The Translation of Sexual Puns in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic

Abdali al-Saidi¹, Sahira Salman², Abed Khalaf ³

ABSTRACT

Puns in Shakespeare's plays are of great artistic significance. They endow and enrich these plays with secondary and even tertiary meanings. However, because of the double or triple-tiered meanings of puns, these stylistic devices are not easily amenable to translation. The rich cultural connotations behind puns and the distinctive features of the puns' form, sound and meanings pose great challenges to translators. Accordingly, care should be taken in the interlingual/intercultural transference of puns to transfer the effect achieved by these devices on the source recipients to the target recipients. Any mistranslation of puns will leave bad consequences on the recipients' comprehension of the play's atmosphere and characterization. In light of this, this study aims at identifying the strategies adopted by six Arab translators when rendering sexual puns in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic and the effect of each strategy on maintaining the intended communicative effect of puns on the recipients. In the analysis of the translation of puns in the Arabic versions of the play, Delabastita's (2004) model was considered as the main theoretical framework. The data for analysis were collated from the play and its translated versions in Arabic by identifying puns in the ST and their counterparts in the TTs. The findings of the study show that the pun-to-pun, pun-to-zero-pun and pun-to-non-pun strategies were adopted when rendering puns in Hamlet into Arabic to naturalize the play to the Arab recipients, although this was at the expense of preserving the intended functions and communicative effect of this important stylistic feature.

Keywords: puns; translation strategies; quibbles; sexual overtones; Delabastita.

Introduction

Literary critics and linguists argue that what assured Shakespeare's works eternal fame are his rhetoric, peculiar style and skillful use of language. More importantly, critics attest the significance of such features in communicating the intended message in each of Shakespeare's masterpieces. They attest, moreover, that Shakespearian masterpieces are rich in figurative language including "images, comparisons, and analogies" beside other tropes such as metaphor, irony and wordplay (McEvoy, 2000, p. 28). Shakespeare manipulates one or more of these tropes which he believes influential in making harmony with the depicted general atmosphere in the paly. *Hamlet*, for instance, "has more quibbles than any other of Shakespeare's tragedies." (Mahood, 2003, p. 112). Moreover, according to Sulik (1977, p. 132) (cited in Francisco and Diaz Perez, 2010, p.21), wordplays in Hamlet "play a larger role (. . .) than in any other Shakespearean drama". This heavy reliance on the use of wordplay coincides with the 'detective' atmosphere in *Hamlet* whereby almost every character spies on the other. Accordingly, each character attempts to assume a disguise for itself to remain ambiguous for other characters (Mahood, 2003, p. 111). In situations like these, it is natural for these characters to resort to punning. However, Hamlet, the hero of the play, stands out of all characters as "an inveterate punster" (Martin, 2017, p. 169). He always uses allusive figures and puns to express his true thoughts while simultaneously concealing them from other characters. Unlike other characters in the play, Hamlet is keenly aware of his skillful use of language to achieve his objectives. On this basis, for Shakespeare, puns represent the trope deemed more appropriate in depicting such an atmosphere.

---

¹Thi Qar University/College of Arts/ Dept. of English ²Ministry of Higher Education & Scientific Research Research & Development Office³University Of Anbar. Received on 12/1/2020 and Accepted for Publication on 2/6/2020.

Puns in Shakespeare's plays are of great artistic significance since they endow and enrich these plays with secondary and even tertiary meanings. This stems from the nature of pun as "an expression that achieves emphasis or humor by contriving an AMBIGUITY, two distinct meanings being suggested either by the same word (polysemy) or by two similar-sounding words (homophone)." (Baldick, 2001, p. 209). This double entendre mechanism has been manipulated by Shakespeare as a defensive tactic for the characters in *Hamlet*. Hence, in many occasions a character may say something which seems straight forward on its face value only to imply a deeper meaning which is difficult to comprehend by his/her opponent. Accordingly, this tactic is used as a weapon to attack other characters and as "a way to avoid giving definite answer." (Hooper, 2003, p. 122). This is done by exploiting the double meaning of the employed word or its sound or linguistic structure. In this way, puns will be of great dramatic significance for the development of the plot and for characterization. Moreover, they will "have a communicative effect, which can be humorous, attention getting, persuasive, or of any other type." (Francisco and Diaz Perez, 2010, p. 22). They also give an indication of the character's psychological inner feelings, to get relief from emotional tensions. Hence, the employment of puns invites the reader for an in depth analysis of each character.

A corollary of the previous account on the role and functions of puns in *Hamlet* indicates that they are significant for the readers for accurate comprehension of the plot and its characters. On this basis, the role and functions of puns need to be accurately handled in the translation process from one language to another so as TT readers, who depend exclusively on translation, will have an identical or similar comprehension of the playful effects of puns in the play. In fact, it would be a serious loss for the target readers if wordplay in *Hamlet* were lost in translation. Undoubtedly, translating the wealth of wordplay in Hamlet represents a heavy burden on the shoulder of any translator. This is because within the term wordplay, two words or phrases which sound the same but may mean different things in one language, generally do not sound the same in another language. In addition, wordplay utilizes particular structural characteristics of a language for its meaning and effect, whereby a counterpart in another language is often impossible to find (Koochacki, 2016). More importantly, it is sometimes impossible to decide on the meaning intended by the playwright when dealing with double entendre. The translation of puns is further complicated by the concept of culture specificity since wordplay manipulates the shared knowledge between the sender and recipient. What is shared by the speakers of a particular linguistic and cultural system is by and large different from what is shared by other linguistic and cultural systems. Indeed for some scholars, puns are untranslatable stylistic phenomena. (Martin, 2017; Martin, 2018; Arnaiz, 2005). The difficulty of translating puns "is due to the fact that the semantic and pragmatic effects of source text wordplay find their origin in particular structural characteristics of the source language for which the target language more often than not fails to produce a counterpart, such as the existence of certain homophones, near-homophones, polysemic clusters, idioms or grammatical rules" Delabastita (1994, p. 223). To further complicate the task of the translator, Shakespeare uses a great deal of sexual puns which demonstrate sensitive issues which might shock the readers (Martin, 2018; Arnaiz, 2005).

