Austin's Speech Act Theory on Four Translations of *Macbeth*

By

Shaimaa Adham Basheer
Lecturer in English Literature
Qena Faculty of Arts
South Valley University

أربع ترجمات لمسرحية "ماكبث" في ضوء نظرية أوستن لأفعال الكلام

شيماء أدهم بشير

مدرس الأدب الانجليزي – قسم اللغة الانجليزية

كلية الآداب بقنا

جامعة جنوب الوادي

ملخص:

ساهمت نظرية أفعال الكلام لجون لانجشو أوستن مساهمة مبتكرة في مجال التداولية وعلم الدلالة بعد نشرها في عام ١٩٦٥. وتقترح نظرية أفعال الكلام أن أفعال التواصل تنقسم إلى ثلاث فئات: الصيغة والمعنى المقصود والتــأثير. وأضافت هذه النظرية بعداً جديداً للأقوال وحلت محل التعريف الضيق للمعنى والمغزى في التواصل اللغوي. يهدف هذا البحث إلى تحليل نظرية أفعال الكلام لأوستن من خلال أربع ترجمات مختلفة لعمل درامي من أعمال شكسبير وهو ماكبث، ترجمه مطران عام ١٩١٧ وأبو حديد عام ١٩٣٤ وجبرا عام ١٩٧٩ وعناني عام ٢٠٠٥ . تعد هذه المفاهيم الثلاثة: "المعني اللفظي" و"المعنى المقصود" و"التأثير" العناصر الرئيسية لإطار البحث الحالي الذي وُضع لوصف منهج كل مترجم في نقل نص شكسبير الأسطوري إلى اللغة العربية. في محاولة لتحقيق «وحدة المعنى» في ضوء نظرية أفعال الكلام لأوستن فإن كل مترجم من المترجمين الأربعة أبرز منهجه المميز في الترجمة. و الاتجاه الذي اتخذه كلٌّ من مطران وأبو حديد في صياغة الترجمة صياغة حرفية نتج عنه تشويه المعنى المقصود في النص المصدر. على النقيض فقد أحدثت ترجمة جبرا تأثيرات معينة لدى المتلقي، الأمر الذي نتج عنه عدم نقل المعنى المقصود في النص المصدر بأمانة. أما المنهج الذي أتخذه عناني في الترجمة فهو نقل المعنى المقصود الذي يترتب عليه نقل النص المصدر بأمانة ونقل ما يقصده المؤلف.

Austin's Speech Act Theory on Four Translations of *Macbeth*

Abstract

Published in 1965, J. L. Austin's Speech Acts theory made a groundbreaking contribution to the field of pragmatics and semantics. The Speech Acts theory suggests that communication acts fall into three categories: locution, illocution, and perlocution. This theory adds a new dimension to utterances that supersedes the narrow definition of meaning and sense in linguistic communication. This paper aims to analyze Austin's Speech Act theory through four different translated versions of Shakespeare's dramatic work, *Macbeth*, respectively authored by Mutran (1917); Abu Hadid (1934); Jabra (1979); and, Enani (2005). The three notions of locution, illocution, and perlocution are key components in the present framework to describe the approach each of the four translators in rendering the legendary Shakespearean text into Arabic. In attempting to achieve "sameness in meaning," each of the four translators demonstrates his own distinctive approach in light of Austin's Speech Act theory: Mutran's and Abu Hadid's locutionary perspective led to some distortion of the intended meaning in the source text. Conversely, Jabra's translation elicits certain responses in its receiver at a perlocutionary level, with the result that the intentionality of the source text is not delivered faithfully. Enani's translation, on the other hand, represents an illocutionary approach that achieves a faithful transference of the source text with its full authorial intention.

Keywords: locution, illocution, perlocution, *Macbeth,* translation.

Austin's Theory on Speech Act

In the seminal work *How to Do Things with Words*, J.L. Austin presents a communication theory that contrasts with other linguistic perspectives. Specifically, he argues that language has different uses, whilst other scholars claimed (at the time) that language serves as the means to describe reality and discuss different states of things. Austin's Speech Act Theory posits that any form of linguistic communication is conducted through linguistic actions. The theory's central premise is that communication acts fall into three categories, namely locution, illocution, and perlocution. This paper will discuss the three acts of speech (locution, illocution, and perlocution) as well as explore how they apply to translation studies, applied to four translations of *Macbeth*.

Definition of Key Terms

Locution pertains to those utterances that convey a certain meaning. A distinguishing feature of locution is that it is the act of interrupting silence. To put it differently, a person can perform a locutionary act by uttering something, while silence, as the opposite of speech, both precedes and follows the utterance. Locution may be of two types: proposition or utterance (Baktir 100). While proposition is associated with specific meaningful messages, utterance acts refer to mere expressions of language units.

Illocution suggests that a sentence or another language unit is expressed with a certain intention that is commonly referred to as illocutionary force (Baktir 111). Illocutionary acts imply that a person can succeed in illocution only if they manifest the message of a communication act (Austin 30). The performance of an illocutionary act is premised on the conventional consequences that are synonymous with commitments made by a speaker.

Perlocution refers to speech acts from the perspective of consequences (Austin 54). In other words, a perlocutionary act is one that is followed by specific consequences imposed on listeners, such as persuasion or encouragement. Hence, the central aspect of the perlocutionary act is that it features a certain impact on another person.

How to Do Things with Words (1962)

In his groundbreaking work, *How to Do Things with Words,* Austin explores the notions of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts through the thematic of performance. "The total speech act in the total speech situation", Austin says, "is the only actual phenomenon which, in the last resort, we are engaged in elucidating" (Austin 147), implying that sense and performance becomes a major component of speech. It is not what is said, it is how it is said, to whom, and in what performance. Simple utterances can vary from threats, promises, information, warnings, to asking or answering questions, and so on. Austin suggests a number of procedures to be followed until one gains a full and total understanding of speech. Simply put, locutionary acts refer to the normal speech we use every day to exchange information with each other. In these literal words with no layers of meanings or figurative coverage, simple statements that can be determined either true or false are categorized as locutionary utterances. Thus, locution aims to give meaning and sense to utterances.

On the other hand, illocutionary acts refer to utterances that convey layers of meaning beneath the literal meaning of the words. According to the literature, illocution refers to the figurative meaning of the words that cannot be understood outside the context of the work examined. Because the literal words are accompanied by performance, illocution considers not only the sense, but also the performance. This means that the way the speaker utters the words is indispensable to both the listener and the reader. To show that illocution is completely different from meaning, Austen explains:

> Admittedly we can use 'meaning' also with reference to illocutionary force – 'He meant it as an order', But I want to distinguish force and meaning in the sense that meaning is equivalent to sense and reference, just as it has become essential to distinguish sense and reference. (100)

From the above, we realize that Austen makes a double distinction between meaning and force, and, between meaning and sense. That is, locution gives meaning and reference to the utterances while illocution is the force that accompanies the meaning to make

sense of words (Felman 18). In presenting the two different realms, locution and illocution, or meaning and beyond the meaning, Austen suggests that words fall into two levels: meaning or abstract sense and ultra-meaning that has energy, force, and decision. Locution is definite and only leads to sense while illocution is exactly the opposite. This means that illocution has two options: either it leads to nonsense or it leads to a different sense of the superficial meaning of the utterance.

Understanding locutionary acts does not require much effort since the words are clear enough. Illocutionary acts of speech, on the other hand, need contextualization to achieve their full power. Missing the context in illocution takes the sense out of it, rendering it mere nonsense. If any sentence fails to make sense on the level of locution, the listener or the reader has to find solutions on the illocutionary level. "For Austin, sense remains a product of locution, which further enforces the distinction between meaning and force" (Thomas 361). According to Bennett, meaning the thing one utters constitutes a locutionary act, while "doing something *in* saying something" (Bennett 129) is an illocutionary act. This adds action to utterances, in addition to meaning and sense, as when threatening someone by saying "I warn you".

The last category, perlocution, is described by Bennett as "doing something *by* saying something" (129). Thus, Austin focuses on the *doings* that are done by saying which leads to the "full normal sense" of utterances. By using this unique terminology, Austin presents us with a wider dimension of words. To move with words from a locutionary act to an illocutionary level, one needs a full performance of acts that is produced by correct sounds and noises (phonetic act), accurate grammar (phatic act), and the intent of meaning (rhetorical act).

