The Translation of Swearwords in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Arabic: A Pragmatic Perspective

By

[1]Abdali Hammood Shihan   [2]Zeydan Khalaf Omar   [3] Sahira Mousa Salman   [4]Abed Shahooth Khalaf

brunosaidi8@gmail.com   zeydan1953@yahoo.com   sahirasalman@yahoo.com   abeeid@yahoo.com

[1] Thi Qar University/College of Arts   [2]University of Anbar/College of Education for Humanities
         Dept. of English   Dept. of English
[3] Ministry of Higher Education & Scientific Research   [4]University of Anbar/College of Arts
         Research & Development Office   Dept. of English

Abstract

The stigmatized nature of swearing expressions renders their intrlingual/intercultural transference a problematic issue in translation. This stems from the fact that cultures differ in their tolerance of the use of swearing expressions. Accordingly, in the act of intrlingual/intercultural transference, translators adopt certain translation strategies to carefully handle the sensitive issue of such expressions. However, although the choice of a particular strategy is influenced by different ideological, cultural and contextual factors, there is a consensus that swearing expressions are either toned down or completely deleted. In light of this, this study attempts to identify the translation strategies adopted by two Arab (male and female) translators when rendering such expressions in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic. The aim is to examine whether gender has a role to play in determining the translator's orientation either for domestication or foreignization. To achieve this objective, a corpus consisting of Hamlet's original text and two translations of it in Arabic is collated. Moreover, in the analysis of the translation strategies Vermeer's (1978/2000) Skopostheorie is utilized and Venuti's (1995) model of 'domestication' and 'foreignization' is adopted to determine the overall translation behavior of the translators as being either source text/culture oriented or target text/culture oriented. The findings of the study indicate that the translators have adopted a number of domestication translation strategies including deletion, de-swearing, ambiguity and generalization to abide by cultural norms in the target culture and a number of foreignization strategies including changing non-swearwords to swearwords, over-translation (over-swearing), and literal translation to preserve the spirit of the source text. However, in comparison with the male translator, the female translator was more risk aversive when it comes to making translation decisions, a fact which might be attributed to her little experience in literary translation. Hence, she was more faithful to the source text.

Keywords: swearing expressions, interlingual transference, translation strategies, domestication, foreignization

الملخص

إن الطبيعة الفظة للتعابير البذيئة تجعل عملية نقلها الى لغة او ثقافة اخرى مشكلة في عملية الترجمة. وهذه الحقيقة تبع من اختلاف الثقافات في درجة التسامح في استعمال مثل تلك التعابير. وبناءا على ذلك، ففي عملية نقل لتلك التعابير الى لغة او ثقافة اخرى يتبنى المترجمون استراتيجيات معينة للتعامل بعناية مع تلك القضية الحساسة. وعلى اية حال، فعلى الرغم من ان اختيار استراتيجية ترجمية معينة ينبغي ان يراعي مختلف العوامل الايديولوجية والثقافية والسياقية، الا ان هناك اجماع على ان التعابير البذيئة اما ان تخفف او تحذف بشكل كامل. وفي ضوء ما سبق، تحاول هذه الدراسة تحديد استراتيجيات الترجمة التي استعملها اثنان من المترجمين العرب (أحدهما رجل والآخر امرأة) عند نقل التعابير البذيئة في مسرحية هاملت للكاتب شكسبير الى اللغة العربية، لبيان فيما اذا كان لجنس المترجم اي دور في تحديد اسلوب الترجمة سواءا كان نحو توطين او تغريب تلك التعابير في عملية الترجمة. ولتحقيق هذا الهدف، تم جمع عينة للدراسة تتكون من النص الأصلي لمسرحية هاملت واثنين من ترجمات تلك المسرحية الى اللغة العربية. وكذلك تم تبني نظرية سكوبس للعالم فرمير (١٩٧٨/ ٢٠٠٠) في تحليل تلك البيانات ونموذج فيوتي (١٩٩٥) للتغريب او التوطين في الترجمة لتحديد السلوك الترجمي العام للمترجمين سواءا كان متجها نحو النص او الثقافة الاصلية او نحو النص او الثقافة الهدف. وتشير نتائج الدراسة الى ان كلا المترجمين استخدما عددا من استراتيجيات الترجمة التوطينية مثل استراتيجية الحذف وازالة الصبغة البذيئة في التعابير واستراتيجية الغموض والتعميم للتماشي على التقاليد الثقافية في الثقافة الهدف، وعددا من استراتيجيات الترجمة التغريبية مثل تغيير الكلمات غير البذيئة الى كلمات بذيئة او زيادة درجة البذاءة في المفردة او استخدام الترجمة الحرفية للحفاظ على روح النص الأصلي. وعلى اية حال، فبالمقارنة مع المترجم (الذكر)، كانت المترجمة (الانثى) اكثر جراءة في اتخاذ القرارات الترجمية، ويمكن اعزاء هذه الحقيقة الى خبراتها القليلة في الترجمة الادبية، الا انها كانت اكثر حفاظا على النص الاصلي.

1. Introduction

William Shakespeare's picturesque of the vicissitudes of human experience has assured him a special place in the literature of the world. His unique treatment of universal themes has granted him eternal fame, and his readership records attest to his worldwide reputation. It is widely acknowledged that Shakespeare is a supreme literary genius whose eminently timeless works are replete with information on a variety of encyclopedic topics ranging from astronomy, geography, history, politics and science, to culture, including the Bible and mythology (Sun, 2010, p.234). What is distinctive about Shakespeare's works are his rhetoric and peculiar style. Taking note of this, critics and other scholars have directed their attention to Shakespeare's works to unravel the significance of such features in communicating the intended message in each of his master pieces. These critics and scholars attest that Shakespearian texts are rich in figurative language including "images, comparisons, and analogies" beside other tropes

(McEvoy, 2000, p. 28). However, a meticulous reading of any of these texts shows that there is an overriding trope or rhetorical device which characterizes that particular text. Hamlet, for instance, abounds with swearing words and expressions which come from different semantic fields to accomplish certain pragmatic functions including the expression of the character's inner feelings and his/her relationship with other characters in the play. Recognizing the function of these figures of speech and conveying it to the target readership is necessary. Otherwise, significant elements of the source text remain unveiled to the recipients. It should be emphasized that when a translation lacks important aspects of the original text, it is likely to deprive its audience of the privileges entailed in interlingual and intercultural communication.

Acknowledging the difficulty in translating Shakespeare's works, Romaine (2003) attributes the challenging nature of Shakespearian language to being "poetic and highly figurative"

More challenges appear when conceiving that Shakespeare varies his language depending on the situation, effect, and impression he makes. For instance, Hamlet, the hero of the play Hamlet, had been preoccupying critics as one of the most controversial characters Shakespeare had ever produced since this hero produced different moods towards every character he meets and hence every character has a different opinion of him. There is much discussion and little agreement among his critics about his mood and what it implies.

In line with this way of argumentation, this study attempts to apply some translation theories about Shakespeare's Hamlet to identify the Arab translators' orientation when rendering swearing expressions in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic. Specifically, our aim in this study is to detect and analyze the swearing expressions used by characters in Hamlet on various occasions and unravel the underlying features behind them. In order to tackle the problem of rendering swearing into Arabic, the study attempts to sketch out a functional approach of translation which envisages that the translator is free to opt for any translation strategy to translate chunks in the source text as far as the goal or function of that text is preserved in the target text. Nevertheless, there are certain socio-cultural factors that might have their effect on the selection of any translation strategy. The translator's ideology, his/her familiarity with the target text readers' expectations or his/her gender can play a role in this regard. The gender of the translator, for instance, has been the focus of several scholars and translation experts to identify the positive or negative correlation between the translator's gender and his/her performance.

Recently, a lot of studies have tackled the relationship between the gender of the translator and the characteristics of the translated text, explaining whether gender has any impact on the type of theories adopted, the strategies used, the style, their attitude, and the accuracy of the translated text (Rezaaei, 2012; Moghaddas, 2013; Yang, 2014 & Amanati 2016). For instance, Rezaaei (2012) studied the role of feminists' ideology on translating literary texts. One of the aspects she tackled in her study was the translation of a novel by females comparing it to its translation by males. She found out that female translators use specific strategies in translating the text. These strategies are "supplementing (expanded to addition and deletion…) prefacing/footnoting, and hijacking" (Rezaaei, 2012, p. 3). On the other hand, male translators used those strategies more frequently than women translators.