The translation of sexual puns becomes more challenging for translators dealing with very remote linguistic and cultural systems as in the case when translating from English, an open culture, into Arabic, a very conservative culture. In light of this, the present study attempts to identify the translation strategies adopted when rendering sexual puns in Hamlet when translated into Arabic and the effect of each strategy on preserving the intended communicative effect of puns on the recipients.

1.   On the Categorization and Translation of Puns

Scholars addressing the subject of wordplay conceive that the terms "wordplay" and "pun" can be used interchangeably. However, Leppihalme (1997, p.142), argues that "pun" represents a subclass of wordplay. A more comprehensive categorization of puns is that proposed by Delabastita (1996, p. 128) who lists all possible types of linguistic structures (spelling and sound) that constitute the various types of wordplay (homonymy, homophony, homography and parnnymy). Thus, a homonymic pun occurs if spelling and sound are identical (the word 'present'), if

sound is identical but spelling is different, (the English words *right* vs. *rite),* the pun is homophonic, if spelling is identical but sound is different, (the English *read* (present) vs. *read* (ed2), the result is a homographic pun, or differ slightly in both spelling and sound, (the English words *friend* vs. *fiend),* to make a patronymic pun. Moreover, based on the syntactic relationship, a pun can be vertical when its two meanings (surface and underlying) can be present in the same utterance, whereas it is horizontal when these meanings can be shown through repetition in context.

Puns represent a form of rhetoric used to create humor, draw attention, or to persuade by virtue of the multiple meanings of words or phrases. McMillan Dictionary (2015) defines pun as "a humorous use of a word that has two meanings, or of words with the same sound but different meanings." In literary works, puns play a great important role since they are intentionally used for dramatic effects, and are expected to trigger immediate responses amongst the readers. However, as discussed in the introduction, due to the differences amongst linguistic systems, some linguistic difficulties come to the fore (semantic or pragmatic effects) in shifting from one language into another in translation in an attempt to achieve equivalent dramatic effects. An effective translation is measured against whether the target recipients can feel the dramatic effects of pun conveyed to them. In addition, the adopted translation strategies also influence target recipients' understanding of the text. In light of this, various translation strategies have been proposed in the interlingal transference of puns.

For instance, following Delabastita (1996), these strategies include; translating the ST pun with a pun in the TT, which might be different, translation with some loss of the punning aspect, replacing the ST pun with another device in the TT which creates a similar effect (e.g. rhyme, irony), or deleting the pun (p. 134). However, Gottlieb (1997), argues that although other devices might create a similar effect on the TT readers as the pun in the ST does, it is still best to translate the ST pun with a pun in the TT.

Another set of strategies for the translation of puns is that proposed by Leppihalme (1997). However, Leppihalme argues that the choice of a particular strategy should be based on certain factors including the function of the pun in the ST, audience's expectations, and TL norms and conventions (p. 149).

Moreover, Veisbergs (1997) and Delabastita (1996) suggest the use of footnotes as explanatory information for puns, but it is not guaranteed whether this strategy will preserve the punning comic elements. In addition, Veisberges (1997) proposes the omission of either the whole passage or the pun used in it as a possible strategy. The author even conceives this strategy as a good choice, if the pun serves a marginal function or if too much punning would create an artificial effect (p. 171).

The omission strategy is also proposed by Newmark (1981) arguing that "puns (. . .) are most difficult to translate. Often the puns simply have to be scarified" (p. 12). A similar view is held by Reiss (2000) who believes that "in translation, puns and other kinds of play with language will have to be ignored to the great extent so as to keep the content invariant" (p. 169). However, this view ignores the ST producer's intentions behind the utilization of puns to achieve certain intended dramatic functions on the recipients.

A more recent set of strategies for translating puns is that proposed by Delabastita (2004) which is adopted in this study and will be discussed in the methodology section.

2.   Literature Review

The great number of sexual puns in *Hamlet* and the sensitivity and difficulty of translating such tropes have attracted the attention of a number of scholars and translation experts. (Ghanooni, (2012); Arnaiz (2005). The main focus of scholars has been on the strategies adopted when rendering sexual puns, the impact of sociocultural and political factors on the translators' orientations and the effect of the selected strategies in preserving the communicative effect of these puns on the recipients.

For instance, Arnaiz (2005) conducted a study on the translation of sexual puns in *Hamlet* into Spanish. The objective was to identify the strategies adopted for that purpose and the translators' orientation whether towards bowdlerizing or maximizing sexual puns in their renditions of *Hamlet* into Spanish by comparing two rival translations (by Clark and Macpherson) that appeared within less than a year in Spain. The finding of the study indicated that Clark

opted for literalness and the maximizing of sexual puns as a reaction against previous censorship of the original, whereas Macpherson opted for bowdlerizing these puns in order not to dishonor Shakespeare's plays and his reputation for the Spanish readership. This indicates that both translators had a special perception of the translation activity. They understood translation as a flexible activity that gave them "permission to rewrite the Shakespearean text attending to personal, literary or historical factors" (p. 34).

Similarly, Ghanooni (2012) examined the translation of sexual puns in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* into Italian, French and Persian to see how bawdy language is treated in three different cultures. The analysis of selected instances of sexual puns in the source and target texts showed that in almost all the cases in the three languages, the sexuality overtone of the punnistic words had been omitted, euphemized and mitigated, indicating the loss of punning activity. However, in the Persian version, there had been more omissions compared with the other two languages. Hence, the bawdy language and the aesthetic aspects characteristic of the original work had been toned down for the TL readers and the double layer of meaning is rendered into non-punny expressions without any sexuality overtone. This indicates that translation is an ideologically-governed activity influenced by factors in the recipient language.

In addition, Oana and Raluca (2013) studied the translation of bawdy wordplay in excerpts from two different mediums; Shakespeare's plays and an American sitcom with their translations into Romanian. The objective was to identify the various linguistic and other factors which might influence the translation of bawdy wordplay, and the strategies and solutions translators opt for when facing such instances of language use. The finding of the study highlights the fact that bawdy wordplay and allusions are normally mitigated with the use of less offensive counterparts in the translated version regardless of the medium used.

