



**A CASE STUDY OF CULTURE AND
TRANSADAPTATION OF SHAKESPEARE'S
HAMLET IN JAWAD AL-ASSADI'S FORGET
HAMLET**

**2021
MASTER THESIS
Department of English Language and Literature**

Ali ABBAS

Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Abdul Serdar ÖZTÜRK

**A CASE STUDY OF CULTURE AND TRANSADAPTATION OF
SHAKESPEARE’S HAMLET IN JAWAD AL-ASSADI’S FORGET HAMLET**

Ali ABBAS

T.C

Karabuk University

Institute of Graduate Programs

Department of English Language and Literature

Prepared as

Master Thesis

Prof. Dr. Abdul Serdar ÖZTÜRK

KARABUK

January 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
THESIS APPROVAL PAGE.....	3
DECLARATION	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
ABSTRACT.....	6
ÖZ.....	7
ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION	8
ARŞİV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ	9
ABBREVIATIONS.....	10
SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH	12
PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH	12
METHOD OF THE RESEARCH	12
HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH/RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	12
SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS / DIFFICULTIES	12
INTRODUCTION	14
Research Methodology And Literature Review.....	21
Methodology.....	21
Literature Review	23
1. CHAPTER ONE Culture, Translation, And Adaptation	25
1.1 Culture: Concept and Definition	25
1.2 Culture and Language	28
1.3 Culture, Language and Translation.....	31
1.4 Translation: Concept and Definition	36
1.5 Adaptation: Concept and Definition	41

1.6 What is Adaptation?	41
1.7 Types of Adaptation.....	45
1.8 Adaptation and Translation.....	49
2. CHAPTER TWO Shakespeare's Journey To The Arab World.....	52
2.1 Shakespeare's Drama between Adaptation and Translation	52
2.2 Hamlet in Arabic.....	61
2.3 Arabic Translations of <i>Hamlet</i>	63
2.4 Samples of Arabic Translation and Adaptation	73
2.4.1 The Religious "Culture-bound words" (Culture Specific Terms).....	74
2.5 Pun Words Translation in Hamlet	75
2.6 Hamlet's Fourth Soliloquy—"To Be or Not To Be, That is The Question"	77
2.7 The Nunnery Scene	80
2.8 The Recent Arabic Translations and Adaptations of Hamlet	85
3. CHAPTER THREE Analysing Hamlet's Trans-Adaptation "Forget Hamlet"	91
3.1 Translation, Adaptation or Trans-Adaptation.....	91
3.2 Similarities and Differences between <i>Hamlet</i> and <i>Forget Hamlet</i>	92
3.2.1 Settings	96
3.2.2 Analysis of Hamlet's Characters	102
REFERENCES.....	115
CURRICULUM VITAE	123

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

I certify that in my opinion the thesis submitted by Ali Mahmood Abbas ABBAS titled “A Case Study of Culture and Transadaptation of Shakespeare Hamlet in Jawad Al-Assadi’s Forget Hamlet” is fully adequate in scope and in quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Abdul Serdar ÖZTÜRK

.....

Thesis Advisor, Department of English Language and Literature

This thesis is accepted by the examining committee with a unanimous vote in the Department of English Language and literature as a Master of Arts thesis. January 26, 2021

Examining Committee Members (Institutions)

Signature

Chairman : Prof. Dr. Abdul Serdar ÖZTÜRK (KBU)

.....

Member : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Harith TURKI (KBU)

.....

Member : Assist. Prof. Dr. Yıldırım ÖZSEVGEC (RTEÜ)

.....

The degree of Master of Arts by the thesis submitted is approved by the Administrative Board of the Institute of Graduate Programs, Karabuk University.

Prof. Dr. Hasan SOLMAZ

.....

Director of the Institute of Graduate Programs

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own work and all information included has been obtained and expounded in accordance with the academic rules and ethical policy specified by the institute. Besides, I declare that all the statements, results, materials, not original to this thesis have been cited and referenced literally. Without being bound by a particular time, I accept all moral and legal consequences of any detection contrary to the aforementioned statement.

Name Surname: Ali Abbas

Signature:



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As my thesis has come to an end, I would like to offer my thanks and gratitude to my supervisor, **Prof. Dr. Abdul Serdar ÖZTÜRK**, who has been a source and inspiration of knowledge. Without his criticism, patient preparation and meticulous proof reading, this thesis would not be completed. I am grateful to the assistance of my other professors and friends, who made my university time extremely valuable through constant learning. My profound gratitude goes to my supportive family: the soul of my father, my mother, my brothers and sisters. A very special and heartfelt thanks to my wife Cheeman Saber for her never ending support, encouragement and prayers throughout my studies. I am also thankful to Dr. Ozcan, Dr. Harith Al-Darweesh, Dr.Tavga Saeed,Dr. Nazila and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muayad Enwiya Jajo Al-Jamani for their inspiring tips and supervisory efforts. They instilled in me the spirit of research and provided me with the sources, references, constructive criticism and precious time, which improved quality of my research. Additionally, I am deeply grateful to Professor Margaret Litvin, Associate Professor of Arabic and Comparative Literature at Boston University, for providing me with valuable resources and guiding me throughout writing process. I also want to offer my gratitude to Dr.Shakir, Lecturer at the American University of Iraq-Sulaimani, for revising my thesis, proofreading, giving valuable advices, his non-stop encouragement, feedback and recommendations to improve my thesis. I am grateful to Dr. Jawad al-Assadi for generously devoting his time to my questions about his trans-adaptation of Hamlet. I would like to thank all my classmates for their guidance and friendship. Once again a special thanks and shout out to my dad and mom for their consistent encouragement and love throughout my life.

ABSTRACT

This study makes a comparison and contrast between Shakespeare's Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, and Forget Hamlet (initially called Ophelia's Window) by Jawad Al- Assadi. It explores the similarities and differences between the two plays. It shows the significant points in Shakespeare's Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, and Jawad al-Assadi's play, titled Forget Hamlet (Ophelia's Window). The study focuses on the different and similar aspects of the characters in both texts, and for this purpose, it tends to view the influence of Shakespeare on Jawad Al- Assadi's writings. The study also examines how Al-Assadi succeeded in turning upside down the Shakespearean text, *Hamlet*, thus ordering the audience to Forget Hamlet and think about the tyrants, bloodthirstiness, and throne usurpers. Jawad Al-Assadi exposes different understandings of Hamlet due to different cultures, traditions, and social concepts of religion. The study paves the way for more adaptations of the sacred texts to bridge the gaps among the nations through exchanging cultures and heritage. The study renders the two works from the perspective of culture, plot, theme, structure, style, and character. "To be or not to be that is the question" is the slogan that the Arab political leaders exploited for their interests and Jawad Al-Assadi is one of many, who spent years in exile. He has been exiled twice; first, he was exiled by the former regime, and second, he chose to live in exile willingly. He roamed the world performing his "Forget Hamlet" asking the West and the East that we have to focus on the barbarians and tyrants represented by Claudius rather than Hamlet. Through *Forget Hamlet*, he aims at granting an even chance to the minor characters to express themselves and utter their suffering against Claudius and all brutal rulers around the world.

Keywords: Culture, translation adaptation, trans-adaptation, Shakespeare's Hamlet, Jawad Al-Assadi's Forget Hamlet

ÖZ

Bu tez, Shakespeare'in Hamlet, Danimarka Prensi ile Jawad al- Assadi'nin Forget Hamlet'i (başlangıçta Ophelia'nın Penceresi olarak adlandırılır) arasında bir karşılaştırma girişimidir. Shakespeare'in Hamlet, Danimarka Prensi ve Jawad al- Assadi'nin Unut Hamlet (Ophelia'nın Penceresi) oyunundaki önemli noktaları,iki oyun arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıkları incelemeye çalışmaktadır. Çalışma her iki metindeki karakterlerin farklı ve benzer yönlerine odaklanmakta ve bu amaçla Jawad al- Assadi'nin yazılarında Shakespeare'in etkisini araştırma eğilimindedir. Araştırma ayrıca, Jawad al- Assadi'nin Shakespeare'in Hamletmetni alt üst ederek yazdığı yeni metinde, seyirciyi Hamlet'i unutturmasını ve tiranlar, kana susamışlık ve taht gaspçıları hakkında düşünmesini gerektigini vurgulayarak, bunu nasıl başardığını da inceliyor. Jawad al- Assadi, farklı kültürler, gelenekler ve sosyal din kavramları nedeniyle Hamletin farklı yorumlama anlayışını ortaya koymaktadır. Çalışma, kültür ve miras alışverişi yoluyla milletler arasındaki boşlukları kapatmak için kutsal metinlerin daha fazla uyarlanmasının önünü açıyor. Çalışma, iki eseri kültür, olay örgüsü, tema, yapı, üslup ve karakter açısından ele almaktadır. Jawad al- Assadi Arap siyasi liderlerin çıkarları için kullandıkları slogan “Olmak ya da olmamak” şiarının etkisiyle yıllarını sürgünde geçiren birçok kişiden biridir. İlki eski rejim tarafından, ikincisi ise kendi istegi ileiki kez sürgün hayatı yaşamıştır.. “Hamlet'i Unut” yazdıktan sonra, dünyayı dolaşıp batıya ve doğuya Hamlet yerine Claudius tarafından temsil edilen barbarlara ve tiranlara odaklanmamız gerektigini vurgulayarak,oyunu kültürel uyarlaması ileörgülatiyor. Forget Hamlet ile, ikincil karakterlere kendilerini ifade etmeleri gerektigini, Claudius ve dünyadaki tüm acımasız yöneticilere karşı, acı çektiklerini dile getirmeleri için eşit bir şans vermeyi amaçlıyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler : Kültür, çeviri, uyarlama, Shakespeare'in Hamlet eseri, Jawad al-Assadi'nin Unut Hamlet eseri.

ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION

Title of the Thesis	A CASE STUDY OF CULTURE AND TRANSADAPTATION OF SHAKESPEARE HAMLET IN JAWAD AL-ASSADI'FORGET HAMLET
Author of the Thesis	Ali Mahmood Abbas ABBAS
Supervisor of the Thesis	Prof. Dr. Abdul Serdar ÖZTÜRK
Status of the Thesis	Master's Degree
Date of the Thesis	26.01.2022
Field of the Thesis	English Literature
Place of the Thesis	KBU/LEE
Total Page Number	121
Keywords	Culture, translation adaptation, trans-adaptation, Shakespeare's Hamlet, Jawad Al-Assadi's Forget Hamlet

ARŞİV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ

Tezin Adı	JAWAD AL-ASSADI NİN'FORGET HAMLET ESERİNDE SHAKESPEARE HAMLET ESERİNİN KÜLTÜR VE UYARLAMAYA İLİŞKİN BİR VAKA İNCELEMESİ
Tezin Yazarı	Ali Mahmood Abbas ABBAS
Tezin Danışmanı	Prof. Dr. Abdul Serdar ÖZTÜRK
Tezin Derecesi	Yuksek Lisans
Tezin Tarihi	26.01.2022
Tezin Alanı	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Tezin Yeri	KBU/LEE
Tezin Sayfa Sayısı	121
Anahtar Kelimeler	Kültür, çeviri, uyarlama, Shakespeare'in Hamlet eseri, Jawad al-Assadi'nin Unut Hamlet eseri.

ABBREVIATIONS

SL: Source Language

TL: Target Language

TT: Target Text

ST: Source Text

ALCC: Arab League's Cultural Committee

SA: Standard Arabic

CA: Classical Arabic

ALECSO: Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization

SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH

This study aims at exploring the reasons behind people's understanding of the adaptation method as a strategy in the translation process and their tendency towards adaptation rather than translation, especially in *Hamlet* adaptation.

PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this study is to understand and explain the reasons behind people's tendency of using adaptation as a method in re-writing classic texts in general and Shakespeare in specific. The importance of this research is to provide sharp ideas for why the newly created strategies were initiated to transform from the source texts to the target audience. Furthermore, it elaborates on the effects of this newly initiated method, which makes translation more interesting and acceptable.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

This study uses literature review as a method to collect data and the theory of adaptation by Linda Hutcheon as a tool to analyze the collected data and obtain a conclusion. Both literature review and theory of adaptation are discussed in detail in the first chapter of this study.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH/RESEARCH PROBLEM

Various scholars confirm that Shakespeare's works have been damaged during the process of translation as they fail to transfer the Shakespearean spirit and theme to the audience. Culture, translation, and adaptation are three coined terms, which need to be understood separately, but when translators of Shakespeare's works resorted to re-writing Shakespeare, the end result has always been lifeless and spiritless texts. The new style emerged with the improvement of translation research to use a range of strategies, like adaptation, re-writing, and even trans-adaptation in the equal textual content to attain the supposed message. Thus, this study implies that mixing translation and adaptation in a new approach referred to as trans-adaptation is the future of transcultural literary works. There are no sacred texts; all texts have to be re-written and reshaped to go well with the cutting-edge temper, culture, and environment.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS / DIFFICULTIES

The study is concerned with the analysis and discussion of two plays, namely *Hamlet*, Prince of Denmark by William Shakespeare, and *Forget Hamlet* by Jawad Al-

Assadi. It uses the comparative and the cultural approaches as a springboard for its discussion. As this study is restricted to the two plays, namely Shakespeare's Hamlet and Jawad al-Assadi's Forge Hamlet, the results cannot be generalized to include all Shakespeare's plays or all Jawad's adaptations of classical plays



INTRODUCTION

A literary work is like an iceberg; one percent stays on the surface and the other nine percent is hidden under the water. This fact is what can be applied to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. *Hamlet*, the Prince of Denmark, is Shakespeare's most translated and adapted play. It has been translated to most of the world's languages, including the Arabic language. *Hamlet* was written around 1599-1601 CE and Shakespeare wants to show us through *Hamlet* the ideological, political, and social clashes during the Renaissance¹ period. The era was enriched with many of Shakespeare's journeys and it took a long time to reach the Arabic world, but the French Invasion of the Arabic world brought his works together.

Shakespeare's plays have been known to Arab audiences since the late nineteenth century. They entered through the French, not as literary works but as script fodder for the Egyptian stage, where francophone Syro-Lebanese immigrants adapted Shakespeare's tragedies to suit the states and theatre-going habits of a rapidly emerging urban middle class (Litvin, 2019, p. 1).

The new generations of Arabic scholars, translators, audiences, and dramatists started to take Shakespeare's works from their original English texts. The direct translations, adaptations, and stage performances have led to the appearance of two different trends in receiving Shakespeare's works, especially his tragedies. The first trend was represented by the Arab politicians, who exploited *Hamlet* for their national interests. They used *Hamlet* as a political motto to hide their failures on one hand and their permanent eagerness for power and ruling the ruined states on the other hand. The second trend was represented by the Arabic scholars and the Arabic audiences, who were mostly from the middle class, for whom *Hamlet* was the rescuer and the long waited Hero who may confront the tyrants and oppressors.

These two trends have continued side by side until the beginning of the 21st century when new concepts are formed, including different topics, such as Shakespeare's tragedies and their performance on stages to suit the dramatic and rapid changes witnessed by the Arabic region. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is the history of the whole era; it pictures vividly the ideological, social, and cultural hidden struggle among the society's classes. It is not a mere revenge tragedy as some critics argue about it. A deep study of

¹The Renaissance is a reformation period (15th – 16th century) of European history that means a transition from the Middle age to modernity.

Hamlet enables the individual to think seriously about everything around us, starting with oneself and ending with the question of life, death, reality, loyalty, self-identity, and power. *Hamlet* is relevant even nowadays although it was written 400 years ago. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* deals with certain norms and values that are considered valuable and cultural principles in every society and even at present. As Marvin W. Hunt states in his book *Looking for Hamlet*:

William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is an unlikely masterpiece—crowded, ungainly, gratuitous, and impossibly long, more than twice the typical length of a play from the period. Uncut, it runs more than four hours on the stage. At 212 minutes, William Wyler's screen epic *Ben-Hur: A Tale of the Christ* comes in well under the running time of the uncut *Hamlet*. A play so long and so old—written more than four hundred years ago—would seem of improbable interest to us. Furthermore, though it ends in mass violence, for much of *Hamlet* not much happens" (Hunt, 2007, p. 1).

Hamlet was living in a society dominated by the patriarchs. Hamlet himself blames Ophelia for being so submissive and obedient to her father Polonius and is restricted as well as terrified by the ghost of his dead father. He is obedient to him even after his death. The permanent instructions and urging Hamlet to avenge his father spoiled the young son's life, and it even turned Hamlet's life into an endless hell. Hamlet has many reasons for his delay in taking revenge; among them is the religious motif; he does not want to solve a sin by committing another sin and live the rest of his life in a continuous anxietylike Claudius.

Hamlet keeps on seeking evidence for condemning the true murderer. Andrew Cecil Bradley, in his famous book *Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth*, argues that although Hamlet tries to avoid committing an unwanted crime, ultimately he is driven to kill the old Polonius, who was spying on Hamlet. Therefore, he got the right punishment. "Hamlet, recoiling from the rough duty of revenge, is pushed into blood-guiltiness he never dreamed of, and forced at last on the revenge he could not will. His adversary's murders, and no less his adversary's remorse, bring about the opposite of what they sought" (Bradley, 1992, p. 20).

It is considered a great misinterpretation to think that Hamlet is not more than a young tragic man who is unable to take a suitable decision at the right time because of being a man of imagination and thinking rather than action. Although Shakespeare adapted his tragedy from the former tragedies, it does not resemble the Elizabethan tragedies except for its outward framework. Shakespeare wanted his tragedy to be a new

type of tragedy that embeds his concept of tragedy. Harold Bloom in his book *Bloom's Guides: Hamlet*, states explicitly

The largest mistake we can make about the play, *Hamlet*, is to think that it is the tragedy of a man who could not make up his mind, because (presumably) he thinks too much. Though Shakespeare adopts the subgenre of revenge tragedy, his drama has only superficial resemblances to other Elizabethan and Jacobean visions of revenge (Bloom, 2004, p. 7).

In the same book, Bloom exposes what Nietzsche also observed about *Hamlet's* tragedy and states "Nietzsche, in the spirit of *Hamlet*, observed that we only can find words for that which is already dead in our hearts, so that there always is a kind of contempt in the act of speaking" (Bloom, 2004, p. 8). Shakespeare uses his characters to raise some philosophical, existential, and bewildering questions concerning human life, mind, and existence which were used to be asked at that time and passed down to the present time. These questions and inquiries revolve around humans. What is a human? What is the secret behind existence, and what is the system that enables humans to understand or know themselves and others?

These persistent doubts form a chaotic atmosphere for human beings resemble the darkness and fearful situation for the guards, who are on watch around in Elsinore Castle. They are waiting for the unknown enemy at any time in the darkness and the cold weather. The fear makes them inquire about the newcomers although they are certain about being friends. It became impossible for them to differentiate between friends and enemies due to the darkness and the anarchy. Even their words are not coherent; they utter them haphazardly without any sense or feeling. These are very well depicted by Shakespeare in the opening scene of *Hamlet*:

Bernardo:	Who's there?
Francisco:	Nay, answer me. Stand, and unfold yourself.*
Bernardo:	Long live the king!
Francisco:	Bernardo?
Bernardo:	He
Francisco:	You come most carefully upon your hour.*
Bernardo:	'Tis now struck twelve; get thee to bed, Francisco.
Francisco:	For this relief much thanks. 'Tis bitter cold, and I am sick at heart.
Bernardo:	Have you had a quiet guard?
Francisco:	Not a mouse stirring (Shakespeare, 1968, p. 1).

A deeper understanding of these lines exposes what turmoil those people are experiencing through their discourse, as well as the agitation and anxiety caused by the darkness and cold fearful night. They feel the situation although they predict that something is going on around them, but they are unable to determine it exactly because of the thick darkness. Therefore, one is not safe till declaring loyalty to the Monarch. With "unfold yourself", he means to identify yourself to be safe. Through the dialogue between the two guards, Shakespeare portrays the whole state's condition and how all the populace are in a chaotic mood, even though they cannot control their words. Shakespeare draws his picture perfectly. He tells us about all the details of the battlefield and the elements of that military tension that dominate the Elsinore castle after the killing of the King, Old Hamlet.

So Shakespeare opens his plays with this utter dark, fearful and cold night. All these words inspire an inactive sense, referring to unwilling events. The play starts with the news of the death of Old Hamlet and predicts more deaths. "With mirth in funeral and with dirge in marriage. In equal scale weighing delight and dole, Taken to wife: nor have we herein barr'd your better wisdoms, which have freely gone with this affair along: for all, our thanks" (Shakespeare, 2006, pp. 1.2.6-16).

Claudius is busy with his sensual and political affairs; he is so indifferent to the populace. What he wants to defend and preserve is the throne and the Queen for his sensual desires. Claudius is a cunning schemer with a honey tongue, and an eloquent individual, who smoothly persuades his opponents. Through the crowning ceremony, he pretends to show the populace that the hastening in the process of his marriage to Queen Gertrude is to keep the stability of the monarch and the security of the state of Denmark. Then, Claudius cunningly draws the attention of the attendees to the threats and troubles that the young Fortinbras may pester the whole state of Denmark.

Now follows, that you know, young Fortinbras,
Holding a weak supposal of our worth,
Or thinking by our late dear brother's death
Our state to be disjoint and out of frame,
Colleagued with the dream of his advantage,
He hath not fail'd to pester us with message,
Importing the surrender of those lands
Lost by his father, with all bands of law,
To our most valiant brother. So much for him (Shakespeare, 2006, 1.2.17-25).

Claudius the silver-tongued speaker continues in deceiving the poor people pledging that the state of Denmark encounters great threats from Norway represented by the young Fortinbras. Then, he starts to attract Hamlet's interest by addressing Hamlet "but now, my cousin Hamlet, and my son...". Hamlet on the contrary does not feel any affection towards Claudius, although he addresses Hamlet by my son. Hamlet abhors Claudius for being his father's murderer and the one who deprived him from reaching the throne by his incestuous marriage to Queen Gertrude. Claudius plans to win Hamlet's trust to fortify his power. Thus, the monarch is busy with their internal affairs, neglecting the populace's priority. Shakespeare, within these two scenes, successfully painted the condition of the society, the cultural norms, the religious debates, and the political ideology of the whole era.

Back to the point of Elsinore castle, Shakespeare intends to show us the condition of those who are missing the king, Old Hamlet. They are missing their king, but at the same time, they show total preparedness to defend the state and keep its stability. However, one should ask as Bradley raises an inquiry about the reason behind Shakespeare's use of the 'Ghost' in *Hamlet*, "what is the effect of the appearance of the Ghost?" He continues in his inquiry "and, in particular, why does Shakespeare make this Ghost so majestic a phantom, giving it that measured and solemn utterance" (Bradley, 1992, p. 147).

It is possible that what Myron Stagman confirms in her book *The Mystery of Hamlet: A Solution* is one of the most important effects of the appearance of the 'Ghost' of king Old Hamlet. Stagman states;

The Ghost of King Hamlet suffers in hellfire for foul crimes committed in my days of nature. Hamlet pities the Ghost, and Shakespeare stresses this pity. Thus, Hamlet learns that a soul suffers in hellfire for unconscionable acts committed on earth, and takes it to heart (Stagman, 2010, p. 126).

Shakespeare uses the 'Ghost' as an instructor for Hamlet. He always warns Hamlet of the punishment afterlife and instills in Hamlet's mind and soul the concept of revenge, which Hamlet is not content with. The 'Ghost's' appearance deepens Hamlet's inner conflict and increases his anxiety, which results in an unbearable hesitating in fulfilling the revenge. What Shakespeare intends in *Hamlet* is to portray the whole Elizabethan era through Hamlet. He burdens his shoulders with the responsibility of

representing the ideological and religious conflict that he witnessed at that time. He uses the 'Ghost ' to represent the ongoing debate about the concept of 'Ghost'.

The populace in the Elizabethan era was not concurrent with the concept of the 'Ghost' due to different religious interpretations of the 'Ghost'. Nearly in all cultures, the ghost appears as a soul or a spirit of the murdered victims in the Elizabethan era, where the playwrights use it to utilize this technique in their plays. Shakespeare, in *Hamlet*, exploits this technique differently. He manipulates this technique to show the audience the continuous debate about the existence of ghosts. Shakespeare intends through *Hamlet* to show the importance of the concept of the ghost, and at the same time, he leads the populace to reach a kind of content about the problematic and complex concept of the ghost.

Shakespeare has not shown any inclination towards any of the two popular religious groups of his time. A close analysis of Shakespeare's lines makes one understand that Shakespeare is inclined towards Catholicism rather than Protestantism.

The ghost's suffering reinforces Hamlet's fear of sin and punishment in the afterlife. His father was a good man, but his spirit is doomed to undergo horrible torments. If these are his father's sufferings, what might Hamlet be if he commits a sin greater than any of what his father has been guilty? He will not be a good son if he does not secure revenge, but to be “an avenger is to descend into the arena with the Claudiuses of the World”, to become like them, and to experience intense self-loathing and fear of divine retaliation (Paris, 1991, p. 43).

As the main focus of this study is on analyzing transadaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Arabic and the introduction of Shakespeare in the Arab world, the first chapter of the study lays the foundation of the study. The researcher explains the research methodology and the method that was used to conduct this study. The readers need to have some basic knowledge and understanding of the main concepts used throughout the study. The second chapter defines and compares the terms and the concepts connected to culture, language, translation, and adaptation.

The fourth chapter explains the historical journey of Shakespeare through the Arab world, how Shakespeare was introduced, and how he was received with a special

focus on Hamlet with the help of its translations and adaptation. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Jawad al-Assadi's adaptation *Forget Hamlet* have been under discussion for decades since the latter came into existence. The fourth chapter elaborates on the tension between the scholars on how to categorize Jawad al-Assadi's *Forget Hamlet*. The last chapter concludes the topic with an in-depth analysis.



Research Methodology And Literature Review

Translation and adaptation studies are an extremely important field of studies to bridge the gap between different cultures, societies, ethnicities, nations, and civilizations. To keep the evolution process continue and develop the ideas, we need to have a better communication that connects the past to the present. Translation and adaptation work is a bond to strengthen intercultural and interlingual ties. They do not work independently, but they are based on an interdisciplinary approach. A translator or an adaptor needs to be aware of anthropology, cultural studies, gender studies, linguistics, history, literature, semiotics, philosophy, and many others.

The main objective of this study is to analyze the arrival of William Shakespeare as an author to the Arab world and the way Arab scholars, playwrights, and audiences treated him. Scholars have always argued about the difference between translation, adaptation, and trans-adaptation; therefore, this study focuses on understanding the differences between them. Along with this, the study will also explore the reasons behind the cultural and religious influences that played an important role in translating, adapting, and transadapting Shakespeare's Hamlet. To have a better understanding of the topic, the researcher will focus on answering one main question:

1. Why transadaptation is not translation?

As well as four supplementary questions:

- a. How do the Arabs view adapting Shakespeare's Hamlet?
- b. What changes did Jawad al-Assadi make to Shakespeare's Hamlet in the process of transferring from page to stage?
- c. What are the reasons behind the cultural and religious changes?
- d. What textual characteristics of Shakespeare are preserved in Jawad al-Assadi's Forget Hamlet?

Methodology

According to M. D. Myers and D. A. Avison, conducting a study is a strategy to inquire about a specific issue, problem or matter through research designs and collecting different types of data (Myers & Avison, 2002). In general, research is a continuous process of finding alternatives and possibilities. Social Science and Humanities experts

believe that the best and most suitable practical method to research in these fields is the qualitative method (Mack & Woodsong, 2005).