Similarly, Yang (2014) argues that there is a difference between male and female translators when translating a text that deals with feminism and other issues related to gender. The finding of the study indicates that female translators are more inclined to understand the source text and translate it accurately because they are affected by "gender awareness" (Ibid, p. 373.(

In addition, Moghaddas (2013) and Amanati (2016) studied the impact of gender on the accuracy of translations through analyzing novels that are translated by male and female translators. This accuracy indicates how translators view and understand the source text message. However, both scholars concluded that gender does not affect the accuracy of translation in translating novels.

2.   Plot of the play

The play narrates the story of the King Claudius's killing of his brother, the former king Hamlet's father, and quickly marrying his widow, Queen Gertrude. Following this incident, the ghost of the former King appears and begs Hamlet to revenge his foul murder. Prince Hamlet agrees and to carry out his revenge, he pretends insanity. Polonius, the lord chamberlain, tells the King and the Queen that Hamlet is mad for his daughter Ophelia. Hamlet continues in his challenging behavior and blames his mother for her hasty marriage. She becomes frightened and calls for help. On an attempt to take revenge, Hamlet draws his sword and kills Polonius. Then Laertes, Polonius's son, blames the King Claudius for his father's death but the King persuades him that Hamlet is his target. Later on each one wounds the other fatally.

3.   Swearing

Different scholars have attempted to define swearing and propose a categorization for its types, functions and semantic fields. For instance, Ljung (2011, p. 311) defines swearing as "an utterance intended to invoke a supernatural power to inflict harm or punishment on someone or something". As for the types of swearing, the author (Ibid, p. 114) mentions three types of swearing which are ritual insults, name calling and unfriendly suggestions. These types indicate that swearing is a stigmatized act designed to express powerful emotions by using strong language. This status of swearing comes from the fact that it belongs to the offensive language which together with cursing, coarse language, foul speech, strong language, dirty words, cussing, bad words, bad language, and vulgar language form a big subject. Such a language is commonly used to criticize, insult and degrade the other, although there is also an element of humor in offensive language.

Profanity and other forms of offensive language have become increasingly prevalent in oral communication. They are socially and/or morally unacceptable public expressions of generally familiar words, gestures and behavioral symbols. For instance, vulgarity, which is one of the most stigmatized use of offensive language, is a form of swearing that makes use of crude words such as 'bloody'. Another form of offensive language is curses which are verbal realizations of speaker's wish that something evil should befall on the addressee in the future and often contain invocations of heavenly power.

In line with this account of swearing, Andersson and Trudgill (1990) categorize swearing into; 'abusive swearing', 'expletives', 'humorous swearing' and 'auxiliary

swearing'. While both abusive swearing and humorous swearing are directed at the addressee, only abusive swearing is intended to do harm; humorous swearing is used mainly to arouse banter. Expletives mainly express psychological emotions like anger, frustration, or happiness, and auxiliary swearing is idiosyncratic in an individual's speech (p. 61).

It is commonly agreed upon that swearing is used to avoid physical aggression. On this basis, Hydén (1995, pp. 55-56) considers two varieties of aggression: verbal and physical violence. Verbal aggression refers to a verbal act which intends to symbolically hurt or threaten to hurt another. It is usually associated with anger which is a form of aggression that expresses an emotional state associated with the development of hostile attitudes and aggressive behavior.

From a semantic fields perspective, Swan (2005, p. 575) classifies swearwords in English into three main groups:

1. Words concerned with Christian religion, e.g. names of Christ, God, etc.
2. Words related to sexual activity, e.g. fuck, balls, etc.
3. Some words referring to the elimination of bodily wastes, e.g. piss, shit, etc.

Such words can afflict:

a. Unfriendly suggestions: All these expressions have almost the same insulting degree which causes a great moral harm to the addressee to mean 'shut up', e.g. 'to hell', 'eat some shit.'
b. Obscene words referring to the private sexual organs of the human body.
c. Making fingers, spitting and other body movements or gestures to indicate either sexual harassment, ridiculing, underestimating, etc.

Another classification of swearing is that of Beebe (1995, p. 22) who confirms two types of swearing: propositional and non-propositional, which Swan (2005, p. 275) subdivides into five types; abuses, cathartic, emphatic, social and blasphemous. Below are some representative examples:

- Where have you been, old bastard?
- Where is that bloody knife?
- God damn it.

Following Swan (2005), Allan and Burridge (2006) presented a model that categorizes swearwords into semantic fields. According to their model, swearwords come from five semantic fields namely: 1. Bodies and their effluvia (sweat, snot, faeces, menstrual fluid and so forth); 2. The organs and acts of sex, micturition and defecation; 3. Diseases, death, and killing (including fishing and hunting); 4. Naming, addressing, touching and viewing persons and sacred things, objects and places; 5. Food gathering, preparation and consumption. (p. 1.)

When applying these notions of swearing on Shakespeare's way of writing, one can see that in most of Shakespeare's works, thousands of new words are created, many of them are obscene, profane and insulting. Shakespeare used profanity to communicate multiple meanings. For instance, when Hamlet says to Ophelia "Get thee to a nunnery", the word 'nunnery' has two meanings. The first is that he is telling her that he and all other men are "arrant knaves. Believe none of us. Go thy ways to a nunnery". Meaning 'protect' yourself Ophelia. The other meaning is that the word 'nunnery' in Elizabethan English meant 'brothel'. The use of both, the sacred 'nunnery' and the profane 'brothel'

is classic Shakespeare. One does not exist without the other and true nature of each is discovered through antithesis, paradoxes and contrasts (Rubinstein, 1989.(

Moreover, in Hamlet, most of the exchanges produced by Polonius and Hamlet lead to broken conversation by which the effect they trigger is funny. They may illuminate a character or situation, or may designate some critical defeat in a relationship. Such ridicule is expressed to a great extent through many flaws and a number of missed connotations of speech.

4.   The pragmatics of swearing expressions

As has been previously stated, swearwords are used to achieve certain pragmatic functions. Hence, any accurate understanding of the pragmatic functions of such words has to be approached within the realm of pragmatics to determine the intended meaning of the utterances. Generally speaking, pragmatics caters for cases in language use where more is being communicated than is actually stated. It focuses on language use from the perspective of the users engaged in an act of communication to achieve particular goals. This encompasses meaning as use which implies speakers' intention to communicate a special effect by the utterances. Of significance for the success in determining meaning in interactions is an understanding of the context of situation of what is said and its influence on the interpretation of these utterances. The notion of context covers elements of the when, where, under what conditions and who the speaker is addressing. Thus, meaning is determined by considering the interaction of these contextual elements which may yield different interpretations of an utterance in different sociocultural contexts. This variation in interpreting utterances across different sociocultural settings is the main reason for the disparity in conveying the communicative effect of swearwords in interlingual/intercultural communication.

Accordingly, since communicating the expressive functionality is the most important when handling swearwords, it seems useful to study them under the realm of the Speech Act Theory. Introduced by Austin (1962), this theory construes speakers' utterances as performing certain acts. The theory attempts to analyze these utterances by relating them to the behavior of the speaker and the addressee engaged in an interpersonal communication. Hence, the speech act of an utterance represents a communicative activity reflecting the speaker's intention and the effect s/he intends to achieve on the addressee. In interlingual transference, knowledge of the implications of this theory is useful to arrive at an understanding of various constructs in language use where meaning cannot be decided via the truth conditions of speech exchanges.

According to the Speech Act Theory, upon the articulation of an utterance (locution), the speaker is achieving a simultaneous act known as the illocutionary force of the utterance which intends to affect the addressee to behave in a particular manner (the perlocutionary force). According to Pedersen (2008), the same speaker may send two illocutionary forces encapsulated in a single indirect speech act. These the author designates as primary and secondary forces/points. Since the primary illocutionary point pertains mainly to the non-literal meaning of utterances (Verschueren, 1999), it is this force that should be retained in interlingual transference of swearwords. It is usually seen as a communicative act within the framework of a sociocultural dimension.