Moreover, Martin (2018) examined the Romanian translators' patterns of rendering sexual puns in selected Shakespeare's sonnets and plays in line with Delabastita's (1993) wordplay translation techniques. The finding of the study invalidated the notion that sexual puns are untranslatable. In other words, Romanian translators provided daring renditions of Shakespeare's sexual puns using various translation techniques. However, the bowdlerization of such puns can be attributed to "factors such as the scarce Romanian slang, the translators' moral standards, their poor skills and lack of access to supplementary critical materials" (356).

In another study, Martin (2017) studied the extent to which Romanian translators succeeded in preserving the bawdy overtones of Shakespeare's bawdy puns despite the censorship apparatus on such sensitive issues during the communist regime. To achieve this objective, Martin collected instances of bawdy puns from Shakespeare's plays in parallel with their Romanian translations and adopted Delabastita's (1993) model to identify the adopted translation strategies. The finding of the study indicates that out of the six instances of bawdy puns analyzed, four have been rendered using equal bawdy puns in the target texts, during and after the communist regime, which indicates that bowdlerization is not a normal practice among Romanian translators. This enhances the fact that the less successful translations of Shakespeare's bawdy puns do not share political agenda or undertones.

A keen reading of the surveyed studies on the translation of sexual puns in Shakespeare's works shows that translators have adopted different approaches and translation patterns in the intrlingual/intercultural transference of these linguistic devices. Some translators have maximized the sexual overtones of puns in their translations, while others mitigated or deleted the puns on ideological and cultural basis. However, the surveyed studies cover language pairs such as English and Romanian, English and French, Italian or Persian, but no study so far has been carried out on the translation of sexual puns in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Arabic. Accordingly, the significance of the present study lies in its being one of the first attempts to identify the strategies adopted by six Arab famous translators when rendering sexual puns in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Arabic and the impact of each strategy in maintaining the intended communicative effect of puns on the recipients.

3. Methodology

This study adopts Delabastita's (2004) definition of wordplay as "the general name for the various textual

phenomena in which structural features of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a communicatively significant confrontation of two (or more) linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings" (p. 128). Accordingly, sexual puns fulfilling this definition in the play are extracted for inclusion in the data. In the discussion, each of these words and its counterparts in the Arabic translations of the play are highlighted and put parallel to each other. Moreover, a literal back translation of the Arabic equivalents is provided with a transliteration to enable non-native speakers of Arabic to read them.

4.1 Approach and Data of the Study

This study is qualitative in nature. It is a descriptive study with no attempt for value judgment and it adopts a corpus-based analysis approach to identify the strategies adopted by the Arab translators (Jabra (1979), AOECSs (Arab organization for Education, Culture and Sciences, henceforth AO), (2000), Niazi (2008), Kiwan (2008), Abdul Maqssood (2009) and Mutran (2012) when handling the sensitive issue of sexual puns in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Arabic and the effect of these strategies on preserving the intended communicative effect of such tropes to the recipients. The selected translators are the most common in the Arab World and the rationale behind collating this number of translations is to widen the scope and analysis of the study. The data of the study comprise only typical illustrative sexual puns extracted from a corpus consisting of the original text of *Hamlet* and six of its translated versions in Arabic. The rationale behind choosing to focus on one of Shakespeare's masterpieces is due to the status Shakespeare globally entertains. Moreover, Shakespeare is the most widely translated playwright. In addition, some scholars have compared Shakespeare with the Scripture in terms of the fulfilled unique cultural functions. Shakespeare has contributed in shaping cultural identities, ideologies, and literary and linguistic repositories all over the world. Thus, pioneering writers and politicians have been attracted by the challenge of translating Shakespeare's works (Delabastita, 2013). Accordingly, "Many translation scholars have elected to test their views against the case of Shakespeare in translation, using it as a touchstone for the relevance and validity of their theoretical constructions" (Ibid, p. 264).

4.2 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The procedure for getting the required data is composed of four stages which can be summarized as follows;

(1) Reading the original text of *Hamlet* and extracting couplets containing sexual puns;

(2) Finding their equivalents in the Arabic translated versions of the play;

(3) Identifying the translation strategies applied based on Delabastita's (2004) model for the translation of puns which is summarized below, and

(4) Examining whether the intended communicative effect of sexual puns has been preserved in the translated versions of the play or not.

Delabastita's (2004) model comprises a list of eight "translation techniques" for dealing with puns. They are quite straightforward and seem to cover all conceivable scenarios in which puns might be used, as follows:

1.   PUN~ PUN: a target language pun, which might function structurally, semantically or textually differently, replaces a source text pun.

2.   PUN~ NON-PUN· a source text pun is transferred into a non-punning phrase which may keep both senses of the wordplay, or maintain one at the expense of the other.

3.   PUN~ RELATED RHETORICAL DEVICE: a source text pun is rendered by "some wordplay-related rhetorical device (repetition, alliteration, rhyme, referential vagueness, irony, paradox, etc.)" to reproduce the effect of the pun in the target text.

4.   PUN~ ZERO: the source text pun is omitted.

5.   PUN ST =PUN TT: this strategy implies reproducing the source-text pun, may be in a similar environment in the target, although not actually 'translating' it

6.   NON-PUN ~ PUN: this implies using a pun in positions in the target text which do not contain wordplay in the source text to compensate for source-text puns lost elsewhere.

7.   ZERO ~ PUN: a pun used in the target text not to translate a source text pun but as a compensatory device

8.   EDITORIAL TECHNIQUES: this takes the form of explanatory footnotes, endnotes, or comments provided to illustrate a translation decision when handling puns (p. 134).

4.   Results and Discussion

The analysis in this section is concerned with the translation of only typical illustrative sexual puns in *Hamlet*, especially those appeared in the dialogical exchanges between Hamlet and Ophelia, and Hamlet and Polonius. The section provides an overall discussion of the data via addressing every illustrative example's intended meaning in the ST along with its Arabic translations. Of particular significance in this regard is an account of the double entendre of each pun in the ST and the effect of its context on foregrounding its sexual punning status. Then, the selected translations are analyzed in terms of the strategies of translation employed and the Arabic equivalents used for the ST intended meanings. Finally, the translations are assessed according to the extent to which the selected translators have rendered the ST intentionality as adequate as possible.