Research helps us explore a deeper understanding and meaning of a particular context through different methods. This study uses a combination of 'Adaptation Theory' and 'Literature Review.' Theory of Adaptation is a way of developing creative adaptation, and it considers that story-telling is incomplete without it. Besides, this theory considers story-telling the most important tool to share new ideas and teach each other about different cultures; it explains the functionality of adaptation (Hutcheon, 2006).

Once the research question is set and the research is ready to be conducted, there are numerous ways of collecting data and analyzing them to get the desired result. The research method selected to be used for specific research depends on the objectives of the study. In this study, the literature review is used as a research method, and the Theory of Adaptation is used to analyze the collected data. The literature review is one of the most common tools to research in the field of Social Science and Humanities. Through literature review, researchers can collect data by analyzing, reviewing, and comparing already existing research literature. It helps researchers identify the main research works and theories as well as gaps between the previous studies (Bhattacharjee, 2012). Many people have written about Shakespeare and his journey to the Arab world and many people have critically analyzed Jawad al-Assadi's adaptation *Forget Hamlet*, but I have selected some important scholars whose work is important for this study. Below, I will explain why these authors are important for this research work.

Literature Review

Before the arrival of Shakespeare's literary works to the Arab world, Arab culture was unaware and unexposed to the theatrical drama and there was always the potential for controversies and strange experiments. Jawad al-Assadi's adaptation *Forget Hamlet* was one of those experiments that received much criticism from other scholars and critics, and because of its controversial nature and strange adaptation, it plays the central role in this study. Contrary to the original character of Hamlet, Al-Assadi's Hamlet is weak, indecisive, and ineffective. Therefore, it is the main focus of this study.

A Lebanese poet and author called Mutran Khalil Mutran, who later made Egypt his second homeland, and a Palestinian-Iraqi writer called Jabra Ibrahim Jabra are two most debated literary figures in the Arab literary world in relation to Shakespeare's translated or transadapted works. To understand the controversy between translation and adaptation, the researcher analyzes the texts "Religious Culture in Mutran's and Jabra's Translation of Shakespeare's Hamlet" by A. J. Assi (2018), "Translation and Intertextual Space: The Religious Intertextuality of Islam in the Translation of Hamlet by Jabra Ibrahim Jabra" by S. S. Qaddoumi (2018) and "Decommercialising Shakespeare Mutran's Translation of Othello" by S. Hanna (2019).

Margaret Litvin, Katherine Hennessey, and Marvin Carlson are among those authors who worked extensively on Shakespeare and his adaptations in the Arab world. This study uses a number of her literary work to benefit from them, including *Shakespeare and the Arab World* (2019), "Multilateral Reception: Three Lessons from the Arab Hamlet Tradition" (2017), *Four Arab Hamlet* (2015), *Hamlet's Arab Journey* (2011), and "The French Source of the Earliest Surviving Arabic Hamlet" (2011).

William Shakespeare's writings in general and Hamlet, in particular, are the most famous pieces of literature since the 15th century. Scholars, philosophers, and critics from around the globe have tried to write about the humanistic, psychological, and political aspects of Hamlet. Thus, this study explores the works of renowned authors and analyzes their understanding of Hamlet as a play and a character. *Shakespeare: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* by Edward Dowden (2009), "Hamlet in Arabic" by M. F. Al-Shetawi (1999), *Characters of William Shakespeare's Plays* by W. Hazlitt (2009),

Looking for Hamlet by M. W. Hunt (2007), “Allusion in Three Translations of Hamlet into Arabic” by O. I. Khalifa (2016), and “The Metamorphosis of Hamlet in Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's Translation” by M. F. A. Tajdin (2005) are the key works that will accompany this research process.

As translation, adaptation, and transadaptation of William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Arabic language and Arab culture are the main themes of this study, it is important to dig deeper into the theory of adaptation and nitty-gritty of translation. Therefore, along with the *Theory of Adaptation* by L. Hutcheon (2006), this study will also use *Theories of Translation* by A. I. Ilyas (1989), *Meaning Based Translation* by M. L. Larson (1988), Peter Newmark's *Approaches to Translation* (2001), and *A Text Book of Translation* (1988). Eugene Nida's *Language, Culture, and Translating* (1993), the *Theory and Practice of Translation* (1982), and *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964), as well as Juliane House's *Translation: The Basics* (2018), *Translation as Communication Across Language and Culture* (2016), *Translation Quality Assessment Past and Present* (2015) and *Translation* (2009) are part of this study.

Research is a complex phenomenon, and to achieve the desired results and credibility, it needs an intensive literature review analysis. During this research journey, along with the above-mentioned literary works, the researcher used various other books, articles, and online materials to obtain a conclusion. It is difficult to mention every source that was used during this research, but the followings are a few prominent sources: *Translation, Adaptation, and Transformation* by L. Raw (2012), *Meaning Across Cultures* by E. N. Reyburn (1981), *Adaptation and Appropriation* by J. Sanders (2006), *Shakespeare's Wordplay* by M. Mahood (2003), *Shakespeare: The Tragedies* by N. Marsh (1998), *Shakespeare's Philosophy* by C. McGinn (2006), and many others.

1. CHAPTER ONE Culture, Translation, And Adaptation

Translation, culture, and language are the tripartite overlapping inseparable concepts. There are no distinct boundaries capable of separating these three elements from each other. Understanding this mutual interaction among this triangle one has to have prior knowledge about them, but it is important to be aware that these concepts are very ambiguous. Taylor's culture definition has attracted the attention of numerous scholars. Besides, Edward Dowden views culture as a complex system that includes a variety of things, such as knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, customs, and many other abilities, as well as customs and habits that humans acquire from a society (Dowden, 2020).

1.1 Culture: Concept and Definition

The term of culture is one of the most complex, complicated, and problematical terms, around which a lot of controversy and debates revolve. The controversy over the definition of culture is deep-rooted. Everybody sees the culture through his binoculars. Therefore, there is no consensus on the term culture among the theorists and scholars. In general, some scholars and specialists consider the term culture a comprehensive word that includes customs, traditions, values, and religious beliefs. Others believe that culture is an umbrella that covers food, items of clothing, greetings, religion, and all lifestyles of the society. In this domain, Merriam-Webster Dictionary classifies the definition of culture as:

- A. The customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious, or social group.
- B. A set of shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterizes an institution or an organization.
- C. A set of values, conventions, or social practices associated with a particular field, activity, or societal characteristic.
- D. The integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief, and behavior that depend upon the capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations.

(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2021)

Culture is a broad concept that covers all the above-mentioned definitions. In the light of what has been mentioned above, E. T. Hall views culture as the most complicated concept which has various definitions.

Culture has many definitions, and it affects everything people do in their society because of their ideas, values, attitudes, and normative or expected patterns of behavior. Culture is not genetically inherited, and cannot exist on its own, but is always shared by members of a society (Hall, 1976, p. 6).

Similarly, some other scholars define culture as “a system of people, places, and practices that shows up in ways of acting that reflect shared and contested beliefs and values” (Raeff et al., 2020, p. 298). It seems it is impossible to set fixed boundaries around the term culture. That is, it is not possible to draw specific boundaries for what culture includes. It overlaps with language, customs, traditions, and religious beliefs, in addition to being intertwined with methods of greeting and exchanging respecting expressions, as well as the way of wearing, dressing, eating, and even the vocabulary of daily life.

Although Dowden, as an anthropologist, in his comprehensive definition of culture did not let out any cultural elements, scholars still adopt different views of the problematic concept of culture. This different understanding of the culture clearly appears in Fons Trompenaars's view as he admits “in the 25 years we have seldom encountered two or more groups or individuals with identical suggestions regarding the concept of culture” (Trompenaars, 1993,1997, p. 21). However, Clifford Geertz’s definition of the concept of culture looks a little bit different in its content:

Culture denotes an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about attitudes toward life (Geertz, 1993, p. 89).

Culture, according to Peter Newmark, is everything except language. Newmark is considered as one of the most opponents to those who believe that language is the most essential component of culture. For Peter Newmark, culture is “the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression” (Newmark, 1988, p. 94). Since different views of the problematic concept of culture exist, it is extremely difficult to find two similar definitions of it. For instance, David Katan thinks:

Originally, culture was simple. It referred exclusively to the humanist ideal of what was civilized in a developed society (the education system, the arts, architecture). Then a second meaning, the way of life of a people, took place alongside. Emphasis at the time was very much on 'primitive' cultures and tribal practices. With the development of sociology and cultural studies, a third meaning has emerged, related to forces in society or ideology (David, 2009, p. 74).

In line with David Katan, Julian House views the concept of culture in a more thoughtful mode:

Whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its [i.e. a society's] members, and do so in any role that they accept for any one of themselves [...] culture is not a material phenomenon; it does not consist of things, people, behavior, or emotions. It is rather an organization of these things. It is the forms of things that people have in mind, their model of perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting them (House, 2016, p. 40).

Besides, M. Salehi, who is a very famous anthropologist, explains in a different definition:

Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiment in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional(i.e., historically derived selected) ideas and especially their attached values. Culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other hand, as conditioning elements of future action (Salehi, 2012, p. 77).

The question, "what is culture?" has been rolling for a long time in the mind of all scholars of the translation field. One of those scholars is Alessandro Duranti, who tries in his interesting book *Linguistic Anthropology* to answer the traditional inquiry about "what is culture?" stating "culture is that of something learned, transmitted, passed down from one generation to the next, through human actions, often in the form of face-to-face interaction, and, of course, through linguistic communication" (Duranti, 1997, p. 24). Based on the above-mentioned definition, one can perceive that Duranti is one of the language pro scholars and he believes that language and culture are interrelated twines. Duranti claims that culture is not a genetic issue; it is acquired through experiences and learned from human actions and communication. For Duranti, language is the main factor in shaping and forming the culture.

From a different perspective, the researcher, Hasan Ghazala, considers culture as "the most difficult problem of translation", so he defines culture as "the umbrella under which come many things in a society, including language. So language is an integral part of the culture as clearly stated in the encyclopedia of Britannica" (Ghazala, 2008, p. 194).

The concept of culture anthropologically refers to different ways of acquired behavior through teaching, which is resulted from the social interaction to the individuals. As a matter of fact, culture meets their sociological and psychological needs. Culture is reflected to the life of human beings to the fact that these ways make human to adopt it according to its desires and expectations, gaining new behavior to foster a suitable life in the society (Alquraishy, 2018, p. 167).

Another anthropologist, Cristina-Mihaela Botîlcă, thinks “culture can be defined as being a part of multiple social dimensions” (Botîlcă, 2021, p. 143).

1.2 Culture and Language

Culture, language, and translation are the three intertwined concepts and they have generated interesting debates over the years. A widespread argument has been held on these three concepts. However, there is not any kind of agreement among scholars on these ambiguous concepts. Consequently, various definitions appeared among scholars, and they viewed the topic from different perspectives. Edward Sapir, who is an anthropologist from the US, thinks “language more or less faithfully reflects the culture and whose purposes it serves. It is perfectly true that the history of language and the history of culture move along parallel lines” (Sapir, 1921, p. 219).

Taking this discussion a step further, Sapir asserts “language has a setting [...] does not exist apart from culture, that is, from the socially inherited assemblage of practices and beliefs that determines the texture of our lives” (Sapir, 1921, p. 208). With this line of thought, C. Hongwei explains “it is no exaggeration to say that language is the life-blood of culture and that culture is the track along which language forms and develops” (Hongwei, 1999, p. 122). In this regard, Hongwei believes that language has a great role in shaping the culture model. Moreover, he asserts “language mirrors other parts of culture, supports them, spreads them and helps to develop others” (Hongwei, 1999, p. 121).

There are different understandings of the nature of the relationship between language and culture. Some scholars believe in the indispensability of the interrelation between language and culture, whereas others insist firmly on the irrelevancy of such an intertwined relationship. This notion is given credence by Claire Kramsch, who asserts:

In the dyad 'language and culture', language is not a bunch of arbitrary linguistic forms applied to a cultural reality that can be found outside of language, in the real world.

Without language and other symbolic systems, the habits, beliefs, institutions, and monuments that we call culture would just observable realities, not cultural phenomena. To become a culture, they have to have meaning. It is the meaning that we give to food, gardens and ways of life that constitute culture” (Kramersch, 2013, p. 62).

Regarding the interrelated relationship between culture and language, Selma Elyildirim in her research “The Importance of Cultural Knowledge in Translation” points out “the importance of cultural knowledge in comprehending and translating the texts loaded with cultural references. Considering the fact that language and culture are interwoven”(Elyildirim, 2008, p. 1). She also elaborates

The relationship between language and culture is undoubtable; thus, language cannot be understood without a cultural context, and culture cannot exist and be spread without language. Hence, language is the core issue of culture; both of them are necessary for their existence (Elyildirim, 2008, p. 13).

Another point that is worth mentioning concerning the intertwined relationship between language and culture is M. L. Larson's understanding of this topic. He believes

Culture is surely the main core of language since it is the main source of all the changes and developments in the growth of all-natural languages. Languages and culture are closely interrelated. This is a fact generally accepted because language reflects various aspects of culture (Larson, 1984, p. 432).

According to the above-mentioned definitions of language and culture, it is obvious that translation scholars are divided among themselves into different trends. Some of them consider language as the main core of culture, whereas others regard language as a linguistic element separated from culture. Although no one can definitely deny the existence of a kind of interrelationship between language and culture, some scholars oppose strongly linking language to culture. For instance, Peter Newmark the prominent pioneer in translation discipline, affirms “I do not regard language as a component or feature of culture” (Newmark, 1988, p. 95).

Moreover, he confirms “if it were so, translation would be impossible” (Newmark, 1988, p. 95). This concept is also supported by Ghazala “one of the best, clearest, simplest and most straightforward definitions of culture is provided by Peter Newmark” (Ghazala, 1995, 2008, p. 94). Similar to Newmark, Ghazala views culture “as way of life” and believes that the status of the language within the culture is like the status of the heart within the body. He adds that the translators who disregard the

existence of a mutual connection between language and culture will commit an unforgivable mistake (Ghazaala, 2008).

Within the same line of thoughts, Ghazala promotes Newmark's approach concerning language classification, and he successfully distinguishes three types of language, 1) cultural; 2) universal; and 3) personal. He explains the universal language as common words of neutral references, such as eat, speak, man, street, door, and so on. The personal language is a tool to express yourself in a personal way. For example, the use of your dialect or idiolect and the cultural language is what we will concentrate on as it is possibly the most difficult problem of translation (Ghazaala, 1995, 2008).

Taking this concept further, Komissarov states “language and culture are obviously the two dominant factors” (Komissarov, 1991, p. 33). Moreover, Komissarov believes that both culture and language play an essential role in the process of translation as well as communication. He asserts that a well understanding of the conveyed message leads to achieving total communication. He also confirms:

The cultural factor in translation is also undeniable if not so obvious. No communication is possible unless the message transmitted through speech utterance (or texts) is well understood by the communicants. But this understanding can be achieved only if the information contained in language units is supplemented by background knowledge of facts referred to in the message” (Komissarov, 1991, p. 33).

This concept is supported by Snell-Hornby, who affirms the existence of the intertwined relationship between language and culture and their vital role in the process of translation. Snell believes that language and culture are two indispensable twins and play an essential role in the process of translation (Snell-Hornby, 1988, 1992).

Snell- Hornby states “It has for centuries been taken for granted that translation mere takes place between languages. This assumption unleashed the word vs sense debate in traditional theory and lies at the heart of the concept of equivalence” (Snell-Hornby, 1988, 1992, p. 39). Snell argues that none of the previously mentioned definitions of translation is clear enough and refers to this point stating “language is not seen as an isolated phenomenon suspended in a vacuum but as an integral part of the culture” (Snell-Hornby, 1988, 1992, p. 39).

Hence, scholars started to focus on language and the related aspects of context. For example, Hans J. Vermeer, one of the pioneers and a leading figure in the translation field, opposes Newmark's concept of language and culture and their role in the translation process later on. Vermeer based his opposition on the foundation of his

definition of translation, where he states “I have defined translation as information offered in a language Z which imitates information offered in language A of culture A, to fulfil the desired function”. That implies:

A translation is not the transcoding of words or sentences from one language into another, but a complex action in which someone provides information about a text under new functional, cultural and linguistic conditions and in a new situation, whereby formal characteristics are imitated as far as possible” (Snell-Hornby, 1988,1992, p. 46).

Concerning this problematic relationship, K. R. Vermeer states:

The language of a particular society is an integral part of its culture, and that the lexical distinctions drawn by each language tend to reflect the culturally important features of objects, institution and activities in the society in which the language operates (Vermeer, 2013, p. 138).

1.3 Culture, Language and Translation

Translation is not only a tool of conveying a message from the SL (source language) to the TL (target language); the translation process includes transferring the meaning and the message in addition to the culture. In other words, the translator must be bilingual as well as bicultural. H. Vermeer holds the same view represented by the new dominant trend in translation studies. They advocate a new approach represented by the orientation towards cultural aspects of the text rather than the linguistic ones. In fact, it is an attempt to free translation from the traditional restricted boundaries of linguistics. This does not mean ignoring the linguistic aspects of the text but focusing on the cultural context of the text. H. Vermeer and some other translation experts opposed the scholars who ignored the cultural aspect of the text for decades without taking into account the existence of any interconnection between language and culture and their essential role in the process of translation (Vermeer, 1992).

From another perspective, Vermeer argues:

Translation involves linguistic as well as cultural phenomena and processes. Therefore, it is a cultural as well as linguistic procedure, and as language, now is understood as a specific language, it is part of a specific culture. Translation is to be understood as a ‘cultural’ phenomenon dealing with specific cultures: translation is a culture transcending process (Vermeer H. , 1992, p. 40).

Julian House views the interconnection between language, culture and translation from a different angle. She starts with the translation definition, "translation is not only a linguistic act, it is also an act of communication across cultures” (House, 2015, p.

3).House continues the argument that the successful translator needs to master the source language of the text in addition to the target language. He/she must know not both languages, but both cultures, too. House believes that both language and culture are mutually interconnected and they are indispensable. House's view stems from the former translation scholars, such as Eugene Nida.

House also states “in the process of Translation, therefore, not only the two languages but also the two cultures come into contact. In this sense, translating is a form of intercultural communication”(House, 2009, p. 12). With the same line of thoughts, Gideon Toury and Lawrence Venuti asserts “Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves as at least two languages and two cultural traditions, i.e., at least two sets of norm-systems on each level” (Toury, 2000, p. 200).

In relation to translation and culture, M. Akbari explains that translating consists of reproducing in the receptor language, the closest natural equivalent of source language message, first, in terms of meaning and secondly, in terms of style. Translation involving the transposition of thoughts expressed in one language by one social group into the appropriate expression of another group entails a process of cultural de-coding, re-coding, and en-coding (Akbari, 2013, p. 14).

As confirmed above by Toury, the process of translation involves two languages in addition to two cultures, and as language is an integral part of the culture, so no translation can be achieved with the absence of culture. Thus, Anthony Pym sums up this concept and reformulates it in a more concrete statement “The simplest fact of translation presupposes contact between at least two cultures. To look at translation is immediate to be engaged in issues of how cultures interrelate” (Pym, 2000, p. 2). Concerning the existence of language and culture and their essential role in the process of translation, Ghazala asserts:

A long time ago a vital link between language and culture was found by Von Humboldt, Sapir and Whorf, and that no language can exist unless it is rooted in the context of culture. In the same way, no culture can exist without having it Centre the structure of language (Ghazala, 2008, p. 193).

This notion is given credence by J. B. Casagrande, who points out “the attitudes and values, the experience and tradition of a people, inevitably become involved in the freight of meaning carried by a language. In effect, one does not translate LANGUAGES, one translate CULTURES” (Casagrande, 2012, p. 338). Mary Snell-

Hornby puts an end to this longitudinal debate about the role of culture and language in the process of translation. She corroborates Casagrande in his approach to culture and translation. They believe in the indispensability of culture and translation taking into account the indispensability of the cultural background of the text and its role in the process of translation. Hence, the inevitability of a relationship is beyond dispute.

Moreover, they assert that the translation process generally and cultural translation especially do not involve only two languages, but two cultures. So according to their approach, translators must be bicultural and bilingual. Snell-Hornby sums up this point of view stating:

The concept of culture as a totality of knowledge, proficiency and perception is fundamental in our approach to translation. If language is an integral part of the culture, the translator needs not only proficiency in two languages, he must also be at home in two cultures. In other words, he must be bilingual and bicultural. The extents of his knowledge, proficiency and perception determine not only his ability to produce the target text, but also his understanding of the source text (Snell-Hornby, 1988,1992, p. 42)

Concerning cultural differences and cultural gaps that result from these differences, scholars have different views and various strategies for solving these obstacles. Larson confirms this fact and explains “One of the most difficult problems in translating is found in differences between cultures” he goes on to add that “The people of a given culture look at things from their own perspectives. Many words, which look like they are equivalent are not. They have special connotations”(Larson, 1988, p. 149).

For example, although Christianity and Islam have a lot in common. They share numerous cultural concepts, but they also differ in some basic points. Both Christianity and Islam have a different perspective of the word ‘pig’. For the Christian society, it has a positive connotation, but the word pig has a very negative connotation for the Muslim society. Moreover, it is considered *haram*.² According to the Islamic legislation, it is a big sin to eat it.

Further, T. A. Assaqaf experienced cultural differences in the field and states,

To make the point clearer, I might give a funny example with my PhD supervisor, when he once told me, your mother is a cow. At the beginning, I was irritated and terribly shocked since the names of animals in general and cow in particular in Arabic culture is used to dispraise people. But, then I recognized that my dear professor did not mean it, but he meant to praise my mother for the good education she gave to me. He is Hindu. It

² It is an Arabic word, which means something forbidden, especially in the religious context.

is a well-known fact that in Hindu culture Cows are holy and dignified (Assaqaf, 2014, p. 784).

Translators and scholars follow different strategies in handling the pitfalls that arose through the process of Translation. Concerning the cultural differences and the obstacles that result from such cultural differences between the SL and the TL, Nida explains “differences between cultures may cause more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure”(Nida, 1964, p. 130). There are different approaches in rendering the source text into the target text. Translators adopt different strategies to surmount the challenges and problematical hinders and obstacles that arose during the process of translation.

A famous anthropologist and expert in the Chinese literature, Fernando Poyatos, claimed:

The three difficulties in rendering a text into the target language were the demands of 'faithfulness', 'elegance' and 'comprehensibility'. The quality of 'elegance' depends on the translator's artistic talent, 'comprehensibility' on his/her mastery of the target language, and 'faithfulness' on a thorough understanding of the literal and cultural content of the source text (Poyatos, 1997, p. 69).

Based on the translation definitions mentioned above, it seems clear that translation is not a mere transferring of the meaning and message of the source text into the target language. Moreover, it is not just finding the equivalent expression of the source text in the target text. The translation is, as Komissarov states, “an important vehicle for contacts. Translating from culture to culture means, first and foremost, to bring the receptors, new facts, and ideas inherent in the source language culture, to broaden their cultural horizons”. Komissarov's intention behind the widening receptors' cultural horizon is “to make them aware that other people may have different customs, symbols and beliefs, that other cultures should be known and respected”(Komissarov, 1991, p. 46).

A similar notion is asserted by Nida in a slightly different way. “The role of language within a culture and the influence of the culture on the meanings of words and idioms are so pervasive that scarcely any text can be adequately understood without careful consideration of its cultural background” (Nida E., 1993, p. 11). Since there are no two similar languages in the whole world, it is difficult to represent the same social reality in two languages “no two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered

as representing the same social reality. The world in which different societies live is distinct worlds not merely the same world with different labels attached”(Sapir, 1956, p. 69).

Another anthropologist, Y. B. Lotman, affirms “no language (in the full sense of the word) can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture, and no culture can exist which does not have, at its center, the structure of natural language” (Lotman, 1978, p. 212). Therefore, it seems based on the above-mentioned views that translation is not mere transferring of meaning and message of the source language text and replacing it with the target text. The core idea of translation is conveying the meaning of the text within the context and the culture that accompanies that text.

Such kind of transferring achieves the receptor’s approbation. Besides, it affirms that the main goal of translation is communication and more specifically intercultural communication. J. House mentions that the idea of ‘difference’ lies at the heart of translation, and this difference not only relates to the two languages involved in the acts of translation but also relates to the two cultures in which these languages are embedded (Katan, 2004). Therefore, we can say that translation is also an act of communication across cultures. Languages are culturally anchored in a way that they both express and shape the cultural reality.

The meanings of linguistic units – words, phrases, paragraphs, texts – can only be properly understood when considered within the cultural context in which they can be used (House, 2018). The linguistic items whether they are words or any other units should not be understood properly and sufficiently depend on their status in the text only. Ignoring the context of these elements and their cultural backgrounds leaves the target language receptors in a maze. Therefore, for a perfect translation and an understandable target text (TT) by the target language receptor, the translator has to be aware of both the SL and TL units and their proper cultural context of the texts. From a communication point of view, Susan Bassnett contends

Language, then, is the heart within the body of culture, and it is the interaction between the two that results in the continuation of life-energy. In the same way that the surgeon, operating on the heart, cannot neglect the body that surrounds it, so the translator treats the text in isolation from the culture at his peril (Bassnett, 1991, p. 23).

Based on the above-mentioned definitions of translation and culture language is regarded as a vital means of communication. Furthermore, the existence of the

indispensable connection between culture and language encourages the translators to pay more attention and consideration to the cultural backgrounds of texts. The translator, the unknown soldier, can surmount all the challenges and barriers that may arise through the process of translation. Mastering not only the source and target languages but also their cultures would be urgent demands for a successful translation.

Pitch falls that result from linguistic, cultural and syntax differences among languages may be solved through adopting various strategies. The following section will highlight some prominent pitch falls that face the translators through the process of translation between two different languages. We focus on English as a source language and Arabic as the target language. Although the English and Arabic languages are two different languages, the big gap between them can be bridged. Some cultural bound terms and expressions will be selected to show the differences between the two languages; English belongs to the indo- European language family, whereas the Arabic language has Semitic roots.

These two languages are grammatically, lexically, syntactically, and culturally different. Arabic is associated with the society, has its norms and specific cultural concepts, and is quite different from what is related to the English language and its society. Based on the above-mentioned facts about English and Arabic, translating from English into Arabic and vice versa involves mastering two languages and two cultures as well. Moreover, both the Arabic and English languages belong to two different settings and different time. These differences result in many challenges and cultural pitch falls that come across the process of translation from English into Arabic or vice versa. To sum up, these languages are culturally unrelated and alien. Since English and Arabic have so many differences, serious gaps and cultural unmatched expressions would result in the translation process. These cultural-bound expressions and unmatched cultural concepts cause great challenges for translators, especially novice translators.

1.4 Translation: Concept and Definition

Translation, in its simplest form, is the process of transferring a written or spoken text from one language called the source language (SL) into another language called the target language (TL). The product of this process is called the target text (TT). The translation phenomenon means conveying the meaning of the text of the source language into the target language taking into consideration the different lexical, cultural, and

contextual characteristics of both languages. Therefore, translators have to take into consideration both the text and its context.

The concept of translation differs from one person to another according to the individual's education, knowledge, and responsibility. More specifically, translation for the military official is a valuable weapon, while it is a precious asset for the merchants in commercial transactions. Thus, translation has been defined from early ages and its definition has witnessed dramatic changes due to time, place, and the purpose behind its usage. One of the relevant translation definitions is J. C. Catford's comprehensible definition which covers the whole process of translation.