Speakers within a speech community grasp the illocutionary force of utterances depending on their schemata or shared background knowledge with the members of their speech community (Cutting, 2002). In cases of 'misprocessing', pragmatic failure ensues as a result of identifying unintended forces or relegating intended ones (James, 1998). In interlingual transference, if the translator succeeds in identifying and rendering the primary illocutionary force/point of the source text in the target text, his/her translation is highly felicitous. If s/he renders only the secondary illocutionary point, his/her translation is less felicitous. Finally, if none of these points is rendered, the translation is erroneous or infelicitous (Pedersen, 2008).

5.   Literature Review

Translating Shakespeare into other languages is one of the pushing back boundaries since he has extensively employed the linguistic game of playing on words in terms of meaning, usage and pronunciation (Hooper, 2003, p. 121). There are many challenging areas to translate in Shakespearean works, namely sexuality, swearing, Biblical terms and stories, mythological expressions, to mention but a few. What seems so problematically challenging in literary translation is the issue that the source text's initiators rely heavily on their own language and culture in terms of their situational and socio-cultural context. Accordingly, the meanings they imply are often hard to retain or even understand should the source language and the target language are linguistically and culturally alien (Jing, 2010). Nevertheless, a number of studies have been carried out on the interlingual transference of the cultural bumps in Shakespeare's Hamlet.

For instance, Shunnaq (2007) examined the translation of some metaphorical expressions in Shakespeare's Hamlet. The researcher explored 15 metaphorical expressions in six Arabic versions of Hamlet, i.e. Kiuaan, Hameed, Shaheen, Mohammad, Jabra and Jamaal, in terms of fullness, appropriateness and metaphoricity. The researcher adopted Newmark's (1981and 1988) models to analyze the selected data where the translation strategies employed are identified as well. The findings of the study revealed that metaphor is translatable even via the strategy of demetaphorizing the metaphorical expression. Sometimes, the six translators succeed in retaining the source text in the target text accurately but they fail at other times.

In an introduction to his translation of Hamlet, Niyazi (2008) provided an in-depth critique to two poular Arabic translations of Hamlet, namely Jabra's and Al-Qut. He pointed out that the two translators have ignored Shakespeare's literary tactics in writing his plays, especially his being a peot of concepts where his words are highly preganat with far-reached meanings and images. He added that the two translators have relied heavily on their understanding of Shakespeare's literary language which is quite tricky and even misleading. Niyazi has provided many illustrative examples on how the said translators have drastically failed not only in translating Shakespear's words or expressions but even in understanding them.

Al-Quraishy (2008) examined swearing in Shakespeare's Hamlet in terms of their linguistic, semantic and psychological aspects. The researcher highlighted the different types of swear words, i.e. abusive, cathartic, social, emphatic and blasphemous. She rightly states that the use of swearwords is not limited to lower social classes but they

are often used by presidents and monarchs. She comes up with the finding that the effects swearwords have on listeners rely basically on the speaker's psychological state where such effects can be labeled abusive, cathartic, social, …etc.

Taking a judgmental stand, Al-Thebyan, Al-Shalabi1, Salameh1 and Al-Omari. (2011) studied Jabra's translation of Shakespeare's the Tempest in terms of accuracy and adequacy. The researchers asserted that sometimes Jabra's translations tend be much more inaccurate and quite literal. Additionally, they highlight the fact that Jabra seems to be unaware of the better options available in the target language to render the Tempest into Arabic more dynamically.

In another study, Tatu, and Sinu (2013) attempted a novel perspective in approaching the issue of cultural bumps in Shakespeare's plays where culture-bound wordplay and allusions are examined as challenging areas in translating Shakespeare. The researchers have devoted a subsection to bawdy wordplays in Shakespeare plays and an American sitcom. The findings of data analysis indicate that bawdy wordplays in Shakespeare's plays are highly transparent and upfront while they are quite opaque and elusive in the sitcom. Furthermore, the data analysis highlights the perpetuity of wordplay occurrences and the translation strategies adopted to achieve functional equivalence.

From a pragmatic perspective, Al.Saidi, Salman and Khalaf (2017) (forthcoming) viewed impoliteness in Hamlet where swearwords were included. Impoliteness was examined in terms of the impolite strategies utilized by Hamlet and the verbal responses the offended characters used. The data were pragmatically analyzed according to Culpeper's (1996/2011) and Culpeper, Bousfield and Wichmann (2003). models. As for the concerned responses, the researchers adopted Bousfeiled's (2008) model to account for the interlocutors' responses to impoliteness. The findings of this study showed that mock impoliteness (sarcasm), bold on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness are repeated in the play, of which mock impoliteness is the most frequently used strategy. As far as the responses strategies are concerned, the defensive and defensive-offensive strategies were frequently used by the interlocutors in the play but the most frequent one was the defensive strategy.

In another study, Al-Rasheedi (2016) investigated the translation strategies Arab translators have employed in rendering the implicit meanings in Shakespeare's Hamlet, making some references to swearwords. The researcher attempted to view whether the Relevance Theory can be well employed as a successful perspective in translating literary works like Hamlet. In the light of the Relevance Theory, the researcher has examined three Arabic translations of Hamlet, namely Jabra's, Mutran's and Al-Ma'aref's translations. Based on the Relevance Theory, the researcher has utilized the effort-effect trade-off in examining the three translations stating how each translation maximizes the contextual effect and reduces the processing effort of the contextual effects of the original. The findings of the study revealed that Jabra's and Al-Ma'aref's translations are more faithful to the original whereas Mutran's is less faithful and hence less reliable.

A meticulous review of the above studies would reveal that although much scholarly work has been devoted to investigate various cultural bumps in Shakespeare's Hamlet, however, up to date, no study has been exclusively devoted to examine swearing in the Arabic translations of this paly. All the studies explored have never provided a

comprehensive account on the translation of swearing in Hamlet into Arabic, particularly when it comes to identifying the strategies adopted for that purpose or the effect each strategy has on preserving the pragmatic functions of swearwords. More importantly, no study has looked into the effect of gender on the translator's behavior when handling swearwords from an open into a conservative culture. Thus, the value of this study stems from its attempt to identify the translation strategies adopted by a male and a female Arab translators when rendering swearwords in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic. The aim is to examine the orientation of each translator when dealing with these words and the consequences of this orientation on the intended pragmatic uses of swearwords.

6.   Methodology

In any study, it is imperative to clearly define any concept or term as used in the study. The term 'swearword', as adopted in this study, follows Andersson and Trudgill's (1990) definition, which perceives a swearword as a type of language that:
1.   Refers to something that is taboo and/or stigmatized in the culture؛
2.   Should not be interpreted literally؛
3.   Can be used to express strong emotions and attitudes (p. 53.(
Accordingly, swearwords fulfilling this definition in the play are extracted for inclusion in the data. In the discussion, each of these words and its counterpart in the Arabic translations of the play are underlined. Moreover, a literal back translation of the Arabic equivalents is provided with a transliteration to enable non-native speakers of Arabic to read them.

6.1. Approach and Data of the Study

This study is qualitative in nature. It adopts a corpus-based analysis approach to identify the strategies adopted by the Arab translators when handling the sensitive issue of swearwords in Shakespeare's Hamlet, representing a more open culture to the more conservative Arab culture. The data of the study comprise swearwords extracted from a corpus consisting the original text of Hamlet and two of its translated versions in Arabic.

6.2 Data Identification and Analysis

The model adopted to examine the translation patterns of the Arab translators in this study was that of Vermeer (1978/2000) known as Skopostheorie. The main focus of this theory is on preserving the function or goal of the source text in the target text regardless of the translation strategy adopted. Hence, the translation behavior within this theory can be understood as moving through a continuum with two extremes. On one extreme, there is the concept of foreignization and on the other, there is the concept of domestication Venuti's (1995). The translator may work along this continuum as long as the purpose of the translation strategy is justified in transferring the function of the translation to the target recipients as conforming to the target recipients' expectations. The usefulness of this theory to the translation of swearwords has been confirmed by scholars such as Alavi, Karimnia, and Salehi Zadeh, (2013) and Fawcett (2003).