The philosophy of Austin's theory opens up the unlimited range and unrestrained power of language and its influence. From a linguistic perspective, locution embraces all aspects of grammar such as phonetics, syntax, and semantics, while illocution and perlocution fall under the pragmatic character of language. In literary terms, however, we can say that locution is literal while illocution and perlocution are figurative. Irony, for example, calls for a full understanding of the context of the literary work to be grasped. We

may thus conclude that locution is controlled by the "physical and syntactic nature" of utterances (10).

Illocution is no longer a semantic matter whose sole focus is on delivering meaning. Rather, the intention of the speaker is the most important factor, whereas meaning should be accompanied by a specific performance in order to be recognized. The most important thing is that both speaker and listener should share the same standards of communication. So, it can be said that this is a kind of inherited experiences between both communicators: the speaker and the listener. Given the intricacies involved, delivering the meaning between two different languages requires an extraordinary effort on the part of the translator.

Perlocution goes beyond the previous processes of meaning and intention between the speaker and the listener, or, in other words, locution and illocution. Perlocution is similar to illocution in terms of intentionality; both speech acts fall on the level of intentional influence by the sender on the receiver. However, perlocution bypasses the process involving mutual recognition between the sender and the receiver. To give an example, lying is a perlocutionary act performed by the speaker to deceive his or her listener. Consequently, "the perlocutionary intent is not structurally standardized" (Landa 91). Rather, the perlocutionary act depends on both the author, or in our particular case, the translator, as well as the reader or the receiver. The notion of perlocution goes beyond the literal meanings of words in locution to influence the reader in one way or another. The translator's perlocutionary intentions come out by use of specific words that carry specific allusions and evocations; influencing readers with overtones of meanings that direct them to a specific idea is completely perlocutionary. This is because the writer or the translator fills their text with codes that are discerned by the reader depending on the "interpretative act" (Harris x). As communication codes are mostly cultural, the translator works on these codes in order to stimulate "the reader to transform his own codes in order to make the most of the text" (Landa 99).

In translation studies, knowledge of speech acts can be used as an effective tool to ensure high-quality translation. From a theoretical standpoint, Speech Acts Theory is associated with the functional perspective on languages, meaning that speech acts are an

essential functional element of communicative interactions between speakers (Blum-Kulka 90). Accordingly, in translated texts, speech acts should play the same communicative role as they do in the source language. In other words, the translator's task is to capture the essence and type of speech act in the source text and reproduce it in the target text using appropriate language devices. Speech acts in translation should perform the same function as in the original. Therefore, a translated text should have the same communicative intention as the original, without loss of the meaning or acquisition of a new one.

From a practical standpoint, a translator should not only render the meaning of the text but also consider the intention of the author. This entails making a distinction between two approaches to translation: literal translation can be used when dealing with locutionary acts, while idiomatic translation is more appropriate in the case of illocutionary acts (Setyaji 17). Meanwhile, when dealing with perlocutionary acts, the translator has a two-fold role: to adequately translate the message of the text and to ensure that the translated text has the same effect on the audience as in the source text. That is, the translator has a duty to honestly (to the best of their ability) transfer the same influence from the source text to the target text.

In conclusion, the Speech Act Theory distinguishes three types of speech acts, locution, illocution, and perlocution. While locutionary acts are an utterance of language units, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts perform a more in-depth communicative function. Illocution suggests an intention or function that is incorporated into the utterance. Perlocution, in turn, is seen as the impact on those who listen or perceive the utterance. When carried forward to translation studies, the task of a translator lies in conveying the text with due consideration of these three perspectives. Therefore, a translator should render the text without loss of meaning and intention in addition to avoiding the addition of new meanings that may distort the original.

Shakespeare in Translation

Shakespeare's work has had a positive reception in the Arabic World. This may be attributed to the compatibility between Arabic

conservative attitudes and Shakespeare's rational instructive message. Twentieth-century pioneers found in Shakespeare a deeply inspiring mentor: for example, in *Memoirs*, Mahmoud Abbas Al-Aqqad urged translators to render Shakespeare's work into Arabic to provide an opportunity for Arabic readers and writers to become acquainted with the unlimited cultural knowledge offered by Shakespeare. According to Al-Aqqad, the study of Shakespeare is like delving into an authoritative reference on human nature, history, and psychology (vol.2 p. 303-308). Most of Shakespeare's plays have been translated into Arabic, a number of which translated works appear in different versions. *Macbeth*, for example, has been translated 12 times by different translators across different eras. It can be concluded that both the Arabic reader and Arabic stage writers have wholeheartedly embraced Shakespeare's works.

Modern translators have shown a keener fascination than their earlier counterparts with translating Shakespeare's works. This is because modern forms of free verse have enabled them to approach this task with more flexibility and freedom. The first version of *Macbeth* in translation appeared in 1900, mostly in prose with a few lines in verse and even embellished with a number of new lines borrowed from Arabic poetry, signaling a clear departure from the original text. This translation is representative of the same flaws from which early translations suffered, namely addition and omission. Such changes defaced the play on many levels. Dialogues between characters were incomplete, making the play appear fragmented. This loss of sequence and unity stripped the play of its impact. On the level of language, the translation occasionally verged on the disastrous as it followed Arabic standards without considering the essential linguistic differences between English and Arabic. Despite these features of trial and error characteristic of pioneering efforts, earlier generations of translators of Shakespeare from the second half of the nineteenth century up to the early twentieth century contributed to the wealth of Shakespearian works translated into Arabic.

The Present Study

Apart from a comparative perspective, the study sheds light on certain elements of each version of the four translations of *Macbeth* under study. The four translations of *Macbeth* are by four prominent

translators: Khalil Mutran (1917), Mohammed Farid Abu Hadid (1934), Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1979), and Mohammed Enani (2005). This paper focuses on a comparative analysis of the translated text and the source text. It examines specific elements that influence the context of the play such as the external structure, internal structure, and vocabulary used. The study attempts to identify the approach adopted by each translator to finally deliver their interpretation of the original text to the Arabic reader.

The basic approach, as mentioned above, is Austin's Speech Acts Theory. I apply a set of basic elements taken from Austin's framework. This attempt will reveal the three pragmatic levels (locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary) underlying the elements that each translator adopts in his rendering. These three notions are key components in the present framework as the researcher uses them to describe the approach each of the four translators adopts. For each analyzed example, a simplified situational context is provided, allowing the reader to grasp the intended meaning in the source text and, more pertinently, determine whether or not the translated text conveys the same intended meaning. Any changes made by the translator in the source text are observed to evaluate whether such alterations disrupt the intended interpretation in the translated text. Accordingly, each of the following four translations of *Macbeth* is examined in light of Austin's Speech Acts theory.

Mutran's Translation

Khalil Mutran (1872–1949) was a renowned Arabic poet who made remarkable contributions as a writer in English and Arabic literature. One of the founders of modern Arabic poetry, Mutran is a translator whose work has enriched Arabic culture. His inspiring translation of Othello in 1912 was recognized and appreciated by most critics of that time. He also translated into Arabic many other Shakespearean dramas such as *Hamlet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *The Tempest*, *Richard III*, *King Lear,* and *Julius Caesar*. The renowned poet and Shakespearean translator presented his translated version of *Macbeth* in 1917.

Mutran's translated version of *Macbeth* underwent so many fundamental changes on multiple levels that the external structure of

the play changed dramatically. Whole scenes are omitted or merged and, in some cases, Mutran rearranged the sequence of some scenes. For example, in Act I, Mutran retains only two scenes out of the original total of seven. Entire events are overlooked, leaving the reader unaware of the general setting of the play. Shakespeare's original Macbeth introduces readers to each of the seven scenes by including titles such as: "A desert place", "A camp near Forres", "A heath near Forres", "Forres". The palace", "Inverness. Macbeth's castle", "Before Macbeth's castle", and "Macbeth's castle". Despite their importance, all seven scenes are condensed into only two scenes. This interference in the external structure of the plays is due to the limitations of space and funding facing the Arabic theatre in the early twentieth century.