It is worth noting that Hamlet's use of pun is peculiar in that he has employed it "as both his primary weapon and mode of defense; he directs his quibbles at nearly every character, playing a linguistic game of attack and counterattack…since the ambiguity of pun gives [him] a way to avoid giving a definite answer" (Hooper, 2003, p.122). Accordingly, translators are required to be fully aware of Hamlet's specific use of language so as to render the meanings intended accurately. Consider the following examples;

1.   Polonuis: Do you know me my lord?

Hamlet: Excellent well; *you are a fishmonger*. (Hamlet, 2.2.174)

No. (1)	ST	
	Hamlet: you are a *fishmonger*.	
TT		
Jabra	" أنت بياع سمك"	(1979, p.83)
AO	"إنك صائدُ سمكٍ "	(2000, p.83)
Niazi	"أنت بائع سمك "	(2008, p.127)
Kiwan	" أنت تاجر سمك ".	(2008, p. 148)
Abdul Maqssood	" " أنت بائعُ سمكٍ ".	(2009,p.135)
Mutran	No Translation!	

In example (1), *fishmonger* refers normally to 'one who deals in fish' where *monger* is seller rather than buyer', however, *fish market* is an allusion to a brothel (Williams, 2006, p.126; Holder, 2008, p.181). In this context, *fishmonger* is to be interpreted as a person "who arranges opportunities for (illicit) sexual intercourse; a procurer; a pimp" (Díaz-Pérez , 2013, p.292; see Delabastita, 1993, p. 380; Patridge, 2001, p. 136). In addition, the bawd sense of *fishmonger* is more appropriate here when Hamlet (II.ii.174) describes Polonius as 'a fishmonger', "implying that the latter's daughter, Ophelia, was a prostitute", whether or not he [Hamlet] is aware of Polonius's manipulation of his daughter (Holder, 2008, p.181; Williams, 2006, p.126; see Niazi, 2008, p.149). In a prior exchange with the King and Queen, Polonius affirmed them that Hamlet's madness is caused by his love to Ophelia. To prove this, Polonius suggested to let Ophelia 'loose' herself in front of Hamlet to see his reaction. In response to this behavior, Hamlet accused Polonius of being a '*fishmonger*'; a pimp. It is clear that Shakespeare plays on the double entendre of this word to hide his ridicule of Polonius.

In the cited translations, the first five translators have rendered *fishmonger* literally into بائع سمك *ba'ei samak* (lit. fish seller), صائدُ سمك *sa'id samak* (lit. fisher) and تاجرسمك *tajir samak* (lit. fish dealer). Two important points are to be considered in this respect: firstly, the examined translators seem to have never realized that all the Arabic TT counterparts of the ST pun are not concerned with sexuality in the target culture at all. Puns like سِمسار *simsār* or the non-punning قوّاد *qawād* (both mean a man who finds customers for a prostitute) would have been better alternatives. Secondly, the said translators have never attempted to reproduce in the TT the ST intended meaning even by footnoting strategy where the ST embedded bawd connotation is to be highlighted to the TT readers. Accordingly, the ST implied message is totally lost in the TT for the TT versions never reflect the ST allusion to sexuality. As a result, the intended communicative effect of the ST pun which implies Hamlet's mockery and severe attack to the shaky character of Polonius has not been preserved to the Arab recipients.

On a different level, Mutran has not only omitted the ST in question but he also deleted the whole dialogical exchange between Hamlet and Polonius where *fishmonger* is mentioned (see Hamlet, II.ii, 173-182). It is worth noting that the omission of the ST in the translation results in the loss of the original message in the TT.

According to Delabestita's (2004) model, Jabra, AO, Niazi, Kiwan and Abdul Maqssood have used Pun-to-Pun translation strategy in rendering the ST *fishmonger* into the TT. However, these translators might have been unaware of the fact that the TT puns never express or maintain the sexual connotation embedded in the ST, i.e. Polonius is a pimp, which has never been reproduced in the TT. Unjustifiably, Mutran has tended to employ Pun-to-Zero-Pun strategy where the ST is completely absent in the TT.

2.   Hamlet   :   …I   loved   you   not. Ophelia: I   was   the   more   deceived. Hamlet: ***Get   thee   to   a   nunnery***:   why   wouldst   thou   be   a breeder of sinners?(Act 3 scene 1)

No. (2)	ST
	Ham: ***Get thee to a nunnery***: why wouldst thou be a breeder of sinners?(Act 3 scene 1)
TT	
Jabra	" ...إذهبي الى دير وترهبي..." (1979,p.109)
AO	" ....إذهبي الى دير..." (2000, p.108)
Niazi	"...أدخلي دير راهبات " (2008, p.161)
Kiwan	" ."إذهبي الى دير لتكوني راهبة (2008, p.208)
Abdul Maqssood	"إذهبي الى دير الراهبات ". (2009, p.161)
Mutran	""...إذهبي الى دير (2012, p. 52)

Nunnery, in example (2), originally refers to the set of places (buildings) where 'a community of nuns' reside, but the meaning of *nunnery* is also extended to express "the set of places where men pay to have sex with prostitutes or the set of brothels" (Díaz-Pérez , 2013, p.295; see Delabastita 1997, p. 7; Partridge 2001, p. 199; Kiernan 2007, p. 191). Bearing in mind the nature of Hamlet-Ophelia relationship, Hamlet is seen as having a divided self, especially in this scene, where one part of him, on the one hand, still loves Ophelia and tries to protect her from evil, i.e. *becoming a breeder of sinners*. On the other hand, his other part is appalled by her for she is a woman, like his mother. "It is this other part of his divided self that leads Hamlet to treat Ophelia, by using bitter innuendoes, as though she was a prostitute...[and thus] sexual pun in Shakespeare's plays is able to express profound and complex feelings" (Kiernan, 2007, p.191; see Williams, 2006, Niazi, 2008). What gives priority to the sexual interpretation of the pun in this extract is Hamlet's questioning Ophelia's "honesty" and its transformation to "bawd" in a previous exchange. Hamlet implies

that Ophelia's vanity is the main cause of the change in her relationship with him. Thus, he plays on the double entendre of the word 'nunnery' as a shield to cover his implied intention.