The Skopostheorie comes within the functionalist approach which represents a shift from the linguistic to the functionalist and sociocultural approach. It defines translation as a purposeful activity and emphasizes the function of the target text in the hosting culture rather than equivalence between source texts and target texts. Moreover, it emphasizes the role of the translator, the target text's recipients' cultural norms, purpose of the text, client and commission of translation in translation decision making processes. Following this approach, Vermeer (2000, p. 221) views translation as an "action which is based on a source text" and argues that this action has an aim or purpose that leads to a target text or what he calls 'translatum'. That aim or purpose should be negotiated with the client who commissioned the action. This shows that the human involvement is present both in the translation process and as a receiver of the translation product. The translator should figure out the purpose of the translation s/he is commissioned to undertake, and the recipients' needs and expectations within their cultural framework should come to the fore when selecting the translation strategy, hence each strategy is purposefully selected (Nord, 1997). For this end, the translator needs to analyze the sociocultural and contextual factors that help identify the function of the source text and that of the translatum in the target culture. This requires knowledge and competence as well as command of both the source culture and the target culture by the translator. Therefore, the translator is the key factor being the first recipient of the source initiator's intention which s/he needs to mediate and convey to the target recipients. In this mediation process, the translator has to opt for the appropriate translation strategy as suits the audiences' needs and nature of the translated text.

For many scholars, the Skopostheorie gives the translator more freedom in opting for the translation strategy which s/he finds suitable in conveying the message to the target recipients. For example, Gentzler (2001) argues that by adopting the Skopostheorie, "translators may choose to be faithful to the source text's spirit, or they may choose a word-for-word strategy, or they may add, delete, or change information as they see it fit, depending upon the cultural conditions and the needs of the audience/consumer." (p.71). As for its suitability for translating swearwords, Fawcett (2003) argues that translators need to free themselves from 'fidelity' to the source text and concentrate instead on the circumstances of the recipients if adequacy is sought at all. As an appropriate approach in such situations, Fawcett affirms that "Skopostheorie comes into its own." (p. 158). For this approach to be influential in literary translation, the translator needs first to determine the function of the literary text whether to entertain, discuss a particular issue or to educate. Moreover, it is necessary to know the genre of that text and the needs of the readers.

7.   Results and Discussion

The analysis of the results shows that almost all characters in the play used a great deal of swearwords that come from various semantic fields including the religious (profanity, blasphemy), abuses, incest, adultery, sex activities, among others (Allan & Burridge, 2006: Ljung, 2011). The questions that need to be addressed, however, are how did each of the Arab female and male translators render each of these swearing expressions when they translated Hamlet into Arabic? Who exhibited more inclination

towards domesticating the source text, and hence became more adherent to the active norms in the target culture? And who exhibited more inclination towards foreignization, and hence became so faithful to the source text?

To address these questions, typical representative examples of swearing expressions from different semantic fields and their Arabic counterparts in the two selected translations will be discussed in light of the strategies adopted in rendering these swearing expressions. The first step for that end is to arrange the adopted translation strategies on a continuum of two ends. The right end extreme on the continuum was given the designation 'domestication' and the one on the left was given the designation 'foreignization' (Venuti, 1995). As Figure 1 shows, if the pendulum swings more towards the domestication pole, the translation pattern was target text-oriented. If, on the other hand, it swings towards the foreignization pole, the pattern was source text-oriented. In the identification of the adopted translation strategies, the swearwords in the play were compared with their equivalents in its Arabic versions and the way each of these words was treated in these versions was highlighted.

Figure 1. Translation strategies adopted in transferring swearwords into Arabic

As Fig. 1 illustrates, a number of domestication and foreignization translation strategies was opted for when rendering swearwords in Hamlet into Arabic. In what follows, a detailed discussion of each of these strategies is given with illustrative examples

7.1 Deletion

Deletion is the first domestication strategy identified in the analysis of instances of swearing expressions in Hamlet when translated into Arabic. As a domestication translation strategy, deletion refers to the omission of swearwords in the source text when rendered into its Arabic version. According to Dimitriu (2004, p. 165), deletion is used "in order to adjust - linguistically, pragmatically, culturally, or ideologically - the translated texts for their target audiences." On this basis, this strategy has been placed very far to the end of the domestication pole since it removes any trances of swearing used in the source text when translated to the Arab readership. By so doing, the translator seems to be more inclined to the norms and conventions active in the target culture. However, a great deal of the pragmatic functions swearwords are used to accomplish have been lost as a result of this domestication strategy. Consequently, Arab readers who exclusively depend on the translation of the source text would be deprived of all the expressions of the character's inner feelings or his/her relationship with other characters in the play because of the deletion of swearwords in the target text. It is worth to note that Jabra (male translator) used this strategy more than Kiwan (female translator). Examples 1 and 2 are illustrative of this strategy؛

Example (1): Act II Scene II

Swearword in the ST	Jabra's translation	Kiwan's Translation
'Swounds, I should take it:	------------------------	قسما، سأتقبل ذلك......

In example 1, the used swearing expression in the source text is ''Swounds' which is an oath uttered to emphasize the speaker's assertion, meaning 'God's wounds'. It was uttered by Hamlet on seeing how the ordinary player was affected by the scene of the murdering of his fictional father. Hamlet uttered this oath after a long soliloquy in

which he directed a very severe and long reproach to himself on not taking revenge for his father. Hence, the swearing expression has a significant pragmatic function as a culmination for the speaker's insults to himself. All these pragmatic/semantic nuances are clear to the native speakers of the source text. However, in Jabra's translation of the play, the swearing expression was completely deleted. As a result, the intended primary pragmatic force of the swearing expression was diluted to the Arab readership who cannot access the source text (Shunnaq, 2007). And since this force was not relayed in the target text, this translation is said to be erroneous or infelicitous (Pedersen, 2008). Nevertheless, Jabra's orientation towards domestication is clear and might be justified on the basis of the religious differences in terms of the beliefs of the two cultures. To explicate, this swearing expression pertains mainly to Christian beliefs of Christ wounds which is taken as a strong oath. On their part, when Muslims want to make an oath, it should be by Allah only. On this basis, fearing the rejection on the part of the Arab readership if the expression was literally translated, Jabra opted for deletion which signals a domestication orientation that seeks to observe the target culture's norms and conventions although at the expense of not being faithful to the source text.

On her part, Kiwan opted for generalizing the swearing expression in her translation of the play by deriving a noun (qasaman), from the expression 'I swear'. Thus, the translation avoided the problematic issue pertaining to religious beliefs in case the swearing expression was literally translated. By so doing, the translator was able to preserve part of the pragmatic force intended by the swearing expression in the source text. Consequently, her translation is more loyal to the source text and it does not conflate so much with the target culture's convention. Example 2 will further discuss the deletion strategy.

Example (2): Act IV Scene V
Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation Kiwan's Translation
By Gis and by Saint Charity..   --------------------------   ...قسما بالمسيح والعناية الالهية

In example 2, there are two religious culture specific expressions namely, "By Gis' and 'By Saint Charity' which were uttered by Ophelia on seeing her father's dead body. These expressions were mentioned in one of her folkloric songs to express her deep grief and sorrow. This is why she felt that the strong swearing expression 'By Gis', (By Jesus) was not enough to express her inner feeling, hence, she added another very strong oath 'By Saint Charity'. The strength of these swearing expressions cannot escape a Christian reader or viewer of the play. However, by opting for deletion as a translation strategy to deal with these expressions, Jabra has removed all these pragmatic forces and shades of meaning from the Arab readership who depend on the translation of the play to understand its message and the expression of its characters' inner feelings. Nevertheless, his translation is more inclined to the target culture's conventions for the same reasons explained in the discussion of example (1). Hence, the translation is not felicitous to the source text.

Kiwan's translation, on the other hand, exhibits more loyalty to the source text. In other words, by opting for the literal translation of the swearing expressions in the Arabic version of the paly, Kiwan was able to preserve their intended primary pragmatic force.

Accordingly, an accurate portrayal of the character's inner feelings was relayed to the Arab readership, making the translation more felicitous and more faithful. However, this foreignization orientation has enhanced the otherness of the text to the target readers who usually do not expect swearing by 'Jesus' or 'Saint Charity.'

