مجلة كلية الآداب بقنا (دورية أكاديمية علمية محكمة)

The Image of the Jew in Arabic Translations of Titus Andronicus

إسراء محمد سعيد أحمد

مدرس مساعد بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية

كلية الآداب– جامعة جنوب الوادي

DOI: 10.21608/qarts.2023.211051.1682

مجلة كلية الآداب بقنا – جامعة جنوب الوادي – المجلد (٣٢) العدد (٥٩) أبريل ٢٠٢٣

الترقيم الدولي الموحد للنسخة المطبوعة ISSN: 1110-614X

الترقيم الدولي الموحد للنسخة الإلكترونية ISSN: 1110-709X

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

The Image of the Jew in Arabic Translations of *Titus Andronicus*

Abstract

This study explores the image of the Jew as portrayed in Arabic translations of an Elizabethan play, William Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*. It draws on insights of key theoretical concepts of Translation Studies, especially the polysystem theory, discourse analysis and pragmatics, to demonstrate their relevance to the analysis of drama translation, and in particular, the image of the Jew in Arabic translations. The study proves the influence of background cultural, political and historical factors on the translator's rendering of the source text into the target text. The study attempts an in-depth literary analysis of the relevant texts with the purpose of finding out how the essential lexical, semantic and pragmatic components of the work of art can be wittingly or innocently manipulated to create a certain image that may not have been intended by the original author of the work. The question the study attempts to answer is whether ideological and cultural backgrounds interfere in the translation.

Keywords: image of the Jew, William Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, Translation Studies, polysystem theory, comparative analysis, manipulation, Arabic translations, pragmatics.

1. Introduction

Though sharing the basic qualities of Barabas, Christopher Marlowe's protagonist in *The Jew of Malta,* Shakespeare's Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* is simply described as an atheist. He shares those qualities which distinguish the hero of the former play so much as to be regarded a parody by Harold Bloom (1998), and to be consistently compared to Barabas by other critics such as Eugene Waith (1984), if not as parody, then as a replica. Never specifically referred to as a Jew in the play, his association with Barabas makes him a trial version, rough and sullied, of the refined and superb image of the Jew in *The Merchant of Venice,* namely Shylock. Harry Levin in *The Overreacher,* 1952, establishes the "basic qualities" of Barabas in *The Jew of Malta* as at once an atheist, a Machiavellian, and an Epicurean. He defines atheism as pagan or natural (as opposed to revealed) religion, while the Machiavellianism is today considered mere political realism (35).

A major, important reason for the suggestiveness of Aaron's affinity with Barabas is the significance of the former's name itself as Jonathan Bate argues in his Arden edition of *Titus Andronicus* (2018): "almost all of Shakespeare's original audience would have known the name of Aaron as that of the brother of Moses in the Old Testament" (122). A few learned readers or spectators might have remembered the story, told in the Qur'an, about the joint mission which Moses and Aaron carried out for the Pharaoh in Egypt: they were commissioned by God to guide him to the true faith, the monotheistic, revealed religion of Judaism. However, as the ancient Roman setting of Shakespeare's play could hardly accommodate religion as a factor or a motive in the horrendous acts committed by practically all the characters, no specific mention is made of any revealed religion.

Atheism is nevertheless a safe way out: it is not as though the pagan Romans could much more easily stomach atheism than a revealed religion, but the crux of the conflict is more related to the character being a foreigner. Barabas is alien in Malta, and so is Aaron, and so will Shylock be, with great differences in characterization, in *The Merchant of Venice.* The alienation of such a central character in the early plays by Marlowe and Shakespeare is a driving force in the action, though the reason for this alienation varies considerably from one play to the other. In *The Jew of Malta*, Marlowe gives us the typically traditional image of the Jew as an atheist at heart and a Machiavellian who worships money and, when his obvious riches are confiscated by the State, becomes intent on vengeance. In *Titus Andronicus,* Shakespeare attributes the alienation to the colour of the skin: The Moor, captured and brought to Rome, is dark-skinned. He is equally an atheist and a Machiavellian like Barabas, who finds exceptional pleasure in avenging his low social status by hurting the fair-skinned Barabas, who had captured then freed him. In *The Merchant of Venice*, Shylock's alienation is channelled through a purely materialist conflict, made to appear (but only ostensibly) attributable to different religious creeds.

The Moor in *Titus Andronicus* shares the pragmatism of the Romans, and, like them, he swears by their pagan gods. Assuming that the action of the play, which is definitely fictional and occurring in the pre-Christian era, is more related to the Elizabethan tradition of the revenge play than to Shakespeare's later mature concerns, the role of religion is almost irrelevant. As mentioned above, Bloom regards *Titus Andronicus* as a parody of *The Jew of Malta*, and Waith tells us that Shakespeare was thinking of "Barabas in creating the role of Aaron" (38). Intent on relating the

action of the play to the atrocities committed by the Islamists in our time, Jonathan Bate suggests that he could be a Muslim terrorist (122). However, this early view of the Moor contradicts Shakespeare's typical images of Moors, first in the image of the Prince of Morocco in *The Merchant of Venice,* obviously a Christian, then in the towering image of Othello, the Moor of Venice, who, when committing suicide, proudly tells the visiting Venetian officials how he defended the prestige of Venice when a Muslim Turk insulted the State. Othello here professes to be a faithful servant of the Christian state, though originally alien, thanks to his Christian creed. In playing this role, Laurence Olivier wore a huge golden cross around his neck to rule out any suggestion of religious conflict. Othello's last memorable words are:

in Aleppo once,
Where a malignant and a turbaned Turk
Beat a Venetian and traduced the state,
I took by the throat the circumcisèd dog,
And smote him, thus.
(Stabs himself)

(*Othello,* V. ii. 352-5)

A conclusive argument about the affinities between Barabas, the Jew, and Aaron, the Moor, is given by Harold Bloom in *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human,* 1998, in the form of a comparison between two speeches made by Barabas and Aaron. Bloom's comment is that Shakespeare wins, saying, however, that Aaron "combines with Tamburlaine's rant Barabas' talent for making the audience his accomplices. The result is a Marlovian monster more outrageous than anyone in Marlowe" (82). Thus,

Aaron becomes a demonic answer to Barabas. In other words, Shakespeare recreates the Jew in the Moor who believes in no religion (that is, no revealed, or monotheistic, religion).

2. Arabic Translations

Though there is no reference to the One God of monotheism in this essentially pagan play, Shakespeare peppers his text with references to Heaven in the monotheistic sense, implying both God and paradise, apart from being the opposite of both Hell and earth. A survey of the references to these monotheistic terms should confirm the monotheistic subtext of this pagan play. Statistics can be deceptive, but when one finds that references to the Roman gods are accompanied with references to 'God' and 'Heaven', one must conclude that a touch of monotheistic feeling is implied. Apart from references to God and Heaven, the play is full of references to Christian rituals. Some examples will show how the translators viscerally felt the subtext and adequately responded to it, eminently a credit. The following examples are confined to Act 1. Rabei's translation is given followed by Mashati's:

Titus: Thou great defender of the capitol. (I. i. 77)

١. وأنت يا "جوبيتر" يا حامي الكابيتول العظيم

٢. فيا أيها المدافع العظيم عن الكابيتول

Tamora: Wilt thou draw near the natures of the gods. (I. i. 117)

١. ألا تريد أن تتشبه في خلقك بخلق الآلهة؟

٢. إذا كنت تريد التقرب إلى الآلهة،

Tamora: O cruel, irreligious piety! (I. i. 130)

١. يا لقسوة هذه العبادة الكافرة!

