

Rabab Mizher*

Leaving Readers and Writers in Peace: Translation of Religious Terms of Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* into Arabic considering Venuti's Invisibility

Abstract: This paper is an endeavour to examine the translation of religious terms (praying and oath words) in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* pertaining to two translations by Muhammad al-Sibā'ī (1881-1931) and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1920-1994) into Arabic. This paper seeks to ascertain whether the translators opt for leaving readers in peace and bringing source text (ST) writers' home or leaving writers in peace and sending target text (TT) readers abroad. The study is based on the theoretical framework of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) and the pivotal role the translated literature as facts of the target culture in the poly-system of world literature. The study reveals that each of these translations represents a specific strategy in translation. Visible translator is mostly adopted by Jabra Ibrahim Jabra and invisible translator is mostly adopted by Muhammad al-Sibā'ī.

Keywords: DTS, Religious Terms' Translation, Translated Literature, Translator's invisibility, Translator's visibility.

Introduction

Highly setting the role of translation to bridge the gap between peoples, cultures and languages is to celebrate their diversity to think independently together. By giving a priority to the source text of a literary work as the engine that generates boundless number of readings and interpretations with an aim to enrich world literature, this paper brings to light the worth of considerate, mindful and tactful understanding of translated literature among utterly disparate nations by trying to leave both writers and readers in peace.

The route of this research firstly discusses the Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) approach that attempts to categorize the translations as they have been done, instead of, to prescribe them as how they should be done (Holmes

* Al-Balqa Applied University, Jordan.

1954:176). Secondly, it underpins the tacit role of “translated literature as an integral system within any literary poly-system” (Even-Zohar 1990:193) paving its way of being “facts of target cultures” (Toury qtd. in Munday 2012:170). Then the researcher highlights the concept of equivalence in translating religious terms.

Finally, the researcher explores the strategies utilized by two eminent Arabic translators Muhammad al-Sibā‘ī (1881-1931) and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1920-1994) when translating religious terms (praying and oath words) in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus* into Arabic. It seeks to determine whether the translators have had an inclination toward leaving readers in peace and bringing source text (ST) writers’ home or leaving writers in peace and sending target text (TT) readers abroad or mingled both. To this aim, the researcher attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the religious terms (praying and oath words) in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*?
2. How are these terms translated into Arabic by Muhammad al-Sibā‘ī and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra?
3. What is/are the strategy/strategies utilized by Muhammad al-Sibā‘ī and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra in translating these terms?
4. Have the translators used any religious terms (praying and oath words) in their target texts that have no direct equivalents in the source text?

Descriptive translation studies (DTS)

Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) emerged in the late 1970s and 1980s (Munday 2012:21). This approach marked translation departure from the normative prescriptive approach that portrayed translation of being correct and incorrect. The main objectives of DTS introduced by Holmes (1954:176) in his seminal paper “The Name and the Nature of Translation Studies” are: “(1) to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience, and (2) to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted because DTS ‘maintains the closest contact with the empirical phenomena under study.’”

Holmes (1954:176-177) identifies three major types of research under the umbrella of DTS. Although they might be interdependent, still each one embraces a research type of its own. Firstly, process-oriented DTS research pursues to describe what is happening in the translator’s mind during the process of translation; it is the mental process of the translator’s making-decision. It might fall within the domain of future studies of translation psychology. Function-oriented DTS research aims to describe the context, not the texts. So, it might be concerned with the future research of translation sociology. Finally,

product-oriented research attempts to provide comparative-contrastive analysis of the original literary work and its translation(s). Descriptive surveys of this approach might be synchronic or diachronic. However, the present study falls within the domain of the product-oriented branch, for it is a comparative/contrastive descriptive analysis of *Coriolanus* and its two translations.