Although Mutran's modification of the structure of the play can be justified, it reduces the impact of the opening scenes of *Macbeth*, where the audience needs to be introduced to the atmosphere and the theme. Mutran also omitted the murder scenes, whose violent content would have upset Arab audiences at that time. Such an omission was a serious error as violence constitutes an essential component of *Macbeth,* and, the play seems to indicate, of human history as a whole. As critic Jan Kott points out, "Unless it renders the image of a world drowned in blood, any setting of *Macbeth* will invariably be wrong".

Mutran's meddling did not stop at the external structure; he interfered in the internal structure as well. Dialogues and soliloquies differ from those in the original text, displaying abundant omissions, additions, reductions, and alterations freely employed by Mutran in the belief that lengthy conversations between characters were not suitable for Arabic audiences. Religious considerations may also have compelled Mutran to make cuts in the dialogue, while earlier changes made to the scene structure caused, in turn, more alterations, such as giving one character's lines to another. An example of these changes is clear in Act II, Scene III, where the conversation between Ross and the old man about the ominous accidents of the previous night becomes a soliloquy where Ross talks to himself; the scene becomes Scene IV of Act II.

Another example of such alternations made by Mutran is where he replaces Lady Macbeth's soliloquy with a conversation

with her husband. The husband, Macbeth, faces the audience while restating the same words in a soliloquy:

لست وحدي المضطرب، ان قريتي مع تظاهرها لي بالشجاعة لا

تفتأ تقول: ان من أضيع العناء حصول المرء علي مطلوبه اذا

نغص دون التمتع به، ففي مثل هذه الحال يكون حظ القتيل خيرا

من حظ القاتلين.

(م١،ف٣،ص٦٨)

As previously mentioned, Mutran's interference in the external structure invariably affected the internal structure, which in turn impaired the overall coherence of the work.

Changes made to the external structure of the play forced, in turn, a series of changes in the events, characters, and characterization. These changes were so frequent that Mutran himself admits that his version of *Macbeth* constituted an 'Arabization' rather than a translation. Using such terminology confirms Mutran's belief in content over structure, which freed him from the constraints posed by the external and internal structure of the original text. With this in mind, the glaring disparities between the original text and Mutran's translated version may be justified by the cultural differences between East and West. There is plenty of evidence of Mutran's 'Arabization' in the play, including the occasional usage of Quranic sayings and Arabic proverbs. Some alterations made in the dialogues and soliloquies served to accommodate the conservative nature of Arabs or Muslims. Mutran's translation of Macbeth's words, "It's too late" later evolved into the well-known Arabic saying, "سبق السيف العذل".

Mutran adopted a literary prose style, described as a 'grand style' which is occasionally burdened by the addition of unfamiliar words in order to showcase the writer's literary ability. Mutran's lofty prose style was full of consonance and assonance, one example of which clearly appears in the following translation of Macbeth's soliloquy:

> I am in blood
> Stepp'd in so far, that should I wade no more,
> Returning were as tedious as go o'er.
> (III.IV.135-137)

لقد تماديت في غمر الدماء المهراقة حتي لو

أردت النكوص علي أعقابي، لكانت مشقة العود

الي الشاطئ الذي شخصت منه كمشقة السير

الي الشاطئ الثاني.

(م٢،ف٣،ص٨٠)

    Sometimes, Mutran's fondness for rhetorical devices such as consonance, alliteration, rhyme leads him to add unnecessary phrases to the text. This is obvious in Banquo's words to Macbeth where he blames him for his belief in witches and their ominous predictions:

أيها الهمام مالك تجف؟ وعلام تجف؟ أتخيفك

أمثال هذه الكلمات، علي عذوبة موقعها من المسامع.

(م١، ف١، ص٢٥)

Good sire, why do you start, and seem to fear

Things that sound so far?

(I.III.51-52)

The question, "وعلام ترجف؟" is surely imposed for reasons of consonance and inner rhyming.

    Mutran, unlike some of his contemporaries, strove to prioritize fidelity to the original text over commercial success. He belongs to a new generation of drama translators in general, particularly of Shakespeare's works, who offered what can be described as "paratexts" (Hanna 33) of the original texts. On the front cover of his translation of *Macbeth*, published in 1911, Muhammad 'Iffat wrote a versified dedication that read: "Our Arabization is dedicated to the whole world; to every writer, poet or scholar" تعريبنا يهدي لكل العالم من (*Riwayat Makbith* [The Play of *Macbeth*]. كاتب أو شاعر أو عالم It thus became popular for translators to present their translation using the term, "Arabization". These early pioneers tried to separate the linguistic creativity involved in translating drama from the stress of commercial success and the pressure of catering to theatre producers at that time, especially Salama Higazi's musical theatre. They felt they had a moral responsibility to transfer the 'noble meanings and

profound thoughts' in Shakespeare's drama to the Arabic-speaking audience.

Mutran's translation of *Macbeth* demonstrates his best effort to remain true to the original text. Although Mutran interfered in the external structure of the play by adding or omitting scenes, he kept the core of the theme intact. In his introduction to his published translation of *Hamlet*, Mutran describes the changes he made to the external structure of the play by reducing its original five acts into four:

> This story I translated as it is in the original. However, to make its beauties stand out in Arabic acting, it was thought that its scenes should not be kept as in the original, because they are too lengthy in terms of time and the requirements of modern acting… Everything included in the dialogue that implies… noble meanings was translated literally and thoroughly. Some unusual talk included in the dialogue, which did not fall within the core theme, was unanimously thought by the artists in charge to be better left out of the play. This would be more appropriate for acting and more effective for the spectators. (5)

Mutran's own words clarify his conservative approach to translating Shakespeare's works. While he emphasizes the conventions of Arab stage performance and Arab audience expectations, he also affirms his fidelity to the meanings in the original text as the "noble meanings were translated literally and thoroughly." This literal translation of the meanings and all additional talk included in the dialogue is, presumably, in the service of a more powerful effect on an Arab audience.

Mutran's translation of *Macbeth* makes use of the locutionary act of language. His philosophy in translation asserts the locutionary act of the utterances in different dialogues and monologues used by the different characters in *Macbeth*. One of the best examples that shows Mutran's adherence to the meaning and his effort in transmitting the semantic meaning of words is his brilliant translation of the word, "fires" into "أنوارك" not "نيرانك". The image of fire is

used by Shakespeare to reflect Macbeth's evil intention to kill the king:

<div align="center">

Stars, hide your fires!

Let not light see my black and deep desires;

(I.IV.50-51)

</div>

<div align="right">

أيتها الكواكب واري أنورك

لئلا تنفذ أشعتهن الي خفايا مقاصدي.

(م١،ف١،ص ٣١)

</div>

This brilliant substitution of "fires" with "أنوراك" instead of "نيرانك" is more factual and locutionary.

According to Austin, the locutionary act of utterances in language is delivers the exact meaning that makes sense to the listeners. Achieving this task would not be possible in literature in the absence of a clear context. In translation, the task is made even more difficult as the translator is anticipating and catering to the challenges faced by the other language receiver. That Mutran pulled off this task is clear in the following translation of the revealing words spoken by Lady Macbeth to her husband:

<div align="right">

...أنت غطريف "جلاميس" و غطريف "كودور"وستكون ما ذكرت المتنبئات. غير أني لا أمن عليك طبعك، فلن فيه من لبن الشفقة، ما يردك عن طلب غايت، من أقوم طريق، تتمني العلياء، و فيك مطمع، غير أنك فاقد المكر الذي يوصل الي العلياء، مرمي نظرك بعيد الا انك تبغي ادراكه من أطهر لمسالك، تأنف أن تستبيح ما حرم من وسائل الالتماس، ولكن لا تأنف من كسب المحلل، قلبك مولع بالحصول علي تلك النعمة التي تناديك: "هذا مأخذي فخذني"بيد أنك تخشي الفعل الذي يؤدي الي ذلك الربح، و لو فعله غيرك ما ساءك، فتعال لأفرغ في أذنك الحماسة والشجاعة، تعال لأزيل ببأس لساني ضعفك نفسك، و أبدد الوساوس الدنيئة التي تعوق يدك عن غصب الاكليل الذهبي، الذي تريدا لمقادير ادارة ظاهرة أن تضعه علي جبهتك.