In reference to translation, all the selected translators have translated *nunnery* literally into دَيْر *dir* (residence of nuns), which has no obscene connotation in the Arab culture since *dir* has a highly religious association. In the light of the additional implied meanings of the ST pun identified above, the translators seem to have been unaware of its sex-related implication, i.e. Ophelia was a prostitute. They could have transferred *nunnery* into بيت البغاء *bayyit al-bigha*, which expresses exactly the same sexual cues in the TT. These translators have never attempted to reproduce the ST implicit sense in the TT even by using footnote translation strategy. Accordingly, the ST intended message appears to have been lost in the TT. This being the case, the intended communicative effect behind the use of the sexual pun in the ST has not been relayed to the Arab recipients.

As for Delabastita's (2004) model, all the translators examined have employed Pun-to-Pun strategy. However, the TT punning expressions, identified above, never convey or maintain the ST intentionality since the sexual overtones in the ST pun have been ruled out from the translated versions.

3.   Hamlet: Lady, shall I *lie in your lap*?

Ophelia : No, my lord.

Hamlet: I mean, my head upon your lap?

Ophelia: Ay, my lord.

Hamlet: Do you think I meant *country matters*?

No. (3)	ST
	Hamlet: Do you think I meant *country matters*?
TT	
Jabra	"...أظننت أنَّي أعني ضجوعاً؟" (1979, p.117)
AO	(2000, p.119) "هل حسبت أنَّي أردت أنْ التصرف تصرف الأجلاف من أهل الريف؟ "
Niazi	"هل ظننتِ أنَّي ألمِّح الى قضايا جنسيَّة؟" (2008, p.171)
Kiwan	"أحسبتِ أنني قصدتُ أموراً سيئة وفظة؟ " (2008, p.228)
Abdul Maqssood	"هل ظننتي أنني أقصد ما يقصدهُ أهل الريف؟ "(2009, p.171).
Mutran	No translation!

Example (3) above contains two instances of sexual puns. First, the meaning of *to lie* in expressions like "to lie down, to recline", (especially in bed) often refers to sexual intercourse (Patridge, 1996, p.132 and 136; see Williams, 2006, p.182; Holder, 2008, p.247). Second, the expression '*country matters*' is originally derived from that kind of women who often wed to country copulatives since they repent their match with a foreigner and turn to their countrymen, therefore; 'country matters' is often linked to sex (Williams, 2006, p.88). In this sense, it is normally conceived as a metaphor for lewd pastoral sexuality. Moreover, according to Partridge (1996) and Williams (2006), this wordplay goes even deeper whereby the pun is on the first syllable of the word *country* that sounds similar to *cunt*, the female sexual body organ, in Elizabethan and in contemporary English. (Martin 2018, p. 355).

In the dialogical exchange above, Ophelia's initial refusal indicates that she has never taken Hamlet's words (*to lie* and *lap*) literally and she, therefore, assumes that they imply sexual connotations. In addition, even the neutral word *head* may indirectly refer to Hamlet's male private part, "especially after Hamlet's following reference to '*country matters*' (Arnaiz, 2005, p.30; Hibbard, 1987). Furthermore, Ophelia would have never felt offended just because the prince had asked to sit in her lap (her feet), unless there is something obscene in the conversation, even the lines that follow suggest the same idea of having sex (Arnaiz, 2005).

In line with this, all the translators, save Niazi, have translated '*country matters*' either literally or more broadly. Specifically, Jabra has rendered it into ضجوعاً *ḍuju'an* (lit. sleeping), whereas AO and Abdul Maqssood have translated

it intoالريف أهل مايقصده *mayaqsuduhu ahlu alrīf* (lit. What countrymen mean) and الريف أهل من الأجلاف تصرُّف *Tasarufa al-ajlāfi min ahli al al-rīf* (lit. as rude countrymen behave), respectively. These translators seem to have not realized the sexual connotations implied in the ST expression since all the three TT equivalents have never expressed the ST intended meaning. Further, the word *ḍuju'an* does not necessarily refer to sex and the last two TT expressions, i.e. الريف أهل من الأجلاف تصرُّف and الريف أهل مايقصده, are not commonly used in Arabic for man's sexual intention or desire in women's beauty or attractiveness (sexual appeal).

In the same context, Kiwan has transferred the ST into وفظة سيئة أموراً *umuran say'ā wafaḍa* (lit. bad and rude things), which is quite general and never indicates the ST intentionality since having sexual appeal for a woman is not necessarily bad and/or rude behavior. Unjustifiably, Mutran has left the ST untranslated despite the fact that he has translated many similar expressions before and after the expression in question. The translator's orientation to employ the deletion/omission translation strategy seems to indicate his inability to find the approximate TT counterpart to the ST. Finally, Niazi appears to fully grasp the ST intentionality and thus renders it into جنسيَّة قضايا *qaḍaya jinsiya* (lit. sexual matters). Further, he has used the verb يُلَمِّحُ*yulammihu* (lit.to allude) to indicate that Hamlet has implicitly showed his sexual desire for Ophelia.

Based on Delabastita's (2004) model, four translators, namely Jabra, AO, Abdul Maqssood and Kiwan, have employed the Pun-to-Pun strategy in that they have replaced the ST pun with a TT pun, which functions structurally, semantically or textually differently. The TT provided puns seem to have nothing to do with sexuality and the ST intentionality and its effect have never been rendered to the TT, as discussed so far. Besides, Mutran has resorted into Pun-to-Zero-pun since he has omitted the ST pun completely in the TT. Moreover, Niazi has utilized the pun-to-Non-pun strategy where he transfers the ST pun into 'a nun-punning' phrase that maintains the ST intentionality but at the cost of the effect implied in its indirectness. However, Niazi could maintain a similar communicative effect of the pun on the TT readers as intended by the ST pun on the ST readers.

4.   Hamlet: That's a fair thought ***to lie between maids' legs***.

Ophelia: What is, my lord?

Hamlet: Nothing.