The pivotal role of translated literature in the poly-system of literary genres is explored thoroughly by Even-Zohar. Even-Zohar (1990:192-7) argues that translated literature could be examined by two ways. On the one hand, the criteria of selecting the source texts to be translated and whether they are compatible with “the home co-systems of the target literature” (1990:193). On the other hand, the way the source texts assume specific norms, or behaviours that reflect the source texts culture. Accordingly, the resulting translated literature may undertake ‘a repertoire of its own’ that makes it occupy a system within “the home co-systems of the target literature” (ibid.). Furthermore, translated literature does not only assume a position in the target culture whether primary or secondary, but also is considered as “facts of the target culture” (Toury qtd. in Munday 2012:170). Toury perceives translated activities and their products as facts in a target culture. Thus, they do cause changes in that culture, and these changes are meant to fill an existing gap in that culture.

The relationship between culture and language is stressed and deeply investigated by many writers and researchers. Translation is a process that deals with languages and language is a mirror of culture, as a result, translation from one language to another is a cross-cultural communication interaction. Newmark (1988:94) defines culture as “... the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expressions.” Moreover, Casagrande (1954:338) states it clearly that “in effect, one doesn’t translate LANGUAGES, one translates CULTURES.” Bassnett (2002:6) portrays translation as “a process of negotiation between texts and between cultures.” Lefeveré (2003:6) refers to the concept that translating from one language to another does not mean that all characteristics of original language, particularly culture-bound features, are acceptable by target language receiver. Therefore, if the translator provides intolerable equivalent, his/her translation will not leave the required effect on the target text audience. This rebuttal is mounted when dealing with translation of religious terms.

The concept of equivalence in translation of religious terms in literary texts has gained the interest of many researchers. Hatim and Mason’s (1990:8) definition of equivalence implies that there is no equal equivalent in the target text (TT) element of the source text (ST) element. Newmark (1988:48) emphasizes the issue of equivalent effect as “it has sometimes been said that the overriding purpose of any translation should be to achieve “equivalent effect”, i.e. to produce the same effect (or one as close as possible) on the readership of the translation as was obtained in the readership of the original.” Dealing with

equivalence as the “closest possible approximation of ST meaning” (Hatim and Mason 1990:8) or with an aim to leave the same effect on target text reader as that of the source text reader is highlighted when translating culture-bound expressions.

Religious Terms Translation

Larsen believes that the translation of religious cultural terms is usually a complicated process “both in analysis of the source vocabulary and in finding the best receptor language equivalents” (1984:180). “The reason is that these words are intangible and many of the practices are so automatic that the speakers of the language are not as conscious of the various aspects of meaning involved” (Larsen 1984:180). Considering religion as one of the main forces that dominate any culture, especially the Arab culture. Amin-Zaki goes beyond and state that

[I]n the Arab world, Islamic culture predominates. While there have always been significant numbers of Christian and Jewish Arabs, Islamic culture—in the use of language, for instance—has exerted a tremendous influence even on non-Muslims in the Arab world. Accordingly, translators usually eschew those references which might give offence to a Muslim audience (1995:223).

The implications of cultural religious terms are hard to attain. However, some of these terms are of specialized meanings that suggest many connotations rather than the exact meaning of the terms themselves like الصلاة (prayer) or الصيام (fasting) because they have equivalents in Christianity, but they do not have the same implications or emotive meaning as in Islam. The problem is further complicated in translating words that do not originally occur in the target language like (زكاة – alms¹) [¹<https://www.almaany.com/>] or جهاد (a holy war or a war waged in support of religious cause²) [²<https://www.almaany.com/>]. These themes and concepts, from the point of view of some Muslims, are untranslatable because of their implications, emotive meaning and above all their absence in any other religion, i.e. language. For instance, translating جازكاة ‘alms’ underestimates its meaning because it is an obligatory tax paid by rich Muslims whose money reached a certain amount. Accordingly, the religious themes and concepts of this paper will only be restricted to the words of “God”, “gods”, “heaven”, and “oath and praying words”—provided that they are accompanied by “God” or “gods”—in the source text and the two target texts under investigation.

In Summary, the notion of equivalence becomes problematic when the translator deals with culture-bound expressions, particularly religious terms. According to Venuti, the translator has two binary antonyms, s/he either keeps

the source language values prominent by being visible to the reader or domesticates them to make them part of the target language and thus being invisible to the reader.