(م ٢،ف١،ص٣٢)

</div>

.......Glamis thou art, and Cawdor; and shalt be What thou art promised: yet do I fear thy nature;It is too full o' the milk of human kindness To catch the nearest way: thou wouldst be great; Art not without ambition, but withoutThe illness should attend it: what thou wouldst highly,

That wouldst thou holily; wouldst not play false,And yet wouldst wrongly win: thou'ldst have, great Glamis,

That which cries 'Thus thou must do, if thou have it; And that which rather thou dost fear to doThan wishest should be undone.' Hie thee hither,That I may pour my spirits in thine ear;And chastise with the valour of my tongue All that impedes thee from the golden round, Which fate and metaphysical aid doth seem To have thee crown'd withal.

(I.V.15-31)

The above translation of this part of Lady Macbeth's soliloquy reveals Mutran's intention of delivering the meaning untouched as in the source text, keeping his interference to the minimum. He avoids distorting the original words in order to keep the "noble meaning", especially in the powerful lines delivered by the key character in the play, Lady Macbeth.

The locutionary aspect of speech acts endows Mutran's translation with its distinctive flavor. However, this sincere delivery of the meaning faced numerous harsh attacks by some literary critics, both contemporary and modern. Salah Niazi criticizes this literal (locutionary) translation of these words between Macbeth and his servant with particular emphasis on Mutran's translation of the phrase, وصيّرك أبله كالإوزة which is not the meaning Shakespeare meant to put in the mouth of Macbeth as he is addressing his servant.

مكبث:(مواصلاً):هبلك الشيطان،وسوّد وجهك،ما الذي نقع وجهك بهذا الاصفرار، **وصيّرك أبله كالإوزة.**

الخادم: عشرة آلاف.

الخادم: من الجنود يا مولاي.

مكبث:إذهب فافرك وجهك،واستعد حمرتك التي هرّبتها يا رعديد،أي الجنود يا صعلوك؟هلكتْ نفسك إن رؤية خديك الممتقعين لتجلب الرعب،أيّ الجنود يا وجه اللبن المعصفر؟

(م٣،ف١،ص ١٠٢)

 MACBETH. The devil damn thee black, thou cream-faced loon!

Where got'st **thou that goose look**?

SERVANT. There is ten thousand—

MACBETH. Geese, villain!

SERVANT. Soldiers, sir.

MACBETH. Go prick thy face, and over-red thy fear,

Thou lily-liver'd boy. What soldiers, patch?

Death of thy soul! those linen cheeks of thine

Are counsellors to fear. What soldiers, whey-face?
(V.III.11-19)

Niazi asserts that this translation is literal rather than accurate. He says that the term "goose look" carried a different meaning in Shakespeare's time; that is, it was a form of invective phrase which is used as an expression of insult rather than describing the "goose" as an "idiot", as Mutran rendered it. Of course, a native speaker of English is familiar with the dead metaphor of "you silly goose", and would thus not render the actual bird into another language. However, bearing in mind that Mutran was translating from the French version of *Macbeth*, his translation would be considered as almost literal and locutionary.

Maintaining a high degree of closeness to the source text shows the honesty Mutran feels he owes to his Arabic readers. Any changes were made under pressure to meet the needs of the Arabic theatre of the time. He claims that his standard or "classical" Arabic style is the only means to transfer the lofty meanings Shakespeare presented in his original *Macbeth*. In the introduction to his translated version of *Utayl*, Mutran once angrily said, "By God, if I could put my hands on the vernacular, I would have killed it unremorsefully, and this I would have done in revenge for a glory [of the past] that is elevated above all glory … and for a nation whose unity has been shattered by its vernaculars" (8). The locutionary level of both languages, English (from the French version), and Arabic serves Mutran's mission to translate Shakespeare to the Arabic world. For him, it is meaning that matters most.

For Arabic readers, such locution occasionally leads to some confusion, one example of which is Mutran's translation of the word "horrible" to رائع:

Hence, **horrible** shadow!
Unreal moc'ry hence!
(III.IV.105-106)

وراء أيها الشبح **الرائع**
وراء أيها اللطيف المخيل.

(م٢،ف٣،ص٧٨)

Mutran uses an archaic word in a defunct usage of Arabic that originally means "horrible" or "terrifying", but which has shifted, in

modern usage, to mean "wonderful", and which would have been understood even by contemporary audiences as such. He really intends to say "مروع" in the modern usage of the word. While this translation cannot be considered a mistake on the level of meaning and language, it conveys a completely different meaning to Arab audiences as it describes the shadow as "wonderful". Mutran well understood the meaning in the source text; however, his locution of the word into the Arabic text misses the diachronic reference of the word.   From a pragmatic point of view, the word in the source text and the equivalent word in the translated text are therefore drastically different. The locutionary dimension here is physically and semantically correct; however, the intentionality on the Arabic side has been lost.

From the above, it may be concluded that Mutran adopts the locutionary framework in his translation. Perlocution is clear in understanding the source text rendered to translation. On the same locutionary level, this understanding is relocated in the Arabic version. The pragmatic aspects of the utterances from dialogues and soliloquies are presented on the level of locution, ensuring a degree of accuracy and loyalty to both the original author and the target reader. However, this locutionary usage undoubtedly led to some confusion by ignoring the illocutionary level in his approach to the translation. In other words, illocution could have provided some much-needed cultural, historical, rhetorical, and figurative dimensions to the words and phrases in the dialogues and soliloquies of the different characters in the play.

Abu Hadid

Muhammed Farid Abu Hadid (1893 –1967) was an Egyptian writer, translator, poet, and historian, a historical and social pioneer, and also a groundbreaking figure in verse drama and poetry. In 1952 he was elected as a member of the Academy of Arabic Language in Cairo. Abu Hadid's translated version of *Macbeth* appeared in 1934, a time when the musical theatre was thriving and Arabic blank verse was commonly used in Modern Arabic poetry. Unlike Mutran, Abu Hadid made no changes to the external structure of the play; he kept the same number of acts and scenes of the source version he used. As for the internal structure of the play, the plot, characterization, dialogues, and soliloquies, underwent minor changes so as not to offend the

sensibilities of conservative Arabic readers/audiences at the beginning of the twentieth century.

The salient difference between Abu Hadid and Mutran is in their respective styles. Abu Hadid realized that the exceptional talent of Shakespeare in drama lies in the universal themes couched in compelling dialogue, soliloquies, and vibrant poetic language. Abu Hadid states this in his introduction to his translated *Macbeth*:

> Shakespeare's genius does not lie in the plot of the story, in the well-wrought dialogue, or the emotion-stirring events as much as it lies in his poetry, the images he crafted in his unique technical style and the characters depicted in his ingenious language that plumbs new depths. (44-45)

Because Abu Hadid was keenly aware of the power of Shakespeare's poetic style, he decided against depriving Arabic readers of the magic and power of the imagery and rhythm in the source text. Accordingly, he rendered the play into blank verse to allow the Arabic readers/audience to enjoy the same mood and atmosphere experienced by their English counterparts.

In undertaking the difficult task of transferring Shakespearean poetic dialogue into Arabic blank verse, Abu Hadid used different Arabic metrical feet, in the same manner as Shakespeare in his source play. Shakespeare varies his rhythms between traditional iambic pentameters and rapid trochaic pentameters. Prose in the source *Macbeth* scarcely penetrates the rhythmic groups of lines, and is kept mainly for humorous references within the dialogues. As is well-known in Shakespeare, his tragedies always appear in poetry while his comedies are largely in prose. In *Macbeth*, Shakespeare reserves prose for modest and lower-ranking characters, while the nobility and high-ranking characters use verse.

Abu Hadid did his best to abide by these *conventions. He presented a variety of Arabic meters such as Al-motakarib (المتقارب), Al-Khafif (الخفيف), Al-Mogtath (المجتث) and so on.* Following in Shakespeare's footsteps, he rendered the prose sections into prose and the poetry parts into poetry. Mirroring Shakespeare's rhyme

schemes in the verse lines was another concern of Abu Hadid's. An example of this achievement appears in the following lines:

> I'll drain him dry as hay:
> Sleep shall neither night nor day
> Hang upon his penhouse lid;
> He shall live a man forbid…
> (I.III.18-21)

سأنزف الدماء منه كي يجف الهشيم

و لن ينام ليلة، و لا نهارا يستنيـــــم

وسوف يغدو جفنه كسطح سقف مائل،

ينحدر النوم عليه، كانحدار الســـائل.