Ophelia: ***You   are   merry***,   my   lord.   (3.2.117-120)

No. (4)	ST	
	Ophelia: ***You are merry***, my lord.	
TT		
Jabra	" مرحٌ إنَّك يا مولاي ""	(1979, p.118)
AO	" ومرح طرب لفي إنك يا مولاي "	(2000, p.119)
Niazi	".أنتَ لعوبٌ، سيدي اللورد " "	(2008, p.171)
Kiwan	" ياسيدي سعيد انت "	(2008, p.228)
Abdul Maqssood	" " يامولاي مرح انت	(2009, p.171)
Mutran	""يامولاي مسروراً أجدك	(2012, p. 54)

In example (4), Hamlet's final remark "*that's a fair thought to lie between maids' legs*" overtly refers to the idea of having sex, something that will appear once more in the following dialogue with Ophelia (Arnaiz, 2005, p.30). *Merry*, in the example above, is connected with negative sexual connotations, i.e. lustful desire (Williams, 2006, p.206). This indicates that Ophelia has grasped Hamlet's sexual innuendo and responded accordingly using the word *merry* to mean that Hamlet is playful.

In the example above, five translators, namely Jabra, AO, Kiwan, Abdul Maqssood and Mutran, have translated the ST pun '*you are merry*' literally where *merry* indicates one's being so happy (joyous). Jabra, AO and Abdul Maqssood have used the Arabic مَرح *mariḥ (lit.* very joyous), whereas Kiwan and Mutran have employed the Arabic سعيد *sa'īd* (lit.

happy) and its synonym مسرور *masrūr*, one by one. It seems obvious that all the TT counterparts used never reflect any sexual connotation associated with the ST pun. Accordingly, all the five translators, referred to above, seem to have been unaware of the ST intentionality, thus their translations are totally literal and inadequate.

Quite differently, Niazi have transferred ST *'merry'* into لعوب *la'ūb* (lit. playful) (Wehr, 1980, p.869) and this particular pun is connected with sexual appeal and lustful desire when used in such a context, as appears in Ophelia's remark to Hamlet's statement "*That's a fair thought to lie between maids' legs*". In fact, Niazi appears to have realized the ST intended meaning and thus rendered it adequately and, thus, preserved the intended communicative effect to the TT recipients.

In the light of Delabastita's (2004) model, all the translators, save Niazi, have utilized the Pun-to-Non-Pun translation strategy since they have translated the ST very literally. This strategy neither maintains the ST intentionality nor does it indicate its socio-cultural and contextual function. Notably, Niazi has resorted to Pun-to-Pun strategy where he has translated the ST pun into a TT pun, which is approximately similar in meaning and function to the ST pun. When used in a similar context, لعوب *la'ūb* is used in Arabic to refer to a person who is obsessed with sexuality, i.e. very concerned with lustful sexual desire (Wehr, 1980).

5. Hamlet: I could interpret between you and your love, if I could see the puppets dallying.
Ophelia: ***You are keen***, my lord, ***you are keen.***
Hamlet: It would cost you ***a groaning to take off my edge***. (3.2. 244-246)

No.5	ST
	Ophelia: ***You are keen***, my lord, you are keen.
TT	
Jabra	" إنك حاذقٌ يا مولاي " (1979, p.124)
AO	No translation!
Niazi	"...أنتَ حادٌ يا سيدي اللورد " (2008, p.178)
Kiwan	" ...كلامك لاذعٌ ياسيدي " (2008, p.244)
Abdul Maqssood	"...إنَّ لسانك حادٌ يا مولاي " (2009, p.178)
Mutran	No translation!

In example (5), the word *keen* is not used in its normal sense, i.e. "intellectually acute, sharp-witted, shrewd", but it is taken as a sexual innuendo by Hamlet to mean "sexually sharp-set" (Hibbard 1987, p. 262; Mirdas, 2016, p.79). Based on this, he has made his next comment suggesting that "if Ophelia were to satisfy his sharp sexual appetite, she would lose her virginity and would therefore moan in pain" (Arnaiz, 2005, p.30; see also Partridge, 1996).

In terms of translation, Jabra has rendered *keen* into حاذقٌ *ḥadhiqun* (lit. very smart) that seems to be far from the ST original meaning, which is loaded with sexual connotation. Niazi, Kiwan and Abdul Maqssood have translated the ST into حادٌ *ḥaddun* and its synonym لاذعٌ *lādhi'aun* (lit. hurting with words) (Wehr, 1980, p.836), one at a time. Obviously, the TT equivalents used never express the ST intentionality since the focus in both words is on one's tongue that could be biting or hurting others (with words), and they both are irrelevant to sexual sharpness. In the same vain, both AO and Mutran have left the ST untranslated! Keeping in mind how the selected translators have dealt with the ST, one can conclude that all of them seem to have missed the ST relevant socio-cultural and situational context. Thus, they seem to have failed in capturing both the ST intention and function. On this basis, the intended communicative effect triggered by the use of the pun in the ST has been lost in the Arabic translated versions of the play.

Relying on Delabastita's (2004) model, four translators, particularly Jabra, Niazi, Kiwan and Abdul Maqssood have manipulated the Pun-to-Non-Pun translation strategy in rendering the ST into the TT. The non-punning TT never maintains the ST intended meaning. Conversely, AO and Mutran have utilized the Pun-to-Zero-Pun strategy since they opted for omitting the ST pun in the TT. It is worth noting that when a translator employs omission as a translation

strategy, the ST meaning and function are unpardonably lost regardless of any justification s/he presents.

6.   Hamlet: It would cost you ***a groaning to take off my edge***. (3.2. 244-246)

No.6	ST	
	Hamlet: It would cost you ***a groaning to take off my edge***.	
TT		
Jabra	"ستتكبدين أنيناً أنْ أردت إزالة حدتي "	(1979, p.125)
AO	No translation!	
Niazi	"...حتى توهني صرتي فلا بدَّ من تأوهاتُ فتاةٍ حين تفضُ بكارتها "	(2008, p.178)
Kiwan	" إنَّ تبديد حدتي يكبدك الأنين "	(2008, p.244)
Abdul Maqssood	"ستتأوهين إذا أردت القضاء على حدتي "	(2009, p.178)
Mutran	No translation!	

In example (6) above, *edge* entails "sexual desire in a man, with special reference to erection" and '*groaning'* means" a woman's cry or groan at losing her virginity" (Partridge, 1996, pp.98). Contextually, in response to Ophelia's protest that *'he is keen'*, Hamlet uses ' *It would cost you groaning to take off mine edge*' where he employs edge as a pun to 'sharpness of sexual appetite'. (Williams, 2006, pp.109-110; see also Niazi, 2008, p.208).