Visibility vs Invisibility

Friedrich Schleiermacher, who is considered “the founder of modern hermeneutics” and could be viewed as the initiator of “translational hermeneutics” (Cercel et al. 2015:18), is the pioneer who differentiates between two types of translators, namely, those who translate commercial texts and those who translate scholarly and artistic texts, and the latter breathe new life into the language (Munday 2012:45-46). Schleiermacher presented his theory in his prominent essay “On the Different Methods of Translating” in 1813. According to him, the translator either “leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him” (Schleiermacher 1813: 49). His approach to translation prepared the ground for modern translation studies that “Nida’s formal and dynamic equivalence, Newmark’s semantic and communicative translation, ... Venuti’s resistant and transparent translations are just a few examples of [his] tradition” (Al-Ali and Le’ibi 2018: 7-8). Such a notion has introduced the visible translator (leaving ST writers in peace) versus invisible translator (leaving TT readers in peace).

Considering that Schleiermacher main concern is to bring the writer of the ST and the reader of the TT together, he assigns a privileged respect to the ST culture, i.e. the visible translator who “leave[s] the writer in peace as much as possible and moves the reader towards him” (1813:49). In this way, the TT reader will be brought to “an understanding and enjoyment” of the ST reader “as correct and complete as possible without inviting [TT reader] to leave the sphere of his mother tongue” (Venuti 2004: 100). In their analysis of the above essay, Al-Ali and Le’ibi explain that the translator who leaves the author in peace “should preserve the art of the original, [its] touch, smell and music through the target text” (2018:23).

Furthermore, the TT readers of visible translation will have the sense that they are reading a translated foreign text. The translator will be attached to the ST as much as the TL tolerates. As a result, target languages will be flourished and enriched through their direct contact with source languages, and it will enable “languages to revive their antiquities and classical works” (Al-Ali and Le’ibi 2018: 9). Venuti introduces the visible translator as the one who preserves the ST and sends the reader abroad since “translation enlists the foreign text in... the revision of literary canons in the target-language culture” (2004:19). In other words, if the target language reader observes the task of the translator then it is a foreign text or a translated text.

On the other hand, if the translator is invisible, then the ST author is brought home (TL home). The translated text will appear as if it is an original text and thus it will have the same effect on its new readers. Although Schleiermacher (1813:44-45) might adopt this method in translating commercial texts, he is not in favour of applying it on literary texts because such a practice will not bring new life into the target language (Munday 2012: 45-46) which is one of the main functions of translating literary texts.

For Schleiermacher (1813:49), the translator who brings the author home (TL home), will not only make this author a TL native speaker, but will also portray him/her as if he/she has been born in the TL culture. This translator tries to show how the literary work of ST writer is prominent to its source language and culture by allowing the TT reader to reach that author as if the ST has been developed originally for the target reader (Al-Ali and Le'ibi (2018:23). However, it is not advisable for a translator to be both visible and invisible within the same text because "any attempt to combine them being certain to produce a highly unreliable result that the writer and the reader might miss each other completely" (Schleiermacher 1813:49). Although it is difficult to achieve, Schleiermacher explains that the translator might be invisible only if the two texts, i.e. ST and TT have been developed simultaneously (Al-Ali and Le'ibi 2018: 23).

Venuti has supported Schleiermacher's vision by trying to "make the translator visible to resist and change the conditions under which translation is theorized and practiced... in English speaking countries" (Venuti 2004: 17). According to Venuti (2004:1), the invisibility of a translated text is accepted when it is fluent and transparent due to the lack of "any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities." Such translator's invisibility is multifaceted. While focusing on translation from other languages into English, the selection of the material to be translated ought to be in harmony with Anglo-American cultures.