(م٣، ف١،ص٦٩)

Despite his extraordinary efforts in mirroring Shakespeare's form, Abu Hadid did not neglect the pragmatic aspect of translation underlying the successful choices of equivalences in the target language. He followed the same faithful approach in delivering the exact meanings written by Shakespeare, revealing his locutionary approach in understanding the original meanings and delivering them faithfully.

Such locutionary understanding of the meaning in the source text empowered Abu Hadid to endow the Arabic version with exactly the same intended meanings, one example of which is his translation of Lady Macbeth's words when ordering her servant to hurry up and take care of the messenger bearing news of Macbeth and his imminent arrival:

> Give him tending;
> He brings **great news**.
> (I.V.9-10)

Abu Hadid translates it to:

و أولوه بالإسعاف، قد جاءنا

يحمل أنباء **عظام الخطر**.

(م٥،ف١،ص٨٨)

Abu Hadid described the "great" news in the original text as "عظام الخطر", a locutionary act of conveying meaning in the receiving language with the same accuracy that reveals to his readers the magnitude of Lady Macbeth's ambitions while waiting for confirmation that her husband has murdered the king. At a locutionary level, news of a murder carried out is equal to the phrase "dangerous news" or "عظام الخطر"

However, this is not always so successful. The same locutionary approach in other instances distorts the intended meaning, as shown in the following example when Abu Hadid renders Macbeth's words when he imagines he is beholding the ghosts of eight kings:

<div dir="rtl">

و أري بعضهم عليه شعار

كرتان علي **سيوف ثلاث**.

(م١، ف٤، ص١٩٠)

</div>

The English words are: "…and some I see/ That two-fold balls and treble scepters carry" (IV: I. 120-121). Rendering "scepters" to "**سيوف**" (swords) subverts the illocutionary connotation of 'power' implicit in "scepters" into 'force and bloodshed'; the real meaning refers to the symbol of the three united coronations under King James III, which should be translated to "صوالج ثلاثة". From a purely locutionary perspective, the translator did not take into account the historical background and symbolic meaning carried by this phrase. This error by Abu Hadid is an example that locution, unfortunately, does not take into consideration connotation, the figurative and implied references embedded in language.

Despite adopting a locutionary framework for his translation, Abu Hadid's translation of *Macbeth* remains one of the most accurate and faithful translations. This is due to Abu Hadid's keen desire to bridge the gap between the source and target languages. In addition, his persistent use of the locutionary framework in translation prevented him from making any serious changes to the external structure of the play, as did Mutran. Minimal interferences and modifications are introduced for the sake of rhythm and rhyme in the Arabic language. Unlike Mutran, Abu Hadid was careful to present his version as an art of translation rather than Arabization. His contribution was appreciated for its faithful and accurate approach,

which reflects his commitment to the locutionary power of language. That said, this style of translation resulted in some errors that departed from the intended meaning. Unfortunately, locution does not take into account the richer pragmatic layer that lies beneath the lexical items in both the source and translated texts.

Jabra's Translation

Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1920-1994) was a Palestinian writer, critic, poet, artist, painter, intellectual and translator. Jabra published his translated version of *Macbeth* in 1977. Literary translation in the seventies had developed into an independent art, thanks to many theories and rules that situated translation as an art form worthy of recognition. At that time, when the translation movement was flourishing, Jabra introduced his translated version of *Macbeth*. This translation was especially well received not only for its accuracy and precision, but also for the dimensions it added that were lacking in previous translations of *Macbeth*. These dimensions appeared when Jabra used Arden's edition in his translation rather than the original quartos or folios. He consulted the footnotes and critical comments in the Arden edition, which eliminated much of the ambiguity that had marred previous versions.

Unlike Mutran's prose Arabization and Abu Hadid's poetic style, Jabra used a "flowing prose style" (Hadi 130). Jabra not only did his best to closely adhere to the Shakespearean poetic style, but he also imitated his musical sound techniques. By following this approach, Jabra employed the "prosaic and the literal methods of translation" (Al-Thebyan et al. 64). Achieving a high level of similarity accompanied by effective sound techniques was the ultimate goal of his translation. This is clear in the following example in which Jabra excels in transferring the rhymed lines as they appear in the source text:

<div dir="rtl">

ساحرة ١:
متى نلتقي نحن الثلاث
في رعود وبروق، و أمطار كاللهاث؟
ساحرة ٢:
حين يكف الهرج و المرج رعبا
و يمسي القتال خسرانا و كسبا.
(م١،ف١،ص٦٦٢)

</div>

FIRST WITCH.
When shall we three meet again
In thunder, lightning, or in rain?
SECOND WITCH.
When the hurlyburly's done,
When the battle's lost and won…

<div align="right">(I.I.1-4)</div>

Another example of the exceptional effort that has gone into the internal structure is clear in Jabra's creative alliteration that mirrors the one used in the source text. His ability to come up with alliterated words in Arabic that parallel the English ones is remarkable. In the following lines, Macbeth comments on the escape of Fleance:

<div align="right">

أما الان، فاني محشور، محصور، محتبس: تكبلني
لجوج المخاوف و الشكوك.
(م ٤،ف٣،٢٣-24،ص٧٢٨)

</div>

But now, I am cabi'd, cribb'd, confin'd in
To saucy doubts and fears.

<div align="right">(III.IV.23-4)</div>

However, in some cases Jabra attempts to "make up for the loss of sounds and sound effects by choosing suitable Arabic words and sounds" (Al-Thebyan et al. 56). On the illocutionary level, Jabra shows a keen awareness of the evocative power of words and phrases, being careful to deliver the same atmosphere of the source text. This is obvious in his excellent rendering of the dialogue between Malcolm and Donaldbain when their father has been brutally murdered and they are planning a stealthy escape:

And let us not be dainty of leave-taking,
But shift away: there's warrant in that theft
Which **steals itself**, when there's no mercy left.

<div align="right">(II.III.142-4)</div>

<div align="right">

دعنا من مجاملات الوداع،
و لنغادر خلسة، اذا ما الرأفة انعدمت
كان في الخلسة ما يبررها حين **تسارق نفسها**.
(م٣،ف٣، ص٧١٠)

</div>

Jabra's usage of the Arabic verb "يسارق" is striking. The verb in Arabic bears a nuanced meaning, as it is used usually when someone steals a look, "يسارق نظرة". This meaning parallels the one intended by Shakespeare in wishing to express the idea of undercover theft, prompting Jabra's inspired selection of the Arabic verb "يسارق".

Despite this tendency towards accuracy in meanings and adherence to the source text, Jabra, as a Palestinian Orthodox Christian, was inspired by different cultural influences. While the locutionary interpretation of the text is faithful, it has a different perlocutionary effect from the other translations of *Macbeth* by Mutran and Abu Hadid. Jabra consciously and unconsciously manipulates the text in an attempt to elicit the readers' perlocutionary response. His translation of *Macbeth* is full of allusive words and phrases, most of which are Biblical, to add a fabricated Christian atmosphere to the play, cementing the notion that his his translation represents a perlocutionary act of language.

This perlocutionary intent becomes clear in his usage of Arabic allusive words and phrases. Biblical references are repeatedly used throughout this translated version of *Macbeth*. One such instance is found in Macduff's words when he discovers the murder of the king:

> Most sacrilegious murder hath broke ope
> **The Lord's anointed temple, and stole thence**
> The life o' the building!
> (II.III.66-8)

<div dir="rtl">

لقد انتهك القتل الحرام عنوة
هيكل الممشوخ بزيت الرب
وسرق منه حياة البنيان !
(م٣،ف٣،ص705-٧٠٦)

</div>

Shakespeare's choice of the words "Lord" and "Temple" refer to his belief in the divine right of kings, as kings during this era were "anointed" at their coronation. To convey the same connotation, Jabra lifts whole phrases from Biblical verses such as الممشوخ بزيت "الرب" (Samuel 24:10, authorized Arabic version) and انكم هيكل الله الحي (Corinthians 6:16, authorized Arabic version).

The same influence is perceived in Jabra's perlocutionary leanings in the literal rendering of "bellman" into قارعة الناقوس للمحكومين بالموت:

LADY MACBETH.
…. Hark! Peace!
It was the owl that shriek'd, the **fatal bellman,**
Which gives the stern'st good-night.