Catford in his book *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* defines, translation, which is the most debated concept, as “an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another” (Catford, 1965, p. 1). In the second chapter of the same book, he defines the theory of translation in a more precise way to restrict it with certain linguistic elements. He states that translation may be defined as follows: “The replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)” (Catford, 1965, p. 20).

In his theory, Catford argues that translation is a process of replacing the meaning from a source language with a target language. He focuses on the existence of linguistic equivalence between the text in the source language (SL) and the target text (TT) (the product). In other words, he bases his assumptions on linguistic principles. Later on, Catford tries to make further distinctions between the two main keywords in his definition, namely textual material and equivalence. He redefines translation as:

Any TL form (text or portion of text) which is observed to be the equivalent of a given SL form (text or portion of text), and that portion of a TL text, which is changed when and only when a given portion of the SL text is changed (pp. 27-28).

Larson in his groundbreaking book *Meaning Based Translation* draws a wonderful frame for the definition of translation stating:

Translation is basically, a change of form. When we speak of the form of a language, we are referring to the actual words, phrases [...]. These forms are referred to as the surface structure of a language [...]. In translation the form of the source language is replaced by the form of the receptor (target) language (Larson, 1988, p. 3).

Nida coincides with Catford in the concept of traditional. Although Nida adopts the same assumption concerning the text equivalence principle, he opposes Catford in

considering translation as a science subject. Nida has embodied his new unique ideas about translation in his famous books *Toward a science of Translation* and *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. The impact of these works is flowering in Nida's definition of translation when he regards translation as “the transference of a message from one language to another is likewise a valid subject for scientific description” (Nida, 1964, p. 3).

Nida proposed a new concept of dynamic equivalence and his definition of translation in the latter parts is far away from Catford's assumptions. Nida defines translation as a process of reproducing “the closest natural equivalence of the source language (SL) message, first in term of meaning and second in term of style” (Nida, 1969 and 1982, p. 12). Besides, Nida views translation as an activity of reproducing the meaning and the message of the SL in the receptor language.

Newmark is considered one of the most prominent linguist group theorists. He is arebellion member of Catford and Nida linguistic group. Newmark diverges from them in his focus on text and text's meaning. According to Newmark, translation “is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text” (Newmark, 2001, p. 5). The core idea of Newmark's approach regarding the source text is that ST should be analyzed thoroughly. In Newmark's opinion, the ST is considered as the fountainhead of the transferred meaning to the receptor language. Based on this principle, Newmark counts translation “a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language” (Newmark, 2001, p. 7).

In line with the previous definitions of translation, the Dictionary of Translation Studies defines translation as an incredibly broad notion that can be understood in many different ways. For example, one may talk about translation as a process or a product, and identify such sub-types as a literary translation. It includes a technical translation, subtitling, and machine translation, while more typically, it just refers to the transfer of written texts. The term sometimes also includes interpreting (Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997, 2014). Furthermore, Jakobson defines translation as “an interpretation of verbal signs through some other language” (Jakobson, 1959, p. 233).

Jakobson classifies translation into three categories: intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic ones according to the language functions. In his groundbreaking text

On Linguistic Aspects of Translation, Jakobson states “a translation is a reported speech; the translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source. Thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes” (Jakobson, 1959, p. 233). However, Jiri Levy views translation from a different perspective and defines translation as “a process of communication whose objective is to import the knowledge of the original to the foreign reader” (Levy, 2000, p. 148).

Further, Roger Bell defines translation as “the replacement of a presentation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in the second language” (Bell, 1991, p. 20). This notion is given credence by Brislin stating:

The general term referring to the transfer of thoughts and ideas from one language (source) to another (target), whether the languages are in written or oral form; whether the languages have established orthographies or do not have such standardization or whether one or both languages is based on signs, as with sign languages of the deaf (Brislin, 1976, p. 1).

According to Roger Bell, translation is “the transformation of a text originally in one language into an equivalent text in a different language retaining, as far as is possible, the content of the message and the formal features and functions roles of the original text” (Bell, 1991, p. xv). Following the same line of thought, Ghazala believes that the core idea in the translation process is transferring the meaning and message of the text. So he affirms “translation generally refers to all the process and methods used to render and/or transfer the meaning of the source language text into the target language as closely, completely and accurately as possible” (Ghazala, 2008, p. 1).

Ghazala takes this concept further and states “we translate neither grammar, words, style nor sounds. [...] We always translate one thing only “MEANING”. Then he adds “meaning is a complicated network of language components comprised of Syntax (grammar), vocabulary (words), style, and Phonology (sounds)” (Ghazala, 2008, p. 2). A. I. Ilyas in his book *Theories of Translation* practically defines translation as an operation that is performed on languages (two or more) in which the source text is replaced by the target text based on the equivalence between both texts (lexis and grammar of the source text are replaced by equivalent lexis and grammar of the target language and the source language phonology or graphology). It is also consequently represented by the target language phonology or graphology (Ilyas, 1989, p. 19).

Taking this concept further, Al-Sulaimaan confirms that translation means finding the suitable equivalent item in the target language, which suits the source language text. He states:

Translation means replacing the source text (ST) in source language (SL) with the target text (TT) in the Target language (TL) taking as much as possible all the elements (e.g. lexical, syntactic, semantics, pragmatic, literary, textual, discoursal and cultural) of both languages into consideration (Al-Sulaimaan, 2016, p. 23).

Widening the above definitions J. House defines translation:

As the result of a linguistic-textual operation in which a text in one language is re-contextualized in another language. As a linguistic textual operation, translation is, however, subject to, and substantially influenced by, a variety of extra-linguistic factors and conditions. It is this interaction between 'inner' linguistic-textual and 'outer' extra-linguistic, contextual factors that makes translation such a complex phenomenon (House, 2015, p. 2).

In House's perspective, translation is not a mere "linguistic-contextual operation" nor is it reproducing a new text. Translation, according to House, is an interaction between the text of the source language and the created text in the target language. It is a replacement of the original source text in one language (SL) with the created text in the target language (TL) on a condition that the original text should be substituted by the second-best text. Therefore, translation, as mentioned above, can be a means of stretching the ways and bridging the gaps among different nations and cultures. It can also help in sharing and exchanging experiences (House, 2015).

Depending on the previous definitions of translation, the researcher considers that both Newmark and House's opinions concerning translation definition and translation studies cover all aspects of both fields of knowledge. They view translation and translation studies as independent disciplines. Although they overlap a lot with linguistics, still they are considered independent fields. Besides, both believe that translation is not only a mere "linguistic textual process" that focuses on text form and context in the translation process opposing the traditional concept of translation (Newmark, 1988, p. 5; House, 2015, p. 2).

They also coincide with Nida regarding the language and culture as two inseparable elements of successful translation. Nida believes that language and culture cannot be separated because culture is already embedded in language and the process of conveying the source text includes conveying the culture within the language (Nida,

1964). Based on the above-mentioned definitions of translation, translation can be summarized as a process of replacing the natural equivalent written text meaning and message from the source language into the target language. The translation is not a mere transferring process of conveying the message and meaning of a written text from one language into another language; it is an interpretation of the hidden message behind the text of the source language into another language.

The process of translation includes analyzing the content of the text and the intent of the written words of the text. Moreover, in translating the source language into the target language, we have to take into consideration the receptor who receives the source language text and the context of both the source language as well as the target language, and the translator to get the suitable and acceptable target text. Based on the examples of translation definitions above, it can be noticed that there is no unanimous agreement on the definition of the concept of translation. Translation theorists and scholars do not agree on the types, models, and strategies of the translation process. The following section highlights some prominent types of translation and certain strategies adopted by translation scholars.

1.5 Adaptation: Concept and Definition

Similar to the translation concept, there is no agreement on a certain definition of adaptation, but there are no boundaries between the two concepts. Many times, these two phenomena overlap with each other; therefore, scholars and theorists find it difficult to draw a line between them. The following section will define adaptation first and focus on what differentiates adaptation from translation. In addition, it exposes the excuses of the Arab scholars and translators for adopting adaptation strategy as the safest way of transferring Shakespeare's plays to the Arabic stage.

1.6 What is Adaptation?

Adaptation in its simplest form is a process of rewriting, reforming, and/or adjusting a certain text of a certain time and place to suit and fit the contemporary context and audience's mood. Some scholars represented by Peter Newmark consider adaptation as one of the translation strategies and he puts it in his V diagram about the methods and strategies used in the translation process. Moreover, Peter Newmark, in his book *A Textbook of Translation*, defines adaptation as the 'freest' form of translation. It is used mainly for plays (comedies and poetry; themes, characters, plots) that are usually

preserved, whereby the SL culture is converted to the TL culture and the text is rewritten. The deplorable practice of having a play or a poem literally translated and then rewritten by an established dramatist or a poet has produced many poor adaptations, but other adaptations have rescued plays. In his diagram, Peter Newmark tries to assert:

SL emphasis	TL emphasis
Word for word translation	Adaptation
Literal translation	Free translation
Faithful translation	Idiomatic translation
Semantic translation	Communicative translation

(Newmark, 1988, p. 63)

The everlasting debate about fidelity and infidelity still goes on in different forms and styles. Peter Newmark believes that each text has its context and changing this context results in changing the content and form of the text because of the new TL receivers. He suggests certain methods for each SL text because of the nature of the text and its context taking into consideration the context of the TL and its readers or audiences.

Newmark aims at showing us through his diagram the “word for word” method of translation versus “adaptation” strategy in translation. Oxford advanced learner Dictionary defines the controversial concept of adaptation as “a film/movie, book or play that is based on a particular piece of work but that has been changed for a new situation.” Therefore, to adapt a text means to change, adjust or make it suit a new circumstance or a context. Adaptation as a term in the Dictionary of Translation Studies is used to refer to any TT in which a particularly free translation strategy has been adopted. The term usually implies that considerable changes have been made in order to make the text more suitable for a specific audience (e.g. children) or for the particular purpose behind the translation (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, 2014, p. 3).

Scholars and theorists have various views concerning the adaptation concept and its problematic definition. For example, some theorists and scholars oppose considering adaptation as one of the translation strategies. Moreover, they argue that adaptation cannot be regarded as loyal to the source text. Mark Shuttleworth, in *The Dictionary of*

Translation Studies, characterizes adaptation “a type of pseudo-translation, or in other words not as ‘real’ translation at all.” (Shuttleworth& Cowie, 1997, p. 4). This kind of opposition to the concept of adaptation is preceded by the Bible translator Nida, who approaches adaptation from a different point of view. Nida and Taber consider adaptation as the same as Cultural Translation (Shuttleworth& Cowie, 1997).

Adaptation is associated with culture and language; therefore, translators adopt adaptation when they confront the challenges of the absence of the expressions and terms of the SL in the TL because of belonging to two different cultures or language family. All these reasons force the translator to adopt adaptation as a translation strategy. Similarly, Mona Baker defines adaptation

As a set of translative interventions, which result in a text that is not generally accepted as a translation, but is nevertheless recognized as representing a source text. As such, the term may embrace numerous vague notions such as appropriation, domestication, imitation, rewriting, and so on (Baker, 1998, p. 3).

However, theorists and scholars around the world have not reached a unanimous agreement on the definition of adaptation nor reached the real reason behind adopting adaptation or the types of adaptation. Some scholars consider adaptation as one of the several translation studies strategies. In this regard, Vainy and Darleblent’s definition is regarded as the best-known definition till now. They list all translation strategies, and adaptation is the seventh in their table of strategies. Viny and Darblent (1958) (as cited in Mona Baker, 1998), define adaptation;

A procedure, which can be used whenever the context referred to in the original text, does not exist in the culture of the target text, thereby necessitating some form of recreation. This widely accepted definition views adaptation as a local rather than global strategy employed to achieve an equivalence of situations wherever cultural mismatches are encountered (Baker, 1998, p. 3).

In a similar position, Julie Sanders defines adaptation as “an attempt to make text ‘relevant’ or easily comprehensible to new audiences and readerships via the processes of proximation and updating” (Sanders, 2006, p. 19). “The process of creating a meaning that aims to restore a communicational balance that would be broken by the process of translation” (Sanders, 2006, p. 24). It is also worth stressing that Julie Sanders differentiates between adaptation and appropriation as adaptation signals a relationship with an informing source text or original text. A cinematic version of Shakespeare’s Hamlet, for example, although clearly reinterpreted by the collaborative efforts of

director, scriptwriter, actors, and the generic demands of the movement from stage drama to film, remains ostensibly Hamlet, a specific version, albeit achieved in alternative temporal and generic modes of that seminal cultural text (Sanders, 2006, p. 26).

Even though adaptation has recently gained a crucial role in the world's affairs, it has always been regarded as an unfaithful creative activity towards the source text, or even it is considered treason. On the contrary, some scholars view adaptation as one of the most vital strategies in translation procedures. Susan Bassnett views adaptation from a different perspective and thinks "the debate that, a translation stops being a translation and becomes an adaptation have rumbled on for decades, but I have yet to meet anyone who can give me an adequate definition of the difference between the two" (Bassnett, 2011, p. 40). By these lines, Bassnett challenges the whole theorists and scholars of the field of translation to reach a unanimous agreement about the definition of adaptation or at least draw a distinctive line between the two overlapping concepts limiting their scopes.

It seems that Susan Bassnett is sure of winning this argumentative debate. Therefore, she confronts all challenges, and through her reasonable debate, she proves that translation and adaptation are dispensable overlapping twins. Moreover, she regards translation and adaptation as the two sides of the same coin. Through these lines, she confirms this fact stating:

The basis of the distinction seems to be the degree to which a text that has been rendered into another language diverges from the source. If it seems so close as to be recognizable, then it can be classified as a translation, but if it starts to move away from that source, then it has to be deemed an adaptation. The problem is, though, how close do you have to be, and how far away do you have to move before the labels change (Bassnett, 2011, p. 40).

It is important to point out that Laurence Raw in *Translation, Adaptation and Transformation* considers adaptation as a:

Part of the process of linguistic transfer of a document, created in one source culture and then aimed at another culture. Despite the adjustments and modifications, often imposed by the language of the source text or deemed necessary by the translator, an adaptation still shares a very strong link to the source text (Raw, 2012, p. 23).

Adaptation has been tackled from a different angle by Assaaf who defines adaptation in his article *Adaptation as a Means of Translation*. A type of translation involves a number of changes to be made so that the target text produced is in harmony

with the spirit of the source text. These changes are of various types, including deletion, addition, explanation, illustration, and exemplification (Assaqaf, 2014, p. 783).

Finally, according to what has been mentioned in the above definitions, the researcher agrees with the trend that considers adaptation as one of the translation strategies, which has been confirmed by Yinay and Darbelnet in their famous article about Translation methods.

1.7 Types of Adaptation

Depending on the challenges and problems arising from the process of adapting the original texts, Mona Baker classifies adaptation into two fundamental types: local and global adaptations:

Local adaptation: the most important point in this type of adaptation is that it results from the challenges and mismatches of cultural and contextual concepts that come up through the process of adaption. In other words, the challenge and other obstacles come up from the ST itself. The differences between the language and culture of the SL and the TL results in local adaptation. Local adaptation as an intrinsic adaptation “is essentially a translation procedure which is guided by principles of effectiveness and efficiency and seeks to achieve a balance between what is to be transformed and highlighted and what is to be left unchanged” (Baker, 1998,2001, p. 7).

Global adaptation: this type of adaptation is chosen by crucial factors outside the source text. The impact of the external forces may be applied to the whole source text. The process of adopting this procedure is not determined by the translator. Mona Baker confirms:

Global adaptation constitutes a general strategy that aims to reconstruct the purpose, function or impact of the original text. The intervention of the translator is systematic and s/he may sacrifice formal elements and even semantic meaning in order to reproduce the function of the original (Baker, 1998,2001, p. 7).

Considering adaptation as a means of translation, Assaqaf in his article classifies adaptation differently. He believes that there are four types of adaptation:

Collocational adaptation: Although most languages have a lot in common, there are still many hidden differences, which can be discovered through practice and learning. The English language is rich with collocations that may not have their counterparts in

the Arabic language. Thus, Assaqaf exposes some examples to confirm this fact stating that the verb perform is used with (collocates with the) operation, but not with discussion. So we say, the doctor performed the operation, but we cannot say, committee performed a discussion since held or had not performed collected with discussion. Consequently, we say, the committee held/had a discussion. However, the equivalence of cultural and structural collections cannot be achieved between the Arabic language and English (Assaqaf, 2014).

Within his line of thoughts, Assqaf brings forward another example comparing the English collocation to its Arabic counterpart. He aims at pointing out the strategy that the translator/adopts in such cases. He focuses on adaptation and prescribes it as the more suitable method to bridge the gap between the two languages first and their cultures second. The English phrase, dry cow, is correctly rendered in Arabic as the cow which stopped providing milk. By the way, the literal translation of the former collocation into Arabic will be *baqaraton gafaton*. This kind of expression seems so strange for the TL receptors. It seems to belong to two different cultural contexts, and various language families always oblige the translator to adopt adaptation as an evitable means of solving the challenges and obstacles that encounter the translator while translating (Assaqaf, 2014).

Cultural adaptation: The most controversial concept of culture inspired theorists and translation scholars to view culture from different perspectives. Some of them view culture as a comprehensive concept and it includes many secondary phenomena. Translators adopt this type of strategy when they are translating between the SL text and TL text. Culture is a very controversial and broad concept. It may stretch to cover and overlap with many items and notions related to peoples' life culture and can be defined as the entire system of religious beliefs, customs, attitudes, social habits, and behaviors of a specific society and its members.

This concept has been tackled from different angles by Richards in *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, where he defines culture as

The set of practices, codes and values that mark a particular nation or group: the sum of a nation or group's most highly thought of works of literature, art, music, etc. A difference is sometimes made between high culture of literature and the arts, and small culture of attitudes, values, beliefs, and everyday lifestyles. Culture and language combine to form what is sometimes called 'discourses', i.e. ways of talking, thinking, and behaving that reflect one's social identity (Richards, 1992, p. 138).

Literary adaptation: This type of adaptation is adopted by translators when they translate or convey a masterpiece from one language to another. In this type of translation, translators have to take into consideration the culture of both SL and TL because they are not translating just from one language to another language; they have to be bilingual and bicultural translators. Literary adaptation is one of the most crucial strategies that most successful translators adopt while translating literary works from one language into another. Taking this concept further, Assaqaf states

Literary adaptation becomes a skill instead of a basic requirement. A good poetry translator instinctively knows the difference between the aesthetic traditions of different cultures, so his/her translation can be better appreciated by the target reader and can achieve the required effect. Otherwise, the translation is doomed to be a failure no matter how close or similar it is to the original (Assaqaf, 2014).

Ideological adaptation: This type of adaptation refers to the religious writings and the sexual expressions, as well as the concepts and the terms that most Arab translators and scholars try to avoid as much as possible. Therefore, most of the time, translators translate certain expressions and terms in a way to avoid the embarrassment that these words may cause for the receptors. Assaqaf believes that the translator must be honest and translate exactly what has been mentioned about the TL culture to enable the TL receivers to comprehend what the opposite side says and how they think about the receivers' beliefs. This notion is supported by Assaqaf, who confirms that,

In translation, we as translators, either omit or abbreviate the original sex scene of the source text. Translators often edit the language or the scene or make it implicit instead. "In English - Arabic translation, the translator would always make adaptation to soften the original tone, hoping not to offend the target text readers as well as to escape censorship. This does not mean that Arab literature, especially the old one in the pre-Islamic age never touches upon sex" (Assaqaf, 2014, p. 784).

Translators in general have two different perspectives concerning this topic. The first trend believes that it is necessary to translate everything said in the SL text about the TL culture and religion. For example, translators have to translate what has been said in the Western culture about our prophet Mohammed, peace be upon him, to enable his followers reply and dispute all their misunderstandings about Islam and its prophet. On the contrary, the other trend believes that it is fruitless to mention and translate what that

has been said about prophet Mohammed, peace be upon him. They think that translating such ideas in detail leads to more religious conflicts and endless bloody struggles. This notion is given credence by Assaqaf stating that some might say no need to translate them at all, whereas others are on the opposite side and say a translator should translate everything in detail honestly without hiding anything simply because this is his/her job which is to express others' opinions rather than his/her own. If the first opinion is to be followed and never translate such writings, then we shall not be able to reply against the aggressive writings. However, in case the second opinion is to be followed which is to translate everything in detail, this may offend the target receptors and may lead to a religious conflict (Assaqaf, 2014).

It seems that Assaqaf has a suitable solution for such a dilemma as he suggests that the best option is to translate the main idea of the text in detail and if the translator disagrees on any concept, he/she can leave a note of explanation (Assaqaf, 2014). Sometimes, the translator gets a good reputation more than the author of the source text because of the strategies he/she adopts through the process of translation. Assaqaf brings forward a good example of this topic, namely a book titled *A Place Under the Sun* that was written by the Israeli prime minister and the Likud Party leader Benjamin Netanyahu which was translated into Arabic by Mohamed Odah AL-Dwery and was revised by Kalthoom Alsa'dy. In this book, the author attacks prophet Mohammed, peace be upon him. The translator did not change or distort or even modify his translation. On the contrary, he translated the book honestly as it is, but when the author attacked Islam and prophet Mohammad, the translator delivered some notes at the bottom of the page that deny what the SL author states. The book, the translated version, became the best seller and gave opportunities to many Arab and even foreign writers to reply against his claims (Assaqaf, 2014).

In a nutshell, according to what has been mentioned about adaptation and its types, it seems that there are many kinds of adaptations. Some scholars consider adaptation as a dilemma not just because of being an argumentative concept, but due to having various types, which may bewilder the TL receptors. The following section will highlight the relationship between adaptation and translation to expose the nature of the indispensable relation between adaptation and translation.

1.8 Adaptation and Translation

Adaptation and translation are two complex concepts; no total agreement exists on their definitions nor the nature of the relationship between them. Some theorists and translation studies scholars believe that it is impossible to draw a distinct border between any of them. Some scholars confirm that it is impossible to draw even a line between these overlapping concepts. Besides, scholars have various perspectives about these two phenomena. They are divided into two main trends. Some scholars consider adaptation as a distinct field not related to translation and even regard adaptation as treachery and a kind of distorting the SL texts.

This trend's followers believe there is no need to view adaptation as a type of translation or even as a strategy of translation studies. They have their justifications for such a rigid point of view about adaptation. This trend is headed by Jhon Milton, who confirms "translation and adaptation as fundamentally different processes" (Assaqaf, 2014, p. 785), using the work of the Brazilian translator Monteiro Lobato to prove his point.

Bassnett tried to distinguish between adaptation and translation when she confirms;

The distinction seems to be the degree to which a text that has been rendered into another language diverges from the source. If it seems so close as to be recognizable, then it can be classified as a translation, but if it starts to move away from that source, then it has to be deemed an adaptation (Bassnett, 2011, p. 40).

Taking this concept further, Bassnett puts the cornerstone for any distinction process, thus enabling the receptor to distinguish between these two complicated concepts. She tries to set a kind of measurements to differentiate adaptation from translation. As mentioned before, she raises her inquiry in a form of an unanswerable question stating "The problem is, though, how close do you have to be, and how far away do you have to move before the labels change" (Bassnett, 2011, p. 40). Laurence Raw also believes,

Adaptation refers less to a translation procedure than to the limits of translation [...] since the reality to which the source message refers does not exist for the target culture'. Indeed, although some pretend that anything can be translated, translation has limits. Adaptations and appropriations as global strategies certainly go very often beyond the normal work of pragmatic translators but are commonly used by individuals in many translation settings. They are essential to translation studies and should not be seen anymore as 'non-translations', 'treasons', or 'transgressions' of a source text (Raw, 2012, p. 37).

This notion is advocated by Vinay and Darbelnet, who explain that adaptation is not treason or distortion of the text. They confirm “adaptation isn’t necessarily a matter of treason or needless infidelity towards the original document or its author” (Raw, 2012, p. 22). The importance of adaptation is then underlined with the example of texts published by international organizations that often feel bland or inaccurate. That same point is still very relevant today in this era of mass communication and globalization, where organizations and corporations do not hesitate to send a single and unique message throughout the world (Raw, 2012).

Within the same line of thoughts, Julian Sanders defines adaptation as “an ‘attempt to make text ‘relevant’ or easily comprehensible to new audiences and readerships via the processes of approximation and updating” (Sanders, 2006, p. 28). This notion is given credence by Laurence Raw, who asserts:

Adaptation seems to be part of the process of linguistic transfer of a document, created in one source culture and then aimed at another culture. In spite of the adjustments and modifications, often imposed by the language of the source text or deemed necessary by the translator, an adaptation still shares a very strong link to the source text. On this view, it is the notion of appropriation that could be accused of being an ‘unfaithful’ representation of the source text (Raw, 2012, p. 23).

Bassnett lets the cat out of the bag when she cites the case of one scholar who refuses to call Ted Hughes' *Tales from Ovid* a translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The scholar opposes Bassnett's viewing Ted Hughes' works as a translation of Ovid stating “he did not translate, he adapted or produced versions of texts, and that was not real translation” (Bassnett, 2011, p. 40). So it is not an easy job to deter such scholars that adaptation is one of the methods of translation. Moreover, it is one of the fundamental strategies the translator adopts whenever he/she encounters challenges of two different languages and cultures.

It seems impossible for the theorist and translation studies scholars to reach a unanimous agreement on the definitions of these two complex concepts. According to what has been mentioned about these two concepts and their overlapping relationship, one finds himself/herself without any hesitation to support Bassnett in her well-known statement about this endless argumentative topic. In this regard, Bassnett states “much time and ink has been wasted attempting to differentiate between translations, versions,

adaptations and the establishment of a hierarchy of ‘correctness’ [...] all texts are translations of translations of translations” (Bassnett, 1991, p. 78-79).



2. CHAPTER TWO Shakespeare's Journey To The Arab World

Shakespeare's journey to the Arab world is different from his journey around the rest of the world. Shakespeare reached the Arab region through the French colonialism, and the French soldiers were the first who carried Shakespeare's plays to the Egyptian stage with their occupying campaign to Egypt. The Arab scholars first met Shakespeare through the French language instead of the English original text language. Therefore, the first appearance of Shakespeare's works on the Arab stage was adaptation and Arabization. As Kathrine Hennessey and Margaret Litvin in their introduction to *Shakespeare and The Arab World* affirm,

Shakespeare's plays have been known to Arab audiences since the late nineteenth century. They entered through French, not as literary works but as script fodder for the Egyptian stage, where francophone Syro-Lebanese immigrants adapted Shakespeare tragedies to suit the tastes and theatergoing habits of a rapidly emerging urban middle class (Litvin & Hennessey, 2019, p. 1).

2.1 Shakespeare's Drama between Adaptation and Translation

It is significant to note that 'drama' is a new term for Arabic literature. It did not exist before the French colonial campaign to Egypt. Some scholars tend to consider religious festivals and ceremonies as theatrical activities. They believe that the religious celebration and the anniversary of Imam Hussein³ are a kind of tragic drama activity. The fact of the absence of the genre of drama in Arabic literature is confirmed by Graham Holderness in an article, titled "Arab Shakespeare" which was presented at the British Shakespeare Association Conference.