٢. تبًّا لتقواكم وشعائركم العاتية الشرسة.

Demetrius: The selfsame gods. (I. i. 137)

١. إن الآلهة نفسها ...

٢. الآلهة التي أتاحت ...

Saturninus: Would thou were shipped to hell. (I. i. 206)

١. أفضل أن يلقى بك في الجحيم

٢. أن ترحل إلى الجحيم

Saturninus: Here I swear by all the Roman gods
Sith priest and holy water are so near
And tapers burn so bright, and everything
In readiness for Hymenaeus stand.

(I. i. 322-5)

١. وإني لأقسم بآلهة الرومان جميعًا
إنه ما دام الكاهن والماء المقدس قريبين
وما دامات شموع الفرح وهاجة وكل شيء
معد مهيأ للقيام بشعائر إله الفرح

٢. أقسم بجميع آلهة روما، بما أن الكاهن والماء المقدس
قريبان، وبما أن المشاعل تنشر أضواءها الساطعة علينا،
وكل شيء جاهز للعرس

Tamora: in the sight of heaven. (I. i. 335)

١. على مشهد من السماء

٢. أمام السماء

In the previous examples and others in Act I alone, there is an equal number of the terms ‘gods’ and ‘heaven’. We also have so early in the play a reference to the Christian marriage rituals (321-4) and an indication of a belief in a transcendent deity. As we proceed to examine the way the image of the Jew, as framed in Barabas, influences the image of Aaron and the consequences of this for the Arabic translations, a brief account of the play’s plot may usefully be given.

The play opens with a triumphal welcome home of Titus Andronicus, the renowned military commander, from a successful war against the Goths. These are Scandinavian tribes who, like the “barbarians”, continue to attack the northern parts of the Roman Empire. The commander is said to be elderly, and most of his 25 sons were killed in battle, with only three surviving. The captives include Tamora, queen of the Goths, and her lover Aaron, who is a Moor, that is, a Moroccan, with a dark complexion. An argument erupts about who would succeed Titus Andronicus as the new Roman Emperor, but is soon resolved in favour of Saturninus, son of the late emperor of Rome. When he proposes to marry Lavinia, daughter of Titus, even while admiring the beautiful blonde Gothic queen, Tamora, he is opposed by her fiancé Bassianus, his brother, who insists he have his betrothed. Titus supports Saturninus, and when his son Mutius opposes him, preventing him from going after Bassianus, Titus kills him, calling him a traitor. Earlier, Titus had ordered that one of Tamora’s sons, Alarbus, be sacrificed in a religious offering to appease the souls of his 22 sons killed in battle by the Goths. In vain does Tamora plead with Titus for mercy, but he explains that the “groaning shadows” demand retribution:

"Religiously they ask for a sacrifice." "O cruel, irreligious piety," she retorts.

Meanwhile, the dispute over Lavinia's future husband is resolved when Saturninus decides to marry Tamora, the former queen of the Goths. Everybody grudgingly accepts their new queen, and she instantly intervenes to settle the outstanding quarrel between Titus and Bassanius and the insult that Saturninus has thus received. It is here that we first hear the word 'revenge', the first of the thirty-odd times it occurs, with its cognates, in the play. More important, however, is the variety of abstract principles referred to by most characters, which build up what may be regarded as the Roman ethos (or ethical principles) in the play. The commonest elements are 'noble' (and cognates) – 16 times – and 'honour' (and cognates) – 14 times – plus 'dishonour' (and cognates) – 6 times. In Act I alone, therefore, we have an impressive array of humanistic qualities which could be regarded as a Roman religion. These include virtue, justice, continence, reason, right, uprightness, integrity, courage, as well as treachery, impiety, ingratitude, to mention the ones most frequently used by all the characters in ActI.

What is most notable in Act I is that Aaron the Moor comes on the stage with Tamora and her three sons at the same time as Titus enters (in a chariot) in Line 70. Aaron is there throughout the offering of Tamora's son via the ritual killing and burning, but leaves with her and her two surviving sons during Titus' killing of his son, with the altercation between Saturninus, now the emperor, and Bassanius, his brother, over Lavinia, at line 398. When Titus becomes implicated in the dispute, Tamora intercedes on his behalf to her husband, the Emperor, "to pardon what is past". When he objects to her pacification, we hear "dishonour" and "revenge" for

the first time (432-3). She then delivers a pivotal, long speech (442-455) addressed to the congregation in the first eight lines, then as an aside to Saturninus in the next 14 lines, in which she calls for 'dissembling' in preparation for carrying out her revenge on Titus and his family, before going public again in the last three lines.

Dissembling, according to Coleridge—as has been previously mentioned— is what *The Jew of Malta* is all about. Even though the religion of Rome has been substituted for monotheism (Barabas' Judaism, Maltese Christianity, and Ithamore's Islam), the action still revolves around transgression (now against Roman religion) and revenge.

Tamora's speech is well translated into Arabic in Safiya Rabie's version. She is careful to convey the meaning of the words in Modern Standard Arabic in a poetic way even if not in verse. She is not averse to using the genuine Arabic structures which are sometimes avoided by translators in order to imitate common registers. She uses, for instance, the absolute object (المفعول المطلق) (أذبحهم كلهم ذبحًا) (to massacre them all) as well as idiomatic heritage Arabic (أستأصل شأفتهم وشأفة شيعتهم وأسرتهم). In contrast, Mashati's version is more prosaic, giving the alternative phrasing (قتلهم جميعا) and (إبادة رجالهم وعيالهم).

Rabie often follows the source text syntax in using apposition (البدل) so that the word 'all' is now replaced by the actual referents who stand in apposition to it (هذا الأب القاسي وأبناؤه الخونة) (The cruel father and his traitorous sons). She easily suspends and resumes the syntax in order to convey the implied meaning: so, for "And make known…" she gives a new clause (سأعرفهم) and for the unspecific "What 'tis to let a queen/Kneel" we have (ما جزاء من يترك ملكةً تركع). The idiomatic (ما جزاء) is redolent with heritage implications: it

reminds one of the Egyptian King's wife who tried to seduce Joseph the Patriarch, and when discovered by her husband, she says " ما جزاء من أراد بأهلك سوءًا" (how do you punish him who would transgress against your wife?). The style used is deliberately meant to resonate with Quranic tones. Soon enough, we learn at the beginning of Act II that Tamora is a sinner who keeps her lover Aaron even after becoming an Empress by marrying Saturninus.

In contrast, the phraseology of the Mashati version is not compact and runs in a staccato rhythm which means that the layers of meaning of the source text are reduced to one level; the lexical one. The lines of this version are lumped together in a pedestrian flow:

سأجد يوما مجالا لقتلهم جميعا وإبادة رجالهم وعيالهم، من الأب الشرس إلى الأبناء وكلهم خونة. فقد سببوا موت ولدي الحبيب. وسأعلمهم كم يكلف ترك ملكة تحثو في الشوارع وتلتمس العفو بدون جدوى.

