to shed light on the best tools to let such a function travel through languages and ages without jeopardizing the aesthetic features of Shakespeare's works.

Review of the Literature

Many studies have been written on the problems of rendering Shakespeare's works into Arabic: Ibrahim Abd El Moneim (2013) used the script-based semantic theory of humor to tackle rendering some elements of humour like malapropism, non-verbal humor, humorous imagery, restricted and unrestricted humor in *As You Like It*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Much Ado About Nothing* without covering the translational problems of the clown. Abdelnasser Alboghdady (2016) made a comparative analysis of three translations of *Hamlet* to find out the most convenient approach to be applied in order to preserve form and content at the figurative, metaphorical and lexical levels. Alboghdady (2019) presented a general evaluation of four Arabic translations of the Shakespearean Sonnets, where he discussed problems like rendering metaphor, figurative language, innuendo and lexical items. What is missing in such studies is focusing on a certain phenomenon and analyzing it closely: for example, servant or clown discourse in Shakespeare's theatre. The present study

tackles how the whole philosophy of the clown travels across cultures and how the social value of this character is transferred to the target culture.

Significance of the Study

If translators of drama succeed in provoking the readers'/spectators' interest to read or watch the drama, this is a sign of the success of their product. Bourdieu calls this interest *illusio*: a word derived from a Latin origin meaning 'taking the game seriously' (Sameh Hanna, 2016, p. 59). The translation activity is like a game in which many parties participate as producers and consumers. In short, it is a 'relation' to be established seriously in order to produce satisfactory results for all participants. The significance of this study at the theoretical level is that it attempts to explore the net of relations between various disciplines that might form a stable basis of interrelated theories; it proposes a tripartite prescription to be used in literary translation: that is, a mix between a literary theory, a theory of history and a theory of translation. Literature, history and translation always assist one another for a better understanding of reality (Okasha, 2021, p. 276). They are also essential for a new understanding of an old reality that has aged and needs, as some argue, to be recycled to create a new cultural product. According to Bourdieu, the factors which determine the shape of the new translation are called 'a field of power': social, political, economic, ecological, etc. (Hanna, pp. 63, 74).

Setting the Problem

Understanding Shakespeare differs from one age to another. Translation plays a big role in the change of approach while reading or watching his dramas. The clown is an essential component that is influenced by such a difference. To borrow

Bourdieu's concept of capital, Shakespeare still has more than one form of capital: cultural, literary, historical, etc. Translators seek to retranslate his works to win the honor of having their names with a great canonized playwright who is still read and has the potential to have the same capital in the future. While building a new translation for a Shakespearean work, some translators tend to demolish an old one because it had aged, as they may argue, and no longer suitable for a new age. During such a build-demolish process, the capital may be taken from an old translator and granted to a new one.

The problem of translating drama is that it must be as concise as the source because "the translator does not have the freedom of the translator of fiction who can gloss, explain puns or ambiguities or cultural references" (Abd El Moneim, p. 4). However, some translators use glosses as did Ibrahim Ramzy (2014) in his rendering of *Taming of the Shrew*. The task becomes more difficult with the problematic discourse of fools, clowns and rogues. What is the function of the clown in the play? Is the function of the clown in Western drama the same as that of the clown in Arabic literature—if the phenomenon existed or actually exists in Arabian arts? To what extent did the translator succeed in rendering the art and the idea as far as Shakespeare's clown is concerned?

Art, idea and function of the clown have to be made understandable to the Arab reader. Sometimes, "to draw laughter, the Clown relies both on verbal gags and on non-verbal techniques" (David Wiles, 2005, p. 7). Such paralanguage techniques pose a great difficulty for the translator. They differ from one culture to another, resulting in a change in the message

of the clown. Wiles (p. vii) quotes Hamlet to summarize the problem of rendering the clown's discourse as follows:

“Oh reform it altogether. **And let those that play your Clowns speak no more than is set down for them**, for there be of them that will themselves laugh, to set on some quantity of barren spectators to laugh too, though in the meantime some necessary question of the play be then to be considered.” (Shakespeare, 1601/2003, 3.2. 31-35)

Clowns do not stick to the writer's script. They change the discourse and gestures all the time. Through ages, the discourse is supposed to change and have totally new implications, based on how the new translator and the new audience may understand the themes of the play. Successful translation of clown discourse establishes relation not only with the reader but also with the potential actor and audience through transfer of the tone that eventually leads to rendering not only the comic element but also the thematic. Thus, the play is reproduced as a new social process in which the clown attracts the attention of all social classes as does the original clown (Wiles, p. 174). This is what M. Enani (2004) does in his translation of the passage above where he renders “that play your clowns” into *من يلعب دور المهرج* whereas Muhamed Awad Muhamed (2011) uses the word *المضحكين* (i.e. laughter arousing men), reducing the job of the clown into a mere comic effect to draw laughter. The term *المهرج* (i.e. clown) has

more dramatic connotations than المضحك (i.e. laughter arousing man).

Starting from the second half of the 19th century, a hybrid language (partly classical and partly colloquial) appeared: for example, in his translation of *The Merchant of Venice*, Khalil Mutran (2012) used the colloquial expression ولا مؤاخذة (i.e. excuse me) in the Standard Arabic sentence ولو فارقت اليهودي لأصبح زمامي في يد الشيطان الذي هو – ولا مؤاخذة – الشيطان بعينه (i.e. *and, to run away from the Jew, I should be ruled by the fiend, who, saving your reverence! is the devil himself*)ⁱⁱ. It embodied a conflict between a nostalgia for the old days and a desire for modernity that prefers everything to be new, even the language itself. The clown is highly present in such a conflict because he represents the voice of the common people; he is supposed to speak and think like them. Enani (1988), on the other hand, renders the same passage as إذا استمعت للوساوس.. ذهبت للشيطان! without making such a mix of standard and colloquial Arabic. The same problem is found in the different renderings of the Fool's speech in *King Lear* (1.4. 151-158): for example, Fatima Musa (1997) uses a totally colloquial style whereas Enani (2009) prefers modern standard Arabic. In light of the trust theory (Rizzi et al., 2019), Musa's text may have a short-term trust because its language is directed to a certain audience who belongs to a certain period in history. When the language has the potential to be understood by present readers and even those from the past, this means that it has a touch of universality and may be digested by future generations as well. The wider and more durable the audience, the better the translation is. The problem with the clown's discourse translations is that they have small audiences and the language itself is not as clownish as Shakespeare's, which creates a gap at the stylistic level.

The problem also stems from the fact that the relation between clowns and audiences is not the same as it was at Shakespeare's time. At that time, Shakespeare's Globe theatre was surrounded by audiences from three sides. This established a closer relation with the audience: actors used to address the audience and speak their soliloquies to people who surrounded them from the three sides. Today, the audience sits in darkness and occupies only one side of the theatre away from the clown (Fiona Banks, p. 54; Tina Packer, p. 208). Such a change of décor influenced the close relation with the audience, and led to a change in stage directions and gestures; and translation choices may differ accordingly. Vehemence of a clown, like Launcelot or the gravedigger, speaking alone definitely differs if speaking during the daylight to people surrounding him from three sides. Such a short distance between the clown and audience made him improvise and receive reactions in the form of exchange of talk. By the passage of time, improvisational clowns started to abide by the script (Banks, p. 58). Such a historical development in the performance of the clown means that creative translators must expect the distance between the clown and the expected audience, and manipulate the clown discourse appropriately. Thus, the type of audience is an important dimension in the process of retranslating the clown.