Classical Arabic did not have drama as a genre. There is no equivalent Arabic word for 'drama'; the Graeco-Latin term is phoneticized. The dramatic form as it is known to the Western audiences first appeared in the Middle East in the mid-nineteenth century. The importation of dramatic works from the West was urgently required to help formulate an Arabic dramatic tradition. Shakespeare's works, among others, were assimilated into the language and he, like other European playwrights, played a

³ He is the son of Imam Ali and Hazrat Fatima and grand son of Prophet Muhammad. He was brutally martyred in the desert of Karbala because of a succession dispute with Yazid bin Muawiya.

significant role in establishing an Arabic dramatic field of study (Holderness, 2013, p. 20).

The Arabs got to know Shakespeare through the stage. Tanius Abdu is considered one of the pioneers, who adapted Shakespeare. However, he was not fluent in English; therefore, Abdu resorted to converting Shakespeare's plays from the French language. The demand for translation and adaptation of Shakespeare's plays increased by theatre companies in Egypt and the neighboring Arab countries. Arab translators were inclined to the Western drama, especially Shakespeare, due to the lack of the genre of drama in Arabic literature. The translators and journalists used to rewrite and adapt Shakespeare's works to suit the requirements of the local theatre and the common mood. Fortunately, *Hamlet* was one of the most requested plays by the spectators and the directing companies. Al- Shetawi attributes the popularity of *Hamlet* among the Arab audiences because of the following reasons:

First, the supernatural elements (e.g. ghosts and extraordinary happenings) that pervade the play correspond adequately to supernatural elements that are common in the Arabic folkloric traditions. Second, the theme of revenge which *Hamlet* presents has always been a time-honored trait of the Arab social character. Finally, madness in *Hamlet* adds a melodramatic touch to the play, enjoyed by the ordinary audience (Al-Shetawi, 1999, p. 44).

Abdu has made drastic changes in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. He turned the play upside down by changing the text and context of the play to suit the requirements of the Arabic environment and culture. To attract the Arab audiences' attention, he resorted to cutting and deleting parts of the original play and created additional parts to suit the Arabic context. Despite the success of Abdu in attracting the attention of the Arab audience, he deviated far away from the source text of Shakespeare. In fact, Abdu adapted a translated version of *Hamlet* rather than the original text in English.

This fact has been confirmed, whereby Abdu handles Shakespeare, and points out his deviations. Abdu has, in effect, transformed this Shakespearean masterpiece into a shadowy resemblance of the original. First, Abdu deleted whole scenes and major passages. For instance, he cuts out the opening scene; his version of the play begins with Scene-II, which is also heavily revised.

This excerpt (an adaptation of Act I; Scene-II) highlights 'Abdoh's approach:

All: Long live the king.

King: Peace be with you, O Lords.

All: Long live the Queen (Al-Shetawi, 1999, p. 44)

Abdu added lyrical poems to his work instead of the poems in *Hamlet* and changed the tragic end of *Hamlet* to a happy ending, where Hamlet wins Ophelia. With these changes made by Abdoh, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was emptied of its content and original significance. The play is no longer but a faint Shadow of Shakespeare's masterpiece *Hamlet*. The changes that Abdu has made to *Hamlet* and how decisive Hamlet he created are viewed as:

One may overlook the various changes and excisions in this adaptation, but the most glaring drawback lies in the protagonist himself. Unlike Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, he is determined to wreak vengeance; he is one given to action rather than reflection. One is made aware of Hamlet's resolution throughout the adaptation; he is not as reluctant or over-meditative as Shakespeare's Prince. More like Laertes, he assigns great value to honor which furnishes a valid motive for any course of action he is to take. But, unlike Laertes, who in succumbing to the demands of honor becomes its very slave and thereby induc[es] his own destruction; Hamlet retires at the end with victory. Thus, much of the inner struggle in the original *Hamlet* is lost and, alongside with it, much of the dramatic tension is diminished (Litvin, 2011, p. 137).

This notion is supported by Same F. Hana in *Decommercialising Shakespeare: Mutran's Translation of Othello*, highlighting the changes that Abdu has made in his 1901 version of *Hamlet*.

Abdu introduced three main changes to the original *Hamlet* to make the translation accessible to the majority of Egyptian consumers of culture. First, he changed the plot of Shakespeare's play; instead of the bloody ending we have in Shakespeare, Abdu keeps Hamlet alive and gives him back the throne of his father. The fact that the renowned and very popular singer-actor Shaykh Salama Hijazi (1852–1917) played the title role in the play meant that the audience would not have accepted seeing Hamlet killed. Furthermore, sad endings would have been unusual for theatre audiences at that

time, simply because all the folk narratives they were aware of concluded with happy endings. The second change had to do with *Hamlet*'s language, which was rendered into rhythmic and versified lyrics to be sung by Hijazi. The translation, due to these two changes, shifted the genre of the original from a tragedy into a musical melodrama. Third, the language of the translation was generally a hybrid of fusha (standard or classical Arabic) and 'ammiyya' (the colloquial). Again, the early translators were straddling two types of consumers of drama translation: the new elite and the Egyptian masses. This explains the oscillation between classical and colloquial (Hanna, 2019, p. 40)

Adaptation, rewriting or re-making is advocated by Charles Mee who is the most significant American theatre artist working today. Mee names adaptation as the re-writing process of the old texts. Mee, as cited in Lauriola, defines adaptation differently.

I like to take a Greek play, smash it to ruins, and then, atop the ruins, write a new play. The new play will often take some of the character names of the Greek piece and some of the story – even some of the ruined structure. But it will be set in today's world (Lauriola, 2015, p. 103).

Abdu preceded Mee by many decades in the procedure of “smashing the text into units”; this fact has been affirmed by other scholars as well.

He was perhaps the most irresponsible of all. According to writers and journalists who knew him personally, Abdu did not really translate, but Arabicized what he read. He never followed the original or tried to convey its meaning. He translated anywhere and everywhere, regardless of his circumstances—in a coffee shop, on a sidewalk, on a train, even on the flat roof of his house. Abdu was, if we may believe one contemporary description, a walking library. He carried with him sheets of paper in one pocket and a French novel in the other. He would then read a few lines, put the novel back in his pocket, and begin to scratch in a fine script whatever he could remember of the few lines he had read. He wrote all day long without striking out a word or rereading a line (Litvin, 2017, p. 55)

Since the very beginning of translating Shakespeare's works, Arab translators have faced difficulties with the metaphorical language of Shakespeare. Some Egyptian scholars with the help of some Arab intellectuals adopted the task of rewriting and translating Shakespeare's works. So for a long time, the Arabic receptor relied entirely on the French language in receiving Shakespeare. An ambitious group of intellectuals

and specialists in the field of literature emerged and they took upon themselves the task of translating the international works, despite the difficulties that were waiting for them. Thus, Abdoh's Adaptation of *Hamlet* was performed for decades in the Egyptian theatre.

Groups and teams would perform on the Egyptian stage. Among these teams, there was an English team that performed some of Shakespeare's works. The performance of this team had a great impact on the reformulation and restructuring of these plays in the mind and thoughts of Arab audiences who had not seen the performance of the source text. This English band and its members had a crucial role in unveiling the changes that have been made to the source texts. They exposed the significant changes that were made to Shakespeare's texts and how the adapters distorted the original texts through cutting and adding parts. Finally, the performances of these teams and groups had a great role in encouraging the critics and translators to re-translate Shakespeare's works (Omar, 2020).

Mutran Khalil Mutran's translation of *Hamlet* which is considered more accurate than Abdu's version followed Abdoh's adaptation of *Hamlet*. Mutran took the process of *Hamlet* adaptation one step further, using a different strategy in transforming Shakespeare's works. Mutran resorted to the Arabization method in rewriting Shakespeare; the term Arabization is paralleled in contemporary translation studies to the term domestication. Lamis Ismail Omar in her article "The Stylistic Amplification of Conceptual Metaphors in Translating Shakespeare into Arabic by Mohamed Enani" writes on the Arabization strategy adopted by Abdu.

This strategy in approaching the ST is called 'Arabization' when translating from English into Arabic and 'domestication' in other language combinations. Unlike adaptation, domestication takes place on the level of individual textual components influencing specific lexical units (by deletion or naturalization), such as culturally-embedded items (with references to food, religion, or social practices), names, and stylistic components (Omar, 2020, p. 61).

Regarding Mutran Khalil Mutran, Mohammad Awad, and others who adapted or Arabized Shakespeare's works, even though the works of these translators have won the admiration of the Arab receptors, they did not rise to the level of literary translation. Both Mutran Khalil and Mohamed Awad made great efforts to show their translation as a target language-oriented translation rather than a source language-oriented translation. They sacrificed the source text for the sake of the target text's recipient. Therefore, their translations appeared as if they did not seem to have anything to do with Shakespeare. Regarding Mutran's contribution to the translation of Shakespeare's plays, Sameh F. Hanna mentions: Mutran's contribution to the translation of Shakespeare's plays marks a

significant change in the history of Arabic representations of the Bard and his work. To fully appreciate the legacy of Mutran as a translator of Shakespeare into Arabic, one needs to locate his work within the context of earlier translations/translators of Shakespeare” (Hanna, C.2019, p. 36).

Mutran Khalil Mutran, Mohammad Awad, and other translators tried to make the process of Shakespeare’s translation more accurate. Although they intended to be closer to the source text more than those translators who preceded them in their free translations, they failed in their attempts due to the large gap between the two languages and cultures. Therefore, they have been accused of distorting the source text. Margaret Litvin confirms this fact in her article “The French Source of the Earliest surviving Arabic Hamlet” stating “Mutran’s own 1918 Hamlet, also criticized for inaccuracy, would nonetheless gain lasting prestige for its fine use of literary Arabic” (Litvin, 2011, p. 136).

Mutran Khalil Mutran, Mohamed Awad, and the others aimed at offering a closer translation of Shakespeare's plays into Arabic. More specifically, Mutran focused on content and the structure of the source text in the process of domesticating the lexical units of the original text in his attempt to make the source text more natural to the target text reader. So he resorted to making mass changes on the level of the sentences and other lexical items with their counterparts in the target language and culture. Mutran aimed to expose the significant distinctions between adaptation and domestication in the process of translating Shakespeare. According to what has been mentioned before, it seems apparent that adaptation was liberal in handling the source texts, whereas the domestication retained the main elements of the ST. The main reason behind making certain changes to some lexical elements of the source texts was to naturalize the linguistic content of these texts (Omar, 2020).

Undoubtedly, language is one of the main secrets behind Shakespeare's success. This secret lies in the use of pun words and metaphorical language, which even puzzled the native speakers and not only the foreigners. Well-understanding of Shakespeare’s figurative language leads to decoding elements of the plot and the whole play consequently. This feature is most evident in *Hamlet*, which is full of pun words and metaphorical expressions, and mythical illusions. Mutran relied in his translation on a French version of Hamlet. Therefore, Mutran used a similar Arabic language with only a difference implying that Shakespeare’s language is a combination of prose and poetic language. Mutran used a technical literary Arabic language, to say at least that it is a

wonderful language. However, the defective point in Mutran's *Hamlet* is in his interest in language at the expense of content. His translation is considered a TT- oriented translation because he took the author to the target language receptors. Enani traces the history of Shakespeare's translation to (1930).

It was not until the 1930s that a serious translation work got started. Khalil Mutran, the great Lebanese--Egyptian poet, produced prose translations, possibly from French, of some of Shakespeare's plays. As an early director of the Egyptian National Theatre Company, he exerted a double influence; he supervised the early Shakespearean productions which competed, with varying degrees of success, with the commercial theatre of the inter-war period (which were either too melodramatic or too farcical) and he established his translation language as the popularly accepted language of the grand theatre. Great actors of the period made sure that that language was established as the Arabic equivalence of Shakespeare's English. In fact, when the Higher Institute for Dramatic Arts was first established, all those aspiring to a career in acting had to learn Mutran's prose by heart (Enani, 2016, pp. 157-158).

Within the same line of thoughts, Mohamed Enani, in his wonderful article about translating Shakespeare, tackles an amazing topic related to the process of translating Shakespeare's works. Enani in "On Translating Shakespeare's sonnets into Arabic" asks wonderingly why should all translators of the world over and down the centuries translate verse into verse, while we Arabs, who boast a rich tradition of verse, use prose to render Shakespeare's sonnets? After many decades in which Shakespeare's Arab readers and translators have paid relatively little attention to the sonnets, the past generation has brought a flurry of efforts. About six translations of the sonnets, each was nearly complete, have appeared since the 1980s. Each one tries to reproduce the form of the sonnet, translating some many times, like sonnet 18, and omitting others, such as the notorious 135 and 136. However, they are mostly in prose except for the last one (Enani, 2019).

The translation of international masterpieces and Shakespeare's works especially has witnessed dramatic changes around the fifties of the twentieth century because of the social and political changes in the Arabic region. As Mohammed Enani revealed,

The upshot of this was that by the early 1950s, the Shakespearean canon came to include three of the four “great tragedies” [...] Hamlet, Othello and Macbeth [...] and three other plays, The Merchant of Venice in Mutran’s version, Julius Caesar in Mohamed Hamdi’s version, and Romeo and Juliet in Ali Ahmed Bakatheer’s blank verse version (Enani, 2016, p. 158).

At this stage, the Arab translators and intellectual groups broke the main obstacles that stood in their way of translating Shakespeare for many decades. Their translations were no more free adaptations of Shakespeare's works which were generally in prose. They turned to use "modern standard Arabic" in a form of a mixture of prose and blank verse in their translations. Thus, the establishment of the Arab League's Cultural Committee had a great role in bringing translators and intellectuals together and unifying their discourse in translating Shakespeare into Arabic.

After the second half of the twentieth century, the plays of William Shakespeare started to be retranslated into Arabic by the initiative of certain cultural and academic bodies like the Arab League’s Cultural Committee (ALCC) which initiated the 1950s intellectual project of translating the works of Shakespeare into Arabic (Omar, 2020, p. 61).

This intellectual project had a crucial role in bringing together the Arab translators from different Arab countries; it reunited the Arab translators and unified their discourse in adopting an academic strategy in translating Shakespeare. This academic body of Arab League’s Cultural Committee has attracted the pioneering Arab translators, including Jabra Ibrahim Jabra, Mohammed Enani, Abdil Qadir Al-qat, Mohamed Awad, and others. They adopted a literary translation project from the source of international works, including Shakespeare’s works. In the forefront of those translators was Jabra Ibrahim Jabra, who is considered one of the pioneers and produced the academic translation of Shakespeare’s tragedies.

The translations that emerged at that time did not adopt a liberal approach to the ST and attempted to represent it carefully without modifications in its content, plot, characters, or linguistic properties. According to the early academic research on the Arabic translations of Shakespeare, these translations were ranked as highly intellectual accomplishments considering their celebrated ‘accuracy’ and authentic representation of the original texts (Omar, 2020, p. 61).

It is clear from the previously mentioned analysis that the emergence of new critical studies in addition to regarding translation studies as an independent discipline

paved the way for the appearance of different methods in translating Shakespeare. After the formation of the Arab League's Cultural Committee, more critical studies have appeared about Shakespeare. These critical studies had a great impact in redirecting the course of the translation process. The impact of the ALCC appeared in the form of the following points: the first was focusing on the accuracy in translating Shakespeare, and the second point was evaluating the translated versions of Shakespeare.

Following the Arab League's initiative, accuracy was the main criteria for representing the bard, which gave rise to critical studies that sought to evaluate the translated works "to improve the [...] Arabic versions of Shakespeare. These critical studies focused on the approaches and strategies used by different translators to reflect the content and language of Shakespeare and highlighted the major problems which confront translators" (Omar, 2020, pp. 61-62).

Based on another perspective, Kanaan cites Omar by saying

The purist's ideal of a good and faithful translation of Shakespeare's text into a foreign language, not to mention the translation of Shakespearean themes into foreign cultures, is in reality an impossibility. English metrical niceties, word-plays, imagery, emphases, insinuations, skillful repartee, and the atmospheric use of colour in verse and prose may all evaporate in a straightforward Arab representation of Shakespeare (Omar, 2020, p. 62).

Mohammad Enani in his introduction to his translation of Edward Said's "Orientalism" draws the main outlines of the crucial strategies that should be used in translating Shakespeare and the other masterpieces into Arabic and vice versa. He summarizes in poignant words what a translator should do in translating such texts. Enani emphasizes creating a kind of familiarity with the receptor in a way that overshadows the ideas.

This method in translation is then more "domestic" than "foreign" since the idea is not to produce a "reversed" picture of the original reading from the right to the left, but to offer an honest rendering of the original ideas. What I really mean by "Domestication" is what the contemporary translator and researcher Lawrence Venuti explains as the familiarization of ideas and images to the reader of the translation concerning the concepts and structural styles of his own language. On the other hand, "Foreignization" (using Venuti's term) is the preservation of the foreign flavor of the literary text so that it remains "foreign", not belonging to the literature of the target language and actually beyond its framework (Elmenfi, 2013, p. 3101).

Eventually, the researcher finds himself biased towards adopting the opinion followed by both Mohammad Enani and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra in translating Shakespeare. They adopted different methods and various strategies to reach the depths of Shakespeare's works and convey their content to the Arab receptors. Enani and Jabra's long introductions are full of hints and notes that help the Arabic receptors of Shakespeare in probing the depths of Shakespeare. They refer to the methods and strategies they followed in translating Shakespeare.

What attracts the researcher's attention is their resorting to the margin notes to explain the odd expressions and mythical expressions in addition to paraphrasing the metaphors and symbols used in Shakespeare's texts. It is plain as far as Shakespeare's translation is concerned that Arabic and English are two different languages. They belong to two different cultures, settings, and even two different language families, as well as their phonetic system, grammar, morphology, and word order are different. All these elements are beyond disputed reasons behind the existence of a huge gap between Arabic and English languages. All the above-mentioned obstacles may confront the translators, who try to bridge the gap between the two totally different languages.

The following section will be on two translations of two pioneers in translating Shakespeare. Through these two texts, the researcher tries to follow the critical studies that deal in detail with these two different versions of *Hamlet* by Mohammad Enani and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra. These two translations have been considered for a long time the most perfect versions of *Hamlet* translation.

2.2 Hamlet in Arabic

This section is devoted to highlighting two models of *Hamlet* translation into Arabic. The researcher's aim is not to make a comparison between these two models. Rather, he aims to show the points of contentions and differences that some translators use when translating *Hamlet*. At the same time, he does not intend to trace the chronology of translations of *Hamlet* into Arabic. What arouses the researcher's curiosity is not an inventory of the number of these translations, as much as it is a statement of the differences and discrepancies that branched off from these translations.

Some translations won the readers and audiences' approval and remained for a period of time accepted by readers and audiences. On the other hand, some translations were so poor and weak that they bear no connection to the Shakespearean text. In the

following section, the researcher has chosen two models of Arab translators, who have experience in translation from English into Arabic and vice versa and both of them are bilingual authors, who are fluent in English and Arabic. Both translators were taught by the most eminent professors, including John Dover.

The other key point is that both of them lived in the West and they interacted with the English society and its culture closely. As Sarolta Simóné Fenő in her article *The Translator's Cultural Competence* writes,

Translators are rather bilingual mediators than bilingual communicators who, in addition to decoding and coding the source text, have to possess the ability to transcode it in the way the target readers should not get misinformation or lack information incorporated in the source text. Since translators mediate not only between languages but also between cultures, the knowledge of the source and that of the target culture is also of vital importance (Fenő, 2005, p. 61).

Living abroad, experiencing the Western culture, and saturating the spirit of this culture enabled them to translate *Hamlet* perfectly into the Arabic language. Enani and Jabra are authors who have many books and publications on novels, poetry, and plays, as well as translation and critical studies. Both translations by Enani and Jabra are from certified Arabic translations. The extensive knowledge of both authors and their mastery of Arabic and English significantly enabled them to understand the ancient myths and tales that Shakespeare uses in his plays specifically and his writings generally. In his successful essay, Anthony J. Liddicoat indicates:

The task in translation is to rework a text written in one language into another so as to make available to a new audience something they would not otherwise be able to access. This means that a translator is involved in communicating meanings that have been constructed in one language – with its accompanying cultural contexts for readers who share the language and participate in some way in that culture – to an audience that does not share that language and culture. Hence translation cannot entail simply reproducing the meanings of one text in another language; rather, after constructing a reading of the text and its intention, the translator must rearticulate meanings for new audiences. Through the medium of the translator's voice, multiple linguistic and cultural framings are brought into relation so that meanings may be communicated across linguistic and cultural boundaries (Liddicoat, 2016, p. 347).

Based on the aforementioned points, both Jabra and Enani were able to probe the depths of Shakespeare's texts. However, the emergence of more critical studies for the dismantling and explanation of Shakespeare's texts encouraged the Arab readers and audiences to search for more translations of Shakespeare's works. The emergence of more translation studies and their separation from linguistics studies to form an independent genre had a great impact on the Arab readers and audiences' concept of

translation and translation studies later on. More specifically, the appearance of translation studies had a profound impact on the Arab readers and viewers to have more meaningful and clarifying translations of Shakespeare's texts. Consequently, a group of Arab translators, including Jabra and Enani, and others shouldered this task. They launched their task in a contemporary style that seeks clarity far away from linguistic fabrications and without prejudice to the meaning of the original texts.

Muhammad Madni in his famous critical book *The Critic and Theatre Translation: A Study about the Impact of Critic on the Translation of International Theatre*, highlights Abdul Qadir's efforts as a sample about theatre translation states:

ولا ينكر الدكتور عبد القادر الاختلافات المنهجية و الفنية التي يمكن ان تقوم بين المترجمين عند تصديهم لترجمة عمل مسرحي له ثقله و شأنه الفني، مثلما لا ينكر ظاهرة تعدد مرات ترجمة النص المسرحي الجيد، ما دامت كل ترجمة تنزع نحو تقديم النص المسرحي العالمي على النحو الامثل و التفسير و الصياغة الاقرب له في الثقافة العربية، و ما دامت الترجمة تتجاوز اخطاء الترجمات السابقة و لا تحاول ان تخرج بالنص عن حقيقته الفنية و لا تحيد به عن هدفه الاصلي ، او تقحم عليه ما ليس فيه، و ما عدا ذلك فالقط يشن هجوما نقديا لا هوادة فيه على المترجمين المسرحيين الذين يخالفون هذه القيمة عند تصديهم لترجمة نص ما ، ايا ما يكونوا و كيفما تكون مكانته في حقل الترجمة.

The following is a translation of the Arabic text:

Dr. Abdul Qadir Al-Qat does not deny the methodological and technical differences that can arise among translators when they stand out translating a play that has its technical value and weight. Likewise, he does not deny the phenomenon of the number of times a good theatrical text has been translated as long as each translation tends towards optimally presenting the international theatrical text and the interpretation and formulation closest to it in the Arabic culture as long as the translation goes beyond the mistakes of previous translations and does not try to deviate from the text and its artistic reality as well as it does not deviate from its original purpose or add what is not in it. Further, Al-Qat launches a relentless and critical attack on the theatre translators, who violate this value when they oppose the translation of a text whoever they were and however were their occupation in the field of translation (Madni, 1997, p. 68).⁴

2.3 Arabic Translations of *Hamlet*

Hamlet is considered one of the most translated plays of Shakespeare. No year passes without witnessing the emergence of a new translation of *Hamlet*. Sometimes, the same translator who translated the same work years ago comes back to retranslate the same work. Thus, the emergence of critical studies has had a crucial role in encouraging the re-translation of the previously translated texts. Mohammad Enani was

⁴ Translated by the author.

one of the first who adopted re-translating his previous works. Regarding this topic, he states:

I re-translated the entire text of the latter in a mixture of prose and verse, especially as I had produced a verse adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*, complete with song and occasional music, in 1985. The all-verse version was printed and went out of print, but not out of my memory. I varied the tone adequately in the new version, giving preponderance to verse in accessible modern Arabic. The reception encouraged me to try to do the same with the *Dream*, but too much of the original prose remained. I republished my 1988 verse translation of *The Merchant of Venice*, as the reading public seemed interested in finding out more about Shakespeare, though the attempt to present it at the National Theatre failed twice -- once because it was said that the language was not Egyptian enough, and, more recently, for political reasons (Enani, 2016, p. 159).

In addition to the emergence of more critical studies, many other factors have played a role in adopting the campaign of re-translating the pre-translated works. Some of these factors were related to the translators' understanding of the texts and others are related to the context, and even political reasons had a role in analyzing and decoding the Shakespearean texts. The Arabic translations of *Hamlet* are usually characterized by a long introduction. The majority of the Arab translators avail the opportunity and use the introductions as a chapter to clarify their ideas and the methods they followed in translating Shakespeare's texts. They even trace some critical studies which help the Arabic receptor in comprehending the drama. Some of them refer to some notes and tips that help the directors in performing the translated texts. In his introduction, Jabra Ibrahim Jabra helps the directors in performing the translated text.

Bassnett focuses on the complex topic of theatre translation in an article with McGuire *Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts*, drawing the main outlines for perfect translation of theatre texts. They start their debate by stating:

The translator of theatre texts faces a problem unlike that is involved in any other types of the translation process. The principal difficulty resides in the nature of the text itself, for whilst interlingual translation involves the transfer of a given written text from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL), all kinds of factors other than the linguistic ones are involved in the case of theatre texts. Leaving aside for the moment those texts written as plays but designated as strictly literary (e. g. the 'plays' of Byron

and Shelley, where performance is expressly discounted by the authors), a theatre text exists in a dialectical relationship with the performance of that text. The two texts - written and performed - are coexistent and inseparable, and it is in this relationship the paradox for the translator lies. The translator is effectively being asked to accomplish the impossible - to treat a written text that is part of a larger complex of sign systems, involving paralinguistic and kinesic features, as if it were a literary text, created solely for the page to be read off that page (Bassnett & McGuire, 1985, 2014, p. 87).

O. Zuber, in his book on translating drama *The Languages of Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama* deals with the problem and obstacles that the translators encounter while translating the text from/into another culture. In this groundbreaking book, Zuber puts his finger on the wound that does not heal.

If an author chooses to translate or adapt a work from another culture, particular problems occur. Translation from one language to another will involve questions of idioms, slang, tone, and style. For instance, *La dernière chemise d'amour* is not quite the same as *Love's Last Shift*. Irony, double entendre, word-play, and puns must be communicated if the spirit of the original is not to be lost. The position that a word occupies in a sentence, for example in a language like German, may subtly influence the meaning of the original passage or may be vital to the characterization, communicating something additional to the mere surface meaning of the word by itself. Terms of endearment or of abuse in one language may provoke an inappropriate audience response when rendered too literally in another language, destroying the emotional tone of the scene. Topical allusions require careful treatment; if allusions more appropriate to the new audience are substituted, they may be out of character for the work itself, its original setting, period, or tone (Gostand, 1980, pp. 2-3).

Zuber within this line of thoughts goes on to explain:

If the play is in verse, should a translator attempt to produce the same rhythmic and rhyming patterns? Should s/he concentrate on the meaning, perhaps substituting blank verse, free verse, or a rhythmic prose for tighter verse patterns? A play like T.S. Eliot *Murder in the Cathedral*, which uses a variety of verse and prose forms for characterization and for tonal manipulation, is a challenge to the translator (Gostand, 1980, p. 3).

One of the most famous Arabic drama critics inquires! "What happens to plays when presented in cultural contexts other than their own? [...] to dramatic texts in translation?" This is supported by Enani, who says

This is obviously the central question in any approach to translating Shakespeare into any other language, not merely into Arabic; but with Arabic the question acquires an added difficulty, namely the fact that Arabic lacks the dramatic tradition of most European languages (Enani, 2016, p. 158).