If this target text reveals 'manipulation', it is definitely unwitting, a mere oversight or the outcome of the personal literary capabilities of the translator. The queen's words are majestic and sophisticated with a poetic highly emotive tone. When this is rendered in a mere lexical equivalence, or semi-equivalence, a great deal of the illocutionary force is lost. While the Rabie's version is faithful to the source text, it managed as well to be faithful to the culture and context of the target text. Her translation fits nicely in the cultural system of the receiving audience.

The air of reconciliation which concludes Act I is based, as in *The Jew of Malta,* on dissembling. Act II opens with Aaron's speech, who is supposed to remain on stage after Act I, in which he states his plan for advancement through his love affair with Tamora, now the Empress of Rome. Later on, when he and Tamora's sons have been established in the court of the Emperor, Aaron wonders:

> And now, young Lords, was't not a happy
> star
> Led us to Rome, strangers, and more than
> so,
> Captives, to be advanced to this height?
>
> (IV. ii. 433-5)

The "happy star" is no other than Tamora's love for him, a woman he describes as controlling "earthly honour", that is, having such intelligence "wit" that she can manipulate any situation so as to make it either "honourable" or "dishonourable" at will. It is not, however, religious honour but mundane, even profane. This is confirmed by his second line in which he claims that her power is such as can determine what constitutes virtue and vice. It is the position one finds in the Jewish Barabas: for it is earthly honour that will be achieved by Aaron:

> Away with slavish weeds and servile
> thoughts!
> I will be bright, and shine in pearl and gold,
>
> (II. i. 19-20)

This is rendered by Mashati as:

بعيدا عني، ليس لها سوى مظهر العبيد والخضوع الذليل.

أنا أريد أن أكون ساطعا كاللآلئ، براقا كالذهب الوهاج،

And by Rabie as:

انزع يا هارون ثياب الرق واطرح أفكار العبيد،

فسأتوج باللآلئ وأتألق بالذهب،

Both translators accurately convey the sense of the lines creating the same character image which Shakespeare fashioned in the source text, a materialist secular Jew. However, the second translation attempts to preserve the elegance of Shakespeare's style.

The Jew here is simply a Machiavellian materialist person who has been treated as an alien, and was discriminated against as such. If he is mean and vicious, such qualities arise from his deep desire to take revenge against his oppressors, and not from his stereotypical image of the Jew that was prevalent in Elizabethan England. As an example of exercising Tamora's "wit", he persuades both her children, vying for the love of Lavinia, though married to Bassianus, the Emperor's brother, to follow his advice and have her forcibly, that is, rape her. The plan would be carried out during the hunt, a common aristocratic sport. It is significant that though he claims to have Tamora under his thumb, and that he has long held her prisoner "fettered in amorous chains/And faster bound to Aaron's charming eyes/Than is Prometheus tied to the Caucasus" (II. i. 15-7) he has to defer to her when hatching his plot for Bassianus to be killed and Lavinia to be raped and mutilated by Tamora's sons Chiron and Demetrius. He tells them:

Come, come, our empress, with her sacred wit
To villainy and vengeance consecrate,
Will we acquaint withal what we intend,
And she shall file our engines with advice…

(II. i. 120-3)

It is interesting that Aaron believes in the superiority of his mistress' intelligence, endowing her with divine qualities. Consecration usually has monotheistic connotations, and even if the Shakespearean adjective "consecrate" means "dedicated", the paradox of being dedicated to evil is obvious. The translator here misses the point, which could be regarded as an oxymoron. Adhering to the syntax produces a difficult Arabic syntax in the first three lines, before giving an independent sentence for the last line.

هيا هيا فعلى إمبراطورتنا ذات الذكاء القدسي
التي سخرت مواهبها للشر والانتقام،
سنعرض أمر كل ما انتوينا القيام به.
إنها ستُحكم بمشورتها مؤامرتنا.

[Rabie]

3. Manipulation

Commentators believe that "sacred" means 'god-inspired' or 'godly', in terms of Roman religion but also in terms of all monotheistic religions. Even in its usual sense it may better be (المقدس). The Arabic (القدس) is not immediately relevant, as we are in the pre-Christian era and Jerusalem is ruled out. Some commentators suggest (رباني), which links well with 'dedication' (التكريس) in the following line. Therefore, a sentence like (التي كرست نفسها للشر والانتقام) may be better. The paratactic structure in the Arabic text, in the lines 124-6 (in Arabic) beginning each with (إنها)

detracts from the cohesion, and the anaphora destroys the easy-flowing syntax. These are, however, stylistic considerations which do not affect the role played by Aaron as an atheist villain working in conjunction with Tamora, to wreak vengeance on the Romans and their unethical, dissembling world.

Like Barabas the Jew, Aaron is a stranger plotting to overthrow the power that rules over him and his mistress Tamora. He unveils his design to her thus:

> This is the day of doom for Bassanius;
> His Philomel must lose her tongue today
> Thy sons make pillage of her chastity,
> And wash their hands in Bassanius' blood.
>
> (II. iii. 42-5)

This is the first of many references to the story of Philomel's rape by Tereus, a source of the Lavinia plot as found in Ovid; the other references are II. ii. 26-7, 38-43, IV. i. 47-8, and V. ii. 194-5. Essentially it is a story of rape, followed by the cutting out of the woman's tongue, but the translator reverses the order. Here is the Rabie Arabic version:

إن اليوم هو يوم حساب باسانيوس
ولا مفر من أن تفقد زوجتة لسانها كفيلوميل
إن ابنيك سيغتصبان عفافها
ثم يغسلان أيديهما في دماء بسانيوس

The expression (يوم حساب) can mean "the day he is called to account" when in fact the translator had in mind (يوم الحساب) that is 'doomsday', but the meaning is that it is the day he will be killed. The reason is that Aaron does not believe in Resurrection and 'the

day of reckoning' in accordance with revealed religions. For him, 'doom' has its usual meaning of death (يوم القضاء على باسانيوس).

Act II, iii, presents those planned crimes as they are committed, when Tamora's sons rape Lavinia, cut out her tongue, kill Bassanius and throw his body in a ditch. When Martius and Quintus, the sons of Titus, come onto the scene, they fall into the ditch, whereupon Aaron calls the emperor Saturninus to witness the disaster. He has forged a paper, supposedly written by Titus' sons, which contains a confession, confirming that they had intended to kill Bassanius and then have a reward – a bag of gold hidden nearby. Aaron produces the bag of gold he had hidden and gives it to Saturninus as final proof of the sons' guilt. When Tamora returns to the scene in the company of Titus and Marcus, they hear of the verdict: Saturninus has ordered the sons to be tortured and executed.

Act II, iii, shows that the translators are conscious of the mixing of pagan with monotheistic terms in the play. However, while Rabie translates "Jove" as (الله) in swearing, Mashati uses the pagan original use and translate the deity here as (المشتري).

In Rabie's version, Lavinia's prayer "Jove shield your husband" (70) is translated as (فليحم الله زوجك).

On the other hand, Mashati's translation reads:

فليحفظ الإله المشتري زوجك.

Mashati is careful to create the connotations of the pagan context while Rabie relies on the fact that the word "Jove" is also used in Christian contexts. Since the middle ages, "Jove" has been used as

a literary way of referring to Jupiter (supreme god of Romans). It has also been used to refer to Jehovah, a Hebrew name of God.