The conflict between academic institutions and commercial publishers is also a dimension that causes great differences between translations. With the appearance of new modes of production, new techniques of translation must be used to satisfy the needs of the users of such new modes. The clown of a published drama is supposed to be a clown for all seasons, whereas a staged version is usually intended for a certain audience. Shakespeare made suitable texts for famous clown-

actors like Robert Armin, Kemp and Tarlton (Wiles, 2005). Likewise, Tanyus Abdu made special texts for Shaykh Salāma Ḥijāzī who was a famous singer (Hanna, p. 81). Knowing the potential of the communication vessel helps to produce a successful translation in that it is successfully delivered. In other words, a translator has to do his best not only to produce a message in another language, but also to make sure that such a message in the TL is deliverable. In so doing, a relation of understanding is established between the ST, the communication medium and the audience. Such problems echo the idea that translation is based on a theory of relations (Okasha, 2021, p. 274) that determines why a choice is more suitable than another.

Another problem in the clown discourse arises when critics trace differences between the Quarto and Folio versions; for example, in *King Lear* they found that most notable differences are in the discourse of the Fool (Hornback, p. 143). This is another piece of evidence that everybody working with the clown discourse gave himself the license to make changes.

Research question

The following research questions are dealt with throughout the study in order to reach the best solutions as far as rendering all aspects of the clown's discourse into Arabic is concerned: what are the similarities and differences between clown tradition in Shakespeare's world and the Arab world? What is the importance of studying the history of clown tradition for a better quality of rendering clown discourse? Why to retranslate the clown? Is it for a deficiency in transferring meaning, tone or style, or to meet the need of a new readership? How to make the clown in the translation as natural as it is in the origin, and not artificial? To what extent is the translator successful in reflecting the social

function of the clown? How do some translations manipulate that function: bathos, grotesque, ironic, etc.? In what sense the Renaissance clown differs from subsequent clowns through the Postcolonial clown? How may studying the Bourdieusian influence on translation studies offer solutions to the translational problems of the clown's discourse?

Methodology

Rendering Shakespeare into other languages proves that translation theory overlaps with the theories of history: positivist historiography is an easy approach to the translator because it licenses translation without interpretation, letting the events of the play be understood by the audience. Subjectivism, on the other hand, allows individual interpretation. Emphasis on the social dimension of epistemology stands midway between sheer objectivity of positivists and open subjectivism that licenses all interpretations. "Clash of social interests, ideologies, and social conventions" (John Zammito, p. 74) restructures understanding of old and new texts. For example, tribunes in *Coriolanus* may be viewed as cowardly clowns or honorable citizens (Antony Tatlow, 2001, p. 162). This is an epistemological explanation of why new versions of old artistic works appear regularly as a feature of a historiographical perspective to translation theory transforming a translator into a historian who travels through cultures not only times. "Translation scholars must develop their historical awareness" (Rizzi et al., 2019. P. 6). In other words, "any assessment... of the clown's significance is an interpretation shaped by premises about the art and theatre available to us in the present" (Wiles, p. xi). New approaches in literary criticism lead to new understandings; psychological, feminist, old and new

historicism, ecocriticism, etc. are among those approaches, each presenting a version of the work (Enani, 2010, p. 22).

Thus, consciously or unintentionally, such theories of history and literature are applied by the translator. A translator of literary texts must have studied literary criticism first. The approach to the theatre and epistemology determines what the translation will be like. Viewing the play as a social process produces something different from focusing on the drama as a historical material. And if the historical and the social are ignored or not perceived for an interest in the aesthetic appeal, the final product will be totally different. For example, “the critical dismissal of the clown as mere comic relief, as low entertainment peripheral to the real concerns of the play” (Wiles: 167) on the part of the translator will prompt him to focus only on the comic element in the clown’s discourse, ignoring other messages: social or otherwise. On the other hand, if the translator traces developments in theories of literary criticism, more options will be available: for example, the same play may be viewed as a comedy, tragedy or a black comedy. In short, the writer produces the text but he cannot control the framework of the meanings stemming from it (Enani, 2010).

In the introduction to his translation of *Coriolanus*, Enani (1623/2012) points out that “every director is eager to elicit a certain response, to be driven from the text itself or from his own understanding of the play”ⁱⁱⁱ (p. 58). One director may present the clown as an *Arajuz*^{iv} (i.e. a traditional puppet show), another may focus on his foolish actions highlighting the cognitive aspect of discourse, and a third strategy may be social in order to criticize society at large. Not only do directors of Shakespeare’s plays add stage directions, but also editors of new editions do the same: for

example, Molly Maureen Mahood (2003) says, “a few clarifying stage directions have been added” (Shakespeare, 1600/2003, p. 66). Likewise, a drama translator is a “dramaturge” (Wiles; Enani, 2012, p. 106, 2020, p. 52) who produces a version of the original discourse. That version may be described as new, romantic, post-colonial, distorted, etc. according to the whole situation and theoretical background in which the translation activity takes place. A certain point of view towards the text of the clown should not produce a distorted texture. Enani likens the texture to a textile that may be rough or soft (Enani, 2012, p. 60). If the translator has to act as a dramaturge to satisfy a certain taste by changing the tone, he would agreeably change the text without tearing the texture. New people in every new age produce licenses for themselves to make changes in the heritage of the past, whether tangible or intangible. It is like the controversies that arise when projects of renewing ancient monumental buildings are proposed: whether to keep them intact, add new touches, demolish them to be rebuilt, etc. In this light, dealing with the problem of how to introduce Shakespeare in translation echoes a point of view on how to deal with history and the past at large in order “to explore more closely the role of translators, interpreters, translations, and their clients in the history of intercultural exchange” (Rizzi et al., 2019. P. 3). Such an approach seems to be in line with New Historicism which gives more freedom for understanding the expressive and creative sides of literature and history, rather than insisting on only one reading (Catherine Gallagher & Stephen Greenblatt, 2000).

What Enani and Mahood say above raises the idea of the expert translator. Enani is an expert in drama who not only translates plays but also writes and prepares plays to be acted on the stage. This is clear evidence that it is better when a translator

masters the art or the field in which he translates. When a dramatist translates drama and physicians render medicine, results are supposed to be better. Enani's production is the fruit of an eventful drama translation history that started in the Arab world as early as the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries where al-Ṭahṭāwī described plays as *?al'āb* (i.e. games) or *sbiktaklāt* (i.e. transliteration of 'spectacle') (Hanna, p. 86). It is no longer a question of a strategy better than another; the same translator renders a clown to be staged and the same clown to be read. It may even be argued that Enani's most interested readers are the academics studying arts and translation studies. Some translations have a pedagogical dimension in addition to being a cultural bridge.

The type of strategy used may have political, nationalistic and other symbolic implications. Mutran had political and nationalistic agendas behind his use of classical Arabic to liberate the Arab nation from other forces, whereas Enani works on literary and artistic grounds letting every reader set his own agendas which may change over the years or over the territories; this prompted some critics to claim that Enani's translations of Shakespeare targets "elite readers of literature and academics" (Hanna, pp. 120, 158). In other words, Enani produces something more universal and more Shakespearean accordingly. The more professionally the translator deals with the intra- and inter-notions, the more successful and durable the translation will be. Thus, translation activity is not only a journey through cultures, it is also a journey through times—not only linking past to present, but also putting an eye on the future of the text and expecting its understandability in the future.