The second half of the twentieth century witnessed the emergence of many new trends in the process of re-evaluating Shakespeare. Some translators opted to re-translate Shakespeare academically. The first group chose to be biased towards the source text during their translation of Shakespeare, whereas the second group adopted bias towards the target-language text to stand by the recipients. All of this is nothing but the continuation of the everlasting debate between the free translation trend and the faithfulness to the text and its opposit trend in translation.

After the second half of the twentieth century, the plays of William Shakespeare started to be retranslated into Arabic by the initiative of certain cultural and academic bodies like the Arab League's Cultural Committee which initiated the 1950s intellectual project of translating the works of Shakespeare into Arabic (Omar, 2020, p. 61).

The emergence of these two trends as an academic literary translation style had a great role in reducing the average of more liberate free translations which often caused in many cases the distortion of the original text or at least moving far away from the original text. Jabra Ibrahim Jabra is considered one of the pioneers, who adopted the first trend in his translations of Shakespeare. Although he has been accused of being biased towards the source text language, his translations nowadays are beyond dispute and are considered one of the most perfect and academic translations in the entire Arabic world.

Jabra Ibrahim Jabra was the first to produce academic translations of Shakespeare's plays. The translations that emerged at that time did not adopt a liberal approach to the ST and attempted to represent it carefully without modifications in its content, plot, characters, or linguistic properties. According to the early academic research on the Arabic translations of Shakespeare, these translations were ranked as highly intellectual accomplishments, considering their celebrated 'accuracy' and authentic representation of the original texts (Omar, 2020, p. 61).

There is no doubt that Arabic and English belong to two different language families and to two different cultures. This is followed by certain ideological and religious differences. Following two different religious issues resulted in using different

cultural-bound words. Al-Saidi in his article *Problems of Translating Cultural Signs with Reference to English and Arabic* asserts:

As a matter of fact, Arabic and English belong to two different settings and different language families. The former is a Semitic language whereas the latter is Indo-European. They are different syntactically, prosodically, phonologically and even semantically. Therefore, they are culturally unrelated and alien. In addition, non-linguistic factors, namely cultural and geographical ones, among other things, have to be taken into consideration. The current study investigates the cultural differences between Arabic and English in an attempt to facilitate the development of translation procedures to overcome these hindrances caused by such differences (Al-Saidi, 2013, p. 27).

Despite Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's great mastery of the Arabic language and his dominance on the literary scene in the second half of the twentieth century, he confronted a cruel critical campaign for his academic translations of Shakespeare. He has been accused of being a SL-oriented translator or even being a word-for-word translator. Jabra received a lot of questions and criticism due to the translation of Shakespeare's great tragedies. He was harshly criticized by his opponents who opposed the language he used in translating *Hamlet*. It is generally agreed, despite all that has been said about Jabra's translation of *Hamlet*, that it is still considered one of the most accurate rendering of *Hamlet*.

Sargon Boulus, the Iraqi poet states "surprisingly, Jabra faced many opponents to his cultural adapted translations. Although he was criticized for his incorrect translation, he preferred to choose the 'widespread incorrect.'" Taking this concept further, Boulus asserts "Jabra removed this line because it may provoke the Islamic community." In other cases, Boulus claimed that Jabra cannot present the Shakespearean spirit. However, even the normal reader may sense that Jabra's translation is closer to the English spirit when using parallel sentences (Qaddoumi, 2018, p. 5).

The analysis of the first chapter of Jabra's translation of *Hamlet* shows the extent to which he has been influenced by the Holy Qur'an and Sunnah. He has borrowed many of his words from the Qur'an. The constant use of the words of the Qur'an and Sunnah makes the reader doubt that Jabra is Christian. "Jabra has apparently the knowledge of

Islam despite the fact that he is Christian. Jabra has acquainted himself with the two Islamic sources: the Holy Quran and Al-Sunnah” (Qaddoumi, 2018, p. 8).

The following extracts confirm the validity of the researcher’s observations about the first chapter as well as the whole play. The opening scene in *Hamlet* is one of the most important parts of the whole play, where Shakespeare puts a lot of philosophical hints through an ordinary discourse among the characters. The translator must be aware of certain cues that help understand the play later. Jabra Ibrahim Jabra translates the opening scene of Shakespeare into Arabic as follows: “The castle at Elsinore. A narrow platform upon the battlements; turret-doors to right and left. Starlight, very cold. Francisco, a sentinel armed with a partisan, paces to and fro. A bell tolls twelve. Presently Barnardo, another sentinel likewise armed, comes from the castle, he starts hearing Francisco's tread in the darkness,

Barnardo: Who's there?
Francisco: Nay, answer me. Stand and unfold yourself.
Barnardo: Long live the ting!
Francisco: You come most carefully upon your hour*
Barnardo: This now struck twelve, get thee to bed, Francisco.
Francisco: For this relief much thanks, 'tis bitter cold, And I am sick at heart.
Barnardo: Have you had a quiet guard?
Francisco: Not a mouse stirring.
Horatio. Friends to this ground.
Marcellus, And liegemen to the Dane (Shakespeare, 1934, 1954 and 2009).

Jabra translates these lines into Arabic as follows:⁵

قلعة السينور. في احد الابراج. ظلام
فرانسيسكو: في مكان الخفارة، يدخل عليه برناردو
برناردو: من هناك ؟
فرانسيسكو: بل أنت أجب ! قف واكشف عن نفسك
برناردو: عاش الملك
فرانسيسكو: أجل أنا
فرانسيسكو: شكرا لمجيتك بديلا لي. البرد قارس و في صدري ضيق
فرانسيسكو: ولا فأ يتحرك
هوراشيو: صديقان لهذه الارض

⁵The Arabic extracts are taken from Shakespeare' tragedies (الماسي الكبرى in Arabic).

مرسلس: ومواليان لملك الدانمرك
برنردو: قل لي ، أ هوراشيو هناك ؟
هوراشيو: قطعة منه

In these lines, Jabra focuses on a literal translation. He tries to be faithful as much as possible to Shakespeare's text. He succeeded in putting the text in an Arabic context, but still, the text is spiritless. The words are well-chosen and arranged perfectly, but still, the sentences are senseless and vague to the TL receptors. Jabra got benefits from the former adaptations and the Arabization of *Hamlet*. Therefore, for "who is there ?" he uses the Arabic expression "من؟" هناك instead of "من الزول؟" the expression used by Mutran Khalil Mutran. Here, Jabra tries to use the most acceptable Arabic language (the Standard Arabic (SA)), which differs from Mutran's Arabic (the classical Arabic).

Through the previous lines of the dialogue among the soldiers who are on duty, one can sense the anxiety and the restlessness they are living in. Here, Shakespeare depicts the first scene with his usual skill to transport his spectators into an atmosphere of fear, dread, and anticipation resulting from the utter darkness and the cold weather that surrounds the place. This is the point that Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's translation of this scene lacks since the reader or the spectator cannot sense the anxiety and the fearful atmosphere due to the darkness and the bitter cold. Following word-for-word translation resulted in a senseless text for the TL receptors. Thus, he has been bitterly criticized for adopting the SL-oriented method in translating *Hamlet*.

Al-Abdullah Tajdin in an article, titled *The Metamorphosis of Hamlet in Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's Translation*, exposes the defective points of Jabra's translation of *Hamlet*. He points to the weakness that Jabra fell into through his translation of *Hamlet*.

Jabra adopts a formal equivalence strategy that generates an honest, but a crude version of *Hamlet* in Arabic. His literal servility to the original text limits his ability to render the play in normal and idiomatic Arabic. The problem goes beyond that as the Arabic version is doubly estranged from Arabic culture, as lexis is rendered out of linguistic context and themes and allusions are out of the cultural context. Thus, the new product looks like an artificial transplantation of an alien work in the indigenous habitat of Arabic. The source of this problem stems partly from the initial choice of the translator of a word-to-word rather than sentence-to-sentence or thought-to-thought translation,

and partly from the very nature of Shakespeare's elaborate cultural and figurative texture of *Hamlet* (Tajdin, 2005, p. 1).

The differences in culture of two different languages such as Arabic and English generate more challenging differences and gaps. These differences are represented in the formulas of obstacles and pitfalls that the translators confront through the process of translation. Thus, the translators are obliged to resort to various strategies to bridge these gaps (Alquraishy, 2018). What distinguishes Shakespeare from other poets and playwrights is his language. He often resorts to manipulation of pun words and other figurative language manners to achieve his desired goal. As Abdul Sattar Jawad explains,

Shakespeare is fond of words and wordplay. The double meaning is widely used to create ambiguity and some effects to enhance linguistic connotations and to generate new meanings and new words. He has a great love for word coinage.

In *Hamlet*, Act V, Scene-1

Hamlet: Upon what ground?

First Clown: Why, here in Denmark: I have been sexton here, man and boy, thirty years.

The ground here means to cause, but in the next line, the grave digger takes the word in the sense of 'land, country'. The translator should be aware of the confusion that might emerge in choosing the wrong equivalent. He needs to explain the complexity in a footnote and convey the meaning embedded in the word ground (Jawad, 2018, p. 4).

The abovementioned extracts show that Shakespeare is genuine in using language in terms of manipulating pun words and other figures of speech properly in formulating his thoughts and feelings. The genius and skillfulness of Shakespeare are evident in the previous lines. He depicts with certain simple sentences an atmosphere of fear, anxiety, and restlessness with his magic ability in adapting the language to manipulate it in shaping his thoughts. Shakespeare's ability in adapting the language to serve his texts is a skill that no one else can match. To avoid committing unforgivable mistakes, the translator of Shakespeare's works must be well-versed in the English language and culture. Jabra Ibrahim Jabra, despite his knowledge of English, language, and culture, made serious mistakes in translating *Hamlet*.

As it has been mentioned before, there is a huge gap between Arabic and English. Both languages belong to different language families and different, as well as different

contexts. All these differences cause real challenges for the translators, who try to bridge these pitfalls. Cultural bound words or as some scholars call them “cultural specific items” are one of the most challenging obstacles that hinder the translator's efforts.

Cultural bound term as the terms which refer to concepts and institutions, which are specific to the SL. He presents techniques for translating including functional equivalence and linguistic equivalence, while the third strategy is borrowing or reproducing the original terms (Abood, 2018, p. 2).

The same previous lines have been translated into Arabic by Mutran Khalil Mutran as follows:

برنار دو: من الزول؟ تعرف
فرانسيسكو: لا ، و انما عليك الرد ،قف ، وقل من انت
!برنار دو: يحيا الملك :
فرانسيسكو: أ "برناردو"؟
برنارو: هو بعينه
فرنسيسكو: الف حمد لك على هذه المنة، البرد قارس ، وقلبي في وحشة
فرنسيسكو: لم يتحرك فأر في حجر
هوراشيو: اصدقاء لهذا البلد
مرسل: ومن بطانة ملك ال " دانمرك
برناردو: ماذا تريد أ "هوراشيو" من ارى هناك ؟
هوراشيو: بضعة صغيرة منه أو بعضه

There are visible differences between Jabra and Mutran's translations of *Hamlet*. These differences can be classified into two main items. First, Mutran uses in his translation classic Arabic, whereby the majority of Arab native speakers cannot understand. A good example for this point is the opening word he uses, namely the classic Arabic word "من الزول" instead of the standard Arabic word "من هناك" which is known to the majority of Arab reader, including native and non-native speakers. The second difference is that Mutran adopted the free method in his translation of *Hamlet* and translated *Hamlet* from a French version rather than the original English.

Therefore, he is twice away from the original text. Yowell Aziz is also considered one of the most prominent pioneers, who referred to the huge differences between the standard Arabic (SA) and the classical Arabic (CA). In his article “Cultural Problems of English-Arabic Translation” he confirms

Spoken Arabic however is one thing and Standard Arabic (SA)—the prestigious variety used by all educated Arabs on formal occasions and especially in written Arabic and on translation—is

another thing. The former comprises local varieties and is normally not used in translation (Aziz, 1982, p. 26).

Aziz goes a step further as he admits “translation is not merely a linguistic process, it also involves culture. Cultural differences often pose greater difficulties for a translator than linguistic differences do. Nevertheless, cultural aspects of translation have so far received relatively little attention” (Aziz, 1982, p. 25). In this regard, Mutran distorted the original text by adapting and abbreviating the five-act play into four adapted acts play.

It is obvious that each of them, Jabra and Mutran, adopted different strategies in *Hamlet* translation. Reading Mutran's translation, one feels as if he/she was reading an Arabic original text. It has no relation to Shakespeare's text except the characters' names. In the first scene of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, one feels Shakespeare's usual skill in depicting and transporting the reader and spectator into an atmosphere of fear, dread, and anticipation resulting from the bitter cold and utter darkness, thus creating a kind of anxiety and instability among the soldiers. However, none of the adaptations nor the previous translations succeeded in giving this hidden sense, which Shakespeare intended to focus on.

The differences in culture between the two languages generate more pitfalls, and huge gaps for translators, who have to adopt various methods and strategies to confront them. Sometimes, translators refer to different strategies within the same text to heal the rift caused by huge gaps between two different cultures. Translators have different approaches concerning these differences and the way to overcome them. Thus, one can say no matter how wonderful, accurate and professional the translation is, it will never match the original text. In this regard, when we mention Mutran's translation of *Hamlet*, we must point out that he probably relied on the French version of *Hamlet* translation, and was looking sometimes at the English version.

By comparing Mutran's translation to the original English text, one discovers that Mutran presents the fourth and fifth acts in a brief shortened act. Thus, he distorted the original text represented by the third act, especially the nunnery scene and the pun words in the original scene. The existence of many translations of *Hamlet* in the Arabic language indicates that these versions did not succeed in clarifying *Hamlet's* aesthetics, or it could not reach its depth. It also shows that the translator felt that the previous

translations and adaptations have failed in reaching the sense that Shakespeare tries to grant through his texts. To reach a concrete conviction about the above-mentioned facts, the researcher has chosen five different examples from the translated and adapted versions of *Hamlet*.

2.4 Samples of Arabic Translation and Adaptation

In this section, the researcher will expose some examples to confirm the above-mentioned points about the Arabic translation and adaptation of *Hamlet*. The researcher will focus on different aspects of the referred samples to show the strategies that have been used in performing the processes of translation and adaptation. Both Jabra and Mutran used different strategies in their translation and adaptation of *Hamlet*.

Fran. For this relief much thanks; 'tis bitter cold,

Francisco: And I am sick at heart.

(Act 1, Scene 1)

Mutran's Translation:

فرنسيسكو: الف حمد لك على هذه المنّة، البرد قارس ، وقلبي في وحشة

Jabra's Translation:

فرنسكو: شكرا لمجيتك بديلا لي . البرد قارس و في صدري ضيق.

It is obvious from the Arabic versions that both Jabra and Mutran followed different strategies in rendering Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. At the same time, they are both influenced by the Islamic culture represented by the classic Arabic used by Mutran and the Modern Arabic used by Jabra. The translators have to choose one of the two ways of translation; there is no third way, either he chooses the domestication method or the Foreignization method in rendering any literary text.

According to the American translation theorist L. Venuti, domestication refers to “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home” while Foreignization means “an ethno deviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad” (Venuti, 1995, p. 20).

This notion is given credence by both Shuttleworth and Cowie by stating:

Domestication designates the type of translation in which a transparent, fluent style is adopted to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text for target language readers, while Foreignization means a target text is produced, which deliberately breaks target conventions by retaining something of the foreignness of the original (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997, 2014, p. 59).

Generally speaking, cultural and linguistic differences compel the translators, consciously or unconsciously, to resort to one of these two methods of translation, or sometimes a combination. In this regard, culture plays a great role in directing the translators in the current examples of Arabic translations of Hamlet. However, each of Jabra and Mutran adopted a different strategy in their translations, whereby the cultural bound words are the main obstacle that hindered them. This topic has been tackled by Nida and Reyburn asserting “difficulties arising out of differences of culture constitute the most serious problems for translators and have produced the most far-reaching misunderstandings among readers” (Reyburn, 1981, p. 2).

2.4.1 The Religious “Culture-bound words” (Culture Specific Terms)

Hamlet: For God’s love, let me hear!

(Shakespeare, 2005, Act I, Scene 197).

Jabra's translation:

هاملت: بربك تكلم

Mutran's translation:

هاملت: ناشدتك الله تكلم

The above extract is one of the hundreds of religious and cultural bound words in *Hamlet*. At the first glance of the two Arabic phrases, it seems clear that each of them adopted a different strategy in translating the religious-cultural bound words (Culture-Specific Terms). Regarding Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's translation of “For God's love, let me hear!” he rendered it into Arabic as “بربك تكلم” in which he tries to grant it an Islamic impact for the target language (TL) receptors although Jabra has been accused of adhering to the “Foreignization” method in his translation. Here, he resorts to the domestication method in rendering the religious-culture bound words (C. S. I). Religion plays an essential role in shaping the culture and the language of any society. Christianity plays a major and pivotal role in shaping much of English vocabulary and identified a

pattern of life for its society. At the same time, the Qur'an has played a major role in formulating and shaping the Arabic language vocabulary in addition to its influential impact on drawing the lifestyle of the society's members (Aziz, 1982).

In contrast to Jabra Ibrahim Jabra, Mutran Khalil Mutran adopts the natural strategy in his translation process. So Mutran resorts to Arabization rather than translation. He adheres to the Qur'anic intertextuality in an attempt to bring the text closer to Arabic by using the classical Arabic language in his rendering of Hamlet. Mutran, unlike Jabra, tries to transfer the Arab reader and spectators to the original text. To achieve his purpose, Mutran adopts the free translation method. Mutran is not bound by restrictions or limits in his translation. It seems what preoccupies Mutran's mind is the arrival of the idea of the original text in an attractive Arabic language. He tries to find an equivalence to the word of the English oath by substituting it with an Islamic oath word, thus drawing the target reader to the source text. By this, he succeeds in creating a kind of naturalness of the source text. He uses the Islamic oath word stating “ناشدتك الله تكلم”

Generally speaking, domestication designates the type of translation in which a transparent fluent style is adopted to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text for target language readers, while Foreignization means a target text is produced which deliberately breaks target conventions by retaining something of the foreignness of the original (Eisawy, 2017, pp. 1367-1368).

Taking this concept further, Eisawy states:

In the light of these definitions of domestication and Foreignization, we may find out that Gabra's translation did not achieve a lot of domestication of the Shakespearean text into Arabic. His text, in many aspects, remains alien to the Arab readers though written in Arabic. It may be acceptable to say that Jabra has used Foreignization effectively to translate cultural elements of the foreign text regardless of accepting them by the Arab readers. He was very honest to the culture of the source language (SL) text (Eisawy, 2017, pp. 1367-1368).

2.5 Pun Words Translation in Hamlet

There is no dispute that language is one of the most important features of Shakespeare's plays, and it is a characteristic that distinguishes him from other writers. Besides, *Hamlet* is full of pun words that the translators may counterpart in their

translating process of Hamlet. Playing with words and coining new words are two unique skills that Shakespeare had, and no one could compete with him. Using pun words skilfully is one of the means that helped Hamlet to pretend to be insane and hide him from the sight of the palace and the King's entourage. In the following dialogue, Hamlet pretends madness by using pun words to prevent Polonius and others from detecting Hamlet's real intentions.

The following extract is a small portion of pun words in *Hamlet*.

Polonius: What do you read, my lord?

Hamlet: Words, words, words.

Polonius: What is the matter, my lord?

Hamlet: Between who?

Polonius: I mean the matter that you read, my lord (Hamlet, Act-II, Scene-II, l.192-3, p. 102).

Jabra's translation:

بولونيوس: ما الذي تقرأ ، يا مولاي .

هاملت: كلمات ، كلمات ، كلمات .

بولونيوس : و ما الذي فيها ؟

هاملت: في من ؟

بولونيوس : في الكلمات التي تقرأها يا مولاي.

Mohammed Awad's translation:

The same extract has been translated more accurately and professionally by Mohammed Awad:

بولونيوس: ماذا تقرأ يا مولاي ؟

هملت: ألفاظ. ألفاظ. ألفاظ.

بولونيوس : و ما الموضوع يا مولاي ؟

هملت : موضوع في أي مكان ؟

بولونيوس: اعني موضوع الكتاب الذي تطالعه يا مولاي .

Here, Mohammed Awad successfully got the idea and he translated the pun word perfectly when he uses the Arabic word (الموضوع) which can mean a subject as a definite noun, and at the same time, it may refer to an indefinite noun (subject, موضوع). Awad uses the Arabic word to achieve a kind of playing with words. His translation contains

a kind of word playing and pun words tricks taking the source text to his readers and creating a kind of naturalness in the translated text.

Mutran's translation:

On the contrary, Mutran skipped the above-mentioned dialogue from the text as rendering the play. Mutran deleted the previous extract totally in addition to many other extracts from his translated text. He reduced the second and the third act of the original text to form a reshaped act three. In addition, he merged the fourth and fifth acts in one new act known as the fourth act. As it has been mentioned previously, Mutran has distorted the original text, justifying it to access the spirit of the original text.

Mutran's adopting domestication can be justified as an indirect representation of the ST in his given TT. He pardoned himself from the constraints of the original text and adhered to the target ones. Therefore, his intended aim was to move the writer towards the target readers. However, Mutran sometimes violated his domestication of *Hamlet* and applied Foreignization in his given translations without pointing out any justification for doing so (Assi, 2018, pp. 14-15).

2.6 Hamlet's Fourth Soliloquy – “To Be or Not To Be, That is The Question”

“To be or not to be, that is the question”, around this sentence a lot of confusion and controversy arose. It is one of the most well-known sentences in English literature as a whole. This is Hamlet's fourth soliloquy; it is the most prominent soliloquy in the whole play. This soliloquy sums up the entire first scene of the third act or rather sums up the whole play as it brings to mind the concept of death and life. It exposes the state of anxiety, hesitation, indecision, and the loss of the ability to choose between life and death. “To Be or Not To Be, That is The Question”; this line and the following lines of the fourth soliloquy sum up Hamlet's dilemmas. Hamlet lives an unbearable kind of inner struggle that causes him agonizing pain. He is torn between two options. He is confused whether to prefer death or prefer life with all its suffering.

In his soliloquy, Hamlet is concerned with doubt: whether life is better than death. He is alone, but he speaks in the first person plural because he is giving voice to the biggest man's dilemmas. He wonders which is the right attitude towards life: whether

it is better to live and suffer stoic noble forbearance of adverse fortune or have an active opposition to it (Traduzione, 2013, p. 4).

Arab translators view the previous soliloquy from different perspectives, so their translations varied according to their understanding of the lines of the fourth soliloquy. As it has been mentioned before, the drama was a new genre to Arabic literature, and much strange was the soliloquy. The Arab translators could not reach an agreement on the meaning of this soliloquy. Besides, most of the Arab writers and translators are unable to reach unanimity about the fourth soliloquy. Up till now, there is still a hot debate about the meaning of this soliloquy and its lines.

Some translators and academic scholars believe that it has to be translated into Arabic in the form of verse. Others say it is impossible to be translated as verse so they translate it into prose. Mohammed Enani has his comment, on this topic inquiring why all translators around the world, translate Shakespeare's poetic works into poetry rather than prose? On the contrary, we who boast of being the nation of poetry and eloquence language render Shakespeare's poetic language into prose (Enani, 2019).

The fourth soliloquy is translated by Jabra Ibrahim Jabra:

Jabra's translation:

هاملت : أأكون أم لا أكون؟ ذاك هو السؤال
أمن الأنبل للنفس ان يصبر المرء على
مقاليع الددھر اللئيم وسهامه
،ام يشھر السلاح على بحر من الهموم
ننام وبصدها ينهيها؟ نموت....
انقول بهذھ النومة ننهي و ما من شيء بعد
لوعة القلب ، و الاف الصدمات التي
من الطبيعة تعرض لهذا الجسد ؟ تلك غاية
ما احر ما تشتهي. نموت....ننام.....
ننام-واذا حلمنا؟ أجل لعمري ، هناك العقبة.
،فما قد نراه في سبات الموت من رؤى
،وقد القينا بفانيات التلايف هذه عنا
يوقفنا للتروي.

Mutran's translation:

هملت:

أكون أو لا أكون؟ تلك هي المسألة، أيُّ الحالتين أمثلُ بالنفس؟ أتَحُلُّ الرجم
بالمقابلين وتُلقي سهام الحظ الأُنكد، أم النهوضُ لمكافحة المصائب ولو كانت بحرًا عجاجًا
وبعد جهد الصراع إقامة حدِّ دونها، الموت، نوم، ثم لاشيء. نوم نستقر به من آلام القلب،
وآلاف الخطوب التي وَكَلَتْهَا الفِطْرَةُ بالأجسام، ونخشاهُ على أنه حقيق بأن نَرْجُوهُ، الموت
رقاد، رُقَادٌ وقد تكونُ به أحلام، آها هذه عقدة المسألة، إنما الخوفُ من تلك الأحلام التي
قد تتخلل رقادَ الموت بعد النجاة من آفات الحياة، وهو الذي يَقِفُ دونه العزم، ثم هو
الذي يَسُومُنَا عذاب العيش، وما أطول مداه، إذ لولا هذا الخوفُ، لما صَبَرَ أَحَدٌ على المَذَلَّاتِ،
والمَشَقَّاتِ الرَّاهِنَةِ، ولا على بَغْيِ الباغِي، ولا على تَطَاوُلِ الرجلِ المُتَكَبِّرِ، ولا على شَقَاءِ الحب
المرذول، ولا على إِبْطَاءات العدل، ولا على سلاطَةِ السلطة، ووقاحة القدرة، ولا على الكوارث
التي يُبتلى بها الحَسَبُ الصحيح، والمجدُّ الصريح، بفعلِ الحَظِّلة، وتهجم السَّفَلَةُ، وفي وَسع
المرء أن يترخصَ في الابتعاد، فيسلمَ من كل هذه الرزايا بطعنة واحدة؟ من خُنْجَرٍ في
يده. من الذي كان يرضى بالبقاء رازحًا تحت الجملِ دائم الأئنين، مستترفًا ماء الجبهة من
الإعياء؟

Jabra's translation is accurate and it is a word-for-word method. He is so bound to the source language that he uses the same equivalent word in Arabic. He uses the Arabic term *ذلك هو السؤال* for “that is the question.” Jabra here has his justification for this choice. First of all, there is a problem that stems from the fact that Arabic and English are different in many aspects, such as linguistics, syntax, and cultural differences. There is no verb “to be” in the Arabic language; the whole problem of inaccurate translation of the most famous words of Hamlet “To Be or Not To Be: That is The Question” emerges from this point.

Jabra adopts a formal equivalence strategy that generates an honest but a crude version of Hamlet in Arabic. His literal servility to the original text limits his ability to render the play in normal and idiomatic Arabic. The problem goes beyond that as the Arabic version is doubly estranged from the Arabic culture, as lexis is rendered out of the linguistic context and themes and allusions out of the cultural context. Thus, the new product looks like an artificial transplantation of an alien work in the indigenous habitat of Arabic. The source of this problem stems partly from the initial choice of the translator of a word-to-word rather than sentence-to-sentence or thought-to-thought translation, and partly from the very nature of Shakespeare's very elaborate cultural and figurative texture of Hamlet (Tajdin, 2005).