(II.II.3-6)

ليدي مكبث:
سمعا! صمتا!
البومة هي التي نعبت، **قارعة الناقوس**
للمحكومين بالموت، قارئة أرهب السلام.
(م٢، ف٢، ص٦٩٧)

Although the translation is correct from a locutionary point of view, it loses much of the original's perlocutionary effect. The "bellman" in Shakespeare connotes a meaning of "ill omen" as it follows "owl". This full sense of the word appears clearly in Enani's translation when he translated the same word, "bellman," into الحارسة الليلية ونذير الموت. In a manner that takes illocution into account, Enani was aware of the connotative shadows of "owl" that symbolizes ill omen and a harbinger of death. Jabra's translation used a different equivalent that introduced a church image completely different from the intended meaning in Shakespeare. This is because perlocution causes a different reception of the translated text and, consequently, a different message. Shakespeare's message is universal, for humanity as a whole; meanwhile, Jabra's rendering delivers the same message heavily layered with religious teachings. For example, the word, "prayers" in most Arabic interpretations is translated into "دعوات" while in Jabra's version it is always "صلوات".

Thus, Jabra adopts a perlocutionary approach in his translation of *Macbeth* in a clear attempt to affect his reader in a specific way. Not only does he make a noticeable effort to render the play in rhymed lines that mirror Shakespeare's original, but he also succeeded in achieving a creative symmetry between the semantic structure and the musical devices of alliteration and consonance of the translated words in Arabic. Such efforts take on a perlocutionary dimension in order to maximize the effect on the reader of his translated version, serving his intention to deliver a Shakespearean atmosphere with a markedly Christian flavor to the Arabic reader.

The same perlocutionary framework described above empowers Jabra to elicit a different response in his readers. Jabra's use of Arabic synonyms and allusive words and phrases to create an ecclesiastical atmosphere demonstrates the perlocutionary act of speech in both his understanding of the source text and his interpretation into the Arabic. This perlocution resulted in a distorted translation that departs from previous versions where Jabra's efforts to keep the external structure of the source text along with sculpturing artistic devices and forms of rhyming lines do not guarantee a faithful translation of *Macbeth*. This is because, unlike Mutran and Abu Hadid, Jabra appears to offer his readers overtones that take them to the Biblical realm.

Enani's Translation

Mohamed Enani (b. 1939) is an Egyptian translator, poet, fiction writer, dramatist, critic, and scholar. He has authored over 130 books in both Arabic and English, varying from translations to critical and creative works. Enani's translated version of *Macbeth*, published in 2005, benefited from his extensive experience in both academic and literary translation. This combination of academic accuracy and literary creativity resulted in a unique product. As strict fidelity to the source text is his declared approach, Enani attempts to sincerely parallel the source text with its verse and dramatic structure, a task which demands accuracy as well as creativity. Enani accompanies his translation with a detailed introduction and in-depth footnotes. The introduction prepares the Arabic reader and helps them to understand and appreciate the literary work they are about to read, including the most important critiques of the play, its atmosphere, its historical background, and its poetic and dramatic elements. The footnotes are selected from previous editions of the English source, providing readers from a different cultural background with some critical views to shed light on some difficult or obscure points in the play.

In the preface, Enani explains that his method of translation adopts a style that parallels the source text. He says:

> I think my method in translation has become familiar to the reader who has previously read my translations. I systematically uphold accuracy, attempting to present an Arabic text that is identical to the source text in content and

> form. If I add something that is implied in the source text while requirements of clarity necessitate rendering it explicitly, I put it between square brackets. If I introduce a slight change to accommodate a classical allusion far-fetched for Arab readers, I mention this in a footnote. (7)

In keeping with his stated intention as a translator, Enani preserved the external structure of the play. The Arabic version of the play has the same scenes and acts written by Shakespeare without omissions or additions made to the external structure. Based on his wide experience in Shakespearean texts, Enani decided to convey Shakespeare's poetic work to the Arabic reader, investing much effort and creative talent in rendering identical "form and content". Enani appreciates the musical diversity in *Macbeth,* in the belief that it should be preserved and conveyed in translation. Rhyme and rhythm in poetry are used not only for musical effect, but also to enrich the meaning.

Typically, Shakespeare confined prose to low-ranking and insane characters. Prose is also used in comic scenes or in reference to a mental disorder afflicting a certain character. Otherwise, blank verse dominates the play. The lines are grouped each into a different rhythmical effect, according to the situation or the character in the play. This metrical freedom and diversity is transferred skillfully into the Arabic blank verse adopted by Enani in his translation of *Macbeth*:

> To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
> Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
> To the last syllable of recorded time,
> And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
> The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
> Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
> That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
> And then is heard no more: it is a tale
> Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
> Signifying nothing.
>   (V.V.22-32)

غداً، وغداً، وغداً،
وكل غد يزحف بهذه الخطى الحقيرة يوماً إثر يوم
حتى المقطع الأخير من الزمن المكتوب،
وإذا كل أماسينا قد أنارت للحمقى المساكين
الطريق إلى الموت والتراب، ألا انطفئي، يا شمعة وجيزة!
ما الحياة إلا ظل يمشي، ممثل مسكين
يتبختر ويستشيط ساعته على المسرح،
ثم لا يسمعه أحد: إنها حكاية
يحكيها معتوه، ملؤها الصخب والعنف،
ولا تعنى أى شىء.
(م٥، ف٥، ٢٢-٣٢)

On the perlocutionary level, Enani pays special attention to pragmatic content as he is keen not to waste the valuable meanings intended by Shakespeare. This care is clear in his recognition of the subtle but essential difference between the words "Hail" and "All hail":

FIRST WITCH. All hail, Macbeth! hail to thee, thane of Glamis!
SECOND WITCH. All hail, Macbeth, hail to thee, thane of Cawdor!
THIRD WITCH. All hail, Macbeth, thou shalt be king hereafter!

(I. III.48-50)

الساحرة ١: تحية صدق الي مكبث! سلام اليك أمير (جلاميس)!

الساحرة ٢: تحية صدق الي مكبث! سلام اليك أمير (لكودر)!

الساحرة ٣: تحية صدق الي مكبث! سلام الي من سيصبح ملكا!

(م٣،ف١، ٤٨-٥٠، ص١١١)

"Hail" carries the decisive and sardonic look of the three witches in pretending to be loyal and respectful to Macbeth. The implication of duplicity suggested by "Hail" challenges the reader's deductive powers to feel this implied meaning. On the other hand, Jabra's translation for the same words did not differentiate between "hail" and "all hail":

الساحرة ١: سلاما يا مكبث! سلاما يا أمير (جلاميس)!

الساحرة ٢: سلاما يا مكبث! سلاما يا أمير (لكودر)!

الساحرة ٣: سلاما يا مكبث! سلاما يا ملكا يا ملكا فيما بعد!

(جبرا، م٣، ف١، ص٦٧٠)

This awareness of conveying multi-layered meaning makes Enani extremely selective in choosing the equivalent vocabulary items suitable for the Arabic reader. He sometimes sacrifices his holy grail of accuracy to convey the full sense of words or phrases. Another example of this intelligent adjustment comes when the third witch is concocting a special brew to cast her spell: "Root of **hemlock** digged i'n th' dark" (IV. I. 25). The word "hemlock", which means "عشب الشوكران" in Arabic, is rendered by Enani as "الأعشاب السامة":

جذر **الأعشاب السامة** والمجتثة في الظلمة.

(م ١، ف٤، ٢٥، ص١٩٢)

If the translator were to literally render the word to its accurate equivalent in Arabic, "عشب الشوكران", he would not be sure that the Arabic reader would grasp the notion of this herb's poisonous due to his unfamiliarity with this word. This choice falls clearly within the province of perlocution.

Obviously, Enani gives higher priority to conveying accurate meaning and intention over accurate and literal equivalent words, an approach which is completely illocutionary. According to Austin's Speech Act Theory, literary fiction is a kind of (derived) illocutionary act. Austin views fiction as an undoubtedly illocutionary speech act as we must recognize the intentional design of the author, according to the genre to which the work belongs. As Jon-K Adams puts it, "fiction is defined by its pragmatic structure, and in turn, this structure is necessary part of the interpretation of fiction" (2). Hence, recognizing the importance of conveying the full meaning or the exact intended meaning, Enani, as a translator, realizes the importance of the illocutionary act of language. This illocutionary act is required for the understanding of the intended meaning in the source text and its subsequent faithful transfer to the receiving language of the translated text.