Importance of the issue stems from the fact that dealing with clown discourse is an indication whether the translation is autonomous or under heteronomy. Manipulating a joke for the purposes of a certain agenda is a striking example of how art is used to change power relations. Thus, when Enani sticks to the milieu of the source text (ST), his translation may be sorted as a source in another language, whilst others' are versions. The question here is not: which is better? It is rather: does it render a message? Is it the whole, or part of, the intended message of the ST?

More focus went to printed versions because in England by the end of the 18th century, the emphasis started to change from the spectator to the reader (Aleksei Semenenko, p. 250). Shakespeare wrote the plays to be acted, not to be read, but such a change in the semiotic medium requires a change in translation approaches. Change of focus from the stage to the page seems to have resulted from development of printing and the increase of audiences who did not have the access to the theatre for so many reasons. An acceptable academic text should reflect the multimodality of all potential performance texts. Such a translation will help in filling the widening gaps between the two versions or the "page/stage opposition" (Semenenko, p. 251). Political, social and critical theory changes may require a new understating of universal works like Shakespeare's. For example, "after the fall of the Soviet system the focus on *Hamlet* shifted from socio-political interpretations to aesthetic conceptualizations with a distinct postmodernist flavor" (Semenenko, p. 252). This makes the translation act a process of creation rather than replacement (Semenenko, p. 262). "Different translations of the same source text by people from different countries or ethnic groups" reflect differences between cultures and psychologies that

lead to different versions of the same text (Kaibao Hu, 2020, P. 226).

Translation and Relation

Translation occurs within a mechanism of epistemological and material relations. If understood, established, revised and described well, the theory and practice of the translation career will foster, acquire more lands and build clearer borderlines. The notion of relations agrees with the Bourdieusian social approaches to translation which relate the linguistic message to many practices and propose forces other than the illocutionary force, enabling translators through different times, places and mentalities to produce as many versions of reality. New relations are being established all the time (Okasha, 2021, p. 280), and old ones are revised. This is the core philosophy of interdisciplinarity that causes literature on translation studies to widen; it is time to canonize the mechanism of the concept of *inter-* (or relations) by building well-defined borderlines far from being accused of laxity. To this end, macro and micro aspects of translation have to be studied from a historical point of view to establish well-formed relations that would bridge all the gaps in the translation industry.

“Zohar stressed the commonalities and potential bridges between polysystem theory and Bourdieu’s sociology” (Hélène Buzelin and Claudio Baraldi, 2016, p. 121). Theories hinting on relation stress mostly on cultural and epistemological matters, paying little attention to the material situation in which the work takes place. For example, the availability of a translators’ union in every region to theorize the ethics and logistics of work. Theorists must “think of cultural practices and products *relationally*” (Hanna, p. 5) for establishing a more universal translation theory

that introduces new concepts to the translation studies other than systems, purposes, narratives, etc.

Notions of system, structure and field are attempts to describe the natures of relations between entities in societies. Relations between texts are an example that might be governed by such notions. The merit of the notion of relations is that it offers a complete theory that covers the social space of translation with its fields: pedagogy, business and ethics of translation. Such a relations-theory must be easy and available to all involved in the translation community. Translation as a career may be likened to a community that has social and other weights influencing source and target societies. At the macro level of relations, Hanna calls for a relational methodology for a sociology of translation based on Bourdieu's conceptions.

When rendering the clown discourse, the translator must decide whether to speak from the original writer's point of view or sway the message of the clown to serve contemporary social, political and economic factors. The position of Shakespeare in the Arabic polysystem changes every now and then according to the contributions a new translation makes to the target society. If the "poly system does not allow innovations", many values will remain untransferrable to the target culture (Itamar Even-Zohar, p. 197). Defining the drama translator is an important step towards evaluating his success in his mission: does he translate for the stage or for a readership? What is the intention behind the translation? Choosing the vernacular or standard language does not mean that one choice is better than the other. Success or failure of a choice is judged by how it may activate the network of relations and achieve the intended purposes of all parties involved.

The change of tone for a certain purpose leads to a change in the stylistic level and the ideational in consequence, for example: from standard to colloquial or from formal to informal (Enani, 1993)^v. Deciding on the variety of language for the clown is a big question, which is the best choice? Is it standard or colloquial? And if standard, will it be classical or modern? A translator should not use a variety because he likes it, or thinks that it must be liked by the audience. He must ask first how much it will be successfully produced, disseminated and consumed.

The point of view towards translation as a human activity changes through the ages: “the two terms *ta‘rīb* and *mu‘arrīb* (‘Arabization’ and ‘Arabizer’) practically disappeared from the front covers of most published translations towards the late 1920s and were replaced by either *naql* (transference) or *tarjama* (translation)” (Hanna, pp. 142-143). Such a change in the name of the activity reflects a new method of theorizing and a new definition of translation in the Arab world. Interestingly, that change was historically in line with developments in linguistics: Prague school pioneers at that time called for a functionalist approach towards understanding meaning-making which in turn led to the development of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and social stances towards the study of language. Thus, the transfer of culture started to come to the forefront, irrespective of difference in language. However, *ta‘rīb* is still used in some places in the Arab world, especially the Gulf countries. The overlap between *ta‘rīb* and *tarjama* seems to be a change of focus from the nationalistic or the structural to the epistemological. A particular language is a part of the national identity, whereas knowledge in general is an interest to all humanity. A corpus study of such an overlap is needed for a systematic study of the

development of translation theories and definitions in the Arab world.

Clown's Discursive Levels in Shakespeare's Plays

The phenomenon of clowning in art had had a long history that might have been lost because it was not given a big concern by the researchers, like the phenomenon of *?arajuz* in Egypt. المهرج (i.e. the clown), السفية (i.e. the fool), الوغد (i.e. the rogue), الصعلوق (i.e. the picaro), etc. are examples of clowning in the world literature. Wiles differentiates between the terms *clown*, *fool* and *vice*. In the sixteenth century, 'vice' was a synonym for 'fool' and had a philosophical or moral dimension, while 'clown' had a social one; it acted as a link between the world of the play and the immediate world of the audience (Wiles, pp. 4, 6, 23).

“The term 'Clown' does not appear before the Elizabethan period. The word entered the language because it expressed a new concept: the rustic who by virtue of his rusticity is necessarily inferior and ridiculous. The word was evidently borrowed from Low German, although a spurious etymology from the Latin *colonus* - 'a tiller of the soil' - was posited by some Elizabethans... In Shakespearean dialogue generally, the word 'fool' is used with enormous freedom. The word 'Clown' is never found outside stage directions unless used of, or (for ironic effect) by the character who is designated as the Clown of the play” (Wiles, pp. 61, 68-69).

The concept of the clown or fool in Shakespeare's plays differed from one version to another (Wiles: 69). By analogy, it would be licensable to make changes in the target text (TT) for local purposes: for example, when the clown is weaver, joiner, carpenter, etc. with a name that is connected to their trade, it

would be better to innovate a new name to the clown in the TT to reflect the social and other functions of the character, disregarding the caveat that change of name is against truthfulness of translation. Don Quijote's imaginative beloved *Dulcinea*, for example, may be rendered as حلويات (i.e. candies) and Cutpurse as مشرط (i.e. lancet). In *The Merchant of Venice*, the name Launcelot could mean 'a little knife', as an allusion to the clown's cutting witticisms" (Mahood, 2003, p. 94), lechery or overeating (Wiles, p. 8). In light of this, the clown's name may be rendered as مَطَوَاة (i.e. penknife) or سكينه (i.e. knife) as a reference to the small knife symbolizing his criticism of bad characters. خنجر (i.e. Dagger) may not be adequate because in some Arab cultures it is a symbol of dishonesty or telling lies. Such manipulations make translation an act of rewriting or new writing (Susan Bassnett & Harish Trivedi, 2002).