The translators and earlier the Arab scholars have different perspectives regarding these lines and they have their interpretation of “To Be or Not To Be: That is

the Question.” Some of them consider it as a description of the tragic situation of the internal conflict that Hamlet is experiencing. Others consider it Hamlet's failure in taking the right decision at the right time, as well as the inability of choosing between life and death. Jeffrey R. Wilson, in an article “To Be, or Not to Be” Shakespeare Against Philosophy asserts:

“To Be, or Not to Be” is not what it seems to be. It seems to be a suffering man’s account of the tension between action and contemplation –between the action of taking one’s own life and the contemplation of an unknown afterlife, which prevents that action from happening. In this reading, the power of the speech comes from its characterization of an individual’s struggle, a question of life and death, as a metaphysical problem, as a question of existence and nothingness. “To live, or to die” becomes “To be, or not to be”, but then Hamlet surmises an insurmountable obstacle: death might not end being. There might be a state of being after death that is even more painful than the one he is experiencing in life. He then does a simple risk-reward analysis: it is better to suffer a known amount of pain here in this life than to risk acquiring an unknown amount in the after life to end pain and suffering entirely (Wilson, 2017, pp. 349-350).

Mutran’s translation of the fourth soliloquy differs totally from Jabra’s translation in one central point represented by the use of classical Arabic, which differentiates Mutran from the rest of the translators. In the opening of the fourth soliloquy, he uses “هملت: أكون أو لا أكون؟ تلك هي المسألة,” for the most problematical sentence in Hamlet's soliloquies. He solves the lack of the verb ‘to be’ in Arabic through the use of “أكون أو لا أكون؟” which is the proper equivalence for it. His choice for “المسألة” as an equivalence for “that is the question” is so accurate that TL readers sense the naturalness of the text.

At the same time, it prepares the reader to follow the following incidents reaching an understanding of the whole soliloquy's purpose. Assi abbreviates Mutran's efforts in following domestication method in translating Hamlet, “Mutran domesticates or Arabizes Hamlet by employing Quranic intertextuality [...]. Mutran undermines his purpose of translation by moving the target reader to the source text” (Assi, 2018, p. 9).

2.7 The Nunnery Scene

Hamlet: Ha, ha! are you honest?

Ophelia: My lord!

Hamlet: Are you fair?

[...]

Hamlet: That if you are honest and fair, your honesty should admit no discourse to your beauty.

[...]

Hamlet: Get thee to a nunnery: why wouldst thou be a breeder of sinners? I am myself indifferent honest; but yet I could accuse me of such things that it were better my mother had not borne me. I am very proud, revengeful, ambitious; with more offenses at my beck than I have thoughts to put them in, imagination to give them shape, or time to act them in. What should such fellows as I do crawling between heaven and earth? We are arrant knaves, all; believe none of us. Go thy ways to a nunnery. Where's your father? (Hamlet, 2005, Act. III. I).

The following extract is taken from the third act, especially the first scene is considered one of the main pillars of the play, and it is a cradle for the most famous words uttered ever by Hamlet. Hamlet encounters Ophelia for the first time publicly with the attendance of Claudius and Polonius who were spying on Hamlet using Ophelia as a decoy. Ophelia did this work at the request of her father. Hamlet does not realize the extent of the against him by the old chamber and the King who was spying on Hamlet. What occupied the King's mind was to find out the real reason behind Hamlet's madness. For Polonius, the most important thing was to prove to the King his loyalty and faithfulness even if that costs him his daughter Ophelia. A thorough analysis of the first encounter between Hamlet and Ophelia reveals that,

The nunnery scene which constitutes an important part of act (III , I) is central to *Hamlet* as it is a verbal display of feelings, emotions, and an approach to the realities of life. The conversation is significant for meanings implicated by the speakers with reference to the topic of their discussion in the context of the action of the drama. In the plot, it records a conversation between two lovers, Hamlet and Ophelia, but it is equally crucial for Claudius to ascertain the reason behind the apparently irrational behavior of Hamlet (Khan & Bughio, 2012, p. 25).

The Arab translators differed greatly in translating the nunnery scene in Hamlet. They encountered many pitfalls and challenges because of Shakespeare's language. They followed various methods and undertook different strategies to reach the depth of Shakespeare's intention. Therefore, their translations were because of these different perspectives. Both Jabra Ibrahim Jabra and Mutran Khalil Mutran translated this scene differently; the following extracts show the extent to which they differ in their translation process.

Jabra's translation:

هاملت: ها . ها! أَعْصِفَةُ أَنْتِ ؟

أُوفِيلِيَا

سَيِّدِي

هاملت

أَجْمِيلَةُ أَنْتِ ؟

هاملت

أَعْنِي أَنْ كُنْتُ عَفِيفَةً وَجَمِيلَةً مَعًا ، وَجِبَ عَلَى عَفَافِكَ

. أَنْ يَجْعَلَ الْوَصُولَ إِلَى جَمَالِكَ مُحْرَمًا

[...]

أُوفِيلِيَا

. يَقِينَا يَا سَيِّدِي ، لَقَدْ حَمَلْتَنِي عَلَى اعْتِقَادِ ذَلِكَ

[...]

أُوفِيلِيَا

أَنْنِ فَقَدْ خَدَعْتَ

هاملت

أَذْهَبِي إِلَى دِيرٍ وَتَرْهَبِي . أَتُرِيدِينَ أَنْ تُلْدِي الْخَطَاةَ ؟

أَنَا نَفْسِي عَلَى قَدَرٍ مِنَ الْعَفَةِ ، بُولَكِنْ بَوَسْعِي رَغْمَ ذَلِكَ أَنْ أَتْهَمَ نَفْسِي بِأُمُورٍ هِيَ مِنَ الْإِثْمِ مَا يَجْعَلُ أَمِي

. أَتَتَمَنَّى لَوْ لَمْ تَكُنْ وَلَدْتَنِي

[...]

هاملت

. أَنْ كُنْتُ سَتَتَزَوِّجِينَ ، أَعْطَيْتُكَ مَهْرًا هَذَا الْوَبَاءِ

[...]

. أَذْهَبِي . وَدَاعَا . أَذْهَبِي إِلَى دِيرٍ وَتَرْهَبِي

In these lines, Jabra succeeds in conveying the source text's meaning and impact on the target reader. Part of Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's success in transferring the source text meaning and message is attributed to the use of footnotes as explanations for the pun-words and illusions used by Shakespeare. His Arabic expressions give the sense of a kind of denying Ophelia being honest. In the Arabic language, there is a term called interrogative Question (الاستفهام الانكاري), where the questioner intends to say the opposite. Target language readers can feel the faithfulness of Jabra in his translation, and at the same time, they sense the accurate language used by Jabra. The foot notes help the

Arabic reader gather some crucial information about the culture-bound words and enable them to comprehend the whole source text message.

Mutran's translation of The Nunnery scene:

[...]

هاملت: إن كنت عفيفة وجميلة ، فحذر أن يكون لعفافك أدنى اتصال بجمالك

أوفيليا : ولكن يا مولاي ا يكون للجمال رفيق أفضل من العفاف ؟

هاملت : هذا حق ولكنه يتسنى للجمال ان يحول العفة الى قوادة سافلة ، أكثر مما يتسنى للعفة أن تصور الجمال على مثالها . كأن ما تقولين من المغالطات المتقدمين ، أما الان فالزم على غير ما تظنين، لقد احببتك قبلا

[...]

أوفيليا : لقد زدتنني خيبة أمل

هاملت : اذهبي الى دير ، علام تريدن أن تكوني والدة ، ومرضعا لخاطئين ؟ أنا على شيء من الاستقامة مع هذا استطيع ان اذكر لك عن نفسي اشياء كان خيرا معها الا تلدني امي ، تكاد الذنوب التي تحف بي تكون أكثر عددا مما عندي من الخواطر لا يوائها

[...]

(Mutran, 2013). نحن جميعا مجرمون سفلة فلا تصدقي احدا منا ، سيرى سيرك دراكا الى دير ، أين أبوك ؟

After analyzing Mutran's nunnery scene translation, the following points become clear. First of all, the target language reader and spectators feel as if they were following an Arabic origin text. The second point is Mutran's use of the Classic Arabic language, which was the language of culture and literature at that time. The third point is that Mutran translated Hamlet from a French version rather than English. Although the reference can be made to the English version, he depended on the French version as a source text. Consequently, his translation is too far away from the Shakespearean text. He adopted the free adaptation method and took the author to the target receptors.

In contrast to Mutran, Jabra uses the Arabic expressions, which can mean are you honest for (Honest) in Arabic, and it can be used as a proper noun for a female individual. At the same time, it can be used as an adjective, which means 'honest'. Jabra skillfully gets the benefit of this significant feature of this word and used it as a punword. Jabra's translation gives the sense that you are not honest; he uses the interrogative form in addressing his speech. However, Mutran's translation is a mere question asking the addressed as are you Afifa (Honest) ؟ أنت عفيفة ؟ آها . آها . which means the proper noun for a female individual. Here, it does not give the sense of a pun -word because it has been used just as a proper noun.

Mutran's translation is too away from the intended meaning of Shakespeare. That can be because Mutran was worried about the Arabic coherence rather than the message of the source text. "Mutran, thus, omits allusions "not amenable to fluent translating" rendering only those which are familiar to the Arab audience and often substituting domestic cultural elements for foreign ones" (Khalifa, 2016, p. 125).

As the above discussionsshow, each of Jabra and Mutran tried to be loyal in their translation but from different perspectives. For Jabra Ibrahim Jabra, loyalty meant preserving the significant religious and cultural features of the Shakespearean text as much as possible to the degree of prevailing the ST cultural and religious features. However, specificity over the target language cultural and religious specificity contrasts to Jabra. Mutran Khalil Mutran retains the religious and cultural features of the target language in an attempt to move away from the source text impact on the target language receptors. He resorted to substituting the cultural and religious specific terms (culturally-bound words) with their counterparts and their equivalent in Arabic language and Islamic culture. Therefore, the source text melted in the crucible of the target text and resulted in an adaptation of the source text that differs from all other translations. This is what made Mutran's transadaptation distinguished from the rest of the translations and rewritings of Shakespeare; Mutran's transadaptation is completely different from the original text.

Jabra's translations are distinguished from Mutran's by being an ST biased, privileging the originality of the ST over the naturalness of TT. However, even though he gave his full loyalty to the original and adapted Foreignization, Jabra sometimes broke his norms of the original translation and employed domestication in his translation of religious culture in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (Assi, 2018, p. 26).

Asimilar line of thought can be encountered here:

Overall, there are two types of global translation strategies that distinguished the translations of Shakespeare. The first adopted a TT-oriented approach that focused on the readability of the TT vis-à-vis the target language and culture, whereas the second embraced a ST-oriented approach which observed the principles of accuracy and loyalty to the ST (Omar, 2020, p. 63).

It can be observed that both Jabra and Mutran opted for two different methods in their translation processes. "A translation in which transparentfluent style is adopted to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text".On the other hand,Foreignization is "a

translation which deliberately breaks target conventions by retaining something of the strangeness of the foreign text”(Abood, 2018, p. 3). Abood has recently talked about Jabra's translation of Hamlet:

Jabra Ibrahim Jabra used more than one strategy to transfer the meaning to the TT which are: “domestication”, “Foreignization”, “functional equivalence”, “deletion”, “transliterate” and “cultural substitution”. Jabra’s translation is very close in its effect on the Arabic receiver to the ST. An Arabic reader can fully understand what is going on in Shakespeare’s Hamlet by focusing on Jabra’s translation because Jabra uses a translated version of words and expressions that suits the target reader. In addition, Jabra has a high value in translating texts and cultural items from an English version of a text into another translated one (Abood, 2018, p. 10).

Tajdin also highlights the same point:

Jabra’s translation of Hamlet is an effort to be recognized. It has provided Arab culture with a version of the play that enabled so many scholars and artists who could not read the original to have a taste of Shakespeare though not a complete one. Generally, literature is difficult to translate, especially masterpieces like those of Shakespeare. But through analyzing this work of Jabra, the scholars reach the conclusion that dynamic equivalence is a better approach to rendering literature into another language (Tajdin, 2005, pp. 4-5).

2.8 The Recent Arabic Translations and Adaptations of Hamlet

The end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century witnessed the emergence of new series of translations of Shakespeare. The emergence of recent critical studies about Shakespeare and his works has the greatest impact on the process of translating Shakespeare more professionally and accurately. This new list was topped by many famous translators like Mohamed Anani, Salah Nyazi, and others, who have played a crucial role in changing the Arab readers' and spectators' view about Shakespeare.

This new group adopted different strategies benefiting from the pitfalls of those who preceded them. Their translations and adaptations differ from those who preceded them in two main points. The first of which is that they gained direct access to Shakespeare's originals in their translations and adaptations. Unlike Mutran, who could not access Shakespeare's original texts, but he depended on the French translation of

Hamlet in translating Shakespeare into Arabic, most of the late generation of translators translated Shakespeare from English directly without resorting to the middle languages as Mutran did. Sameh Hanna in his book *Bourdieu in Translation Studies* affirms this fact:

Unlike Mutran, who refrained from stating whether he used the English originals or not, most translators of Shakespeare's tragedies who joined the field at later stages were keen to make it clear in their paratexts that they translated from English (Hanna, 2016, p. 142).

Shakespeare's works go beyond being mere literary texts because they contain many of the language skills that distinguish Shakespeare from other writers. The Shakespearean texts contain, in addition to technical language, his texts swing between poetry and prose, using pun-word and many alliterations, and other linguistic defects, as well as implicit allusions and quotations from classic works, legends, myths, and folklore. He often resorts to using the Greek and Latin myths and classic stories in shaping his intended goal.

What distinguishes Shakespeare from other writers is the existence of a kind of harmony between Shakespeare as an Elizabethan playwright and his spectators. This kind of harmony can be rarely found in any other writer rather than Shakespeare. The existence of such kind of harmony helped in creating a kind of cultural ground that combines the playwright with his/her receptors. Al-Abdullah and Tajdin in their wonderful article *The Metamorphosis of Hamlet in Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's Translation* confirm this fact:

The text of Hamlet probably more than other literary texts includes a myriad of means of signification like classical allusions, legends, the literary genre itself, literary devices, symbolic structures, and rhythmical patterns among others. The message of Shakespeare does not stem from each of these elements alone, but from all of them in interaction. Communication happened and the message was understood by the Elizabethan audience because there was a common cultural ground between the playwright and his audience (Tajdin, 2005, p. 2).

Enani and later Niazi, used different methods in their translation of Shakespeare. Mohamed Enani, the veteran poet, critic, playwright, and translator resorted to a different strategy from those who preceded him in translating Shakespeare. Enani's wide

knowledge of previous translations had a great impact on choosing the appropriate method in re-translating Shakespeare. To bridge the huge gap between Arabic and English language and culture, he resorted to the footnotes as the safest way to convey the meaning and message of the source text properly to the target language receptors. His long introductions helped him in setting out his intention and exposed the methods used in the process of translating Shakespeare.

In addition to the long introduction, he uses footnotes to explain the methodical allusions and pun-words, thus enabling the target language receptors be armed with information about the referred myths and legends. In his footnotes, he explains the story behind using the mentioned figure, thereby helping the Arabic reader understand the whole situation which is related to the mythical allusion. In contrast, other translators such as Mutran Khalil Mutran only mentioned simple clues about the mythical allusions and even most of the time he just Arabized Shakespeare's text without referring to any information about these hints and allusions.

Living in England for a long time and experiencing the English lifestyle enabled the Iraqi Poet, playwright, and translator Salah Niazi, who adopted his method in translating Shakespeare especially *Hamlet*. It is believed that two questions exist in the minds of many readers and scholars, as well as what motivates the translators and creators to re-translate some works that have been translated before. Niazi adopted the idea of translating some of Shakespeare's plays, such as *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. He resorted to this tragedy in translating and reviewing several examples of translations of the translators who preceded him. Niazi began to follow the recent critical studies that brought out many of the mysteries and unveiled what was hidden in Shakespeare's texts. Examining deeper into these studies helped Niazi understand the intended meaning of certain expressions which have led to many misunderstandings of other translations, thus driving them into the abyss.

In his translation of *Hamlet*, Niazi emphasized an essential point, where many of those who preceded him did not think of, which is to trace the metaphorical expressions and mythical allusions and the vocabulary of the texts. Avoiding mistakes made by those who preceded him, Niazi combines poetry and prose in translating Shakespeare, as well as transferring Shakespeare's metaphors and poetic images. What helped Niazi in this procedure was identifying the figurative meanings and accessing the underlying

meanings of the text, as well as reaching the manipulations of words, pun-words, and figurative language.

It is fair to say what distinguishes Niazi's translation of *Hamlet* is the use of footnote, which has been adopted by Enani, Abdul Qadir Al-Qit, Jabra, and others who preceded Niazi in adopting this method. The most important characteristic of Niazi's footnotes is referring to many ancient sources that are full of crucial clues about the Shakespearean texts with certain details which helped in enlightening the Arabic reader and the directors as well. Some scholars and specialists believe that one of the most significant defects of the Arabic version of *Hamlet* is the absence of foot-notes to explain the mythical allusions and metaphors in addition to other literary devices used in *Hamlet*. Niazi is considered one of the few translators, who exploited the footnote strategy perfectly in a way serving the creation of a kind of communication between the translated texts and the target text receptors. Al-Abdullah and Tajdin refer to this point openly in their study about Jabra's translation specifically and Arabic translations of *Hamlet* in general.

This communion between the play and its audience is lost in the Arabic translation not only because of the quality of the translation but also because of the detachment of the text from the sources of its excellence and literary distinction. Thus, the new audience of the translated version is denied the multi-dimensional richness available to the audience of the original text (Tajdin, 2005, p. 2).

It is clear based on the above mentioned models of different translations of *Hamlet* that the translators adopted different strategies. Therefore, the result was a kind of discrepancy between the various translations. Viewing the concept of translation as a separate discipline in addition to the prevailing impression at that time had a great role in choosing the most appropriate strategy to be followed in translating *Hamlet*. During the period of Mutran Khalil Mutran, what was important to the Arab receptors was the poetic language of the text at the expense of the content of the original text and its message.

Later, the attention shifted from the ornamented language only to the text and its content, as well as the linguistic creativity in it. That phase of *Hamlet* translation witnessed the emergence of new trends adopting various strategies to reach the most accurate and acceptable versions of *Hamlet* in Arabic. Some Arabic translations of

Hamlet showed translators who tried to reconcile the aesthetic aspects of Shakespeare's language. In addition, the emergence of translation studies as an independent genre had a central role in comprehending and studying the human dimension in Shakespeare's work.

The new group of translators who adopted a new method in their translations gathered under the umbrella of The Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO). They aimed at re-writing Shakespeare academically away from distorting, cutting, and spoiling the original texts taking into consideration the cultural-linguistic differences between the Arabic language and culture and the source texts. In contrast, Mutran distorted the source twice first by translating *Hamlet* from the French source rather than the English one, and second, he removed many important scenes and he even abbreviated the five-act play into a four-act play. All these changes were carried out without taking into consideration the specifics of Shakespeare's works.

However, the translators who came after Mutran followed the approach of The Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO) in their translation processes. The most prominent pioneers are Jabra Ibrahim Jabra, Mohamed Awad, and Mohamed Enani. They opted for a middle pattern between the source text-oriented trend and the target text trend without siding with one trend at the expense of the other one. The banner of this trend was carried by Mohamed Enani, who chose a different approach. He believes in mixing different methods for the sake of retaining the meaning and message of the source text.

Enani resorted to margins and footnotes in an attempt to convey the classical images and mythical allusions and other language devices used by Shakespeare through finding their equivalence in the Arabic language and culture. He was helped in accomplishing this task by his extensive knowledge of the English language and literature. He deliberately explained through the margins myths, legends, and metaphors as well as other literary devices. Further, he used a mixture of prose and poetry in his translation of *Hamlet*. The most characteristic of modern translations of Hamlet is the presence of a long introduction in which the translator explains the methods he used in translating Shakespeare.

The process of translating and adaptation of Shakespeare did not stop at this point; rather, it continued to include new trends and groups with various approaches

towards Shakespeare's works. These new versions of Arabic Hamlet have resulted in the presence of different Hamlets. The following chapter will focus on one of these adaptations. It will be about “Forget Hamlet” by an Iraqi playwright and director, named Jawad al-Assadi. The study aims through comparing “Forget Hamlet” with Shakespeare's *Hamlet* to find out the reasons behind adapting Shakespeare's works or more specifically *Hamlet* to “Forget Hamlet”.



3. CHAPTER THREE Analysing Hamlet's Trans-Adaptation "Forget Hamlet"

This chapter falls into two sections; the first section will focus on finding the reasons behind trans-adapting *Hamlet* rather than translating it. The second section will concentrate on the comparison of *Hamlet* and *Forget Hamlet*.

4.1 Translation, Adaptation or Trans-Adaptation

Translating theatrical works is different from the translation of other literary genres. Any written work can be read and listened to except a play. The play differs in this respect. The features of a play will not be complete unless it is performed on stage. Arp and Johnson tackle this fact in "Perrine's Literature: Structure, Sound and Sense".

Drama, like prose fiction, makes use of plot and characters, develops themes, arouses emotional responses, and may be either literary or commercial in its representation of reality. Like poetry, it may draw upon all the resources of language including verse. Much drama is poetry. However, drama has one characteristic peculiar to itself. It is written primarily to be performed, not to be read. It normally presents its action (a) through actor/s, (b) on stage, and (c) before an audience. Each of these conditions has important consequences for the nature of drama. Each presents an author with a potentially enormous source of power, and each imposes limitations on the directions a work may take (Arp & Johnson, 2006, p. 1027).

In contrast to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Jawad al-Assadi in *Forget Hamlet* draws the attention of his audience to a certain point in *Hamlet* as a character. Jawad depicts Hamlet in *Forget Hamlet* as an indifferent character, who does not care about anything even his father's death. Hamlet in *Forget Hamlet* is no more the intellectual character, who is always in a state of an inner conflict as Shakespeare's Hamlet. Moreover, Hamlet is not the central character who rotates all the events and everybody's action is not related to Hamlet's actions and sayings as we have seen in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Jawad Al-Assadi turns Shakespeare's Hamlet upside down to recreate and rewrite a copy of Arabic Hamlet to suit and harmonize the Arabic young generation and their miserable state. Hamlet in *Forget Hamlet* is no more the hero or the prince or even the protagonist in contrast to Shakespeare's Hamlet.

The most important hint Jawad al- Assadi aims to give is showing his audiences the meek and futile character of Hamlet. Hamlet does not react to his uncle, Claudius, before and after his father's death. Hamlet's character in *Forget Hamlet* is considered a disappointing character. Hamlet does not give any reaction to the death of his father, or his mother's illegitimate marriage to the villain usurper Claudius. He is a weak, sad, and inactive character. Moreover, he does not care about all the events that are going on around him. Margaret Litvin in her well-known book *Hamlets Arab Journey Shakespeare's Prince and Nasser's Ghost* mentions that before and after the murder, Al-Assadi's Hamlet is disappointing. He mainly prattles or sleeps (Litvin, 2011, p. 209).

Further, in contrast to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, which starts with the absence of Hamlet at the beginning of the first scene, *Forget Hamlet's* first scene starts with Hamlet's presence. In his first appearance in the first scene of *Forget Hamlet*, he starts his role with a sarcastic question "Hamlet: The fools are even blinder than the blind man himself" (al -Assadi, 2006, p. 9).

4.2 Similarities and Differences between *Hamlet* and *Forget Hamlet*

The researcher in this chapter aims at highlighting the main similarities and differences between Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Prince of Denmark, and Jawad al-Assadi's *Forget Hamlet*. Although *Hamlet* has been translated and adapted many times by Arab scholars before Jawad al-Assadi, none of them dared to turn Shakespeare's *Hamlet* upside down as Jawad al-Assadi did. Not only linguistic and cultural differences existed between Arabic and English, but also a huge difference between existed related to the era in which Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was written and the present time. Al-Assadi adopted an adaptation strategy in rewriting *Hamlet* to suit the Arabic audiences' mood and culture. Jawad al-Assadi in his introduction to *Forget Hamlet* illustrates the following reason behind his adaptation of *Hamlet*.

I wanted in my dramatic text, *Forget Hamlet*, to pull the curtain from some characters suffering the edge of madness and to open the door of the text to their desires and their rancor, postponed in the face of Claudius, the state barbarian who swallowed up both his brother and sister-in-law at once to send the former to the grave diggers and the latter to his own bed and his boorish unmanly haste (Litvin & Carlson, 2015, p. 223).

At this point, Al-Assadi views adaptation as Lauriola mentioned:

I like to take a Greek play, smash it to ruins, and then, atop the ruins, write a new play. The new play will often take some of the character names of the Greek piece and some of the story – even some of the ruined structure. But it will be set in today's world (Lauriola, 2015, p. 103).

To expose more similarities and differences, the researcher will focus on certain topics like the characters, plot, theme, language, culture, and structure. Through the following discussion, the researcher will show that Jawad al-Assadi moved far away from the source text to introduce a new version of *Hamlet* that suits the target language and culture. Jawad al-Assadi in his introduction to *Forget Hamlet* confirms:

The idea of rewriting, whether through a new text or a different directorial interpretation, is now accepted both by drama critics and by audiences committed to a historicist view of literature in all its forms. However, it still leaves a negative impression on many Arabs (Litvin & Carlson, 2015, p. 224).

Margaret Litvin, the Associate Professor of Arabic and Comparative Literature at the University of Boston, is regarded as the pioneer in dealing with the Arabic adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. In her ground breaking book *Hamlet's Arab Journey* which was firstly published in 2015, she not only tackles problems and topics, which Arab scholars and critics have avoided but she was bold enough to render and interpret these adaptations in detail to discover the bases on which those adapters based their adapted versions of Hamlet.

Few Arabic and English studies have dealt with Arabic adaptations of Hamlet, whereas several comparison studies have addressed adaptations of *Hamlet* and the source text of *Hamlet*. Margaret Litvin's book *Four Arab Hamlet Plays* is considered the most comprehensive one. Through her survey study, she tries to cover all Arab adaptations of Hamlet. It is worth mentioning that Litvin in her book *Hamlet's Arab Journey* reviews Jawad al-Assadi's *Forget Hamlet* stating:

The unheroic Hamlet is most evident—and the Claudius figure most charismatic and brutal—in Iraqi playwright Jawad al-Assadi's play staged during its author's nearly 30-year exile from Bathist Iraq. Al-Assadi's version explicitly instructs his audience: "Forget Hamlet"⁶ (Litvin, 2011, p. 208).

⁶This drama was published under the title *Forget Hamlet* in 2000, after being staged as Ophelia's Window at Cairo's Hanager Theatre in 1994.

The Arab intellectuals and audiences did not encounter Shakespeare's plays through studying them in school classrooms. They did not read *Hamlet* on pages like other nations. They received Shakespeare through a middle language. Their introduction to Shakespeare came through the adaptation of *Hamlet* from the French translation version of *Hamlet* rather than adapting it from the source text in the English language, as Margaret Litvin and Marvin Carlson confirm this fact in the introduction of a book, titled *Four Arab Hamlet Plays*.

Arab audiences first encountered Shakespeare just as Elizabethan audiences did;; by watching, his works come alive onstage rather than as classroom readings on the page. However, unlike in England, Arab audiences' first introduction to Shakespeare came through other languages and other countries' theatre traditions, starting with French and Italian. However, Arabic-language productions of Shakespeare's plays began in late nineteenth-century Egypt, where Syrian-Lebanese immigrants adapted the French translations of Shakespeare's plays for Cairo's emergent theatre-going middle class (Litvin & Carlson, 2015, p. xvi).