As a continuation of this approach, occasionally a word is added that is not found in the source text to convey the hidden meaning behind implicit information. The word "الفاني" which means "mortal", is added to contrast with the word "خلود", "everlasting" which Shakespeare contrasts with short mortal life by the clever (and

purely illocutionary) choice of the word "primrose", a flower known for its short lifespan:

كنت أري أن أدخل فيها من كل المهن من سيسلكون درب

اللهو ببستان **الزهر الفاني** المفضي لخلود نار جهنم

(ف٢، م٣، ص ١٤٥)

I had thought to have let in some of

all professions that go the **primrose**

way to the everlasting bonfire.

(II.III.18-20)

An illocutionary act of language takes advantage of the figurative language used in the literal work. This illocutionary force gives a fuller sense of the literary work more than locutionary meaning that is closer to merely paraphrase or, in case of translation, resembles literal rendering. One example where Enani uses the image to extract the exact meaning intended by Shakespeare is:

But, for your husband,
He is noble, wise, judicious, and best knows
The fits o' th' season.
(IV.II.5-7)
و زوجك النبيل عاقل حكيم! و خير من يحيط بالذي
تقتضيه هذه **الأحوال غير المستقرة**.
(م٢،ف١٥،٤-١٦، ص٢٠٢)

The image in "the fits o' th' season" refers to bouts of fever and colds afflicting people in inclement weather. This implied meaning is substituted directly by "الأحوال غير المستقرة" or "unstable conditions". Such a translation targets the illocutionary meaning that necessitates more clarity on the Arabic side. The translator successfully conveyed the meaning without causing any ambiguity to the Arabic reader who may find the "instability" connected with seasons a far-fetched concept.

In another example, Enani preferred to preserve the ambiguity present in the original, as it serves the illocutionary act of the words and intended meaning of the author.

ان قوام الضوء

يغلظ...و الان قد طار الغراب لوكره في غابة الغربان!

والصالحون الساربون بالنهار يبدأون في التثاؤب

رؤوسهم مالت علي الصدور**!** و **الساربون السود في الليل** أفاقوا

كل يريد فريسته!

(م٢، ف٣، ٤٩-٥٣، ص١٧١)

Light thickens; and the crow
Makes wing to the rooky wood:
Good things of day begin to droop and drowse;
While **night's black agents** to their preys do rouse.

(III.II.50-53)

Shakespeare uses the word "things" to include all animate beings and creatures rather than only humans. Such an expansion is intended to indicate generalization; hence, the translator uses a general term, و الصالحون الساربون بالنهار In the next line, Shakespeare uses the word "agent" which is translated also in the same general terms, indeed encompassing Macbeth himself, و الساربون السود في الليل. Two different words in English, "things" and "agents" are translated into one vocabulary item in Arabic, الساربون . Obviously, Enani kept the indefinite meaning of the used words, "things" and "agents" in Shakespeare, to parallel the ambiguity intended by the author in the source text. Thus, preserving the ambiguity within the translated text depends on rendering the intention rather than a set of literal meanings.

In another example, the translator intentionally avoids using the dictionary equivalent for the word "give" in the source text, instead using "send". As standards of academic honesty dictate, he explains the aim behind this change in a footnote.

الساحرة ١: و سأرسل ريحا تحملك اليه
الساحرة ٢: هذا كرم أشكرك عليه
(م٣، ف١، ١٠-١١، ص١٠٩)
WITCH1. I'll give thee a wind
WITCH 2. Tha'art kind.
(III.I.10-11)

In his footnote, Enani explains his awareness of the illocutionary force of the verb "give," used here by Shakespeare to reflect the sense of control, authority, and power the witch imagines she possesses. However, the translator prefers using the Arabic idiom, "سأرسل ريحا" which is more familiar to the Arabic reader and to Arab culture in general. Sacrificing accuracy in translation here is reasonable and justified. With all honesty, Enani refers in his footnote to the illocutionary force of the verb, "give", in English, which denotes power and control. However, he explains, he prefers the Arabic idiom to serve the cultural context in his own Arabic version.

Thus, by focusing on illocutionary meaning, the translator enriches his rendering rather than detracting from it. For Enani, the illocutionary act in both languages comes first as a kind of loyalty he owes to both the source text and the Arabic reader. Rendering literary work cannot possibly produce its utmost effect without the illocutionary meaning since "literary art… comes under the general category of 'communication' and the responses which literature seeks are securely anchored in the utterer's intention" (Close 39). In turn, translating literary work demands the same illocution. Essentially, translation is a form of communication between the author and the translator; however, this communication cannot flow smoothly without identifying the right intention and interpreting it back.

Enani's translated version of *Macbeth* demonstrates academic accuracy along with literary creativity, the most effective combination in translating literary works. His approach tends to use illocutionary force in understanding the source text with its intended meanings rather than at the level of superficial or literal meaning. Translating literature into literature— that is, creating an equivalent literary work in the target language— requires a profound understanding of both texts. Literary translation is "interdisciplinary and involves not simply two languages, but two cultures and an intermediary" (Youssef 2-3). Translators have to be "bilingual… bicultural, as well as good writers" (Massoud 313). Meanings as well as their intentions must be conveyed to the reader of the target text on the same illocutionary level.

Enani's method of translation is illustrated in the above quote from his introduction to the translated version of the *Macbeth*, "I systematically uphold accuracy, attempting to present an Arabic text that is identical to the source text in content and form" (7). This accuracy in translation does not imply 'literalness'; rather, it entails conveying the intended meanings on the illocutionary level. Enani intentionally keeps the external structure of the source text as well as its poetic style to retain the context of the play. This identical context of both texts allows the translator to represent his version of translation as if it were written originally in Arabic. Enani's command of both Arabic and English is up to the task of translating a play of the magnitude of *Macbeth*. The task of translation goes beyond a literary exercise as it involves "acquiring new dimensions as a species of literary competitive literature" in what is ultimately "a cultural exercise" (Enani, Foreword ix, x).

Conclusion

This study attempts to present an analysis of four translations of *Macbeth* by four recognized translators: Khalil Mutran (1917), Mohammed Farid Abu Hadid (1934), Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1979), and Mohammed Enani (2005). The application of the methodological model presented by Austin's theory of Speech Acts offers an unconventional approach to these four translations. This approach enables the researcher to trace the method of translation used by each of the four translators in their rendering of the famous play. Austin's Speech Acts theory takes on an unconventional pragmatic perspective by presenting three levels of meaning in language: locution, illocution, and perlocution. Departing from the traditional semantic and pragmatic analysis of utterances, this perspective targets the intention and the multi-layered meaning of words. Each of the four translated versions is examined in light of Austen's theory. Similarities and differences between the source text and the translated text are shown to reveal which act of language the translator adopts in his rendering. This deconstructive approach may provide an analysis not only for the translations, but for the translators themselves, since each translator targets a different segment of readers, requiring them to adopt a different method.

In light of Austin's Speech Act Theory, Mutran presents his translation from a locutionary perspective. Mutran's interference goes beyond the external structure to the internal structure where

dialogues and soliloquies differ from those in the original text. In fact, omissions, additions, reductions, and alternations are all used by Mutran to produce a translated text suitable for performance on the Arab stage, allowing for its limited resources at that time. Despite the fundamental changes he made in the external and internal structure of the play, Mutran keeps to a literal translation of words and phrases. This locutionary meaning causes the translator to overlook many instances of cultural and contextual references necessary for his rendering.

Abu Hadid presents his translation from the same locutionary point of view. Unlike Mutran, he adopts a poetic style of Arabic blank verse without interfering with the external structure of the play as he kept the same number of acts and scenes of the source version he used. Adopting a locutionary approach occasionally leads to a distortion of the intended meaning in the source text.

Jabra's translation showcases a completely different approach in terms of close adherence to the Shakespearean poetic style as well as replication of his musical sound techniques. Jabra also tries to achieve a high level of equivalence in Arabic that is accompanied by effective auditory techniques to serve his perlocutionary approach. The perlocution evident in Jabra's interpretation of *Macbeth* is influenced by his religious and cultural background where many words and phrases in dialogues and soliloquies create a Christian and religious atmosphere. His Arabic version of *Macbeth* includes many words and phrases that create an implied image for the Arabic reader which differs from the source text. Due to the perlocutionary approach adopted by Jabra, the intention of the source text by Shakespeare is not delivered faithfully.