Social and Linguistic Features of Shakespeare's Clowns

Not all clown discourse is jesting. In *The Winter's Tale* the clown seriously describes the horrible scene of a bear killing the man (Shakespeare, 1611/2009, 3.3. 86-104). In Shakespeare's plays, "the phlegmatic cast of character was thought natural to fools" (John W. Draper, p. 98). Such a phlegmatic air in Shakespeare's rogues like Gobbo and the gravedigger should be reflected in the translation. It is a common feature for marginal characters in all cultures not to be serious because they do not have serious tasks in life, although their talk reflects serious ideological and cultural aspects. Translating "wisdom-under-the-guise-of-nonsense" (Draper, p. 99) is the problem of rendering the clowns' discourse in Shakespeare. Clowns, fools and lower-class people have "a considerable role in defining social, religious and racial boundaries" (Robert Hornback, 2009). Understanding the

intention of clowning, other than the mere comic relief, is vital to finding an acceptable translation to the clown discourse.

The Elizabethan clown was marked by his colloquial speech that is sometimes full of syntactic and semantic gaps (Wiles, p. 99). Clowns invent new words that have funny influence and draw laughter on the stage: for example, the word 'directitude' used by the Servingman in *Coriolanus* which is not understood by his colleague (Shakespeare, 1609/2009, 4.5. 215). Shakespeare's clown is usually a male character of low social status, his part is written in colloquial prose and he is free to separate himself from the role and plot structure of the play. The idea of social hierarchy or master-slave relationship is touched in the plays. A character in Shakespeare's dramas is described as a clown through its relation with social superiors (Wiles, p. 106). Clowns fail to bring their wooing to any conclusion; Gratiano can be married off, but not Launcelot (Wiles, p. 112). Such social and mental status of the clown is to be reflected in the TT. The Clown is called by the word "Sirrah" to reflect inferiority. He is not socially powerful. He speaks the truth without fear for he has nothing precious to lose. Sirrah may be rendered as سىكا (Sika, i.e. the name of an inferior person in the Egyptian culture).

Another feature in some of Shakespeare's clowns appears in their syntax: when Shakespeare attempts to convey the impression that the clown is thinking as he speaks, he uses distorted and loose syntax. The disorderly rustic accent and defects in the structure of his sentences bring comedy (Enani, 2012, p. 75; Hussey, 1982, p. 100; Wiles, pp. 63, 131). When such defects and unpolished language are transferred in some way or another to the TT, the same amount of comedy and tone is rendered intact. Distorted syntax of the natural clown must be

rendered in an identical structure. Polished syntax of an artificial clown, on the other hand, should seem polished in the translation.

Natural and Artificial Clowns

Showing the difference between natural and artificial clowns is essential to determine the strategy used in the translation. The artificial fool is more rational and ordered than the natural whose humor is unintended (Hornback, p. 151). Naturalness or artificialness must also be rendered. Natural clowns speak from the unconscious while artificial clowns' discourse is affected and their syntax is polished. It may be argued that syntactic mistakes are indications of naturalness. The issue of naturalizing versus artificializing the clown discourse occupied not only critics but also editors of Shakespeare and maybe Shakespeare himself: for example, in *King Lear*, "He that keeps *neither crust nor crumb*" (1.4.157) in the Quarto text becomes "He that keeps *nor crust not crumb*" in the Folio (Hornback, p. 172; Jay Halio, p. 132). The correct syntactic structure 'neither... nor' is distorted into 'nor... not' to present a simpleminded character speaking his mind. Thus, editors and translators give themselves the license to degrade or elevate the language of the clown to achieve certain purposes.

Folio versions of *King Lear* "tend to cut bitter comedy and create pathos, making the Fool a sweet, pathetic natural" (Hornback, p. 178). This may be the case because "Quarto is called a "History" while the Folio is deemed a "Tragedy" (Hornback, p. 178). The point of view towards the event whether it is a tragedy, a comedy or a history changes the tone of the clown from bitterness to sweetness or vice versa. It is a clash between objectivity and subjectivity that led some directors to produce compromise versions between the sweet natural and the

bitter artificial. Such a compromise could also be a translational choice. Clowns are viewed as a part of the social memory that consciously or unconsciously comments on the fact of things and events. Interpreting that memory differs over time because it is a matter of historicizing the unconscious conscience of societies. The way the clown is understood reflects a life style and ideologies of the interpreter—at the translation and hermeneutic levels, indeed, which may politicize, religionize, socialize, etc. the text. New Historicism emerges here in the process of translation, rejecting to focus on organic unity and aesthetic qualities of the clown and considering literature as a tool that “does not mirror the world but shape it as well as being shaped by it” (Pelagia Goulimari, p. 163; Enani, 2010, p. 36). Every new understanding of the clown’s discourse destabilizes the text and its relation to the new reality that the audience witnesses (Goulimari, p. 295). In this light and to think in a translation-wise direction, the original work itself may be considered a real history and the translation be a literary work mirroring, magnifying, minimizing, politicizing, etc. the ST. Applying old historicism mirrors the original, whereas a new historicist approach results in a new understanding and a newer version of the old work. The new version is not only a new text or copy of the ST but also a new discourse with new implications that satisfy the standards of acceptability and situationality (Robert-Alain de Beaugrande & Wolfgang Dressler, 1986) as far as the target reader is concerned. Such a satisfaction is achieved through a smooth relation of intertextuality between ST, TT and other texts that may potentially be stored in the memory of a target audience.

Different Ways of Rendering the Clown's Discourse

Shakespeare's clown's language is a corpus of colloquial language at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries. It is a social document of simple people's discourse at that time. A translational study of it will play a major role in refreshing our understanding of various social and historical phenomena at that time. The clown's language has a specific text and texture; "the Clown's prose relates to his traditional function as an improvisator" (Wiles, p. 100). Punctuation marks can serve as markers that show stress on some word or idea. His language is different from that versed language of other characters. Such a difference should appear in the translation even if versed language is not used.

The perspective to the definition of translation determines the message of the clown in the product: from an Indian point of view, *anuvad* (i.e. translation) etymologically means 'say again or repeat with corroboration'. From a western point of view, *translation* means 'to carry across' (Susan Bassnett & Harish Trivedi). From an Arabic point of view *tarjama* (i.e. translation) means 'guessing'. The first definition is temporal, while the second is spatial and the third is mental. If the translation of Shakespeare is an act of saying again or repeating, the intention is to take the reader to the end of the 16th century and let him hear the old story again. If it is an act of translation, Shakespeare is exported to other cultures, or other places, with changes that satisfy the foreign consumer of the exported play. If it is *tarjama*, the mental activity would master the situation to produce an adequate text. During this process, paradigmatic and syntagmatic^{vi} preferences, on the part of the translator, create different mental images (Ali Almannā, p. 482). Translators decide whether they are

time-oriented, place-oriented or mind-oriented. Preferring one orientation over the other depends on purposes, contexts and other conditions guiding and drawing the limitations for the translator. A successful rendering of the clown's discourse requires making "sure you know the paradigms of your audience to make sure you call the narrative you want and the associations you want made with your product" (Steven Bradley, 2016). Thus, we have three definitions from three cultures. Each depends on one of these perspectives: time, place, or mind, and difference in translation also occurs when syntagmatic and paradigmatic preferences differ from one translator to another.