Regarding translation, Jabra, Kiwan and Abdul Maqssood have rendered *groaning* into أنين *anīn* and its synonymتأوُّه *t'awūh* (lit. wail, groan (Wehr, 1980, p.29) and the word حِدَّة *hiddah* (lit. sharpness (Wehr, 1980, p.160) for the ST *edge*. The said translators have partly realized the sexual connotation of *groaning* and therefore provided approximate Arabic counterparts in the TT, i.e. أنين and تأوّه, which both entail sexual meaning in the light of the relevant context. As for *edge*, they have utilized the Arabic حِدَّة , which also has nothing to do with sexuality in a similar target context. Words such as *shabaqun* شبقٌand نَهمٌ *nahāmun* can be better equivalents for lustful and sharp sexual appetite, instead (Wehr, 1980, p.452). Thus, the TT counterparts seem to mismatch the ST punning words and expressions and the translators examined are assumed to have never been attentive to the original meaning and the related context.

In contrast, Niazi has realized the ST intention and functions and he, thus, provides the best approximate punning expression. Specifically, he has translated *edge* into صُرَّة *surra* as a euphemistic expression for a male private part. In addition, he has rendered *groaning* into تأوّهات with the addition of " فتاة حين تُفَضُ بكارتها " (a woman's cry or groan at losing her virginity), where he looks quite aware of the ST intentionality, as identified above. Accordingly, the communicative effect of the pun in the ST has been maintained in the TT. On a different level, AO and Mutran have also eliminated the ST pun providing their readers with nothing. They might have avoided translating the ST for socio-cultural considerations since the ST puns look quite sensitive to a conservative Arab and Muslim society. However, they are most likely not excused to omit the ST in the TT since Arabic approximate equivalents are available had those translators done their best in this regard.

In terms of Delabastita's (2004) model, Niazi has manipulated the Pun-to-Pun strategy where he has provided in the TT a punning expression which is approximately similar, in intention and function, to that of the original text. Jabra, Kiwan and Abdul Maqssood have deployed the pun-to-non-pun strategy since they have transferred the ST very literally using non-punning expressions that never express the ST embedded meaning and function. AO and Mutran have resorted to the Pun-to-Zero-pun strategy by omitting the ST pun from the TT unjustifiably since the ST producer has a message in the expressions omitted and this results in a drastic translation loss.

7.   Conclusion

The study has aims at identifying the translation strategies adopted by Arab translators when handling the sensitive issue of sexual puns in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic and the impact of each strategy on preserving the intended communicative effect of the ST wordplay to the recipients. In the light of the analysis conducted so far, it is concluded

that translating puns in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is not an easy task, and it, thus, requires a translator to be not only highly qualified and attentive to grasp the ST embedded meanings and shades of meanings but also to find the appropriately approximate counterparts in the TT. More specifically, the examined translations have revealed that three of the selected translators, namely Jabra, Kiwan and Abdul Maqssood, have hardly ever captured the ST intended meaning and they, therefore; have shown inability to find the TT desirable equivalence. In the same context, AO and Mutran have often omitted the ST pun in the TT, as in examples (1, 3, 5 and 6) and they accordingly, deprived their readers from the message communicated in the ST. In even the examples they have translated the puns, they never provided the acceptable TT equivalents of the ST. In contrast, Niazi has often produced the closest TT counterpart of the ST, and in out of the four examples investigated, he has translated three of them very adequately. This indicates that translatability of a given text is undoubtedly translator-dependent.

As for the translation strategies employed, Jabra, Abdul Maqssood and Kiwan have utilized the pun-to-pun strategy once (in example 1) and the pun-to-non-pun three times (examples, 2, 3 and 4). In the same vein, AO and Mutran have often resorted to the Pun-to-zero-Pun strategy as in examples (1, 3, 5 and 6), whereas, in example 2, they have used the Pun-to-Non-Pun strategy. On a different level, Niazi has remarkably employed the pun-to-pun strategy twice and the pun-to-Non-Pun twice. In most cases, his translation has been adequately the closest to both the ST intention and function. In conclusion, the data analysis shows that the most frequently used strategy is pun-to-non-pun, which indicates that most of the selected translators seem to find it difficult to provide in the TT the adequate pun-to-pun counterpart for the ST. This technique has left its consequences on preserving the intended communicative effect of the puns in the ST when translated into Arabic; in most of the cases, this effect has been ruled out

REFERENCES

Abdul Maqssood, J. (2009) Hamlet: A new vision. (trans.), Cairo, National Centre for Translation (2nd Ed).

Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Sciences (AOECSs). (2000). Hamlet (trans.).Cairo: Dar Al-Ma'arif.

Arnaiz, L. C. (2005) 'Bowdlerizing or maximizing? Two strategies to render Shakespeare's sexual puns in nineteenth-century Spain'. Ilha do Desterro A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies, (49), pp. (025-036).

Baldick, C. (2001) The concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms. Oxford University Press.

Delabastita, D. (1993) There's a double tongue: An investigation into the translation of Shakespeare's wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet. Amsterdam, Neitherlands: Rodopi.

Delabastita, D. (1994) 'Focus on the pun: Wordplay as a special problem in translation Studies'. Target 6/2, pp. (223-243). DOI 10.1075/target.6.2.07del.

Delabastita, D. (1996) Introduction. Wordplay and Translation. Special Issue of The Translator. Studies in Intercultural Communication 2/2. Ed. Dirk Delabastita. Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. (127-139).

Delabastita, D. (1997) 'Introduction', in Delabasita (Ed.), Traductio: Essays on punning and translation, Routledge, London, pp. (1-22).

Delabastita, D. (2004) Wordplay a translation problem: a linguistic perspective. Uberstzung translation traduction, 1(1), 600-606. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Delabastita, D. (2013) 'Shakespeare', in Baker and Saldanah (Eds.), Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, Routledge, London, pp. (263-269).

Díaz-Pérez, F. (2013) 'The translation of wordplay from the perspective of Relevance Theory:

Translating sexual puns in two Shakespearian tragedies into Galician and

Spanish'. Meta: Journal des traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal, 58(2), pp. (279-

302).