7.2 De-swearing

The second domestication translation strategy was the use of non-swearwords as equivalents for English swearwords in the Arabic version of the play (Han & Wang, 2014). Adopting this strategy implies that the translator did not delete the swearwords used in the source text, but s/he replaced them with non-swearwords in the target text. De-swearing represents another technique that emphasizes the translator's orientation towards domestication. The following examples are illustrative of this strategy؛

Example (3): Act III Scene II

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation   Kiwan's Translation

Do you think I meant country matters?   اظننتي اني اعني ضجوعاً؟   احسبت انني قصدت امورا سيئة وفظة؟

In example 3, the taboo expression 'country matters' was used by Hamlet in a form of reply to Ophelia's refusal of not letting him lie on her lap. Preceding this exchange between Hamlet and Ophelia, Hamlet's mother asked him to sit next to her, possibly indicating 'on her lap'. Hamlet replied that he'd rather sit on the cold metal of a chair at a farther distance. Hamlet then goes to Ophelia and does the reverse; asking her if he can sit on her lap. Ophelia replies with a solid and negative response, expressing her frustration with his wild mood. She wants him to show passion, but now is not the suitable time. In a provocative manner, Hamlet asks whether or not she thought ill thoughts by his suggestion to sit on her lap. The offense caused by the expression 'country matters' comes from the pejorative connotations it indicates. According to the Urban Dictionary of most offensive words ever (n.d.), this is a swearing expression implying a pun which means 'cunt'. It mainly indicates 'sexual relations.'

In his translation of this expression, Jabra opted for the use of an archaic and ambiguous equivalent, namely, 'dhajuan', which according to Mukhtar (2008) and Al-Mujam Al-Wasseett (2004), it means 'a female camel', 'a cloud moving slowly', 'imprudent' among other things. However, it echoes the offensive Arabic taboo word 'dhaja', (Lit. to sleep with for sexual intercourse). Hence, although the word 'dhajuan' might have caused confusion to the majority of the modern Arab reader, being a non-swearword by itself, it was used to mitigate the offensiveness of the implied pejorative connotations in the English taboo expression 'country matters'. In other words, Jabra opted for an almost non-swearword in the Arabic translation of the play as another translation strategy that moves in the direction of domestication.

An otherwise clearer instance of the de-swearing translation strategy in dealing with this taboo expression might be that used by Kiwan as an indication of a domestication orientation. Kiwan opted for the two non-swearing expressions 'saiah wa fathah' (Lit. bad and aggressive) as equivalents for the English taboo expression in the source text. That is to say, the words 'saiah' and 'fathah' can be said to be normal words in Arabic which fell short of preserving the swearing overtones implied in their English

counterparts. To conclude, both translators have opted for de-swearing the sexually laden English expression in their translations of the play in an attempt to abide by cultural norms in the target culture. However, the intended pragmatic function behind the use of this pun in the source text might have escaped the Arab readers of the play. Consequently, much of the intended rhetoric, which is a distinctive feature of Shakespeare's style, was eradicated in the Arabic version of the paly. Example 4 further discusses this point.

Example (4): Act V Scene II

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation Kiwan's Translation

He that hath kill'd my king and whored my mother،   هذا الذي قتل ملكي ومومس امي.   هو
من قتل ملكي ولوث شرف امي.

In example 4, one of the most offensive English swearwords 'whored' was used by Hamlet to express his anger and hatred towards his uncle. For Hamlet, Claudius not only killed the true and legitimate king, his father, but by marrying his mother, Claudius turned Hamlet's mother into a 'whore'. This is a very severe insult of a man directed towards his mother. However, the pragmatic significance of this insult in demonstrating Hamlet's vindictive and hostile attitude towards both Claudius and his mother cannot escape the source text readers.

Taking note of this significance, Jabra opted for a more or less direct equivalent for the word 'whored' in the target text. To reiterate, Jabra used the verb 'mawmasah' in the past tense which is derived from the noun 'mwmis' (Lit. a slut). However, although this use of the taboo Arabic word is alien to a great number of the Arab readers, it still retains much of the insulting sexual connotation of the source text. As a result, Jabra's translation of this excerpt shows a more inclination towards foreignization to keep the spirit of the source text to the target text readers.

As for Kiwan, she opted for the expression 'lawathah sharaf umi', (Lit. stained my mother's honor) which is a very general reference that was meant to avoid the direct reference to the word 'whore'. Hence, by avoiding the reference to words such as 'baghi', (harlot) or 'qahba' (bitch), which might be direct equivalents that maintain the spirit of the source text, Kiwan has worked into de-swearing this excerpt for the Arab readers. The aim was to domesticate the foreign text to a culture where the image of the mother is so pure and should not be damaged by the use of this and similar swearwords (Sagarin, 1968). As a result, in comparison with Jabra, Kiwan was more abiding by the active conventions and norms in the target culture.

7.3Ambiguity

The use of ambiguous renditions is another domesticating strategy adopted by the Arab translators when rendering some English swearwords in Hamlet into Arabic. Ambiguity in this context means that the translation was equivocal to the Arab readers. Thus, accuracy was sacrificed for the sake of observing the readers' expectations and cultural norms. Consider the following examples

Example (5): Act IV Scene V

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation Kiwan's Translation

That drop of blood that's calm proclaims me bastard،

Cries cuckold to my father, brands the harlot
Even here, between the chaste unsmirched brow
Of my true mother.   ان تكن في نقطة دم هادئة، فانما هي تعلن انني ابن خنا وتصيح ان ابي خؤون

ان اية قطرة دم هادئة لتعلن   الزوجة وتسم امي الامينة هنا بين حاجبيها الناصعين الطاهرين بميسم الزنى

انني ابن زنا وتصيح بان ابي ديوث وتسم امي الشريفة هنا على الجبين الطاهر النقي بميسم الزنى

Amongst the swearwords used in the source text in example 5 is the abusive word 'bastard'. Although this word designates a child as being born out of illegal sexual relations, as a swearword it describes a person as a mean, despicable and obnoxious. The power of the word 'bastard' comes from its ability to invoke the dubious status of the addressee as being an offspring of wedlock which is a disgrace to the addressee and his/her mother. In this context in the play, the word 'bastard' was used by Laertes as an expression of his furious and hostile inner feeling when he was informed of the killing of his father. By addressing himself, Laertes used this and the other swearwords as a self-reproach which instigates him to take revenge for the killing of his father.

In his translation of the play, Jabra used the expression 'ibnu khina' to mean (Lit. a son of illegal sexual intercourse). However, according to Al-Mujam Al-Wasseett (2004), the word 'khina' is an archaic word which mainly implies 'bad/dirty speech'. This state of affairs could have caused equivocation to the majority of the Arab readership, particularly if linked with the swearwords 'cuckold, harlot' used in the same context (Gamal, 2008). However, this equivocation has attenuated the severity of the sexual overtones of the word 'bastard' if literally translated into Arabic. Seen from this perspective, the steering force behind the use of an ambiguous equivalent in the target text must be to observe norms and conventions in the target culture. Hence, Jabra's main objective was to self-sensor as many of the sexual offensive references congested in the source text as possible, although at the expense of diluting the pragmatic force intended by the playwright through the use of a swearword in this context.

As for Kiwan, she opted for a more direct rendition by selecting the swearing expression 'ibnu zina' (Lit. a son of illegal sexual intercourse). By opting for this translation strategy, she was keen at preserving the spirit of the source text by maintaining the pragmatic function the swearword was meant to express. However, this foreignization strategy has enhanced the otherness of the text and it conflates with the conservative norms in the Arab culture. Example 6 further illustrates this strategy.

Example (6): Act III Scene II

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation   Kiwan's Translation

Do you think I meant country matters??   اطننتي اني اعني ضجوعاً؟؟   احسبت انني قصدت امورا سيئة وفظة؟

As indicated in example 3 above, the taboo expression 'country matters' was translated by Jabra into 'dhajua'n', which is an archaic and ambiguous word in Arabic. It can be used to indicate various meanings, yet it is rarely used in Modern Standard Arabic. The scarcity in which this word is used makes it alien to most contemporary Arab readers. Hence, the purposive use of this ambiguous word is meaningful and is meant to attenuate other pejorative associative meanings if the English expression 'country matters' was directly translated into Arabic. These associative pejorative meanings

pertain mainly to the sexual relation reference triggered in the use of this expression. In line with this argumentation, Jabra preferred to create equivocation to the target readers than opting for the direct or close rendition of the source text taboo word in an attempt to reduce the degree of offense that could have been caused to the Arab readers. This shows that Jabra's translation behavior in this particular excerpt leans more towards domestication as a result of observing norms and conventions active in the target culture.

As for Kiwan, she opted for a completely different domestication translation strategy by preferring to use non-swearing Arabic expressions as equivalents for the English expression in the source text. This shows that she is also abiding by the target culture conventions and norms which put certain restrictions on the use of swearing expressions. Hence, both translators adopted self-censorship which brings the source text close to the Arab readers' expectation, although at the expense of removing all the nuances and peculiarities intended in that text. Among these is the pragmatic functions intended through the use of swearwords.