According to Hanna, kinds of translations in the market can be classified into three types: close translation, re-actualization and imitation. *Atta'rīb* (i.e. Arabization) is an example of close translation, *?attamšīr* (i.e. Egyptianization) is a re-actualization, whereas *?aliqtibās* (i.e. selecting elements from the ST and combining them with new ones) is a process of imitation (Hanna, pp. 32-33). Choice of the relevant strategy is based on the sort of relation needed to be established among the parties to the translation community. Definition of translation is also questioned here: whether it is Arabic, Indian or Western. Close translation is saying again, re-actualization is Western-wise for the text is transferred to another place and maybe another age, whereas imitation comprises the three definitions for the many changes made in the TT. Such a classification echoes the difference between the literary translator and the translator for the stage: the former provides a raw material for the latter. In other words, it is the difference between *?aliqtibās* and close translation. There seems no difference between close translation and re-actualization in the form *?attamšīr*, for instance by using the Egyptian dialect, being a linguistic medium that may be used for translating closely.

Thus, it may be argued that close translation is a re-actualization because the new language imposes new atmosphere that makes the product far away from being close whatever effort is exerted.

Enani's translations of Shakespeare's plays seem to be a close translation for they have an academic weight. He took a long time of scholarly study before embarking on translating Shakespearean discourse compared to other previous translators. He renders the text without rupturing its texture, letting readers form their own understanding which may differ from one person to another. As far as the trust theory is concerned, it is a text to be trusted by persons from different backgrounds and even from different ages. He does not reduce the play to a single interpretation but rather transfers it with its plurality of meanings, unlike translators who have a certain kind of consumer in their minds determining the style and language used. Such a consideration causes early aging of the translation. An eternal product needs a language suitable for all seasons and tastes.

Analysis of Some Samples

Great works, like Shakespeare's, have different interpretations and no one interpretation is supposed to satisfy everyone (Berger, p. 89). Such rich texts pose many translational problems, one of which stems from the point of view towards the clown that controls the tone of the translation: for example, in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Love's Labour's Lost*,... the term 'clown' functions unproblematically as a distinction that is simultaneously theatrical and social. It is Shakespeare's habit to change the name of a character according to situation. His focus is on the situation rather than the characterization. This is very clear in *Romeo and Juliet* with Juliet's mother: she is Capulet's Wife, Old Lady, Lady, and Mother and Peter who is described as a clown, a serving man,

a rogue, etc. (Wiles, pp. 75, 92). A translator of drama should reflect this strategy by coining a name for the marginal character that suits the situation. He is an important character, not a mere stereotype to satisfy the mob.

The gravedigger's discourse in *Hamlet* represents the wisdom of common people in contrast with the pedantic wisdom of educated people (Berger, p. 84). Thus, he is representative of all clowns in Shakespeare, hence the importance of analyzing the rendering of his message. A key skill that is important for the quality of the translation is how much the translator understands "how Shakespeare's text depicts the cognition of his characters" (Nicholas R. Helms, p. 152). Precise rendering of the clown's cognition without changing the tone or other stylistic features opens "new avenues of thought" (Helms, p. 151) to new readers who are given chances to understand the character in a new light. Such a process of understanding the cognition of the clown is done by the reader himself, without a view imposed by a translator or an entity that dictates a translator. *Hamlet* has been made into many films and every generation understands its text in a new light (Arthur Asa Berger, p. 82). A successful translation has to keep, in its text, the same potential of durability over the years. Otherwise, an artificial export of the clown discourse will be made deficiently for being inadequately detached from its context of origin (Sherry Simon, p.9).

If the translator considers the gravedigger's discourse as mere comic relief, the rendering will be totally different from another viewing it as a bitter comment on the fate of humanity at large. At the beginning of Act five, Muhamed Awad Muhamed (2011) renders the stage direction *enter two clowns* as يدخل فلاحان (i.e. two rustics enter) whereas Enani (2004) uses يدخل مُهْرَجَان. The

two choices reflect two points of view towards the message of the clown: the first focuses on the simplicity or naivety of some rustic people that make people laugh, but the second keeps the image of the clown as it is to give the audience a chance to reflect on the function of *مُهْرَجَان* (i.e. two clowns) without narrowing the features of the clown within a framework of a simple or naïve person.

Gravedigger: “A pestilence on him for a mad rogue. A’ poured a flagon of Rhenish on my head once! This same skull, sir, **was**, sir, Yorick’s skull, the King’s jester” (Shakespeare, 1601/2003, 5.1. 151-153).

“There is deliberate distance between Yorick the man and the decayed skull before them. The Gravedigger emphasizes that this skull “was” Yorick’s skull, not “is” (Helms, p. 153). Such a psychological distance between the skull and its owner should be reflected in the translation by using the past tense or maybe another tool if the past tense is not adequate to depict the same cognition of the character. M. Awad ignores the past tense: *إنها هي بعينها جمجمة*. Likewise, Enani renders it as *هي بعينها جمجمة*. It may be better to render it as *كأانت جمجمته*, by using a long ‘a’ sound emphasizing the gap between past and present, and reflecting the bitter tone in the clown’s meta-discourse on a clown like him. The past tense technique is intended here because a few lines before this quotation, the same gravedigger says:

Hamlet: Who is to be buried in’t?

Gravedigger: One that **was** a woman sir. (Shakespeare, 1601/2003, 5.1. 113-114).

Enani renders the past tense: سَيُدفن فيه من كان امرأة and M. Awad gives a similar translation: شخص كان امرأة يا سيدي. Repetition of the technique in the ST requires the same in the TT to transfer the function of the clown as a commentator on the fate of humans, and how he outwits Hamlet by playing with words to mix seriousness with jest to comment ironically on death (Enani, 2004, p. 69).

In some cases, manipulations have to be made in order to make the audience understand the message of the clown easily: for example, understanding the porter's scene in *Macbeth* from a translational point of view refutes the claim that it was added by another hand just to satisfy the mob (Wiles, p. 89, Braunmuller, 1999):

“Here's a farmer that hanged himself on th'expectation of plenty. Come in time - have napkins enough about you, here you'll sweat for't”. (Shakespeare, 1606/2009, 2.3. 3-5).

هذا فلاح جاء إلى النار لأنه انتحر! كان يخشى وفرة المحاصيل وانحطاط الأسعار!
(عناني)

أمن المزارعين؟ حسن مجيئك، وإن ساء محصولك (خليل مطران)

هنا فلاح شفق نفسه لأنه توقع وفرة المحصول (أزهر سليمان)

Literal translation exposes the passage above as a mere comic scene, but Enani's explaining why the farmer hanged himself creates a sort of coherence comparing the farmer to Macbeth, in the sense that both are greedy and committed crimes to gratify their greediness. Such a coherence is not found in Mutran's or

Azhar Suliman's versions. This is a sort of the clown's discourse that requires translation by explanation in order to transfer the message clearly.

In *Romeo and Juliet*, on the other hand, Peter's scene (4.5. 100-135) after the funeral seems to be an interpolation because the lines are comic and do not agree with the theme of horrific death. Peter's discourse here is intentionally paradoxical to ease the strain of the tragedy (Enani, 1993, p. 283). Such a scene does not need manipulation as the previous one. As mentioned above, it may have been done for Will Kemp as the songs composed to Shaykh Salāma Hijāzī.