Díaz, Pérez, and Francisco, J. (2010) Shakespeare in Galician and Spanish. On the Translation

of Puns in" Hamlet". URL: http://hdl.handle.net/11089/1505

Ghanooni, A. R. (2012) Sexual Pun: A Case Study of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet/JEU DE

MOTS SEXUEL: UNE ETUDE DE CAS DE ROMEO ET JULIETTE DE

SHAKESPEARE. Cross-Cultural Communication, 8(2), 91.

Gottlieb, H. (1997) 'You Got the Picture? On the Polysemiotics of Subtitling Wordplay', in

Delabastita (ed.), Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation pp. (207-232).

Hibbard. G.R. (1987) See Shakespeare, William.

Holder, R. W. (2008) A dictionary of euphimism: How not to say what you mean. Oxford and

New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Jabra, I. J. (1979) The Tragedy of Hamlet, the Prince of Denmark. (trans.). Beirut, The Arab Organization for Studies and
    Publishing (5th Ed.).

Kiernan, P. (2007) Filthy Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Most Outrageous Sexual Puns. Penguin.

Kiwan, A. (2008) Hamlet: English-Arabic. Beirut: Dar wa Maktabat al-Hilal.

Koochacki, F. (2016) 'An investigation of pun translatability in English translations of Sa'di's

Ghazals based on Delabastita's proposed model'. Advances in Language and Literary

Studies, 7(4), pp. (147-157).

Leppihalme, R. (1997) Culture bumps: An empirical approach to the translation of allusions.

Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Mahood, M. M. (2003) Shakespeare's wordplay. Routledge.

Martin, A. S. (2017) 'There'sa double tongue in cheek: On the un (Translatability) of

Shakespeare's bawdy puns into Romanian'. American, British and Canadian

Studies, 29(1), pp. (169-189).

Martin, A. S. (2018) The un(translatability) of Shakespeare's bawdy puns: A case study of

Romeo and Juliet's early renderings into French'. Synergy, 14(2), pp. (14-19).

McEnery, T. (2006) Swearing in English: Bad language, purity and power from 1586 to the present. London: Routledge.

Mirdas, S. A. (2016) A Stylistic Study of Irony in Shakespeare's Hamlet and Ben Jonson's Volpone. (MA Thesis), Thi-Qar
    University Journal.

Mutran, K. (2012) Hamlet (trans.). Cairo: Hindawi Publishing House.

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

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

Oana, T. A. T. U., and Raluca, S. I. N. U. (2013) 'From Shakespeare to sitcoms: Translating the

bawdy wordplay'. Studies on Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue,

39.Literatures in English and Cultural Studies, (49), pp. (025-036).

Partridge, E. (2005) Shakespeare's bawdy. Routledge.

Pun. (2015) In McMillan Dictionary online. Retrieved from http://www.

macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/pun_1

Reiss, K. (2000) 'Types, kinds and individuality of text: Decision making in translation'., in

Venuti, L. (Eds.) The translation studies reader pp. (160-171). London: Routledge.

Shakespeare, W. (2004) Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. (Ed.) David Bevington and David S.
Kastan, New York, Bantam Dell,.

Veisbergs, A., (1997) 'The contextual use of idioms, wordplay, and translation'. Traductio: essays on punning and translation, pp. (155-176).

Wehr, H.(1980) A dictionary of modern written Arabic: Arabic-English. Lonodon: Macdonald& Evans LTD.

Williams, G. (2006) Shakespeare's sexual language: A glossary. London and New York:
Continuum, Print.

ترجمة التورية الجنسية في مسرحية هاملت للكاتب شكسبير إلى اللغة العربية

عبد علي السعيدي¹، ساهرة سلمان²، عبد خلف³

ملخص

المستخلص / لصيغ التورية في مسرحيات شكسبير أهمية فنية كبيرة، حيث أنها تغني تلك المسرحيات وتضيف لها دلالات ثانوية بل وحتى ثلاثية. ومع ذلك، فسبب تلك الدلالات المتعددة، تصبح تلك الوسائل الأسلوبية غير مطواعية للترجمة بسهولة، حيث أن المعان الثقافية الضمنية لأشكال التورية وخصائصها المميزة من حيث الشكل واللفظ والدلالات تمثل تحديات للمترجمين. وبناء على ذلك، ينبغي على المترجمين إيلاء الاهتمام البالغ عند النقل الثقافي واللغوي لأشكال التورية بطريقة تحافظ على التأثير الذي تخلقه تلك الوسائل على المتلقي للنص الأصلي بنفس الأسلوب على المتلقي الهدف، حيث أن أي خلل ترجمي لوسائل التورية سيترك آثار سيئة على استيعاب المتلقين للمسرحية، وخصوصا الكشف عن جوها العام وبناء شخصياتها. وفي ضوء هذا الفهم ، تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى تحديد الاستراتيجيات التي استخدمها ستة من المترجمين العرب المشهورين عند نقل أشكال التورية الجنسية في مسرحية هاملت للكاتب شكسبير إلى اللغة العربية، وتأثير كل إستراتيجية من هذه الاستراتيجيات على الحفاظ على التأثير التواصلي المنشود من وراء التورية على الملتقى. ولغرض القيام بتحليل كامل المعنى لترجمة أشكال التورية في الترجمات العربية للمسرحية، تم اعتماد نظرية العالم ديلابستيتة (2004) لتمثل الإطار النظري الرئيسي للدراسة. وتم جمع بيانات التحليل من المسرحية وترجماتها باللغة العربية عن طريق تحديد أمثلة التورية في النص الأصلي ومقابلاتها في النصوص المترجمة. وتشير نتائج الدراسة إلى أن المترجمين استخدموا استراتيجيات ترجمة التورية إلى تورية والتورية إلى مكافئ خال من التورية أو إستراتيجية الحذف في محاولة لتوطين المسرحية للمتلقين العرب، على الرغم من أن هذا الأسلوب كان على حساب الحفاظ على الوظائف المنشودة والتأثير التواصلي المرجو من استخدام تلك الصفات الأسلوبية المهمة.

الكلمات الدالة: التورية، استراتيجيات الترجمة، التضمينات الجنسية، ديلابستيتا.

¹جامعة ذي قار–كلية الآداب–قسم اللغة الإنكليزية؛ ²وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي– قسم البحث والتطوير؛ ³جامعة الأنبار العراق. تاريخ استلام البحث 2020/1/12، وتاريخ قبوله 2020/6/2.