7.4 Generalization and functional equivalence

Another identified translation strategy was the attempt on the part of the translators to find equivalents or swearwords in the target language that only retain the functions of these words in the source text. In most of the analyzed swearing instances, this takes the form of a general expression in the target text that retains some swearing implications to preserve whatever possible of the spirit of the source text. This strategy is different from literal translation in that the equivalent swearwords were not used on the basis of their denotative meaning, but, rather, on the basis of what swearing elements the equivalent swearwords maintain in Arabic. By so doing, the translators were loyal to the playwright's intention behind using the swearwords, though in a less swearing force. In other words, the translators succeeded in conveying approximate functions of the swearwords as used in the play to the target readers. Hence, generalization and functional equivalence as a strategy were placed close to each other on the continuum splitting domestication from foreignization. Consider the following examples.

Example (7): ACT I Scene I

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation   Kiwan's Translation

O, most wicked speed, to post

With such dexterity to incestuous sheets!   الا ايتها العجلة الفاسقة ترفعين بمثل هذه السرعة

ايتها السرعة الفاسقة ان تسافري على جناح السرعة بمهارة فائقة الى ملاءات سفاح القربى   الاشرعة الزانية.

Example 7 contains one of the most offensive swearing expressions in English namely, 'incest' (McEnery, 2006), which would even be more offensive if directly translated into Arabic. It is exploited by swearers to invoke a high degree of insult and humiliation. Everyone even those who are indifferent of insults stemming from vulgarism would react as a result of the fear of incest. The swearword 'incestuous' in this excerpt was used by Hamlet to direct a severe criticism to his mother who got married soon after his father's death. It can be argued that Hamlet might have not been able to find a more pejorative word to express his anger and frustration than the word

'incestuous'. This proves beyond any doubt that the use of this swearword is intended to achieve certain pragmatic functions.

However, in his rendition of this pragmatically important word, Jabra opted for the strategy of generalizing the reference of this swearword. To explicate, although both the English swearword 'incestuous' and its Arabic counterpart 'zaniah', (Lit. adulterous), in the target text, imply sex-related matters, it is only the word 'incestuous' that is specific in its reference to the crime of having sexual intercourse with a parent, child, sibling, etc. The Arabic taboo word 'zaniah' implies a general reference to any woman experiencing illegal sexual intercourse outside the official marriage. Hence, by avoiding the specific reference to incest in the Arabic version of the play, Jabra generalized this reference in an attempt to preserve whatever possible of the intended pragmatic force of this reference in the target text. The steering force behind this orientation is to avoid a reference to a forbidden word in the Arabic conservative culture. In other words, Jabra attempted to make a balance between keeping the pragmatic function of the swearword in the source text and abiding by cultural conventions in the target culture.

On her part, Kiwan opted for a more direct rendition of the English swearword in this excerpt. She used the expression 'sifah al-qurba', (Lit. having (illegal) sex with relatives), which implies a disgusting practice that any Arab people would take as humiliating and disgraceful. However, much of the intended pragmatic force of the source text was maintained in the target text, suggesting that the translation exhibits more fidelity to the source text compared with Jabra's translation. Example 8 further illustrates this strategy.

Example (8): Act III Scene III

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation Kiwan's Translation

Or in the incestuous pleasure of his bed..…   او في لذة الفحشاء من فراشه ... او في لذة الفحشاء في فراشه ..

In example 8, the swearword 'incestuous' was used by Hamlet in the form of a reproach to Claudius. In this excerpt, Hamlet had a good opportunity to kill Claudius and take revenge, but he met the latter praying. Hamlet thought that incase he kills Claudius while praying, the latter would be sent to heaven. Therefore, according to Hamlet, this is not a fair revenge; he is doing him a favor unlike Hamlet's father who was killed full of sins. Hence, the use of the swearword 'incestuous' is significant in this excerpt because Hamlet is reckoning Claudius's crime and illegal marriage of his dead brother's wife. Consequently, it is of a great pragmatic significance as it communicates a great deal of meaning to the Christian source text readers who believe that 'incestuous' is a crime.

In the Arabic versions of the play, both translators opted for generalization with the use of the word 'fahsha'', (Lit. fornication). However, the Arabic taboo word 'fahsha' cannot be said to be an equivalent for the English swearword 'incestuous' since all references to 'incest' and the sin of marriage of blood relatives in Christianity are lost. Rather, it implies reference to all bad deeds. Therefore, by opting for generalization to achieve functional equivalence, both translators canceled much of the vulgarity and offensiveness of the English swearword as intended in the source text. As a result, the intention of the source text's writer was mitigated to the Arab readers. Moreover, the

expression of Hamlet's inner feelings and, as a result, the drawing of his character sketch particularly his relationship with Claudius, were also diluted. However, the Arab readers can still feel the strength of the taboo word especially in its association with the words 'lathah', (Lit. pleasure), and 'firash', (Lit. bed). Therefore, the use of generalization and functional equivalence to render the English swearword into Arabic indicates that both translators are coming very close to the border lines of abiding by strong cultural norms in the target community and keeping the spirit and intentions of the source text's writer.

7.5 Changing non-swearwords to swearwords

The change of non-swearwords in the source text to swearwords in the target text is one of the clearest strategies adopted within the foreignization orientation. This strategy is the opposite of the deletion and de-swearing strategies representative of domestication. The change of non-swearwords to swearwords resulted in increasing the swearing severity of certain excerpts in the play as relayed to the Arab readers. Consider the following examples.

Example (9): Act II Scene II

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation   Kiwan's Translation

In the secret parts of fortune? O, most true; she is a strumpet.   صدقت والله انها لمومس فاجرة

اوه صحيح جدا فالدهر مومس فاجرة

In example 9, Hamlet was speaking with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern about fortune. In an attempt to emphasize Guildenstern's assertion that they represent the 'private parts of fortune' Hamlet used the intensifier 'most' preceding the word 'true'. This means that there was no instance of swearing in this particular expression. However, he also used the swearword 'strumpet' very close to this expression. In his rendition of the non-swearing expression 'most true' in the source text, Jabra opted for the use of a swearing expression in the target text. To explicate, Jabra used the swearing word 'walahi', (Lit. by Allah), as an oath to emphasize his agreement with Guildenstern's assertion. However, this strategy has added more pragmatic force to the statement which was not intended by the source text's author. As a result, Arab readers with knowledge of English might question the unnecessary addition of the swearing expression in this rendition of this excerpt while comparing between the source and target texts. It might be argued that Jabra was affected by the general atmosphere of the play. In other words, since the use of swearing expressions is one of the distinctive features of the play, Jabra felt a need to maintain this spirit in his translation of it. Thus, changing non-swearwords in the source text to swearwords in the target text represents a foreignization orientation which aims at preserving the spirit of the source text, although at the expense of adding a stronger pragmatic force not intended by the source text's author.

Kiwan, on the other hand, opted for the direct rendition of the word 'true' into 'saheeh', with the use of the emphatic expression 'jidan', 'most'. This tendency can be justified on the basis that, in this particular context, there is no need for the use of swearwords otherwise Shakespeare could have used them. Hence, here translation does not add any unintended pragmatic force stemming from the use of swearwords in the Arabic version of the play. Therefore, the two translators differed in the evaluation of the message

intended in the source text to be communicated to the Arab readership. A similar tendency can be illustrated by example 10 below.

Example (10): Act I Scene V

Swearword in the ST	Jabra's translation	Kiwan's Translation
Why, right, you are I' right .	محق والله انت محق	هذا صحيح انت محق

Example 10 is an excerpt of an encounter between Hamlet and Horatio after the former has met with the ghost. Hamlet was trying not to tell the true story of the information he got from the ghost. For that reason, Hamlet was trying to create any other stories to persuade Horatio to stop questioning him. The justifications Hamlet used seemed not to convince Horatio who was suspicious about the appearance of the ghost in this moment of the day. Hamlet used the word 'right' to agree with Horatio's assertion of the unnecessary appearance of the ghost to tell trivial stories. Hence, no swearing expression was used by Hamlet to emphasize his statement.