The Arabic reader may easily accept the translation as (الله), and the translator is justified in using since elsewhere in the same source text the word 'God' is used, as in Rabie's:

> What God will have discovered for revenge.
>
> (IV. i. 73)
>
> **عمن يريد الله أن يكشفه لنا لننتقم منه.**

And Mashati's:

اعلمينا .. بمن تشاء السماء أن تظهره لمعاقبة الجاني.

However, there is a question of register and level of language used in conversation as shown here in using swear words in the following conversation:

> Tamora: How now, good fellow, wouldst thou speak with us?
>
> Clown: Yea, forsooth, and your mistress-ship be emperial.
>
> Tamora: Empress I am, but yonder sits the emperor.
>
> Clown: 'Tis he. God and Saint Stephen give me godden.
>
> (IV. ii. 39-42)

Radie renders the conversation thus:

تامورا: ما وراءك أيها الرجل الطيب؟ أو تريد أن تتحدث إلينا؟

المهرج: نعم والله. إذا كنت أنت صاحبة الجلالة!

تامورا: أنا الإمبراطورة، وهذا الإمبراطور، جالس هناك

المهرج: إنه من أريد. أسعد الله والقديس ستيفن مساءك

The translator should, however, be conversant with other swear formulas in Shakespeare, such as "By 'Lady," (IV. ii. 47), that is, "By Our Lady," that is, the mother of Jesus, or (العذراء/البتول). She translates the expression as (يا سيدتي).

Similarly, Mashati's version does not heed the used register and the intended fun:

تامورا: هل تريد أن تكلمنا يا صاح؟

الفلاح: طبعا يا سيدتي، إن كنت أنتِ صاحبة الجلالة الإمبراطورة؟

تامورا: أجل أنا الإمبراطورة. وها هو الإمبراطور جالس هناك.

الفلاح: أهذا هو؟ حفظته السماء وأنعمت عليه بالحظ السعيد.

Two scenes earlier, when told that Tamora has given birth to a child, Aaron says:

Aaron: Well, God give her good rest! What hath he sent her?
Nurse: A devil.
Aaron: Why, then she is the devil's dam: a joyful issue.

(IV.ii. 63-5)

Rabie's text reads:

هارون: وماذا في هذا؟ عافاها الله ! وما يكون الطفل؟

المرضعة: شيطان.

هارون: إذن فهي زوجة إبليس. بارك الله في النسل.

Aaron's use of 'God' in 63 may have prompted the translator to repeat the reference in 65, though the meaning is different. The source text says (نسل بهيج) but (إبليس) is Satan, and is thus interpreted **in the monotheistic context. Mashati avoids this error:**

هارون: أسأل الله أن يحفظها سالمة، وماذا أنجبت؟

المرضع: شيطانا صغيرا.

هارون: فأصبحت هكذا أمَّ الشيطان، بل أمَّ المسخ.

Act III develops the theme of vengeance wreaked on Titus and his family. Titus is in a frenzy of sorrow and horror lest he should lose two of his surviving sons, unfairly accused of killing Bassanius. Now Aaron comes in to tell Titus that his sons can be ransomed in exchange for cutting off one of his hands, or Marcus' or Lucius' hands, and sending it to the emperor. Titus is delighted and willingly cuts off one of his hands and gives it to Aaron. Soon enough, however, a messenger comes in carrying the heads of his two sons and Titus' severed hand. Scene One ends with Titus ordering his last surviving son, Lucius, to go to the Goths, raise an army and come back to avenge the wrongs done to his father and family members. Lucius makes a farewell speech to Rome, pledging to come back, adding in a deictic shift (التفات) that he is a man of his word:

He loves his pledges dearer than his life. (III. i. 290)

Rabie's version renders it as:

فلقد ترك لديه ودائع أعز عليه من الحياة

(The line is translated by Enani within his translation of Harold bloom's book, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*, as: وَفَاؤُهُ بِعَهْدِهِ أَعَزُّ حَقًّا عِنْدَهُ مِنْ رُوحِهِ)

She adds in a footnote that the meaning is vague and that her translation reflects the interpretation of one (Bildon?). Often quoted in the footnotes, this name should have been given in Roman characters, but is nowhere to be found within this edition or anywhere else.

Act IV may be regarded as the part of the action where revelation takes place, implying a reversal in the direction of the plot. Act IV, scene One, is a contemplation of the events which have taken place so far, especially the rape and mutilation of Lavinia. Titus, his brother Marcus, and Lucius' little son, encourage Lavinia to indicate who the culprit is, and she indicates Tamora's two sons by referring to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Titus becomes more resolved than ever to take revenge, adapting lines from Seneca's *Phaedra*. The adaptation is significant for our purposes. Whereas Seneca says "Magne regnator deum" (Great ruler of the gods), Titus says "Magni dominator poli" (Ruler of the great heavens) but continues "dost thou so calmly hear crimes, so calmly look upon them?" The change to "heavens" is meant to refer obliquely to monotheistic religions. The scene ends with a vow for revenge.

The whole of Act IV. i. is devoted to the 'affairs' of the Titus Andronicus family, concluding with a prayer to heaven, or the "Heavens" (IV. i. 122, 128) by Marcus. He claims that Titus is so pure of heart, so 'just', which in the 16th and 17th centuries referred

to the good and righteous (O.E.D.) (and in Milton it refers to the godly {الأبرار}), that he would not take revenge:

> [He is] so just that he will not revenge.
> Revenge the heavens for old Andronicus!
>
> (IV. i. 127-8)

Having witnessed Titus kill his son for daring to oppose him, the claim of being 'so just', even in its usual meaning of 'fair', must appear strange. The prayer to heaven is significant because of its monotheistic undertones.

Act IV. ii. deals with the other party in the conflict, that is, Tamora's sons (Chiron and Demetrius) in the company of Aaron. Little Lucius, son of Marcus, comes in with a message from 'Old Titus', accompanied by a man carrying weapons. The message is a quotation from Horace (*Odes I,* xvii, 1-2), which says:

> Integer vitae, scelerisque purus,
> Non eget Mauri jaculis, nec arcu
>
> (IV. ii. 20-1)
>
> (The man of upright life and free from crime
> Does not need the javelins or bow of the Moor.)

This is translated by Mashati as:

الرجل البعيد عن الملامة، البريء من كل جرم، لا يحتاج إلى القوس والنبال.

The word (Mauri) Moors is ignored which is a clear case of manipulation, perhaps because some dictionaries translate the word as dark-skinned. Thus, the translator here avoids a possible bias, sacrificing accuracy. This also unwarrantedly and unwittingly

embellishes the image of the speaker somehow as not looking down upon the Moor.

Rabie's version reads:

من كان نقي القلب بلا جريمة

فلن يحتاج إلى نبال العبد الأسود ولا إلى قوسه

One wonders why the Moor (المغربي) is translated as a "black slave." To begin with, "black" in Shakespeare always and consistently means 'dark-skinned' or simply non-white. The technical term for this colour is 'swarthy', also used by Shakespeare in connection with the Moor. This Moor, Aaron, may have been captured by the Romans in the fight against the Goths where he was in amorous association with Tamora. He was a prisoner of war, i.e. a slave, but he was freed by the new emperor, Saturninus, midway across Act I, Scene i. At Line I. i. 275 he says:

Remember here we set our prisoners free.