Even though adaptations of *Hamlet* have currently played a crucial role in bridging the cultural gaps between Arabic and English cultures, they have always been regarded as second-hand art. The adaptor is considered a traitor for distorting the origin text. Even William Shakespeare himself did not escape their criticism. Both Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier view this topic from a different perspective. In the introduction to their book *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*, they state:

As long as there have been plays by Shakespeare, there have been adaptations of those plays. For almost four hundred years, playwrights have been taking Shakespeare's works and remaking them in an overwhelming variety of ways for the stage. In fact, Shakespeare himself was an adapter, taking existing materials from various sources and crafting them into 'new ' artistic creations.

They continue in their reasoning and analysis,

However, much of the long history of appreciating and thinking about Shakespeare has stressed his unsurpassed originality, the sanctity of his texts, and the cultural taboo on presuming to alter them. This view is, nevertheless, beginning to change (Fischlin & Fortier, 2000, p. 1).

This notion is also highlighted by Lida Hutcheon in her book *A Theory of Adaptation*. She defines adaptation as “a form of repetition without replication”, taking this concept further “A Theory of Adaptation is quite simply what its title says it is: one single attempt to think through some of the theoretical issues surrounding the ubiquitous phenomenon of adaptation as adaptation” (Hutcheon, 2006, p. xvi).

While answering the questions, Hutcheon clarifies:

Adaptations are obviously not new to our time, however; Shakespeare transferred his culture’s stories from page to stage and made them available to a whole new audience. Aeschylus and Racine and Goethe and da Ponte also retold familiar stories in new forms (Hutcheon, 2006, p. 2).

She continues talking about the definition of adaptation as:

An announced and extensive transposition of a particular work or works. This “transcoding” can involve a shift of medium (a poem to a film) or genre (an epic to a novel), or a change of frame and therefore context: telling the same story from a different point of view, for instance, can create a manifestly different interpretation. Transposition can also mean a shift in ontology from the real to the fictional, from a historical account or biography to a fictionalized narrative or drama (Hutcheon, 2006, pp. 7-8).

Writ Large was also mentioned by Fischlin and Fortire to indicate the alteration in the adaptations. It was cited that adaptation includes almost any act of alteration performed upon specific cultural works of the past and döve tails with a general process of cultural recreation (Fischlin &Fortier, 2000, p. 4). The Iraqi director and playwright Jawad al-Assadi in his adaptation of *Hamlet* orders his audience to forget Hamlet they have read and studied. He offers them a new version of Hamlet who resembles them in his hesitation and procrastination. Jawad al-Assadi, who spent his life in exile, is affected by the classical drama and the influence of Shakespeare appears clearly in his works.

He opted to adapt Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in an attempt to escape the government censorship on the playwrights and their performance. Jawad Al-Assadi intended to invent a new character that carries his creative and national anxieties instead of returning to Hamlet with whom his audience isfamiliar. He calls his audience to forget Hamlet they knew earlier because he offers them another Hamlet who resembles them because it is the product of the current Arab society with all its crudeness, ugliness, and frustration. However,how can we forget Hamlet’s character who has devoted his life to set justice and stand in the face of Claudius, the throne usurper and murderer? (Al-Abtah, 2000).

The following section will highlight the similarities and differences between the two plays: Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Prince of Denmark, and *Forget Hamlet* by Jawadal-Assadi because these two plays belong to two different cultures and periods. Therefore, prominent differences and similarities are shown and are evident clearly. The researcher chooses certain topics to prove these similarities and differences, focusing mainly on the characters, plot, theme, and structure.

4.4.1 Settings

The two plays have different settings because of different times and places. The incidents of the two plays happen in two different eras. Shakespeare's play *Hamlet*, Prince of Denmark, opens at night and the location is a guard platform at Elsinore castle, a port city of Denmark. The play starts with a doubtful inquiry stating:

Bernardo: Who's there?

Francisco: Nay, answer me. Stand and unfold yourself (Shakespeare, 2005, p. 47)

The paradox in these two lines of dialogue is that the newcomer asks instead to be asked by the soldier who is on duty. These words are a magical clue for the whole scene and the play as a whole. The scene takes place at night, but we are not informed about the accurate time. These opening words refer to something that is hidden in the darkness of the night. They indicate and foretell that something is going to happen so the newcomer is eager to know that secret.

Stephen Greenblatt in his introduction to Norton Shakespeare explains "who is there?" Shakespeare's most famous lay begins. The question, tuned back on the tragedy itself, has haunted audiences and readers for centuries (Greenblatt, 2009).

Bernardo: Who's there?

Francisco: Nay, answer me. Stand and unfold yourself.

Bernardo: Long live the king!

Francisco: Bernardo?

Bernardo: He.

Francisco: You come most carefully upon your hour.

Bernardo: 'Tis now struck twelve; get thee to bed, Francisco.

Francisco: For this relief much thanks; 'tis bitter cold,
And I am sick at heart.

Bernardo: Have you had quiet guard?

Francisco: Not a mouse stirring.

Bernardo: Well, good-night.

If you do meet Horatio and Marcellus,

The rivals of my watch, bid them make haste.

Francisco: I think I hear them. Stand, ho! Who is there? (Shakespeare, 2005, pp. 47-48)

What distinguishes the opening of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is that the guards are in a state of anxiety and anticipation. In general, the situation is as if it foreshadowed an imminent war. The most important characteristic of the general climate is the darkness whereby the guards do not know each other. The darkness is accompanied by bitter cold. The guards show a kind of reassurance and comfort when getting to know each other. The darkness separated the guards and made them fear each other. Nicholas Marsh in *Shakespeare: The Tragedies* summarizes the situation of the guards and the atmosphere that accompany their guarding hours.

What are the outstanding features of this opening sequence? The characters are mounting guard on the battlements of Elsinore Castle, at night, and the opening line is a guard's challenge: 'Who's there?' An atmosphere of military tension is immediately established. With military tension, appears danger, emphasised by their cautious responses to each other ('Nay, answer me; stand, and unfold yourself' and 'Stand, ho! Who is there?') And their expressions of gratitude and relief when they recognize each other: 'Welcome . . . welcome'. Being alone on the battlements is frightening - at the end of his watch Francisco says 'For this relief much thanks' because he is 'sick at heart', and Barnardo does not want to be alone for long ('bid them make haste') (Marsh, 1998, p. 9).

Nicholas Marsh continues and confirms that the darkness isolates people from each other and makes them live in an unstable situation. Due to the darkness and the fearful situation, the guards are doubtfully asking each other "who is there?"

Darkness isolates people from each other. More than a quarter of this extract is devoted to questioning and establishing the identities of others. The introductory exchanges, between Barnardo and Francisco, become a conversation, but when the other two characters arrive and Francisco talks to them, we are reminded of the thick darkness again. Although Marcellus is talking to Francisco, he still cannot see Barnardo and does not realize that he is close by ('Holla! Barnardo!'). Darkness, military tension, fear, and uncertainty: these are our outstanding impressions of the extract (Marsh, 1998, pp. 8-9).

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* begins with the famous brief sentence which abbreviates the whole play by raising this question. "Who is there?" It is a question that carries a lot of connotations. It can be interpreted and analyzed in many different ways. It is a question that carries many meanings. By this opening, Shakespeare intends to put the audience in an atmosphere that is full of restlessness and anxiety, as if they are waiting for the threat of an unknown enemy. The soldiers' words are unclear and there is a kind of ambiguity and uncertainty in their dialogues due to the dreadful atmosphere caused by the dark and cold night. In fact, *Hamlet* is a tragedy of thought. So these lines from the very beginning of the play refer to the central problem of Hamlet as a character and as a play.

The Elsinore castle is considered as a cultural center. It is visited by delegations and visitors from different parts of the world. The whole play takes place inside Elsinore's castle, except for Act Five scene one, which takes place just outside, or possibly on the grounds of the castle. This confined setting reflects Hamlet's situation. He feels trapped by his duty to his father and his duty as a member of the Danish royal family; therefore, his story is confined behind the battlements of the Danish royal fortress. Elsinore is a place with many private spaces. Hamlet is often alone when he delivers his soliloquies. Ophelia has a "closet"—a private space—and so does Gertrude. Claudius prays in a private chapel. These private spaces reflect the play's obsession with how people behave when they are not performing for other people. At the same time, the characters' privacy is often disturbed or spied upon. Polonius spies on Hamlet while he talks to Ophelia. Hamlet invades Ophelia's closet and he spies on Claudius while he prays. When Hamlet invades Gertrude's closet, Polonius is spying on both of them. All this spying contributes to the play's atmosphere of uncertainty and mistrust (Sparknotes, 2021).

Colin McGinn in his book *Shakespeare's Philosophy* describes Shakespeare's opening of *Hamlet* in an amazing way. He views the topic from a different perspective. He believes that the question is double-edged since it has an explicit and implicit connotation.

The play begins with the brief line "Who's there?" as one sentinel questions the identity of the other. "Stand and unfold yourself," Francisco demands. Barnardo refuses, evasively responding "Long live the King!" To Francisco's "Barnardo?" the other simply replies "He." There is uncertainty and reluctance with regard to personal identity in this deceptively simple exchange (McGinn, 2006, pp. 38-39).

According to the above mentioned information related to the setting and its crucial importance, it seems at the first sight that setting is not important. However, the setting plays a major role in drawing the events in a way that is not less important than other elements of the play. It serves as a backdrop to the events. The setting has a pivotal role in informing the audience, as well as it preserves a kind of credibility of the play. The importance of the setting is parallel to the narrator who tells the story.

Shakespeare's purpose behind this strategy is to keep his plays unframed by a certain time and place, which helps preserve Shakespeare's works relevant nowadays. Consequently, the setting can be regarded as hidden signs that help in revealing the veiled implicit meanings and the hidden connotation of the play. For example, most of the incidents take place in the Elsinore castle, the Royal Palace. However, there are some events taking place in the nearby cemetery. The events that occur in the cemetery have special connotations indicating that the cemetery is an indirect response to the permanent inquiry raised by Hamlet and other characters of Hamlet tragedy.

Taking this concept further, Layne Bolden states:

Though on the surface setting may seem unimportant, it actually serves a larger purpose than to provide a backdrop against which literary action takes place. The setting has the power to inform the emotions and attitudes of the audience. This proves incredibly relevant in plays; setting is even more important to the narrative but is often scarcely described. In works steeped in layers of meaning, such as *Hamlet*, setting acts as a key to perhaps unraveling some of these layers. Most of the action in *Hamlet* takes place in the castle, but some of the most notable scenes occur in a nearby graveyard, and with a good reason. Placing such scenes as Act 5, Scene 1 in a graveyard emphasizes the play's obsession with questions of mortality and death (Bolden, 2014).

Unlike Shakespeare, in Jawad al-Assad's adaptation of *Hamlet*, *Forget Hamlet*, the setting is a fictional kingdom that resembles most of the Arab kingdoms. Jawad Al-Assadi has not mentioned any Arabic regime or rulers since he does not want his work to be enclosed in the frame of a certain time and place. The play opens and all the characters seem to be lost and confused. Their looks indicate waiting and bewildering as if they are anticipating something to happen. In contrast to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, in Al-Assadi's play, it opens before the death of the Old King. Although the Old King is weary, he orders to prepare the drinking table for the celebration. Like Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the opening of Al-Assadi's play includes certain clues foretelling the following events.

Set in a fictional kingdom that evokes Saddam Hussein's Iraq, the play takes place amid rattling glass and suspended objects. The stage directions call for mirrors, windows, empty picture frames dangling in midair, old masks and chandeliers, creaky chairs, and hanging beds. Time is bent into dispiriting shapes: the play opens (like Hamlet's Mousetrap) before the Old King's death, but it is somehow already too late to take any action to save him or confront his killer (Litvin, 2011, p. 209).

Through the dialogue among Horatio, Hamlet and Laertes, many features of the play become clear as the following lines:

Horatio (to Hamlet): How desolate the world is!

Laertes, the blind man, stumbles and falls. A shriek from Ophelia, who is holding him. Hamlet also helps Laertes. Horatio brushes the dust off him.

Laertes (exclaims): Which is blinder, the world, or me?

Hamlet (sarcastically): The fools are even blinder than the blind man himself (Litvin & Carlson, 2015, pp. 231-232).

Like Shakespeare, Jawad Al-Assadi tries through the first scene to depict the outlines of the whole play. The first scene is full of incidents that indicate the course of events in the play. For example, the following dialogue depicts the incident.

Old King: Take me to bed, then. Sudden pain is throbbing in my head.

As the Old King and Gertrude are moving toward their bedroom, they meet Claudius.

Claudius: You'll go to sleep, my brother, and God keep you.

The Old King gives Claudius a strange look.

Claudius: Allow me to kiss this hand and these cheeks (Litvin & Carlson, 2015, p. 233).

Laertes, who is blind, always says I smell rather than I see, but he predicates what is going to happen. Every word that Laertes says has a special meaning and refers to what will happen in the following scenes. He feels the wind and says "A cold wind is coming from the direction of the window. A cold cursed wind" (Litvin & Carlson, 2015, p. 234). By these words, Laertes wants to warn the spectator about what will happen. Soon Claudius slaughters his brother the Old King and chases one of the soldiers accusing him of murdering the Old King.

Claudius (dragging one of the servants, with the blood-dripping dagger in his hand): Lowlife! Lowlife! Lowlife! (The servant flees. Claudius chases him until he catches and stabs him. The servant dies.) Who bribed you to kill the king? Who?

Gertrude (to the servant): Lowlife! You slaughtered my husband!

Horatio, Hamlet, and the player run toward the palace and the direction of the piercing scream. Ophelia, half-mad, is screaming.

Ophelia: Hamlet! (Crying) Hamlet! (She repeats this) I saw the slaughter with my own eyes, Hamlet!

Laertes screams

Laertes: Who did this... deed?

Ophelia: Laertes, I saw the slaughter with my own eyes.

Laertes: Oh, what a filthy world! I had a premonition that a crime was going to be committed. Coachman, where's the carriage? (Very loud music)

Coachman, take me away! Drive me, or my bitterness will explode! I want to drag the bull by his horns in front of a huge mirror to show him his crimes!" (Litvin & Carlson, 2015, p. 237).

A rapid glance at what has been mentioned above will reveal that Jawad Al-Assadi in an imaginative method embodied Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the 400 years old play of the sixteenth century in a modern setting. The opening scene is one of the most important scenes in Al-Assadi's *Forget Hamlet*. In fact, it is the longest scene and the richest one. It includes a bunch of clues and hints which draw the outline scheme of the play. Jawad Al-Assadi uses a Christian kingdom as a setting for his play; he displaces his concern with the current Arab political issues.

The researcher believes that both Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and its adaptation *Forget Hamlet* by Jawad Al-Assadi share a common denominator. However, the two plays differ in other matters. For example, *Hamlet*'s setting is the castle at Elsinore, a port city of Denmark, dating back to the sixteenth century. The play opens and the soldiers are in a state of anxiety, anticipation, and fear of the outward enemy. The deep darkness that envelopes the place and the old weather increase the soldiers' anxiety. They are so agitated that they scarcely know each other. They are suffering from the disaster of losing their beloved king, The Old Hamlet. At the same time, they feel that something strange or horrible is going to happen. They are fearful of breaking off a new war. The appearance of the apparition confirms the soldiers' fear and proves their anticipations. However, Jawad Al-Assadi chooses for his rewriting of *Hamlet* (*Forget Hamlet*) a fictional kingdom as a setting in the twentieth century.

Unlike Shakespeare, Jawad Al-Assadi opens his play *Forget Hamlet* before the Old Hamlet assassination by one of his guards as Claudius pledges. Claudius hunts down the murderous soldier and kills him. Besides, unlike Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, no soldiers are guarding on the platform. Jawad Al-Assadi's opening includes many events that

foreshadow the next scenes and events and outlines the plot. Laertes's words in the first scene represent crucial clues to form a full understanding of the whole play. Laertes in *Forget Hamlet* is a blind character; he smells instead of seeing. Jawad Al-Assadi aims to say that even the blind can sense the injustice and oppression of this "filthy world." Laertes's words have an implicit meaning over a superficial meaning as the following lines from the first scene:

Laertes (exclaims): Which is blinder, the world, or me?

Hamlet (sarcastically): The fools are even blinder than the blind man himself.

Laertes: I smell a foul smell.

Laertes: What's driving me mad is being in the walls of this palace. Take me outside Denmark. Bury me outside Denmark. I smell the stench of treachery in the walls of this palace. Where is Ophelia? (Shouting) Ophelia!

Laertes: Oh, what a filthy world! I had a premonition that a crime was going to be committed. Coachman, where's the carriage? (Very loud music)

Coachman, take me away! Drive me, or my bitterness will explode! I want to drag the bull by his horns in front of a huge mirror to show him his crimes!" (Litvin & Carlson, 2015, pp. 231-236).

It seems based on these lines from the opening scene of "Forget Hamlet" that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has been turned upside down. Jawad Al-Assadi in "Forget Hamlet" granted the minor characters more roles to enable the minor characters to reveal their thirst for injustice within their oppressed characters.

The following section will focus on the characters in both plays. The researcher tries through comparing the characters in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Jawad Al-Assadi's *Forget Hamlet* to draw the attention to the significant differences between the two plays.

4.4.2 Analysis of Hamlet's Characters

Hamlet begins with a complete absence of Hamlet's character. He appears in the second scene of the first act to dominate the second scene. He gets the lion's share of the second scene speech. Hamlet, attending King Claudius's coronation party, appears sad and depressed. He wears black clothes in mourning for his departed father. Hamlet tends to isolation and is completely silent. The discourse, which is full of puns and evasion, begins between the cunning King and Hamlet. King Claudius tries, by all means, to attract Hamlet's attention to topics rather than mourning his father's death. King Claudius gets a chance and addresses his speech to Hamlet in an insulting tone.

But now, my cousin Hamlet, and my son,—

Hamlet: [Aside] A little more than kin, and less than kind.

King: How is it that the clouds still hang on you?

Hamlet: Not so, my lord, I am too much I' the sun (Shakespeare, 2005,1.2.64-67).

Hamlet, the master of coining and manipulating words, comprehends Claudius's purpose when he addresses Hamlet (my cousin Hamlet, and my son). Hamlet feels insulted and humiliated by being addressed as Claudius's son. Hamlet is not honored to be the son of that thug criminal ruler, who tries by all means to tame Hamlet or at least to gain his respect. Hamlet's reply represents his awareness of the villain's intention behind the use of pun words weapon. Hamlet without any hesitations confronts Claudius in his word playgame.

Shakespeare, the master of wordplay and twisting words, through Hamlet's character weaves a nice dialogue between the two combats in semi-duel combat, which foretells the final duel between these two opponents. He cunningly replies to him: "A little more than in, and less than kind" (Shakespeare, 2005,1.2.65). Bevington and Kastan paraphrase the previous dialogue and explain.

Too close blood relation, and yet we are less than kinsmen in that our relationship lacks affection and is indeed unnatural. Hamlet lays on Kind as kindly belonging to nature, suggesting that Claudius is not the same kind of being as the rest of humanity (Shakespeare, 2005, p. 58).

Based on this dialogue, it seems that Hamlet and Claudius know each other very well. They read the minds of each other and resort to pun words strategy. Although Hamlet has not been told about his father's death by the ghost yet, it seems that he abhors Claudius and he can not stand his dodging manner in dealing with Hamlet's dilemma. Besides, Hamlet is not so worried about the matter of the throne, but the hasty marriage of his mother and the mysterious death of his father. The intention behind Claudius's words is to insult Hamlet. Therefore, without any hesitation, Hamlet confronts Claudius with the same weapon of pun words. This fact has been affirmed by M. M. Mahood in his book *Shakespeare's Wordplay*.

The first encounter of Hamlet and Claudius in this scene is a verbal duel equal in skill and excitement to the fencing match of the last act. Each character puns in such a way as to make his meaning clear to his opponent and yet beyond the bystanders' comprehension. It soon becomes clear that each has different grounds for his hostility. Claudius directs his insinuations against Hamlet's supposed resentment at being ousted from the direct succession; Hamlet's attack is levelled at Claudius's marriage to Gertrude

within the prohibited degrees. Thus Claudius's first words: 'But now my cousin Hamlet, and my son' are meant to be conciliatory, since 'son' implies 'heir', but Hamlet's muttered rejoinder: 'A little more than kin, and less than kind', in which kind means 'in the family', 'according to natural law' and 'affectionate', defines his bitterness at his mother's match (Mahood, 2003, p. 114).

Moreover, Barnett in his introduction to *Notes On Shakespeare's Play of Hamlet* highlights another point that is worth mentioning here. He says, "Macbeth is a play of Action, Hamlet is a Character - Play. We are interested not by the unfolding of the plot, but by the wonderful development of character." He continues his arguments and adds: "Hamlet too pauses, reasons, reflects, weighs all arguments for and against, forms a resolution, but invariably puts off its performance. Hamlet is quick to resolve but slow to act" (Barnett, 1893, p. 14).

Shakespeare coined Hamlet's character in a well-crafted play and depicted Hamlet as the central character weaving around him all other characters in a skillful network. Hamlet's tragedy transcends a personal matter and Shakespeare intends through Hamlet to depict the uprising conflicts and the struggles that accompanied the renaissance era. Although some scholars and critics accuse Hamlet of being a man of thinking rather than acting, according to Edward Dowden's point of view,

Hamlet is not merely or chiefly intellectual; the emotional side of his character is quite as important as the intellectual; his malady is as deep-seated in his sensibilities and in his heart as it is in the brain. If all his feelings translate themselves into thoughts, it is no less true that all his thoughts are impregnated with feeling (Dowden, 1875, 2009, p. 132).

William Hazlitt in his book *Characters of William Shakespeare's Plays* paraphrases Hamlet's character in a wonderful way where he describes him as:

The character of Hamlet stands quite by itself. It is not a character marked by strength of will or even of passion, but by refinement of thought and sentiment. Hamlet is as little of the hero as a man could well be, but he is a young and princely novice, full of high enthusiasm and quick sensibility. The sport of circumstances, questioning with fortune and refining on his own feelings, and forced from the natural bias of his disposition by the strangeness of his situation (Hazlitt, 1908, 2009, p. 86).

It is clear based on this description by Hazlitt that Hamlet is a hesitant character who spends most of his time thinking and meditating. He is a man of thinking and contemplation rather than a man of action. His way of handling things and remedying the situations made him an indecisive character incapable of taking the suitable decision at the right time. Hamlet's acting does not exceed speculation, thinking, and

contemplation with the absence of action. In other words, Hamlet manipulates his tongue rather than his sword.

In his first appearance in Act one scene two, he dominates the scene by his discourse; the whole scene is about 263 lines, whereby Hamlet quotes more than a third of it. He spends a lot of time collecting evidence on his father's assassination by his uncle Claudius. The process of searching for condemning evidence to prove Claudius's guilt drives Hamlet far away from his main task of avenging his father's murder. The appearance of the ghost changes Hamlet's life. Every time the ghost's appearance costs Hamlet more depression and it burdens him with more responsibilities. More specifically, the ghost turns Hamlet's life into a moveable hell on the earth.

At other times, when he is most bound to act, he remains puzzled, undecided, and skeptical, and dallies with his purposes until the occasion is lost and finds out pretenses to relapse into indolence and thoughtfulness again. Consequently, he refuses to kill the King when he is at his prayers, and by refinement in malice, which in reality is only an excuse for his own purpose of resolution that defers his revenge to a more fatal opportunity, when he shall be engaged in some acts:

That has no relish of salvation in it. Now he is praying, and now I'll don't, and so he goes to heaven, And so am I revenged: that would be scanned. A villain kills my father, and for that, I, h O this is hire and salary, not revenge is sole son, send him to heaven. Up sword and know thou a more horrid hent, when he is drunk, asleep, or in his rage (Hazlitt, 1908, 2009, pp. 86-87).

Many scholars and critics wrote about Hamlet the character and his crucial role in *Hamlet* the play, but none of them dared to call it the "Mona Lisa" of literature. Although T. S. Eliot called Shakespeare's Hamlet "Mona Lisa" in his well-known book *The Sacred Wood: Essays On Poetry And Criticism*, he does not hesitate in addressing Hamlet as an "artistic failure." "So far from being Shakespeare's masterpiece, the play is most certainly an artistic failure. More specifically, the play is puzzling and disquieting, as is none of the others. Of all the plays, it is the longest and is possibly the one on which Shakespeare spent much pain, yet he has left in it superfluous and inconsistent scenes, which even hasty revision should have noticed them (Eliot, 1920, p. 98).

Eliot continues in criticizing Hamlet and he views Hamlet's character as: the Buffoonery of an emotion which can find no outlet in action; in the dramatist it is the buffoonery of an emotion which he cannot express in art. The intense feeling, ecstatic or terrible,

without an object' or exceeding its object, is something which every person of sensibility has known; it is doubtless a study to pathologists" (Eliot, 1920, p. 102).

In response to Eliot, Harold Bloom wonders:

What, one wonders, is an aesthetic success if Hamlet is a failure? And yet, Hamlet does walk out of his play, much as Sir John Falstaff seems to stride out of the two parts of Henry IV. Like the Don Quixote and Sancho Panza of Cervantes, Hamlet and Falstaff are universal creations, who stimulate us to envision them in situations and in enterprises not necessarily present in the original texts (Bloom, 2004, p. 9).

Bloom continues in his ironic inquiry stating that if Shakespeare's Hamlet is an "Artistic Failure" as Eliot views it, why it is relevant nowadays and it has been continuously translated and passed on by generations through more than four centuries. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* represents the suffering of the whole humanity; it is not just a personal dilemma of Hamlet. Shakespeare through Hamlet intended to depict the suffering of humankind in an era dominated by volatility. The instability on certain principles and constant changes in beliefs left a negative impact on individuals and society. Shakespeare painted this suffering as Hamlet's inner struggle and conflict, which robbed him of peace of mind and body. It is about the suffering of a man who is burdened with responsibilities beyond his capacity (Bloom, 2004).

G. Wilson Knight in his book *The Wheel of Fire* tries to go through Hamlet's character systematically. He interprets Hamlet's discourse sometimes and at other times, he interprets the text through Hamlet's sayings. Shakespeare intends to depict the state of humankind in the renaissance era by focusing on Hamlet and his dilemma. Hamlet's catastrophe represents all individuals' suffering due to the reformation and the religious, social, and political conflicts that accompanied the emergence of the renaissance.

Therefore, G. Wilson Knight affirms that so my first and foremost goal is to confine myself to a discussion of criticism and interpretation. I do not intend to discuss the whole play, nor to discuss Hamlet's character alone. However, I intend to discuss the seeds of suffering which may be a cause or an effect of the plot of the event (Knight, 2005). G. Wilson Knight in the first section of his book confirms that Hamlet in his first appearance looks very sad, pensive, and dressed in black.

Our attention is early drawn to the figure of Hamlet. Alone in the gay glitter of the court, silhouetted against brilliance, robustness, health, and happiness is the pale, black-robed Hamlet mourning. When first we meet him, his words point to the essential

inwardness of his suffering: “But I have that within which passeth show; These but the trappings and the suits of woe” (Knight, 2005, p. 17).

When Hamlet is alone, he reveals openly the secrets behind his disaster and the sadness that is camping on his face and his consciousness. Hamlet through his soliloquy exposes the reasons behind instilling anxiety and instability in his mind and consciousness.

When he is alone he reveals his misery more clearly:

O, that this too too solid flesh would melt,
Thaw and resolve itself into a dew!
Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter! O, God! O, God!
How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world!
Fie on't! ah fie, I 'tis an unweeded garden,
That grows to seed; things rank and gross, in nature
Possess it merely (Knight, 2005, p. 17).