Stage Directions and the Clown

Stage directions must be rendered especially as far as the clown's speech is concerned: for example, in his translation of *The Merchant of Venice*, Enani adds some stage directions that agree with the tone and discourse of the clown, adding more dramatization to the translation. Thus, the text is not only translated, but also prepared for performance. Such a dramatization is not in other editions like Khalil Mutran's, being a retranslation of a French translation and a product to be read rather than acted.

The rendering of drama requires a multi-modal translation strategy, by which language, gestures and other non-linguistic messages are transferred. In so doing, not only is the voice in an old text rendered, but also the "vision in terms of human relations" is reflected (Christy Desmet, p. 112). Stage directions in the origin and translations naturally differ from one age to another because reception of voice and vision is not a linear process, but rather a creative action in which products of the past, like Shakespeare's, are seen and heard in a new light to be "a parallel creation rather

than a copy of the writer's creation" (Mazid, 2021, p. 12)^{vii}. Interestingly, change of stage directions is found in different versions of Shakespeare, as mentioned above, to communicate a linguistic message. Enani (1993, p. 241) did the same, for example he adds the stage direction *يعود للغناء* (i.e. sings again) in *Romeo and Juliet* (4.5. 133). It is added for more clarification. The same is done in *The Merchant of Venice* in the following passage by Launcelot Gobbo:

<p>عناني: من أنت من؟ (يلتفت) هذا هو الضمير يهمس لي: (فالتترك اليهودي! كفاه منك خدمة!) لا.. لا (في ذعر) هذا هو الشیطان في أثري! يوسوس لي ويغويني! يقول لي (يا لونسولوت!) (إلى الجمهور) هذا هو اسمي.. يا أيها السادة.. لونسولوت جوبو! يقول لي (يا سيدي جوبو) يا سيدي؟ لا لا (يا أيها الكریم لونسولوت!) (يمد أذنيه كأنما يسمع ما يقوله الشیطان) لا بل يقول (يا أيها الصديق.. يا لونسولوت جوبو! اهرب! أطلق لساقيك الرياح انفد بجلدك!)</p>	<p>Certainly my conscience will serve me to run from this Jew my master. The fiend is at mine elbow and tempts me, saying to me 'Gobbo, Launcelot Gobbo, good Launcelot' or 'good Gobbo' or 'good Launcelot Gobbo, use your legs, take the start, run away.' My conscience says 'No; take heed, honest Launcelot, take heed, honest Gobbo' or, as aforesaid, 'honest Launcelot Gobbo, do not run; scorn running with thy heels.' Well, the most courageous fiend bids me pack. 'Via!' says the fiend; 'away!' says the fiend. 'For the heavens, rouse up a brave mind,' says the fiend 'and run.' Well, my conscience, hanging about the neck of my heart, says very wisely to me 'My honest friend Launcelot, being an honest man's son'--</p>	<p>خليل مطران: لنسلو: ضميري يحتم علي أن أترك خدمة اليهودي مولاي . والشیطان علي مقربة مني، يخادعني بقوله : جوبو، لنسلو، يا صديقي لنسلو، أو يا صديقي جوبو، أو يا صفيي لنسلو جوبو، أعمل فخذيك، وانج بنفسك. ثم يقول لي ضميري: حذار يا لنسلو النزیه، حذار يا جوبو المستقیم، أو كما كنت أقول آنفاً: أيها النزیه لنسلو جوبو. لا تبرح، وترفع عن إجهاد فخذيك في الهزيمة. إلا أنه — أي الشیطان — لا يلبث أن يعيد علي نصيحته بالارتحال متشدداً فيها مهيباً لي: (أقلع. تشجع .</p>
--	---	--

<p>هذا هو الشيطان! أما ضميري .. فإنه يقول (لا خذ الحذر! يا أيها الشريف لونسوت!) (تراه ناداني بنصف الاسم؟ أم أنه يقول لونسوت جوبو؟ يقول لا يهرب! بل إنه عار كبير! يقول (أيها الشريف يا صديقي) (أيها الشريف؟ نعم شريف.. فإن والدي شريف.. (يتردد) أعني عنده بعض الشرف! (في حماس) لكن والدتي شريفة! هو يقول اهرب.. هذا يقول احذر! إذا استمعت للوساوس.. ذهبت للشيطان! إذا استمعت للضمير.. فلن أبارح اليهودي.. وهو شيطان قدير! إذن فذلك الضمير.. قطعاً يريد الضرر.. لا بد أن أمضي.. وأن ألوذ بالفرار!</p>	<p>or rather 'an honest woman's son';--for indeed my father did something smack, something grow to, he had a kind of taste;--well, my conscience says 'Launcelot, budge not.' 'Budge,' says the fiend. 'Budge not,' says my conscience. 'Conscience,' say I, (you counsel well.' 'Fiend,' say I, 'you counsel well.' To be ruled by my conscience, I should stay with the Jew my master, who, God bless the mark! is a kind of devil; and, to run away from the Jew, I should be ruled by the fiend, who, saving your reverence! is the devil himself. Certainly the Jew is the very devil incarnal; and, in my conscience, my conscience is but a kind of hard conscience, to offer to counsel me to stay with the Jew. The fiend gives the more friendly counsel: I will run, fiend; my heels are at your commandment; I will run (Shakespeare, 1600/2003, 2.2. 1-24).</p>	<p>انج بنفسك) عندئذ يعلق ضميري برقبة فوادي، ويقول لي عن حكمة: (يا صديقي لنسلو القويم، ابن الرجل المستقيم وابن المرأة المستقيمة) ذلك أن والذي كان يذوق الثمرة التي بين يديه ولا يخلو من سلامة في الذوق، عندئذ يقول ضميري: (البث لنسلو) فيقول الشيطان (فراراً) فيقول الضمير (إياك) فأقول لأحدهما: (يا ضميري حسنت نصيحتك) وأقول للآخر (أيها الشيطان أين الثواب في مشورتك). لو جاريت الضمير للبث مع اليهودي الذي هو - استغفر الله - ضرب من الشيطان ولو فارقت اليهودي لأصبح زمامي في يد الشيطان الذي هو - ولا مواخظة ^{viii} - الشيطان بعينه، وهذا اليهودي بشخصه . وبذمتي إن ذمتي لتركب الشطط حين تنصح لي بالمكث عند اليهودي . وإنما الشيطان هو الذي ينصح لي نصيحة الصداقة بسافر، سافر . أمرك مطاع أيها الشيطان.</p>
---	--	--

The difficulty of rendering Launcelot's discourse on escaping from Shylock is that it is full of paralanguage, which Enani (1988) renders by stage directions like يتردد (i.e. hesitating) يلتفت (i.e. looking back), في ذعر (i.e. scared), إلى الجمهور (i.e. addressing the audience) يمد أذنيه كأنما ليسمع ما يقوله الشيطان (i.e. straining his ears as if listening to the devil), في حماس (i.e. vehemently), etc. Other translators, like Mutran (2012) for example, do not transfer such non-verbal messages; they only stick to the source text and render every word: like *God bless the mark!* as استغفر الله and *saving your reverence!* as ولا مؤاخذه. This textual translation is not enough to reflect the different levels of clownish discourse. The stage directions in Enani's version seem to be a better solution for they connect the parts of the text, making it more coherent, and creating an acceptable discourse accordingly. Sticking to the ST and ignoring contextual dimensions blur the target discourse and prevent it from having a social or a cultural message.