Literature Review

Several studies have been conducted to trace the difficulty of translating religious terms from Arabic into English / English into Arabic due to their sensitivity in the Arab World. The analysis of the translation of English literary works (novels, poems and plays) into Arabic has received much attention by scholars as well. More specifically, in addition to the literary criticism of the translations of Shakespeare's sonnets and plays, these works have been investigated thoroughly considering different facets; socially, politically, psychologically, linguistically ...etc. The current review, however, is restricted to some representative studies that attempt to portray Shakespeare for the Arab readers through thoughtful focus on translation studies.

The most relevant study is conducted by Amel Amin-Zaki (1995) in her article “Religious and Cultural Considerations in Translating Shakespeare into Arabic.” She investigates the difficulties encountered by Arab translators in translating Shakespeare’s plays. Since Shakespeare assumes that “his audience are familiar with classical and renaissance cultures and literatures” (1995:223), the translator’s unfamiliarity with such background will bring about misinterpretations. Among many Arab translators of Shakespeare’s, Amin-Zaki (1995:225) considered “serious translators” of late nineteenth and early twentieth century like Muhammad al-Sibā’ī, Muhammad al-Qadi, Ali Atieh, Khalil Mutran and Sami al-Juraydini. On the other hand, she has studied the translations of Jabra Ibrahim Jabra, Abd al-Qader al-Qitt and Abd al-Wahid Lu’luah as “well acquainted with the multifarious aspects of their self-appointed task ...[and are] aware of Elizabethan culture and have a sound grasp of Shakespearean language” (1995:225). In her study, she focuses on two aspects: translation of oaths and translation of ribaldry material in public. The second aspect of her study is irrelevant for the current study, and therefore only the findings of the first aspect will be discussed. The findings of her research reveal that some successful translators identify the worthiness to “choose an image which conveys to the Muslim audience the meaning of Shakespeare’s original, rather than rendering literally Shakespeare’s imagery” (1995:23). These translators assume that the literal rendering of these “blasphemous oaths might ‘offend’ the audience and ‘drive them away’.”

Consequently, these translators amend the oath to conform with Islamic beliefs or totally skip it to “avoid embarrassment.” For instance, the oath by Caius Marcus talking to Menenius in *Coriolanus* ‘Sdeath’ (4:1:239) which means “By God’s death” is “considered blasphemous” by Muslims because Islam rejects the divinity of the Christ. Whereas “this expression refers to the Christian belief that Christ ... died on the cross” (1995:227). If the translator uses the literal translation, the Muslim audience will regard it as “an absurd utterance.” Al-Sibā’ī has translated it as أقسم بالموت الزؤام (I swear by sudden death). Alternatively, the other type of translators tries to manage to remain close to the original without Islamizing the oath. The above example is translated by Jabra Ibrahim Jabra as باللعنة (O, damnation). It is “a completely different, though less Islamic, interpretation” (1995:227) for these translators—Jabra Ibrahim Jabra is one of them—are well-familiarized with the Elizabethan culture (1995:225).

Tageldin (2011) portrays al-Sibā’ī’s approach from different facet. She discusses the translation movement during al-nahda (renaissance) in Egypt in her article “Surrogate Seed, World Tree: Mubāarak, al-Sibā’ī, and the Translations of “Islam” in British Egypt, 1882–1912.” She states that Evelyn Baring, first Earl of Cromer, considered that “English literature would do, half by accident, what English colonial policy would not.” Tageldin alludes that:

Empire awaits the agency of the native translator to disseminate its power in native soil; nation hopes that that very soil, fertilized by the native translator, might regenerate the colonized as the colonizer's "likeness" and—through that slow translation—transform the colonial subordinate into the national sovereign (2011).

Tageldin detects several occurrences in al-Sibā'ī's translation of Thomas Carlyle's *On Heroes* into Arabic by using "Quran's tones" purposefully. He, for instance, translated the description of Prophet Muhammad as the "'life guidance' into 'al-sirāja al-munīra,' the 'light giving lamp,' echoing the Qur'ānic description of the Prophet as 'sirājan munīran' (Qur'ān 33:46)." Having al-Sibā'ī translating the English religious terms into Islamic Arabic terms will create a sort of harmony between the colonizer and the colonized. She argues that al-Sibā'ī aim is to imagine "a shared Islam" between the colonizer and the colonized. Thus al-Sibā'ī rejection of British authority is reversed through his "recognition of a religious impulse in English literature."