Before he wins his liberty, Aaron is not heard in Act One. He is there on the stage, but only in the company of his mistress Tamora. Once a free man, he opens Act II with a speech in which he proves himself to be a talented speaker. So to translate "Moor" as (عبد أسود) is difficult to accept.

Personal ideology's influence interferes implicitly or explicitly when such racial issues are involved, and the problems is further complicated by miscomprehension or lack of talent related to the intuitive knowledge of what translation is all about—that is the whole subject that engages translation scholars.

Some thirty lines ahead in the same scene the racial issue arises again with the following excerpt:

> Nurse: Good morrow, lords.
> O, tell me, did you see Aaron the Moor?
> Aaron: Well, more or less, or ne'er a whit at all,
> Here Aaron is, and what with Aaron now?
> Nurse: O, gentle Aaron, we are all undone.
>
> (IV. ii. 52-6)

Mashati's text is tolerably accurate:

المرضع: صباح الخير يا سادتي. هل رأيتم البربري هارون؟

هارون : نعم ولا، أو أبدا. أنا هارون، ماذا تريدين مني؟

المرضع: يا سيدي هارون، سنهلك كلنا إن لم تتدارك الأمر عاجلا.

There is no use of words like (عبد، أسود). However, the use of (البربري) may not be condescending or contemptuous as it is related to the English word "Berber" which refers to a member of an indigenous people of northern Africa (البربر، الأمازيغ).

Rabie's translation gives the following rendering:

الظئر: سادتي صباح الخير

ألم تروا هارون الأسود؟

هارون: أسود. أبيض أو لا لون له!

فهذا هو هارون. والآن ماذا تريدين من هارون؟

الظئر: أيها الطيب هارون، لقد حل بنا الخطب جميعًا.

Moreover, the translator adds a footnote to her translation:

هامش: لم نرتبط بالمعنى الحرفي لكلمة Moor منذ أول الرواية فكنا نترجمها عبد أو أسود أو أسمر. وقد نقلنا هنا التلاعب اللفظي على Moor وMore. بما يمكن أن يحتفظ باستهجان هارون لطلب المرضعة.

ص (١٣٢)

Can one accept such indiscriminate use of the three terms without adequate justification by the translator? One may accept choosing one of the epithets if the context calls for it. For example, if the translator feels that the speaker denigrates the Moor, focusing on the colour of his skin, the translator may use (أسود) 'black'; if, however, the text suggests that the Moor's colour is attractive, the translator may opt for (أسمر/أسمراني). As for (عبد), 'slave', one finds it indefensible. Still, one wonders why not use (مغربي) as opposed to (قوطي) and (روماني)? After all, everybody translates the title of *Othello, the Moor of Venice* as (عطيل: مغربي في البندقية) and the Prince of Morocco in *The Merchant of Venice* as (الأمير المغربي) or (أمير المغرب). The play on words is not apparent in the Arabic text. The words used by Aaron are no doubt meant to be frivolous. In reply to "Have you seen the Moor?" Aaron says, "I have more or less seen him! Or perhaps haven't seen him at all!" Then he confirms that he is the Moor. It is like saying in colloquial Arabic (يعني! شفته تقريبًا) in answer to the same question, in classical Arabic, Aaron's reply could mean

- رأيته إلى حد ما! أو لم أره قط!

The colours the translator gives us hardly convey the pun. In fact, the footnote does not do justice to the actual translation

performance. One of the earliest addresses/ references to the Moor occurs at II. iii. 10 when Tamora addresses him as "My lovely Moor", which is given in Arabic as (حبيبي هارون)! The use of the first name confirms the intimacy and seems to be better than the literal (حبيبي المغربي الوسيم) [lovely means 'pleasing to look at']. Tamora's "my sweet Moor" (II. iii. 52) is given in Arabic as (أيها الأسمر العزيز) which interprets Moor as (أسمر), i.e. dark-skinned. The substitution of (أسمر) for (مغربي), four times, indicates an interpretation of "Moor" not suggested by the text. Likewise, the substitution of (أسود), [black], ten times after Act II, implies a denigration of the position of the Moor, who is simply "a stranger" from "Morocco". When coupled with an adjective, 'Moor' is strangely rendered as (عبد) or (عبد أسود) as it occurs twice in Titus' speech in V. ii. 87 and 88. Then look at the following:

> Lucius: O barbarous Moor [أيها العبد الأسود المتوحش] (V. iii. 4)
> Unhallowed Moor [أيها العبد النجس] (V. iii. 14)
>
> Marcus: Irreligious Moor [العبد الكافر] (V. iii. 120)
> Misbelieving Moor [العبد الكافر] (V. iii. 142)

When interpretation produces a systematic concept, it becomes manipulation. Sometimes such manipulation may distort even the obvious sense of the words. Shakespeare often uses "horns" on one's head as a sign of being a cuckold, or cuckolded. Marcus plays with the names of some constellations of the stars, such as the Bull (Taurus) (برج الثور), saying that he knocked the Ram (برج الحمل), whose horns fell in the court of the emperor of Rome. As the emperor is being cuckolded, that is, having his wife sexually betraying him with the Moor, Marcus continues his joke by saying that the villainous lover of the queen receives the horns. The queen

advises him to give the horns to her husband, now obviously a cuckold! The tone of the images is frivolous, and is made to poke fun at both the Emperor and his adulterous wife (the queen) in her love affair with the villain, i.e. the wicked servant. Here is the English text:

This was the sport, my lord; when Publius shot,
The Bull, being galled, gave Aries such a knock
That down fell both the Ram's horns in the court,
And who should find them but the Empress' villain?
She laughed and told the Moor he should not choose
But give them to his master for a present.

(IV. ii. 70-4)

Rabie's translation gives the following lines, followed by Enani's verse version:

هذا هو الصيد الحق يا مولاي. فإن بيليوس عندما
أصاب، هاج. فنطح الحمل نطحة
أوقعت في البلاط قرني الخروف
ولن تظنه وجدهما غير الأسود وغير الإمبراطورة
فلما رأت الإمبراطورة ذلك ضحكت وقالت للأسود لا عليك الآن
أن تقدمهما هدية إلى سيدك.

(Rabie)

مولاتي تلك لعبة طريفة! فسهم بوبليوسَ طار في السماء عاليًا حتى

أصاب برج الثور.. فإذ به ينقص ثائرًا على برج الحمل
وإذ بقرني ذلك الكبش الكبير يسقطان في البلاط
ومن عسى يلقاهما إلا عشيق الإمبراطورة.. الخادم الأثيم!؟
وعندما رأتهما تضاحكت وقالت للعشيق المغربي
لابد أن تهديهما إلى رئيسك الديوث.