Enani may have avoided rendering the interjections, *God bless the mark!* or *saving your reverence!*, because a rendering like أعزكم الله or لا مؤاخذه , بعد الشر , استغفر الله may cut the cohesion of the text and disturb the coherence too. The stage directions and ellipsis dots (...) between sentences are adequate rendering for such interjectional structures. The dots may be filled by the clown on the stage or by the imagination of the reader, creating a new version of an old reality, not only mirroring the old work by copying the text in another language. Such a strategy seems to be in line with New Historicism that imparts new colours to old images without destroying the historical value of the past, like repairing old portraits of Picasso and da Vinci without making them lose their capital.

If the clown is rendered for the stage for a special political or social purpose, translation in such a case may be described as commercial. Other versions that stick to the source are called literary, academic or aesthetic. Shakespeare's literary clown potentially has many commercial versions that appear in ages to come through translation. From this stance, translation is a tool for exploring the universality of great literary works. Enani's rendering of Launcelot's quotation in *The Merchant of Venice* shows success of the translator at both the levels of "readability and performability". The stage directions he adds enable him to occupy a midway between a translator to the readers and a translator to the stage.

Results and Conclusions

The history of clown tradition must be known very well by the translator tackling clown discourse. Analyses of different translations of clown discourse in Shakespeare prove that simple Standard Arabic is the best solution for such a rhetoric to be trusted by as many audiences in the Arab region and other potential audiences. This solution is not usually applied because sometimes the translation of Shakespeare is directed to a local audience with a special purpose that may entail the use of a certain variety of Arabic like some of Enani's versions and Ibrahim Ramzi's translation of *King Lear* to school students or Fatima Musa's. Translating the clown discourse in 'ammiyya (i.e. the vernacular) will have a limited audience, though. The successful choice of variety may satisfy all potential audiences, not sacrificing an audience for the sake of another. It is not the question of *fusha* and 'ammiyya; people in real life mix the two. The translator's concern should be a message to be disseminated to as much audience as possible. Another justification for using *fusha* is that Shakespeare is not only foreign, but also old; an

identical old style is required for an adequate reflection of the whole linguistic, social, historical, etc. situations in the drama. *Fusha* with all its implications of old times and old habits is a good solution.

Rendering clown discourse in Shakespeare needs revision from time to time to be reproduced in a new way agreeing with the clownish terminology of every age. The translator repaints the character, with the same size and traits using different colours from the East. The translator of a clown discourse is a translator-dramatist. A translator has more freedom with this kind of discourse than he has with discourse of other characters because most of the clownish talk is symbolic and the explanation of symbolic language differs from time to time or even from one person to another. Collecting the corpus of rogues in Shakespeare's dramas, tracing their characteristic and linguistic traits and how these traits must be reflected in translation is not only beneficial to the translation studies, but also to the historical and social research endeavors of England and the West at that time.

Endnotes

ⁱ *Illusio* is a belief about a *field* that leads to forming a *habitus*: for example, many people have a habitus of loving the field of football because of the many positive *illusios* held about it.

ⁱⁱ *The Merchant of Venice* (2.2. 18-20).

ⁱⁱⁱ Origin reads:

"كل مخرج يحرص على تحديد الاستجابة الواحدة التي يريدها ويجتهد حتى يكفل تحقيقها سواء كانت مستوحاة من النص الدرامي أو من مفهومه الخاص له" (p. 58).

^{iv} *Arajuz* is a colloquial Egyptian word, could be derived from two Turkish words: *qurra* (i.e. black) and *guz* (i.e. eyes). Black eye is a reference to criticism of black or evil sides of society or humanity at large. "The word "*Arajuz*" could also be derived from a Pharaonic origin that means the tales maker. According to some other researchers, it is the colloquial translation of "I can see two", as player often plays with two puppets. Others think it is a modification of the name of an old dictator who ruled Egypt, named Qaraqush" (Ashraf Dali, 2015). *Arajuz* is a simple medium for creating a dramatic performance in the streets for poor people in villages and small towns, telling humors and using a lot of puns for comic effect and criticism of bad social habits (Nabil Bahjat, 2020). As social actors, the clown is marginal in the performance, whereas *Arajuz* is a main character. As far as power relations are concerned, some Arab readers, being influenced by *Arajuz* performances, may have more interest in the clown, and interpret him in a different way accordingly.

^v Origin reads:

"تفاوت النغمات الذي يعتمد على تفاوت الإيقاع ... بوحى للقارئ بعدم الانتظام أي بعدم وجود نظام أو نظم في مجرى الفكرة التي ينقلها الحوار" (عنانى، ١٩٩٣: ٢٧)

"كأنما أصبحنا غير واثقين من لون النغمة السائدة" (عنانى، ١٩٩٣: ٣٠)

^{vi} Broadly speaking, paradigmatic means making semantic changes by substituting one sign for another, and syntagmatic means making syntactic changes.

^{vii} Origin reads: الترجمة ليست استتساحاً للإبداع ولكنها إبداع مواز

^{viii} Switching style here is abrupt...

References

- Abd El Moneim, I. (2013) "Translating Humor in Selected Shakespearean Plays: A Linguistic Approach". Unpublished PhD Thesis, Benha University.
- Alboghday, A. M. (2016) "Translating Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Arabic by Different Arabic Translators: A Comparative Study of Three Translations: Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's (1960), Mohammed Awad Mohammed's (1972), and M. Enani (2004)". Unpublished MA Thesis, Minia University.
- Alboghday, A. M. (2019) "An Analysis of Four Arabic Translations of William Shakespeare's Sonnets in the Light of Skopos Theory". Unpublished PhD Thesis, Minia University.
- Almanna, A. (2020). Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Axes as Parameters for Translation Accuracy: Towards Translating Images. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures*, 12(4), 475-490. <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.12.4.4>
- Baer, B. (2011). *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Banks, F (2019). *Shakespeare: Actors and Audiences*. Bloomsbury, UK.: The Arden Shakespeare.
- Bradley, S. (2016, April 19). *Syntagms and Paradigms — Telling A Story With Signs*. Retrieved from <https://vanseodesign.com/web-design/syntagms-paradigms/> (Accessed 24 May 2021)
- Bassnett, S., & Trivedi H. (2002). Of colonies, cannibals and vernaculars. In S. Bassnett, & H. Trivedi (eds.), *Post-*

- Colonial Translation Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-18). London: Routledge.
- Berger, A. A. (2016). *Applied Discourse Analysis: Popular Culture, Media, and Everyday Life*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buzelin, H. & Baraldi, C. (2016). Sociology and translation studies. In Y. Gambier & L. v. Doorslaer (eds.), *Border Crossings Translation Studies and other disciplines* (pp. 117-140). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dali, A. (2015, March 24). Arajuz: A Fortune of Happiness. Retrieved from <http://www.theasian.asia/archives/90895> (Accessed 20 December 2021).
- de Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. (1986). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.
- Desmet, C. (1992). *Reading Shakespeare's Characters: Rhetoric, Ethics, and Identity*. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Draper, J. (1970). *The Humors and Shakespeare's Characters*. New York: AMS Press.
- Even-Zohar, I. (2000). The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 192-197). London: Routledge.
- Gallagher, C. & Greenblatt, S. (2000). *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goulimari, P. (2015). *Literary Criticism and Theory from Plato to postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Hanna, S. (2016). *Bourdieu in Translation Studies: The Socio-cultural Dynamics of Shakespeare Translation in Egypt*. London: Routledge.