However, in his translation of this excerpt, Jabra changed the non-swearing word 'right' in the source text into the swearword 'wallahi', (Lit. by God) in the target text. By doing so, an unnecessary pragmatic force was relayed to the Arab readership since the swearing by Allah in the Arab Muslim culture is used only when there is a strong need for that oath. Hence, an unintended pragmatic force behind the use of the swearword was relayed in the target text, signaling a foreignization orientation which is highly affected by the general atmosphere of the play.

Once more, Kiwan opted for the direct rendition of the English word 'right' in the source text by using its direct Arabic equivalent 'saheeh', (Lit. right) in the target text. In other words, she maintained the same un-emphatic message of the source text to the Arab readership without adding extra swearwords. On this basis, her translation tends to be more neutral and less marked for swearing expressions.

7.6 Over-translation (Over-swearing)

The second foreignization strategy is over-translation, which implies that the translator exaggerated instances of swearing in the target text by adding swearwords or expressions not found in the source text. The result was an intensified degree of swearing in comparison with that intended in the play. Over exaggerating swearing instances in the target text conflates with the expectations of the target recipients. The following examples are representative of this strategy.

Example (11): Act I Scene V

Swearword in the ST	Jabra's translation	Kiwan's Translation
In faith, my lord, not I	قسما بالعلي العظيم	قسما بالله لن افعل ياسيدي

Example (12): Act I Scene V

Swearword in the ST	Jabra's translation	Kiwan's Translation
Nor I, my lord, in faith .	قسما بالعلي العظيم	ولا انا ياسيدي، قسما بالله.

In examples 11 and 12, Horatio and Marcellus were asked by Hamlet to swear on the latter's sword not to spoil the secret of the encounter between Hamlet and the ghost. To

conclude their oath, Horatio and Marcellus used the swearing expression 'in faith', which might be said to be less emphatic compared with swearing expressions such as 'S'wound' 'S'blood' or 'By Gis and by Saint Charity', used in other excerpts in the play.

In their renditions of this swearing expression, both translators tended to over-exaggerate the swearing tone in the Arabic versions of the play. To reiterate, Jabra used the swearing expression 'qasamin bil a'ali al a'dheem', (Lit. swearing (I swear by) the Almighty and the Greatest), and Kiwan used the swearing expression 'qasamin bilah', (Lit. swearing (I swear) by Allah), as equivalents for the English swearing expression 'in faith' used in the source text. As can be clearly seen, although both translators tended to exaggerate the swearing force in the target text by adding other swearwords, Jabra's translation is more emphatic and highly exaggerated compared with Kiwan's. Jabra has achieved this by adding the words 'the Almighty and the Greatest'. Hence, the pragmatic force of the swearing expression in the source text became stronger in the target text, which conflates with the writer's intention behind using this swearing expression. This translation behavior exhibits a tendency towards foreignizing the source text to its target readers, hence, enhancing its otherness.

٧،٧ Literal translation

The third foreignization strategy adopted by the translators was literally rendering swearwords in the play when translated into Arabic. That is to say, the translators provided the denotative meaning of the swearword in the source text as if detached from the context in which it was used. In such a case, the translators were keen at preserving the spirit of the source text. Consider the following examples.

Example (13): Act I Scene V

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation   Kiwan's Translation

Yes, by Saint Patrick, but there is, Horatio, And much offence too.   بلى والله ان فيها لاساءة

بلى اقسم بالقديس باترك .....

Example 13 contains the swearing expression 'by Saint Patrick' which was used in the source text by Hamlet to assert to Horatio that the ghost was offended. In the target text, however, this expression was translated differently by the two translators using different translation strategies. On the one hand, Jabra opted for functional equivalence, whereby the normal Arabic swearing expression used to emphasize assertions, namely, 'wallahi', (Lit. (I swear) by Allah) was used. This is the usual swearing expression Muslim use when they want to make an oath. This relates to the religious differences between the Christian and Muslim cultures. On the basis of this difference, whereas Muslims believe in the oneness of Allah, Christians believe in Trinity. Seen from this perspective, Jabra's translation of this swearing expression would seem more natural and expected by the Arab readership. Moreover, it could maintain the pragmatic function of the English swearword used in the source text. However, the orientation towards domesticating the text on the basis of observing the target culture active norms and conventions is obvious.

In contrast, Kiwan opted for the literal translation strategy by literally retaining the exact swearing words used in the source text 'I swear by Saint Patrick'. Such a rendition has brought the target text's readers very close to the spirit of the source text. It is the

kind of translation that shows complete fidelity to the source text writer's intention. It can help the readers of this text to learn much about the cultural norms of the source culture. More importantly, it could maintain the primary force of the pragmatic function of the speech act of swearing as intended in the source text. Nevertheless, such a literal rendition can be shocking to the Arab Muslim readers for the same reasons pertaining to religious differences stated in the previous paragraph. Such a rendition has enhanced the otherness of the source text to the Arab readers. However, it signals an orientation towards foreignization in an attempt to be loyal to the source text writer's intention. This same notion is further discussed in example 14 below.

Example (14): Act V Scene I

Swearword in the ST   Jabra's translation   Kiwan's Translation

And your water is a sore decayer of your whoreson dead body.   وصاحبنا الماء مفسد لعين

والماء مفسد شديد للجثث اللعينة للجسد الميت ابن الزانية

In example 14, the swearword 'whoreson' was used by the first clown while talking about the dead bodies with Hamlet. It was used as an expression of the educational level and social class of the speaker. It is a distinctive feature that the speech of low class and uneducated people be full of vulgar and offensive words (McEnery, 2006; Jay, 1992). Once more, the two translators adopted different translation strategies to render this expression in their translation of the play into Arabic. For instance, Jabra opted for a more literal translation by choosing the swearing expression 'ibin al zaniah', (Lit. son of adulteress) (Al-Thebyan et. al., 2011). This rendition is very close to the English swearword in the source text as both come from the same semantic field. Accordingly, the intended pragmatic function behind using the swearword in the source text was accurately maintained in the target text. Hence, the translation exhibits complete fidelity to the intended message in the source text, a finding that conforms with that of Al-Rasheedi (2016). It has brought the Arab readers very close to the source text by preserving its foreign spirit. However, this foreignization orientation conflates with the expectations of the Arab readers and the active cultural norms there.

On her part, Kiwan opted form a different translation strategy by selecting a swearword from a different semantic field, namely the religious field, in an attempt to mitigate the offensiveness and vulgarity of the source text's swearword (Han & Wang, 2014). For many scholars, religious swearing expressions are less offensive and less vulgar than other swearwords coming from other semantic fields such as body functions, body parts and sexual activities (Ferklova, 2014; AL-Khatib, 1995). This is the case in Kiwan's rendition since she chose the Arabic religious swearword 'la'eenah', (Lit. damned), which has little to do with adultery. According to Ibn Manzur (1993), the word 'la'nah' implies celestial torture in the day of judgment. This clearly shows that this rendition falls short of preserving the exact intended pragmatic force of the swearword used in the source text (Niayzi, 2008). However, the aim behind its use was to attenuate as much of the offensiveness of the source text's swearword to the Arab readers as possible. On this basis, the orientation towards domestication becomes vivid. Below is another illustrative example of this strategy.

Conclusion

This study has addressed the interligual transference of one of the cultural bumps, namely, the translation of swearwords in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic. It has aimed to identify the translation strategies adopted by the male and female translators which have shaped their translation orientation either towards domestication or foreignization. In light of this, the study has also aimed to examine the effect of gender on the selection of the translation strategies and the impact each of these strategies has left on preserving the intended pragmatic functions of swearwords when rendered into Arabic.

The inconsistency in the selection of the translation strategies by both translators, which ranged from complete domestication to complete foreignization, has emphasized the fact that the translation of swearwords represents a problem to the translators, particularly, when the direction of translation is from a more open culture into a more conservative one. The domestication pole has been represented by strategies including deletion, de-swearing, ambiguity, and generalization and functional equivalence. These have indicated a translation orientation which displays more inclination towards active norms and conventions in the target culture. Hence, they collaboratively worked into taming the source text to the Arab readers to come very close to their expectations. However, almost all nuances and peculiarities of the source text have been eliminated as a result of this orientation. More importantly, the intended pragmatic functions of swearwords in the source text including the expression of the characters' inner feelings and their relationships with each other have been mitigated in the translated version of the paly.