(Enani)

Part of the trouble, as Enani says in his comment on the translation of style, is due to inadequate recognition of tone (cf. *On Translating Style,* 2020). The tone here is definitely frivolous: the joke begins by Titus who, laughingly, says to Publius that his arrow (carrying Titus' grievances) went too high in space until the Taurus constellation, i.e. the Bull sign of the zodiac, and has "shot the bull" and angered him (he laughs, as the translator includes in her stage directions). The tone of Marcus' six lines given above is therefore jocular or playful, and "sport" carries its normal meaning (not the hunt). Reading the published prose translation, one may think that the bull, the lamb and the sheep (الخروف) were actual animals, not signs of the zodiac. The typographical error (ولن) instead of (ومن) in the fourth line does not help, apart from translating "the Empress' villain" as (غير الأسود وغير الإمبراطورة) – a change of meaning which looks unwarranted. However, the real villain of the piece is the word (الأسود). Even if the translation of "the Moor" as (الأسود) (line 73) is accepted, his relationship with the Empress is lost in line 72, by changing the genitival construction into two names joined in two separate phrases by a coordinating conjunction. One wonders why even the word "villain" becomes (الأسود)!

If manipulation requires consistency as evidence, this is generally the case, though the translator cannot maintain her

degradation of the Moor when the source text forces her to abandon her attitude. It has been shown above that she translates "my lovely Moor" as (حبيبي هارون) and "my sweet Moor" as (أيها الأسمر العزيز). However, when Tamora says again "my lovely Moor" (II.iii.190) the phrase is rendered as (يا أسمري المحبوب). When Titus addresses the Moor as "Gentle Aaron" (III.i.157) the translation gives us (ما أكرمك يا هارون), and when Titus says "Good Aaron" (III.i.161), the Arabic text says (يا هارون! أيها الرجل الصالح). When the Nurse addresses the Moor as "O Gentle Aaron!" (IV.ii.53), it is translated as (ما أكرمك يا هارون). But when the Nurse refers to him as "Aaron the Moor" (IV.ii.52) a minute or two previously, the translation gives us (هارون الأسود)!

The character of Aaron, whatever its similarities with Barabas in *The Jew of Malta*, begins midway in Act IV to be humanized. Finding that he has begotten a son, his paternal instinct is awakened, though no humanization can stop him from killing the nurse on the spot and planning to kill the midwife too. Suddenly, Aaron comes into his own as a proud father and a staunch defender of his race. His speeches (IV.ii.87-105 and IV.ii.116) stand out as magnificent indictments of racial discrimination. He endearingly addresses his son as both "blowse" (red-faced) and "black slave"! When Tamora's sons threaten to kill the infant in order to save their mother's reputation, he unexpectedly turns ferociously against them. Unfortunately, the prose translation is marred by the translator's use of (الأسود) for the Moor. In order to ensure that the Arabic word is properly pronounced, so as not to mean 'lions', as the following line refers to the mountain "lioness", the translator adds (الجير) to the noun. Aaron gives us a few lines which speak to our times, reminiscent of the war cry in the 1960's: "Black is

Beautiful!" The rest of Act IV.ii is devoted to Aaron's plan to save his son.

The following scene is generally upbeat: it is where we have a clown, and have Titus and his family and friends shooting arrows randomly carrying Titus' grievances. He is portrayed as having gone mad, and all agree to take care of him, and to "feed his humour kindly as [they] may" (IV.iii.29). They finally decide to send a veiled warning to Saturninus. Act IV, scene iv deals with Saturninus' side of the conflict, showing him and his wife and two children worrying about Titus' success in turning public opinion against them, when a messenger, one Aemilius, arrives to tell them that the Goths have prepared a massive army led by Lucius, Titus' son, and is marching to destroy and plunder Rome. Saturninus is terrified of Lucius and loses his composure, but Tamora, his wife, proposes a ploy to avert the disaster. She sends word to Lucius and his father, informing them that she would like to meet them. She promises to charm Titus "with words more sweet and yet more dangerous/Than baits to fish or honey-stalks to sheep" (IV.v.89-90) so that he may dissuade his son Lucius from attacking Rome. She proposes a meeting with the old man and his son in Titus' house. Saturninus agrees and waits hopefully.

Act V consists of three scenes, the first takes place in the camp of the Gothic army, where Lucius addresses his soldiers. He says that he has received a message from his Roman compatriots confirming Saturninus' worst misgivings, namely that the people hate him and look forward to the impending Gothic invasion for deliverance. Meanwhile, "*Enter a Goth, leading of Aaron with his child in arms"* (a stage direction missed in the Arabic translation) with a report about finding Aaron carrying his baby in a ruined

monastery. This anachronism may be deliberate, as it shows Aaron, the atheist, seeking sanctuary in a Christian place of worship. The place itself strikes the keynote of the conversation about religion between Lucius and Aaron, and a further indication of Shakespeare's consciousness of addressing a Protestant audience. In his attempt to save his child, Aaron appeals to the religious faith of Lucius, promising to make a confession, even in Christian terms, so as to help him realize the truth of what happened. Lucius tells him that his child will live and that he, Lucius, will take care of him. Aaron asks him to swear that he will, hence the following conversation:

Lucius: What should I swear by? Thou
believest no God,
That granted, how canst thou believe an oath?
Aaron: What if I do not? –As indeed I do not,
Yet I know thou are religious,
And hast a thing within thee called conscience
With twenty Popish tricks and ceremonies
Which I have seen the careful to observe,
Therefore I urge thy oath.

(V.i.71-8)

Rabie write:

لوكيوس: وبمن تريدني أن أقسم وأنت لا تؤمن بإله؟

فإذا سلمت بأنك لا تؤمن بإله فكيف تؤمن بقداسة قسم؟

هارون: وماذا لو أنني لا أومن بشيء! إنني حقًا لا أومن

ولكني أعلم أنك ديّن

وأن في قلبك شيئًا اسمه الضمير

وغير ذلك من عشرات الخرافات والعبادات
التي رأيتك تقوم بفروضها في دقة
ولهذا ألح عليك في أن تقسم.

The translator succeeds in presenting the main argument, even adding the word (قداسة) to the "oath" to clarify the intended meaning. She changes the attack on the Roman Catholic rituals by omitting the reference to "Popish" practices. True, the attack on religious ceremonies is conveyed, but their specific nature is lost. Her substitution of (الخرافات) for "Popish" may be defensible in terms of Aaron's rejection of all religion as based on superstition, but this deprives the text of a message intended for the contemporary audience.

Mashati's translation is similar to Rabie's in accuracy and avoidance of translating "Popish tricks" which he manipulated into the innocent (التوسلات والتضرعات):

وأنك مغرم بعشرين نوعًا من التوسلات والتضرعات.

In the confession that follows, Aaron emerges as a replica of Barabas in *The Jew of Malta.* The Arabic translation is on the whole acceptable as it draws a picture of a character who commits heinous crimes for the pleasure of committing them, that is, evil for evil's sake. Though Barabas loves evil for the sake of evil, he seems to regard living as a series of games which he likes to win, rejoicing in the power of victory after every game. Barabas, the Jew, with Ithamore, the Muslim, wallow in the pleasure of defying the dictates of their monotheistic creeds, but Aaron, the atheist, has no belief in any kind of transcendent deity to defy. His materialism renders him too cold to respond to any immaterial ethos. However, he is shocked to face the possibility of losing his own son, his self-

image, and his only hope of a future existence in this world – the only world he is willing to recognize. He regards "murders, rapes, and massacres" as "wondrous things", and that informing Lucius of these things will benefit him greatly, begging him to save his infant and send it to its mother in return for divulging the report of "wondrous things"; he still threatens the Gothic army led by Lucius that vengeance will annihilate them. The crucial lines are:

> Lucius, save the child
> And bear it from me to the Empress.
> If thou do this, I'll show thee wondrous things
> That highly may advantage thee to hear.
> If thou wilt not, befall what may befall,
> I'll speak no more but "Vengeance rot you all!"
>
> (V.i.53-8)

Rabie's version:

هارون: أنقذ الطفل يا لوكيوس

واحمله عني إلى الإمبراطورة

إنك إن فعلت أطلقتك على أمور غريبة

تنفعك أخبارها نفعًا عظيمًا

فإذا لم تفعل، فليكن ما يكون!