- Helms, N. R. (2019). *Cognition, Mindreading, and Shakespeare's Characters*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hornback, R. (2009). *The English Clown Tradition from the Middle Ages to Shakespeare*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Hu, K. (2020). Corpus-based Translation Studies and Translation Cognition Research: Similarity and Convergence. In K. Hu & K. H. Kim (eds.), *Corpus-based Translation and Interpreting Studies in Chinese Contexts: Present and Future* (pp. 221-236). Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hussey, S. (1982). *The Literary Language of Shakespeare*. London and New York: Longman.
- Mazid, B. (2021, Sept. 10). Translation is a parallel creation rather than a copy of the writer's creation. *Aljomhuria Newspaper*, p. 12.
- Okasha, T. (2021). The Rendering of Style in the Ring of the Dove. *Research in Language Teaching, 14(14)*, 268-336.
- Packer, T. (2016). *Women of Will: the Remarkable Evolution of Shakespeare's Female Characters*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Rizzi, A., Lang, B., Pym, A. (2019). *What is Translation History? A Trust-Based Approach*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Semenenko, A. (2011). "No text is an island" Translating *Hamlet* in twenty-first-century Russia. In B. J. Baer (Ed.), *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (pp. 249-264). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Shakespeare, W. (1999). *Macbeth* (A. R. Braunmuller, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1606).

- Shakespeare, W. (2003). *Hamlet Prince of Denmark* (P. Edwards, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1601).
- Shakespeare, W. (2005). *The Tragedy of King Lear* (Jay L. Halio, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1607).
- Shakespeare, W. (2003). *The Merchant of Venice* (M. M. Mahood, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1600).
- Shakespeare, W. (2009). *The Tragedy of Coriolanus* (J. D. Wilson, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1609).
- Shakespeare, W. (2009). *The Winter's Tale* (J. D. Wilson, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1611).
- Shakespeare, W. (2009). *Macbeth* (J. D. Wilson, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1606).
- Simon, S. & St-Pierre, P. (2000). Introduction. In S. Simon & P. St-Pierre. (Eds.), *Changing the Terms: translating in the postcolonial era* (pp. 9-29). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Tatlow A. (2001). *Shakespeare, Brecht, and the Intellectual Sign*. North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Wiles, D. (2005). *Shakespeare's Clown (Actor and text in the Elizabethan playhouse)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zammito, J. (2009). Historians and Philosophy of Historiography. In A. Tucker (Ed.), *A companion to the philosophy of history and historiography* (pp. 63-84). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Arabic Works Cited

- إبراهيم أنيس .المعجم الوسيط .القاهرة، (١٩٧٢).
- إبراهيم رمزي. *ترويض النمرة* تأليف وليم شكسبير . القاهرة. مؤسسة هنداوي للتعليم والثقافة (٢٠١٤).
- أزهر سليمان. *ترجمة مسرحية مكبث* تأليف وليم شكسبير . القاهرة. دار نينوى للدراسات والنشر والتوزيع (٢٠١٢).
- أحمد عشوش. *الأبعاد الثقافية في ترجمة النص الأدبي*. رسالة ماجستير غير مطبوعة. جامعة المنيا. (٢٠٠٤).
- خليل مطران. *ترجمة مسرحية تاجر البندقية* تأليف وليم شكسبير . القاهرة. مؤسسة هنداوي للتعليم والثقافة (٢٠١٢).
- خليل مطران. *ترجمة مسرحية مكبث* تأليف وليم شكسبير . القاهرة. دار المعارف (٢٠٠٥).
- فاطمة موسى. *ترجمة مسرحية الملك لير* تأليف وليم شكسبير . القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (1997).
- محمد عناني. *ترجمة مسرحية روميو وجوليت* تأليف وليم شكسبير . القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (١٩٩٣).
- محمد عناني. *ترجمة مسرحية هاملت* تأليف وليم شكسبير . القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (٢٠٠٤).
- محمد عناني. *ترجمة مسرحية مكبث*. القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (٢٠٠٥).
- محمد عناني. *ترجمة مسرحية كوريولانوس* تأليف وليم شكسبير . القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (٢٠١٢).

محمد عناني. ترجمة مسرحية الملك لير تأليف وليم شكسبير. القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (٢٠٠٩).

محمد عناني. ترجمة مسرحية طرويلوس وكريسيديا تأليف وليم شكسبير. القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (٢٠١٠).

محمد عناني. ترجمة مسرحية تاجر البندقية تأليف وليم شكسبير. القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (١٩٨٨).

محمد عناني. ترجمة مسرحية يهودي مالطا تأليف كريستوفر مارلو. القاهرة. الهيئة المصرية العامة للكتاب (٢٠٢٠).

محمد عوض محمد. ترجمة مسرحية هاملت تأليف وليم شكسبير. القاهرة. دار المعارف (٢٠١١).

نبيل بهجت. الأراجوز المصري. القاهرة. المجلس الأعلى للثقافة (٢٠٢٠).

ترجمة خطاب المهرج في مسرحيات شكسبير إلى العربية: إشكاليات نظرية وعملية

د. طاهر محمود السيد عكاشة

مدرس الترجمة بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية - كلية الألسن - جامعة أسوان

الملخص :

يستكشف الباحث في هذه الدراسة النظريات التاريخية، والأدبية، ونظريات الترجمة، التي قد تساعد المترجم في الوصول إلى أفضل الحلول لمشكلات ترجمة خطاب المهرج في مسرحيات شكسبير إلى العربية. وهي بذلك تعد محاولة لتفسير التداخلات في شبكة من العلاقات بين قروص علمية مختلفة تخدم عملية الترجمة، وهذا التفسير من شأنه أن يساعد في التوصل إلى نظرية شاملة للترجمة. ومن أجل ذلك فإن الباحث قارن بين النظرية التاريخية التي تعتمد على السرد المباشر للأحداث، والنظرية الأخرى التي تعتمد على الاستنباط والتأويل، ثم ربطها بنظرية أدبية ألا وهي التاريخية الجديدة، وكيف أن تطبيقها على خطاب المهرج في مسرحيات شكسبير يؤدي إلى فهمه بطرق مختلفة، وبالتالي تظهر ترجمات متنوعة. كما قام الباحث بتطبيق أفكار بيير بورديو في علم الاجتماع، وذلك لتأكيد فكرة أن الترجمة تعتمد على نظرية من العلاقات، يساعد فهمها على تطوير الجوانب النظرية والعملية في مهنة الترجمة، ورسم الحدود بين العلوم اللغوية المختلفة وغيرها، التي تخدم نشاط الترجمة. وبعد تحليل بعض العينات تبين أن خطاب المهرج يحتاج إلى إعادة الترجمة بمرور الوقت؛ حتى تتوافق اللغة مع الفهم الجديد للخطاب الذي يتغير باستمرار. كما أوصت الدراسة بعمل مدونات لخطاب المهرج في شكسبير، ليس من أجل خدمة دراسات الترجمة فقط، بل لتطوير الدراسات الاجتماعية والتاريخية لانجلترا والغرب في تلك الفترة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الترجمة ، شكسبير ، المهرج ، الترجمة ونظرية الثقة ، نظرية الترجمة.