However, Jabra (the male translator) has demonstrated more inclination towards this domestication orientation compared with Kiwan (the female translator). To reiterate, whereas Jabra opted for complete deletion of swearwords, Kiwan opted for either the literal or generalization strategy. Moreover, while Jabra opted for ambiguity and equivocation, Kiwan opted for direct translation and generalization. Consequently, Kiwan's translation was more faithful in preserving the spirit of the source text, hence, it brought the target Arab readers very close to the playwright's intentions. Moreover, this translation was more felicitous when it comes to maintaining the pragmatic functions of swearwords in the Arabic version of the play.

As for the foreignization orientation, it was represented by strategies including changing non-swearwords to swearwords, over-swearing and literal translation. These strategies worked into enhancing the Otherness of the source text in the target culture and they brought the Arab readers very close to it. It is interesting to note, however, that Jabra has demonstrated more inclination towards this orientation compared with Kiwan. In other words, Jabra changed more non-swearwords to swearwords in his translation of the play, and used more over-swearing expressions than Kiwan.

This state of affairs points to the fact that Kiwan was more risk aversive in comparison with Jabra when it comes to making translation decisions, a fact which might be attributed to her little experience in literary translation compared with Jabra. Nevertheless, she was more faithful to the source text.

Bibliography

Academy of Arabic in Cairo. (2004). Mujam Al-Wasseett. Cairo, Al-Shuruq International Library.

Alavi, S. Y., Karimnia, A., & Salehi Zadeh, S. (2013). 'Translation of taboos from English into Persian: A skopos-based study". Elixir Ling. & Trans, 54, 12289-12292.

Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). Forbidden Words: Taboo and Censoring of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Al-Khatib, M. A. (1995). A sociolinguistic view of linguistic taboo in Jordanian Arabic. Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 16(6): 443-457.

Al-Quraishy, S.W.(2008). A Study of Swearing in Shakespeare's Hamlet. qu.edu.iq/repository/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/swearing.pdf.

Al-Rasheedi, R. (2016). Strategies Used for Translating Explicit and Implicit Meanings in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach. Studies in Literature and Language Vol. 12, No. 6, 2016, pp. 1-16.

Al-Saidi A. H., Sahira M. S. and Abed S. K. (2017). Pragmatic Analysis of Impolite Speech Acts and their Verbal Responses in Shakespeare's Hamlet. (Forthcoming.(

Al-Thebyan, Q. A., Nazmi T. Al-Shalabi1, Fahd A. Salameh1, Kifah M. Al-Omari. (2011.(

A Critique of Jabra's Arabic Translation of Shakespeare's The Tempest. Canadian Social

Science Vol. 7, No. 6, 2011, pp. 64-74.

Amanati, L. (2016). The Translator's Gender and its Impact on Translation Accuracy of Narrative Style. The Social Sciences 11 (9): 2144-2150.

Andersson, L. G., & Trudgill, P. (1990). Bad Language: Basil Blackwell Oxford.

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do Things with Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beebe, L. M. (1995). Polite Fictions: Instrumental Rudeness as Pragmatic Competence. Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics, 154J168.

Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness in interaction (Vol. 167): John Benjamins Publishing.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of Pragmatics, 25(3): 349-367.

Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. Journal of Pragmatics, 35(10): 1545-1579.

Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cutting, J. (2002). Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students. London: Routledge.

Dimitriu, R. (2004). Omission in translation. Perspectives: Studies in Translatology, 12(3): 163-175.

Fawcett, P. (2003). The Manipulation of Language and Culture in Film Translation. In Calzada P. M. (Ed.), A Propos of Ideology. (pp. 145-163). Manchester, St. Jerome.

Ferklová, S. (2014). Subtitles vs. Dubbing: Approaches to Translation of Swear Words and Slang in Film. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic.

Gamal, M. Y. (2008). Egypt's audiovisual translation scene. Arab Media & Society, 5: 1-15.

Gentzler, E. (2001). Contemporary Translation Theories. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Second Edition.

Han, C., & Wang, K. (2014). Subtitling swearwords in reality TV series from English into Chinese: A corpus-based study of The Family. Translation and Interpreting, 6(2): 1-17.

Hooper, T. (2003). Dangerous Doubles: Puns and Language in Shakespeare's Hamlet'. Chrestomathy: Annual Review of Undergraduate Research at the College of Charleston, 2, 120-34.

Hydén, M. (1995). Verbal aggression as prehistory of woman battering. Journal of Family Violence, 10(1), 55-71.

Ibn Manzur, J. (1993). Lisan Al-lisan: Tahtheeb Lisan Al-'Arab. Lebanon, Beirut: Dar alkutb alelmiah, (Vol.1), (1st ed.(

Jabra, I. J. (1979). The Tragedy of Hamlet, the Price of Demark. (Trans.). Beirut: Al-Mu'assasa Al-'Arabiyya lid-Diraasaat Wan-Nashr

James, C. (1998). Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis. London: Routledge.

Jay, T. (1992). Cursing in America: A psycholinguistic Study of Dirty Language in the Courts, in the Movies, in the Schoolyards, and on the Streets. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Jing, H. (2010). The translation of English and Chinese puns from the perspective of Relevance Theory. The Journal of Specialised Translation, 13, 81-99.

Kovačič, I. (1996). Subtitling Strategies : A Flexible Hierarchy of Priorities. In C. Heiss, and R. M. B. Bosinelli (Eds.), Traduzione Multimediale per il Cinema, la Televisione e la scena: atti del Convegno Internazionale (pp. 297-305). Bologna: Clueb.

Kiwan, A. (2008). Hamlet. (Trans.). Beirut: Dar Al-Bihar.

Ljung, M. (2011). Swearing: A Corss-cultural Linguistic Study. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

McEnery, T. (2006). Swearing in English: Bad Language, Purity and Power from 1586 to the Present. London: Routledge.

McEvoy, S. (2000). Shakespeare: The Basics. London and New York: Routledge.

Moghaddas, B (2013). The Effect of Gender in Translation Accuracy of Iranian English Translators. International Journal of Management and Humanity Sciences. Vol., 2 (3), 227-236.

Mukhtar, A. (2008). Mujam Al-Lughati Al-Arabiti Al-Muasseriti. Cairo, A'lam Al-Kutub.

Newmark, P. (1981). Approaches to translation. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice-Hall International.

Niyazi, S. (2008). Hamlet the Prince of Denamrk by William Shakespere (Trans.). Damascus: AlMada Publishng Company F.K.A.

Nord, C. (1997). Translating as a Purposful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained. London: Routledge.

Pedersen, J. (2008). High Felicity: A Speech Act Approach to Quality Assessment in Subtitling. In C. Delia, C. Heiss, & C. Bucaria (Eds.). Between Text and Image: Updating Research in Screen Translation (pp. 101–116). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rezaaei, Z. (2012). The Relation between the Author and the Translator's Gender in Creating and Translating Literary Texts. (Unpublished dissertation). Birjand University.

Romaine, B. (2003). On Writing in Tongues: An Experiment in Simulated Literary Translation. Translation Review, 65, 16-22.

Rubinstein, F. (1989). A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and Their Significance. Macmillan Press Ltd.

Sagarin, E. (1968). The Anatomy of Dirty Words: L. Stuart.

Shunnaq, N. Z. (2007). The Translation of Some Metaphorical Expressions in Shakespeare's Hamlet. Available at: https://works.bepress.com/philadelphia_university/49/

Sun, Y. (2010). General Problems in Chinese Translations of Shakespeare. Asian Culture and History, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.232-235.

Swan, M. (2005). Practical English Usage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tatu, O. and Sinu, R.(2013). From Shakespeare to Sitcoms: Translating the Bawdy Wordplay. www.diacronia.ro/indexing/details/V460/pdf

Urban Dictionary of most offensive words ever. (n.d.) Retrieved from www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=most+offensive+word+ever

Venuti, L. (1995). The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. London: Routledge.

Vermeer, H. J. (2000). Skopos and Commission in Translational Action (Chesterman, Trans.). In L. Venuti (Ed.), The Translation Studies Reader, (pp.221-232). London: Routledge.

Verschueren, J. (1999). Understanding Pragmatics. Oxford University Press. Chicago.

Yang, L. (2014). A Gender Perspective of Translation: Taking Three Chinese Versions of The Purple Color as an Example. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 5, No. 2، pp. 371-375.