إني لن أقول شيئًا إلا قولتي "ألا فلينزل الانتقام بكم جميعًا"

Apart from the pedestrian prose, with its semi-independent sentences, which thus detracts from the cohesion of the lines, the key word, "wondrous", is given as (غريبة), i.e. 'strange', while modern commentators agree that it means 'surprising, wonderful' (Waith and Bate). Aaron promises to "astonish and whet the

appetite of Lucius, even with a promise of worldly good, before playing the common argumentative trick of making a veiled threat" (Evans, 13). Enani's verse rendering (in Bloom's *Shakespeare,* p. 87) seems to present the intended meaning:

إن أنقذت الطفل أيا لوشيوس
ومضيت به للملكة والدته
فسأحكي لك ما تعجب منه وتدهش له!
أخبار وحقائق إن تسمعها جاءت بالخير السابغ لك
لكني لست أبالي إن لم تفعل
بل لن أنبس بعد ببنت شفة.. إلا أن أنذركم
أن الثأر سيحصدكم عن آخركم

Typically, Enani resorts to explicitation, following the opinions of modern critics and commentators, but one is carried along by the rhythm and hardly feels any additions. One such addition is (أخبار وحقائق) instead of "things". Perhaps (أخبار) would be enough as 'things reported' are 'reports' (أخبار), but (حقائق) may be implied by the tone. Towards the end of Act V, scene I, when Aaron has recounted his "news" [and facts?] and Lucius has decided to change the mode of Aaron's execution from simple, quick hanging, which he calls "sweet death" to a mode of death by prolonged thirst and starvation, Aaron is brought down from the high rung of the ladder which he was made to climb in preparation for hanging—way back at Line 53. Back on terra firma, Aaron gives us another reference to a monotheistic idea in which he does not believe, namely that there are "devils" and "everlasting hell-fire". His nonchalance, even defiance, in the face of death is remarkable:

he says he would wish to be truly a devil, if devils do exist, claiming that Lucius would accompany him (147-150).

The deliberate use of monotheistic motifs represents a link with Marlowe's Barabas who, being a Jew, actually believes in the existence of God, devils and 'everlasting fire'. Shakespeare's irony is that however one pays lip service to religion, one's evil actions confirm one's atheism. Both believer and unbeliever who commit crimes are atheists at heart. Aaron is thus a modified image of Barabas, the Jew.

Act V, scene ii, is the scene of dissembling and vengeance par excellence: Tamora intends to convince Titus Andronicus that she is the classical Vengeance (ربة الانتقام), having disguised herself suitably for the performance. She is accompanied by her two sons Chiron and Demetrius, saying that they are called Rape (رب الاغتصاب) and Murder (رب القتل). Titus sees through her disguise and tells her that they look precisely like the Empress and her sons. Intent on winning him over so that he may persuade his son Lucius not to have his Gothic army attack Rome, Tamora insists that she, as Vengeance, will help him take his revenge on his enemies. Asked about her sons, she says they are her ministers, that is, her assistants. The published translation renders "ministers" as (رسل) i.e. messengers or apostles, which is not accurate. The word (رسولان) is the right word, as found in the Qur'an. Moses asked God to appoint his brother Aaron as minister (وأجعل لي وزيرا من أهل هارون أخي) (*Surat Taha,* 24). The verse is invariably translated in this way. Even today, the verb 'to minister (to)' means to give help or service. Another common meaning of the noun is a 'priest'. Outside the technical use in the context of government, the noun still retains its original sense of 'assistant'.

The irony is that while Tamora is hatching the plot in disguise, Titus Andronicus, who has uncovered her real intention, is hatching his counter-plot. Tamora looks forward to a banquet of reconciliation, and Titus agrees, though he plans the banquet to be his revenge for the wrongs committed by Tamora's sons against his daughter Lavinia and the killing of her husband Bassanius, causing two of her brothers to be condemned to death. As soon as Tamora goes out, apparently to dress for the banquet, he confronts her sons, orders them to be gagged, then unveils to them his plan. His speech has always presented difficulties in performance because of the horrific deeds it specifies. It is not translated except as part of the play or as evidence of the atrocious things mentioned. Lines V.ii.180-205 are translated by Enani in his translation of Harold Bloom's *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* pp. 134-5. The revenge consists of killing the rapists/murderers, roasting their heads and cooking them in a pie, whose crust is made of their ground bones then mixed with their blood. Titus actually cuts their throats, while Lavinia collects their blood in a basin, and they all go out, so that Titus may perform his cooking and baking.

Act V, scene iii, is devoted to the banquet scene. Revelations are made. When Tamora has eaten her sons' flesh, much to everyone's surprise, Titus kills Lavinia. Saturninus is shocked:

Titus: Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with
thee,
And with thy shame thy father's sorrow die.
(He kills her)

Saturninus: What has thou done, unnatural
and unkind?

Titus: Killed her for whom my tears have
made me blind.

(V.iii.46-9)

تيتوس : موتي يا لافينيا يهلك معك العار

بذا يهلك معه حزن أبيك القار

(يقتلهما)

ساتورنينوس : ماذا ارتكبت يمناك أيا شاذًا معدوم الإشفاق؟

تيتوس ـ أهلكت فتاة أبكتني حتى أعمت عبراتي الآفاق.

(Enani)

Soon after, Titus Andronicus stabs Tamora, having told her that she has eaten her sons. Quickly Saturninus kills Titus, and is instantly killed by Lucius. The last surviving son of Titus, Lucius becomes the new Emperor of Rome. Aaron's punishment will be meted out later, that is, to be buried alive breast-deep in the earth and be starved to death. We remember that Aaron, for all his crimes, has proved to be a kind father and has saved his swarthy baby by Tamora. "In the mode of Barabas," Bloom says, "Shakespeare, who probably shares our desperate affection for Aaron, allows him the dignity of unrepentant last words" (p. 85). "In the mode of Barabas" is a key phrase, as he thus concludes his role, in the penultimate speech in the play:

Aaron: Ah, why should wrath be mute and
fury dumb?
I am no baby, I, that with base prayers
I should repent the evils I have done.
Ten thousand worse than ever yet I did
Would I perform, if I might have my will.

If one good deed in all my life I did,
I do repent it from my very soul.