G. Wilson Knight reveals two main reasons for Hamlet's mourning and calamity before the appearance of the ghost. Knight traces Hamlet's sadness and disaster to the following reasons:

These two concrete embodiments of Hamlet's misery are closely related. He suffers from misery at his father's death and agony at his mother's quick forgetfulness. Such callousness is infidelity, and so impurity, and, since Claudius is the brother of the King, incest. It is reasonable to suppose that Hamlet's state of mind, if not wholly caused by these events, is at least definitely related to them. Of his two loved parents, one has been taken forever by death, the other dishonored forever by her act of marriage. To Hamlet, the world is now an 'unweeded garden' (Knight, 2005, p. 18).

Hamlet has heard about death from the living tongue; however, hearing the news of death from the ghost made him lose any sense of life and affected his behavior and discourse later on. The ghost of Hamlet's father reveals to Hamlet the secret of his murder at the hand of his uncle Claudius, the villain murderer. Knight follows the impact of the appearance of the ghost on Hamlet:

Hamlet hears of his father's Ghost, sees it, and speaks to it. His original pain is intensified by knowledge of the unrestful spirit, by the terrible secrets of death, hinted by the Ghost's words: I could a tale unfold whose lightest word would harrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood... This is added to Hamlet's sense of loss: this knowledge of the father he loved suffering in death: Doom'd for a certain term to walk the night, and for the day

confin'd to fast in fires... Nor is this all. He next learns that his father's murderer now wears the crown, is married to his faithless mother (Knight, 2005, p. 18).

Hamlet intended to bring the course of events back to the right path, but he faced a major disaster, which is revealing the secret of his father's death. This incident disappointed him in setting things right in the kingdom. Moreover, the successive encounters with the ghost made Hamlet lose any hope in reforming the affairs of the kingdom. Due to the bewildering and the agony that the ghost's appearance caused to Hamlet, he reached the pulse of life and preferred suicide over life.

What irritates Hamlet's soul more than his father's death and his mother's hasty marriage is the death of loyalty in his uncle and his mother's soul to reach later on to his beloved Ophelia. G. Wilson Knight explains that he cries out against the cruel fate that has laid on him, whose own soul is in chaos, the command of righting the evil in the state:

O cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right! (i. v. 188)

Hamlet, when we first meet him, has lost all sense of life's significance. To a man bereft of the sense of purpose, there is no possibility of creative action, it has no meaning. No act but suicide is rational. Yet to Hamlet comes the command of a great act of revenge: therein lies the unique quality of the play a sick soul is commanded to heal, to cleanse, to create harmony. But good cannot come of evil: it is seen that the sickness of his soul only further infects the state his disintegration spreads out, disintegrating. Hamlet's soul is sick to death and yet there was one thing left that might have saved him. In the deserts of his mind, void with the utter vacuity of the knowledge of the death of his father, death of his mother's faith was yet one flower, his love of Ophelia (Knight, 2005, pp. 19-20).

It seems that Hamlet did not care about his life as much as he worries about conveying the truth as it was. Even in his last moments, what occupies his mind and consciousness is the transfer of the truth as it was. Shakespeare here intends to prove that tragedy is close to human destiny as his/her shadow. Tragedy continues in accompanying human existence; it cannot be separated from human existence, and it is

adjacent to their existence. Bevington and Kastan in their introduction to *Shakespeare's Hamlet* confirm this fact.

Horatio sees so limited point in outliving the catastrophe of this play that he would choose to death. Were it not that, he must draw his breath in pain to ensure that Hamlet's story is truly told. Still, that truth has been rescued from oblivion. Amid the ruin of the final scene, we share the artist's vision through which we struggle to interpret and give order to the tragedy that proves to be inseparable from the human existence (Shakespeare, 2005).

Although it is impossible to limit Hamlet's character in a few pages, it seems that there are enough points to show some significant similarities and differences between Shakespeare's Hamlet character and Jawad Al-Assadi's Hamlet character in *Forget Hamlet*. In contrast to Shakespeare, in Jawad Al-Assadi's play, Hamlet is not a heroic character. He is a disappointed and meek person who always sleeps or speaks foolishly. As Margaret Litvin describes Hamlet in Jawad Al-Assadi's play "before and after the murder, Al-Assadi's Hamlet disappoints. He mainly prattles or sleeps" (Litvin, 2011, p. 209).

If action and discourse are the two main features that reveal the characters' significant role in unfolding the plot of a play, Hamlet will have a minor role in revealing the plot of *Forget Hamlet*. Hamlet's role in *Forget Hamlet* is limited to some trivial words and actions that are not so urgent in unfolding the plot. Jawad Al-Assadi's purpose is to grant the minor characters in *Hamlet* a chance to express and reveal the groans and pent-up heartbreaks within themselves. Margaret Litvin gives a detailed explanation about it.

I wanted, in my dramatic text *Forget Hamlet*, to pull the curtain from some characters suffering the edge of madness and to open the door of the text to their desires and their rancor, postponed in the face of Claudius. The state barbarian who swallowed up his brother and sister-in-law both at once to send the former to the gravediggers and the latter to his own bed and his boorish unmanly haste (Litvin, 2011, p. 211).

CONCLUSION

The controversy between the legality of adaptation and translation is eternal. The barren debate between the two sides of the argument is in case adaptation is regarded as a translation system or a distorted translation. Several theorists and scholars consider adaptation as part of translation strategies. Other people consider adaptation as an urgent requirement according to the common developments that followed the emergence of translation studies. The emergence of translation studies as a self-reliant discipline of linguistics has a central role in the prosperity of adaptation activities.

This study examined the process of translating and adapting Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Arabic and focused on the two examples of the vast majority of prominent extinct and fresh Arabic adaptations and translations by two pioneers of translation from the Arab world. After comparing and inspecting the translated and adapted texts of *Hamlet* by Jabra Ibrahim Jabra and Mutran Khalil Mutran, it was revealed that despite the emergence of more translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in Arabic, the controversy between translation and adaptation still exists.

On the one hand, the process of re-translation played a central role in setting things right. On the other hand, it is unquestionable evidence about the failure of previous translations and translators to reach the spirit of Shakespeare's works, especially *Hamlet*. This goes back to the fact that two languages belong to two different linguistic families and two different cultures. All these differences resulted in generating a kind of cultural and linguistic variations and difficulties for the translators. Undoubtedly, countless translations and adaptations of *Hamlet* exist and keep coming in Arabic literature. It is possible that a period of 365 days does not pass without the appearance of a new translation or a re-translation of a preceding one, and sometimes the writer re-translates his/her own translation.

The emergence of several translation studies, vital and analytical studies on Shakespeare in current years has played a key role in the quality and quantity of these translations and adaptations of Shakespeare, mainly *Hamlet* because Shakespeare's works depicted the human sufferings and feelings of humanity with the utmost precision, linguistic mastery, and accuracy. Translating Shakespeare works in general and *Hamlet* in particular along with the Shakespearean language became a very daunting, if not nearly an impossible mission for translators and adaptors. Therefore, due to its

complications, translators, adaptors, and dramatists chose to adapt Shakespeare to suit their cultural environment and linguistic appropriations.

Despite the temporal and spatial differences between the two cultures and two diverse languages, adaptors and translators have their reasons and justifications for adopting and appropriate approaches in re-writing the classical texts. Linda Hutcheon in her book *A Theory of Adaptation* mentions numerous reasons behind appropriate or suitable adaptation according to culture. She nominates economic, cultural, legal, political, and personalized motivations that guide the adaptor to adopt this system of re-writing the unique content to suit the culture and environment of the target language. By mentioning these reasons, Linda Hutcheon tries to hunt an answer to an investigation that has occupied the intellect and sense of most theorists and scholars as well.

Jawad Al-Assdi like other translators and adaptors resorted to adapting classical plays, especially Shakespeare's works, and more specifically *Hamlet*. What distinguishes Jawad from the rest of the adaptors is being in exile for more than twenty-five years and he combined all the above-mentioned motives and reasons behind adaptation and rewriting Shakespeare. Jawad Al-Assadi is considered one of many writers and authors, who have been subjected to banishment and was combated by repressive regimes and tyrannical systems.

After reviewing and tracing some examples of *Hamlet*'s translations and adaptations into Arabic, the differences seem quite clear. Jawad Al-Assadi benefited from the mistakes and lapses that his predecessors made in translating and adapting *Hamlet*. Therefore, Jawad Al-Assadi resorted to adapting *Hamlet* rather than translating it. In his introduction to *Forget Hamlet*, he explains the real motives that led him to adapt rather than translate Hamlet. Jawad Al-Assdi insists on not sanctifying the classic texts by preserving them on the shelves of libraries, but rather turning them upside down.

He granted the frustrated and marginal characters central roles, thus enabling them to express some of their inner sufferings. Hamlet in *Forget Hamlet* is no more the intellectual university student, who throughout the play lives a kind of inner suffering that affects his reaction towards many incidents. In contrast to Shakespeare's Hamlet, Hamlet in Jawad Al-Assdi's *Forget Hamlet* is depicted as an indifferent individual who does not care about his father's death. Thus, Hamlet has no pivotal role in formulating the events of the play.

An obvious disagreement between the two plays is noticeable in their representation of characters. As we have seen, there are a lot of clear differences between the two playwrights' representation of the persona of Hamlet, Ophelia, and Claudius. Shakespeare's Hamlet is a worthy man and an excellent prince, who cares about the interests of his Monarch and its people. He addresses the public politely and is eager to find out the truth of his father's death. On the other hand, Hamlet in Jawad Al-Assadi's *Forget Hamlet* is indifferent in his general attitude. He appears to be unaware of his own personal and familial issues than public issues.

To several extents, he is perfunctory, who tries to be negligent and does not benefit from any opportunity to resist his uncle's conspiracies against him. The vast majority of clear disagreement between the two heroes seems at the end of the play. On the one hand, Hamlet in Shakespeare selected to punish himself as he accepts to challenge Laertes in duel combat. Hamlet's procrastination causes his death and other characters except for Horatio, who is his dearest and faithful friend, who attempts to commit suicide after his friend's death. On the other hand, Hamlet in *Forget Hamlet* seems so careless. He even cannot defend himself against the soldiers who come to kill him and does not show any kind of resistance.

Jawad Al-Assadi began by destroying the play and transforming it from a five-act play into a one-act play consisting of seventeen scenes and an epilogue. The most obvious difference between Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Al-Assadi's *Forget Hamlet* is the setting of the two plays. Shakespeare's setting is Elsinore Castle in Denmark, whereas Al-Assadi chose to set his play in the present, but a room of an unknown palace. Unlike Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, which begins with the guard duty for a group of soldiers, who are currently on watch, distressed, full of distrust, and are worried about the darkness and bitter cold. Shakespeare aimed at indicating the chaotic atmosphere that surrounds the castle representing the whole state's condition. Shakespeare begins his play with a dialogue among soldiers, showing the extent of the soldiers' anxiety and anticipation of the war.

Unlike Shakespeare's play, Jawad Al-Assadi's play begins in unknown settings as an indication that his play is not specified to a certain regime or a country. He chooses one of the rooms in the royal palace as a setting for his play. The other differences include that the Old King Hamlet is still alive and Hamlet is not abroad. Jawad Al-Assadi

wants to show that the vast majority of the chaotic states and issues of the Middle East including the Arab world stem from within and do not come from outside. Then, Old Hamlet is assassinated by his brother Claudius. The motives of assassinating in both plays are the same, which centers around greed for power, the throne, and women.

What differentiates *Forget Hamlet* from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is the process of assassination in Jawad's play. There is no need for the mousetrap (play within a play) to know the assassin because the assassin is already known to the audience. In this regard, Claudius is an opportunist, who tries to hold the benefit of any opportunity so extended as it represents his ends and purposes. Each of the two protagonists faces a different fate at the end of the tragedy for diverse reasons. In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Shakespeare leaves the young prince to face a destined tragedy, whereas, in Jawad Al-Assadi's play, he leaves the protagonist alive and even grants him the absolute power in running the state and suppressing whomever he sees as a source of danger on his reign.

Several similarities between the two plays can be noticed in their treatment of Claudius, the villain persona, and the opportunist, who tries, by all means, to show himself as the most faithful and loyal to the monarchy. Although he is the corn of decay and rottenness in the state, this, later on, affects the whole court and the Monarch as well. Claudius' character in both plays shares nearly the same characteristics along with several microscopic differences. Further, several differences can be seen in Ophelia's relationship with Claudius in *Forget Hamlet*, when she reveals that she is ready to spend a night with Claudius as a deal to release her imprisoned brother, Laertes who has been driven to jail for revealing Claudius's crime. A disagreement can be seen in the representation of Ophelia's character. For Jawad Al-Assadi, Ophelia is no more a submissive and meek persona. She represents the revolutionary woman character who stands in the face of dictators and even fights to regain her stolen rights.

Finally, the two plays vary in their amount of universality and popularity. For instance, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was written over four hundred years ago and has been translated into various languages and diverse cultures. Being a relatively new play, Al-Assadi's *Forget Hamlet* has been translated into various languages, but its final success still awaits various more ages to come. It is still to be seen whether this play is a genuine match to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as it was an attempt to rewrite a classical drama in a more fresh way to suit a diverse audience and diverse times.

The researcher believes that the genius of Jawad Al-Assadi reserves the right in choosing the principle of adaptation as a method of re-writing *Hamlet*. His success lies in not confining the play to a certain time and place and viewing the classic text as mere texts, rather than as sacred texts that should not be touched and paraphrased. In this point, Jawad Al-Assadi follows Charles Mee in his views on the process of re-writing the classic works.



REFERENCES

- Abood, A. S. (2018). "Translation of Culture-Specific Reference in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic." Retrieved on October 27, 2021, from uoanbar.edu.iq: <https://www.uoanbar.edu.iq>.
- A. C. Bradley. (1992). *Shakespearean Tragedy* (3rd Ed.). New York: John Russell Brown.
- Akbari, M. (2013). "The Role of Culture in Translation." *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies* Vol. 3(8) August 2013, pp. 13-21, 14.
- Al-Assadi, J. (2006). *Forget Hamlet*. (1st Ed.), M. Litvin, Trans.
- Al-Quraishy, z. M. (2018). "Cultural Gaps on the Light of Translation." *Cihan University-Erbil Scientific Journal*, 2(Special Issue No.1), 166-181.
- Al-Saidi, A. H. (2013). "Problems of Translating Cultural Signs with Reference to English and Arabic." *Journal of University of Thi-Qar*, Vol. 8, No.3, June.
- Al-Sulaimaan, M. M. (2016). *Translation Theories and Practice*. Erbil: Haval Art Printing Press.
- Al-Shetawi, M. F. (1999). "Hamlet in Arabic." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*. Vol. 20, No. 1, 43-63.
- Alcala, R. S. (2016). *Cultural Boundaries in Translation: Different Approaches to Cultural Words*. De La RioJa: Unversidad De La RioJa.
- Arp, T. R., and Johnson, G. (2006). *Perrine's Literature Structure, Sound, and Sense Drama*. (9th Ed.). London: Michael Rosenberg.
- Assaqaf, T. A. (2014). "Adaptation as a Means of Translation." *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* (ISSN Online):2319 - 7064), 783.
- Assi, A. J. (2018). "Religious Culture in Mutran's and Jabra's Translation of Shakespeare's Hamlet." Retrieved on October 31, 2021, from [repository.najah.edu/handle/20.500.11888/14858](https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11888/14858): <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11888/14858>.
- Aziz, Y. Y. (1982). "Cultural Problems of English-Arabic Translation." *Babel: International Journal of Translation*, 28(1), pp. 25-29.

- Baker, M. (1998). *The Routledge of Translation Studies*. (2nd Ed.), New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (1998 and 2001). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Barnett, T. (1893). *Notes on Shakespeare's Play of Hamlet*. (2nd Ed.), New York and London: George Bell and Sons.
- Bassnett, S. (2016). "The Figure of the Translator." *Journal of World Literature*, 1(3), 299-315. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/24056480-00103002>.
- Bassnett-McGuire, S. (1985 and 2014). "Ways Through The Labyrinth Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts." In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature Studies in Literary Translation* (1st ed., pp. 87-102). New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (2011). *Reflections on Translation*. Bristol: MPG Books Group.
- Bassnett, S. (1991). *Translation Studies*. (3rd Ed.), New York: Routledge.
- Bell, R. T. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Bhattacharjee, Anol. (2012). "Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices" Textbooks Collection. 3. http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/oa_textbooks/3
- Bloom, H. (2004). *Bloom's Guide William Shakespeare's Hamlet*. (1st Ed.), New York, USA: Chelsea House.
- Bolden, L. (2014, Feb. 17). "Intro to Drama." Retrieved on July 17, 2021, from Intro to Drama: The Importance of setting in Hamlet: <http://lupton126002.blogspot.com/2014/02/the-importance-of-setting-in-hamlet.html>.
- Botilca, C. M. (2021). "Retranslation as a Necessity for the 21st Century Reader." *Philologica Jassyensia*, XVII (1, 33), 143-152.
- Brislin, R. (1976). *Translation: Application and Research*. New York: Gardener Press Inc.

- Casagrande, J. B. (2012). "The End of Translation." *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 20, No.4 (Oct., 1954), pp. 335-340, 335-340.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- David, K. (2009). "Translation as Intercultural Communication." In J. Munday, *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (p. 74). New York: Routledge.
- Dowden, E. (1875 and 2009). *Shakespeare: A Critical Study of his Mind and Art*. (1st Ed.), New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisawy, B. (2017). "Journals Ekb." Retrieved on October 27, 2021, from http://journals.ekb.eg/article_122234_e14f318ac3e81c78fb56422283cc37d0.pdf: <http://journals..ekb.eg/article>.
- Elyildirim, S. (2008). *The Importance of Cultural Knowledge in Translation*. SDU Fen Edebiyat Fakultesi, 1.
- Eliot, T. S. (1920). *The Sacred Wood*. (1st Ed.), London: Buttler and Tanner.
- Elmenfi, F. (2013). "Retranslation of Orientalism: Reading Said in Arabic." *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences*, 7(12), 3098-3105.
- Enani, M. (2019). "On Translating Shakespeare's Sonnets into Arabic." In K. H. Litvin, *Shakespeare and The Arab World* (1st ed., pp. 63-76). New York: Berghahn.
- Enani, M. (2016). "On Translating Shakespeare into Arabic, a Translator's Testimonial." In S. A. Ibrahim, *Rewriting Narratives in Egyptian Theatre* (pp. 157-161). New York: Routledge Tylor and Francis.
- Fenyő, S. S. (2005). "The Translator's Cultural Competence." *European Integration Studies, Miskolc*, Volume 4.(Number 2.), pp. 61-72.
- Fischlin, D., and Fortier, M. (2000). *Adaptation of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*. (1st Ed.). (D. F. Fortier, Ed.) New York, London: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1993). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

- Ghazaala, H. (1995 and 2008). *Translation as Problems and Solutions*. Beirut: Dar El-limmalayin.
- Gostand, R. (1980). "Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication: Drama as Translation." In O. Zuber (Ed.), *The Languages of Theatre Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama* (1st Ed., pp. 2-3). Oxford and New York: Pergamon.
- Greenblatt, S. (2009). Retrieved May 31, 2021, from Norton Shakespeare Introduction to Hamlet: <http://web.csulb.edu/~lkermode/engl363/hamletnortonintro.htm>
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. (1st Ed.). New York & London: Anchor Books Doubleday.
- Hanna, S. (2019). "Decommercialising Shakespeare Mutran's Translation of Othello." In K. H. Litvin, *Shakespeare and The Arab World* (pp. 32-62). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Hanna, S. (2016). *Bourdieu in Translation the Socio-cultural Dynamics*. (1st Ed.). New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis.
- Hazlitt, W. (1908 and 2009). *Characters of William Shakespeare's Plays*. (1st Ed.), (J. Loban, Ed.) New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holderness, G. (2013). "Global Shakespeare." Retrieved on September 3, 2021, from GlobalShakespeares.mit.edu/, <http://global Shakespeares.mit.edu/>.
- Hunt, M. W. (2007). *Looking for Hamlet*. (1st Ed.), New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hongwei, C. (1999). "Cultural Difference and Translation." *Meta*, 44(1) , pp. 121-132.
- House, J. (2018). *Translation: The Basics*. (1st Ed.), New York: Routledge.
- House, J. (2016). *Translation as Communication Across Language and Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment Past and Present*. New York: Routledge.
- House, J. (2009). *Translation*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. (1st Ed.), New York: Routledge.
- Ilyas, A. I. (1989). *Theories of Translation*. Mosul: Mosul University Press.

- Jakobson, R. (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In R. Brower, On Translation (pp. 232-239). New York: Harvard University Press.
- Jawad, A. S. (2018). "Explore Shakespeare: Blogs on Shakespeare's Sonnets in Arabic." Retrieved on October 27, 2021, from Shakespeare.org.uk: <https://www.Shakespeare.org.uk>
- Khalifa, O. I. (2016). "Allusion in Three Translations of Hamlet into Arabic." In S. Aaltonen, and A. Ibrahim (Eds.), *Rewriting Narratives in Egyptian Theatre* (p. 125). New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- Khan, Q., and Bughio, F. A. (2012). "Nunnery Scene: A pragmatic Analysis of Hamlet-Ophelia Encounter." Retrieved on November 5, 2021, from [.researchgate.net/publication/289418384](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289418384): https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289418384_
- Komissarov, V. (1991). "Language and Culture in Translation: Competitors or Collaborators?" *Languages and Cultures in Translation Theories*, p. 46.
- Kramsch, C. (2013). "Culture in foreign language Teaching." *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 57-78.
- Larson, M. L. (1988). *Meaning Based Translation*. (2nd Ed.), (B. Brown, Ed.) Boston: University Press of America.
- Lauriola, R. (2015). "Re-making Greek Tragedies: A Perspective on The American Charles Mee's Project with a Case Study." *Dionysus ex machina*, VI, pp. 97-136.
- Levy, J. (2000). "Translation as a Decision Process." In L. Venuti, and M. Baker (Ed.), *Translation Studies Reader* (p. 148). New York: Routledge.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). "Translation as Intercultural Mediation: Setting the Scene." *Perspectives Studies in Translatology*, 24(3), pp. 347-353.
- Litvin, M. and Hennessey, K. (2019). *Shakespeare and the ArabWorld*. (1st Ed.), New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Litvin, M. (2017). "Multilateral Reception: Three Lessons from the Arab Hamlet Tradition." *Middle Eastern Literatures*, pp. 51-63.
- Litvin, M. and Carlson, M. (2015). *Four Arab Hamlet Plays*. (1st Ed.), (M. C. Arab, Ed.) New York: Martin E. Segal Theatre Center Publications.

- Litvin, M. (2011). *Hamlet's Arab Journey*. (1st Ed.), Princeton, New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Litvin, M. (2011). "The French Source of the Earliest Surviving Arabic Hamlet." *Shakespeare Studies*, 39, pp. 133-151.
- Lotman, Y. B. (1978). "On The Semiotics Mechanism of Culture." *New Literary History*, 9, pp. 211-232.
- Mahood, M. (2003). *Shakespeare's Wordplay*. (2nd Ed.), London: Routledge.
- Marsh, N. (1998). *Shakespeare: The Tragedies*. (1st Ed.), New York: St. Martin's Press.
- McGinn, C. (2006). *Shakespeare's Philosophy*. (1st Ed.), New York, USA: Harper Collins Publishers Inc.
- Newmark, P. (2001). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Text Book of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. (1993). *Language, Culture, and Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nida, E. (1969 and 1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Omar, L. I. (2020). "The Stylistic Amplification of Conceptual Metaphors in Translating Shakespeare into Arabic by Mohamed Enani." *AWEJ for Translation and Literary Studies*, Volume 4, Number4. October 2020, 4(4), pp. 58-71.
- Poyatos, F. (1997). "The Identification of Gestural Images in Chinese Literary Expressions." In Y. Shun-Chiu, *Nonverbal communication and Translation* (p. 69). Amsterdam: John Benjamins publishing company.
- Pym, A. (2000). *Negotiating the Frontier Translators and Inter-cultures in Hispanic History*. New York: Routledge.
- Qaddoumi, S. S. (2018). "Translation and Intertextual Space: The Religious Intertextuality of Islam in the Translation of Hamlet by Jabra Ibrahim Jabra." Retrieved on October 27, 2021, from <http://www.academ.edu>

- Raeff, C., Fasoli, A. D., Reddy, V., & Mascolo, M. F. (2020). "The Concept of Culture: Introduction to Spotlight Series on Conceptualizing Culture." *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(4), 298.
- Raw, L. (2012). *Translation, Adaptation and Transformation*. London and New York: Bloomsbury T and T Clark.
- Reyburn, E. N. (1981). *Meaning Across Cultures*. New York: Maryknoll N. Y.: Orbis.
- Richards, J. C. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (3rd Ed.), London and New York: Longman.
- Shakespeare, W. (2005). *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. (5th Ed.), (D. B. Kastan, Ed.), New York: A Bantam Book.
- Salehi, M. (2012). "Reflections on Culture, Language and Translation." *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 77.
- Sanders, J. (2006). *Adaptation and Appropriation*. (1st Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Sapir, E. (1956). *Culture, Language and Personality*. (D. G. Mandelbaum, Ed.) Berkeley and Los Angeles, USA: University of California Press. LTD.
- Shuttleworth and Cowie. (1997 and 2014). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Snell-Hornby. (1988 and 1992). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Sparknotes. (2021). "Sparknotes." Retrieved on July 17, 2021, from Sparknotes: <https://www.sparknotes.com/Shakespeare/hamlet/setting>
- Tajdin, M. F. A. (2005). "The Metamorphosis of Hamlet in Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's Translation." Retrieved on October 26, 2021, from: <http://www.researchgate.net>.
- Toury, G. (2000). "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." In L. Venuti, *Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 198-211). New York: Routledge.
- Trompenaars, F. T. (1993 and 1997). *Riding the Waves of Culture*. London: Nicholas Brealey.

- Traduzione. (2013). "Hamlet: To Be Or Not To Be." Retrieved on November 6, 2021, from <https://valentinacorrente.com>, Just other wordsPress.com site: <https://valentinacorrente.com/2013/03/01/>.
- UK Essays. (2018). "Effect of the Setting in Hamlet on the Play." Retrieved from <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/english-literature/effect-of-the-setting-in-hamlet-on-the-play.php?vref=1>.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. (2nd Ed.), London and New York: Routledge.
- Vermeer, H. (1992). "Is Translation A Linguistic or A Cultural Process?" *Ilha do Destterro. A Journal of English Language, Literature in English and Cultural Studies*, [S.I.], N. 28, pp. 037-051.
- Vermeer, K. R. (C.2013). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action*. (1st Ed.), New York: Routledge.
- Wilson, J. R. (2017, July). "To Be Or Not To Be: Shakespeare Against Philosophy." Retrieved on November 6, 2021, from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318293808>.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Ali Mahmood Abbas has a BA in English language from Saladdin University in Erbil-Iraq in 1991 and his MA in English and literature from Karabuk University. He participated in the training course for teachers and principals successfully for the period from 7-11 December 2003. He worked for the Titan com. from 2004-2006 as an interpreter. He obtained a certificate of participation in a psychological and social support course held by the Iraqi Ministry of Education, the General Directorate of Education in Kirkuk in cooperation with UNICEF. He started working as an English teacher in Al-Furat Secondary in 1991, but now he is working as an English teacher in Al -Mustaqbal Preparatory for boys. He has the intention to apply for a Ph.D. in English literature to extend his research. He also intends to study in the field of theatre, especially the adaptation of plays.