Enani's translated version of *Macbeth* represents an illocutionary approach reflecting his attempt to "present an Arabic text that is identical to the source text in content and form" (Enani, Preface 7). This accuracy and almost word-for-word adherence to the source text is presented on the illocutionary level, upon which the translator depends. Accuracy of meaning with perfect intentionality is fulfilled successfully by Enani where illocutionary meaning is grasped through awareness of the cultural and historical background of the source text. Enani realizes the power of illocutionary meaning, which helps him achieve outstanding accuracy. Figurative speech is completely absorbed in the source text and delivered faithfully to the

translated text while implied meanings are transferred to the Arabic reader in a culturally accessible manner. The result is a full sense of the layers of meanings intended by the author. The illocutionary perspective helps the translator to minimize the gap between the source text and the translated text. The essential aim of translating Shakespeare is to deliver his universal meanings as far as is possible to the Arabic reader, and Enani's rendering of *Macbeth* successfully fulfills this task using illocutionary intention for a full understanding the work; hence, the Arabic reader receives the message with its authorial intention unchanged and unaffected.

In conclusion, Austin's Theory of Speech Acts provides this research with a different perspective that has not been covered by formal pragmatics. The four translations of *Macbeth* are examined respectively in light of Austin's theory. Application of the framework proposed in this paper allows a comprehensive discussion of the changes and additions made by each translator in order to examine their impact on the text. Translations are analyzed in a similar manner to a conversation; the reader grasps the meaning layer of the text and computes it into intentional meaning. Hence, each of these four translators embraces a different viewpoint of the three perspectives: locutionary, illocutionary, or perlocutionary.

Works Cited

Abu Hadid, Muhammed Farid. *Macbeth* (translation). Dar alMa'aref Bookstore, 1934.

Al-Aqqad, Abbas M. *Introduction to Shakespeare*. Dar al-Kitab,1969.

Al-Thebyan, Qusai A., Nazmi T. Al-Shalabi; Fahd A. Salameh; Kifah M. Al-Omari. "A Critique of Jabra's Arabic Translation of Shakespeare's The Tempest." *Canadian Social Science*, vol. 7, no. 6, 2011, pp. 64-74

Al-Zayyat, Latifa. "Macbeth in the Different Translations." *Theatre Magazine.* Issue 4, April 1964.

Asfar, Ayaz. "Speech Acts in the Story of Adam and Eve in the Bible and the Qur'ān." *Islamic Studies*, vol. 54, no. 3/4, Autumn-Winter 2015, pp. 185-202.

Austin, John L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd ed., Harvard University Press, 1975.

Baktir, Hasan. "Speech Act Theory: Austin, Searl Derrida'S Response And Deleuze'S Theory Of Order-Word." *Epiphany: Journal of Transdisciplinary Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2013, pp. 100-111.

BeDuhn, Jason David. "The Historical Assessment of Speech Acts: Clarifications of Austin and Skinner for the study of Religions." *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2002, pp. 84–113.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. "The Study of Translation In View Of New Developments In Discourse Analysis: The Problem Of Indirect Speech Acts." *Translation Theory and Intercultural Relations*, vol. 2, no. 4, 1981, pp. 89-95.,

Close, A. J. "Don Quixote and the 'International Fallacy.'" *The British Journal of Aesthetics*, no. 12, 1972, pp.19-39.

Enani, Muhammed. *Art of Translation*.9th ed. Egyptian International Publishing Company- Longman, 2006.

---. Foreword. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Comparative Literature: Translation*. Eds. M. Enani and M. Abdel Aatty. Cairo: Cairo University, 1999.

---. *On Translating Arabic*. Cairo: GEBO, 2000.

---.*Macbeth* (translation). General Egyptian Book Organization, 2005.

---. *Translation: Theory and Application*. 2nd ^{t} ed. Egyptian International Publishing Company- Longman, 2003.

Glickman, Jack. *J . L. Austin's Theory of Speech Act.* 1972. New York University, PhD dissertation.

Grice, Paul. *Studies in the Ways of Words*. Harvard UP, 1989.

Hadi, Ahlam. *Macbeth: Arabic Translations: A comparative study*. King Fahd National Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data, 2019.

Hanna, Sameh F. "Decommercialising Shakespeare: Mutran's Translation of *Othello*." *Critical Survey*, vol. 19, n. 3, 2007, pp. 27–54.

Harris, James F. "Speech Acts and God Talk." *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion,* vol. 11, no. 3, 1980, pp. 167–183.

Harris, Wendell V. *Interpretative Acts: In Search of Meaning*. Clarendon, 1988.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. *Validity in Interpretations*. Yale UP, 1967.

Iffat, Muhammad. *Riwayat Makbith* [The Play of *Macbeth*]. Cairo: Matbaʿat al-Muqattam, 1911.

Jabra, Ibrahim Jabra*. 1979. The Great Tragedies (Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth).* Arab Institute for Research & Publishing, 2000, https://foulabook.com/ar/book -المآسي-الكبرى وليم-شكسبير-pdf.

Katan, David. "Mediating the Point of Refraction and Playing with the Perlocutionary Effect: A Translator's Choice?" *Critical Studies, vol. 20,* pp.177-195.

Kott, Jan. "The Road to Shakespeare" *Language and Literature*, https://culture.pl/en/article/jan-kott-the-road-to-shakespeare, published 13 May 2010.

Landa, Garcia J. "Speech Act Theory and the Concept of Intention in Literary Criticism." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses 24*, 1992, pp. 89-104.

Lanfear, J. Ray. *An Analysis of Wittgenstein Locution: Meaning in Use.* 1967. Rise University, PhD dissertation.

Levinson, S. C. "Three levels of meaning." *Grammar and meaning: Essays in honour of Sir John Lyons.* Cambridge University Press. 1995, pp. 90-115.

---. *Pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Mandoki, Katya. "Aesthetics and pragmatics: Conversion, Constitution and the Dimensions of Illocutionary Acts." *Pragmatics & Cognition* vol. 7, no.2 , 1999, pp. 313–337.

Massoud, Mary. "Problems of Translation." *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Comparative Literature: Encounters In Language and Literature.* Hoda Gindi. University of Cairo, 1993.

Mutran, Khalil. Introduction. *Hamlet* by William Shakespeare, translated by Mutran, Cairo: Dar al-Maʿarif, 1917.

---. Introduction. *Utayl* [Othello] Cairo: Mata'at al-Maʿarif, 1912.

---. *Macbeth* (translation). *1917.* Create Space Independent Publishing Platform, 2018, *https://www.dar4arab.com/pdf-download-book.*

Nordenstam, Tore. "On Austin's Theory of Speech-Acts." *Mind*, vol. 75, no. 297, 1966, pp. 141–143.

Shakespeare,William. *Macbeth*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2016.

Sebold, Richard. *Of Pragrammatology: Deconstruction, Meaning, and Communication*. 2008. Cardiff University, MA dissertation.

Setyaji, Arso. "How Speech Acts Work In Translation: An Analysis On Speech Acts In Translating A Script Of Titanic Film." *UNS Journal of Language Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2014, pp. 14-31.

Suzuki, Erin. *Lost in Translation: Reconsidering Shakespeare's Macbeth and Kurosawa's Throne of Blood.* dialnet.unirioja.es. 2006.

Thomas, Douglas. "It's Not What You Say, It's That You Say It: Speech, Performance, and Sense in Austin and Deleuze". *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, vol. 29, no. 4, 1996, pp. 359–368.

Tulba, Samar. *Domestication Vs. Foreignisation in the Rendering of Shakespearean Drama: With Particular Reference to Some Translations of The Tempest, The Merry Wives of Windsor and The Merchant of Venice.* 2012. Cairo University, PhD dissertation.

Verschureren, J. "Some basic Notions in Speech Act Theory." *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. 28, no. 1/2, 1978, pp. 69–90.

Wang, Vincent. "A pragmatic examination of translation of implied meaning." *Translations Watch Quarterly*, vol. 3, n. 3, pp. 34-45.

Youssef, Lobna. "Cultural Contexts: Egyptian Translators of English Romantic Poetry." *Essays in Honour of Amin el-Ayouti.* Cairo: The Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University, 2002.