(V.iii. 184-90)

And this is conveyed adequately in Enani's translation:

هارون: هَلْ يَظَلُّ الحِقْدُ أَخْرَسْ؟ وتَظَلُّ الغَصْبَةُ الكُبْرَى هُنَا بَكْمَاءْ؟

لَسْتُ طِفْلًا كْ أُصَلِّي نَادِمًا نَدمًا حَقِيرًا

مُعْلِنًا أَنِّي أتوُبُ اليَوْمَ عَمَّا قَدْ فَعَلْتُهُ

لَيْتَ أَنِّي قَادِرٌ أنْ أَفْعَلَ اليَوْمَ مِنَ الآثَامِ

ما يَرْبُو علَى ما كَانَ آلاَفًا مُؤَلَّفَةً

وإذَا كانَ سِجِلِّي فِيه شَئٌ صَالِحٌ كُنْتُ فَعَلْتُهْ

فَأَنَا أَنْدَمُ مِنْ أَعْمَاقِ رُوحِي أنَّ يُمْنَايَ ارْتَضَتْهُ

Now, this so-called dignified stand, though obviously of persistence in evil, is denied Shylock. When Antonio, in *The Merchant of Venice,* suggests as part of the court's "mercy" to Shylock, that the death penalty be excluded in return for Shylock's conversion to Christianity, the Duke agrees and asks Shylock:

Art thou contented, Jew? What dost thou say?

Shylock replies:

I am content. (IV.i. 389-90)

The forced adoption of another religion is regarded as a ruthless and inhuman act by all critics, and it is this that prevents *The Merchant of Venice* from being the happy comedy it is thought to be. Shylock's words "I am content" signifies a departure from the traditional image of the Jew as the indomitable character

represented by Barabas in *The Jew of Malta,* as well as the image of the atheist Aaron in *Titus Andronicus.* It is therefore significant that the earliest translation of *The Merchant of Venice* into Arabic omits the condition proposed by Antonio of converting the Jew to Christianity. Later translations render Antonio's speech intact.

4. Conclusion

The image of the Jew as represented in Arabic translations of Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* is mostly transparent, i.e., reflecting the source text image. However, some forms of manipulation are inevitable because of both cultural backgrounds and personal preferences or literary abilities and talents.

The source text image of the Jew itself is problematic as the play is an early work of Shakespeare where his talents and vision as a dramatist were still nascent and heavily influenced by the cultural background of his own time. While Shakespeare is usually an impartial, humanitarian dramatist, interested in portraying three-dimensional characters, sympathetically delineated as tragic protagonists, he succumbs in this play to the popular crave for revenge dramas and animosity to aliens. Therefore, Aaron, the Jew of *Titus Andronicus*, is portrayed as a demon and a monster although he is seen by some scholars as only a convenient agent to bring forth a heightened revenge theme.

The Arabic translations discussed here reveal a generally accurate rendering of the intended image of the Jew without much manipulation as far as the relevant image is concerned, which can be the result of the traditional unfavourable image in the target culture, displaying animosity towards Jews—an image shared with the Elizabethan audiences. However, in certain cases the image

created by one translator unwittingly, and as a latent personal and cultural disposition, gives even a blacker image (pun unintended). When one of the play's characters refers to the Moor, the translation gives (عبد، عبد أسود، أسود) in different lines.

Manipulation also was displayed in avoiding derogatory references to Christian themes even when they are not adopted by the original author, but only occurred in the condemned language of Aaron as a villain who hates Christians. Thus, it seems that there is no escape of the clutches of a translator's ideological and personal backgrounds—a problem immensely compounded when the translator's manipulation is also driven by simple linguistic or literary miscomprehension. Additionally, a translator's in-depth knowledge of the indispensable insights of Translation Studies, as in the case of M. Enani, makes a world of difference.

Works Cited

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

Bate, Jonathan. *Titus Andronicus: Revised Edition*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2018.

Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead Trade, 1998.

Enani, M. *On Translating Arabic: A Cultural Approach*. Cairo: G.E.B.O. Press, 2000.

———. *On Translating Style into Arabic and into English*. Cairo: Anglo Egyptian Bookshop, 2020.

Evans, Bertrand. *Shakespeare's Tragic Practice*. Oxford : Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford UP, 1979.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Polysystem Studies," *Poetics Today*. Vol. 11, No. 1 (1990).

Hermans, Theo (ed.). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. New York: Routledge, 1985.

Lefevere, André. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Levin, Harry. *The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe*. London: Faber & Faber, 1952.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Seneca: Phaedra*. Cambridge UP, 1990.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. Edited by Cedric Watts, Wordsworth Editions, 1992.

———. *Titus Andronicus*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

———. *King Lear*. Wordsworth Editions, 1994.

Toury, Gideon. "Translated Literature: System, Norm, Performance: Toward a TT-Oriented Approach to Literary Translation." *Poetics Today*, Vol. 2, No. 4, Translation Theory and Intercultural Relations (Summer - Autumn, 1981), pp. 9-27.

Waith, Eugene (ed.). *Titus Andronicus* (Oxford Shakespeare). Oxford Paperbacks, 1984.

Arabic Sources:

شكسبير، وليم. تيتوس أندرونيكوس. ترجمة: صفية ربيع. مراجعة : محمد عوض ، سهير القلماوي. القاهرة: دار المعارف، ١٩٩٣.

———. تيطس أندرونيكوس. ترجمة: أ. ر. مشاطي. بيروت: دار نظير عبود، ١٩٨٩.

عناني، محمد. شكسبير: ابتكار الشخصية الإنسانية (ترجمة) تأليف هارولد بلوم. القاهرة: المركز القومي للترجمة، ٢٠٢١.

———. مرشد المترجم (الطبعة الثالثة). القاهرة: الشركة المصرية العالمية للنشر– لونجمان، ٢٠٠٥.

صورة اليهودي في ترجمات عربية لمسرحية *تيتوس أندرونيكوس*

الملخص:

تستكشف هذه الدراسة صورة اليهودي كما تبدت في ترجمتين عربيتين لإحدى مسرحيات العصر الإليزابيثي في إنجلترا، وهي مسرحية وليام شكسبير "تيتوس أندرونيكوس". وتستمد الدراسة إلهامها من مفاهيم نظرية أساسية أتاحتها دراسات الترجمة، وخاصة نظرية "تعدد النُّظُم" (الأنساق المتعددة)، وتحليل الخطاب، والتداولية، كي توضح علاقة هذه المفاهيم بترجمة الأعمال الدرامية، وخاصة كيف تشكلت صورة اليهودي في ترجمات وإعادة ترجمات عربية. وتثبت الدراسة تأثير عناصر الخلفية الثقافية والسياسية والتاريخية في طريقة نقل المترجم للنص من المصدر إلى الهدف، وكيف تدخلت عدة نُظُم ثقافية وتفاعلت معا في التأثير على المنتج الثقافي المترجم. كما تحاول الدراسة أن تُجري تُحليلا أدبيا متعمقا للنصوص قيد الدراسة بهدف التوصل إلى كيفية تلاعب المترجم، عن قصد أو سهوا وخطأ، بالنص الهدف بحيث يخلق صورة معينة قد لا تكون تلك التي كان يرمي إليها مؤلف النص المصدر. وتحاول الدراسة أن تجيب على سؤال عما إذا كانت الخلفيات الأيديولوجية والثقافية تتدخل في الترجمة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: صورة اليهودي، مسرحية شكسبير "تيتوس أندرونيكوس"، دراسات الترجمة، نظرية تعدد النُّظُم، مقارنة تحليلية، تلاعب، ترجمات عربية، إعادة ترجمات، التداولية.