In summary, both Amin-Zaki (1990) and Tageldin (2011) provide a subtle innocent justification for al-Sibā'ī's intentions to Islamise the English source text. Amin-Zaki, ostensibly, is in line with the approach that the translator's aim is not to offend the target text reader and to enable him/her to evaluate the aesthetic values of the source text. Tageldin, on the other hand, stresses that al-Sibā'ī's literary achievement "was to make British thought so 'natural' to Egyptian soil that it seemed native to it," by a means of Carlyle's voice to "[revalidate] the possibility of at once embracing European modernity and recovering Islam."

Amin-Zaki (1995:239) discusses also the concept of the time in translation. While al-Siba'ī was in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, other translators like Jabra was in the mid and late twentieth century. According to her, "[the] success of Jabra's translations is an indication that audiences have become more sophisticated with time, and that they may be far more willing to tolerate" (Amin-Zaki 1995:239). According to Hanna (2007), this tolerance has two justifications in Egypt. The first one is the secularization of education by Mohammad Ali and his successors. The other one is the violence in Levant that led the Christians who were educated in French missionary schools to immigrate to Egypt and make it easy to break away from classical norms and aesthetics of Arabic-Islamic tradition. These factors set the ground for the emergence of "young Egyptians ... who needed new forms of culture that would respond to their newly formed tastes" (29-30).

Hanna (2007:29) examines Shakespeare translations into Arabic during the second half of nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Egypt. According to him, there were three types of sociocultural groups of audience: namely the old intellectual elite like al-Azhar students, the new intellectual elite like

Christian Levantines in Egypt and the masses. The last group includes most Egyptians who are characterized of being peasants, small traders, urban workers, unemployed individuals with little or no education. The early stage of these translations was for theatregoers; the majority are the masses. Theatre for them is for entertainment and pastimes. The commercial success of drama culture at that time influenced the translators' choices to make compromises that are compatible with the views of the audience. Consequently, drama translations were dependent on the economic pressure. Hanna speculates that the emergence of the new elite of the Levantines shifted the commercially oriented translations to loyalty-oriented translations. As they do not face financial challenges, the new elite of intellectuals stick more to the source text, and Shakespeare translation—according to them—is 'for study and mediation through reading' (Hanna 2007:33). They have appealed to the support of highly respected intellectual figures to 'establish the legitimacy of the translation, based on criteria other than commercial success' (Hanna 2007:36). So, they have focused on 'a purported fidelity of the original text' (ibid.) and have made the minimum number of compromises.

Ghazoul (1998) studies the translation of Shakespeare's *Othello* into Arabic by different Arab translators and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra is one of them. Jabra follows certain measures such as providing an introduction to *Othello*, a textual history of the play and a preface to A. C. Bradley's famous study of *Othello* for his main concern is to "[contextualize] the work in its own historical and cultural situation, rather than appropriating it" (1998:5). Moreover, Jabra struggles to resettle the translated text in the target culture while preserving the identity of the source culture, i.e. "the other" since Shakespeare's translations for him are "sacred texts" and there is no room for tolerance (1998:5). Jabra, apparently, has a well-defined style in translating Shakespeare. Amin-Zaki, Hanna, and Ghazoul and many other scholars have emphasized his fidelity to the source text without jeopardizing the target text canons and culture.

Mattar's (2014) study is neither related to Shakespeare, nor to the Arabic language. He explores the foreignizing (visible translator) of *The Black Book* (a Turkish novel) for the world literature. Relying upon Bourdieu's consideration of translation as "socially situated phenomenon," (al-Mousawi, 2016), and upon "re-theorizing language as a repository of cultural values and meaning," Mattar endeavours to probe domestication/foreignization (translator's invisibility and visibility) as linguistic categories and to "repurpose them for a sociology of translation of wider value of literary studies" (44). His argument is based on the idea that the context of the translation content whether production, reception, or circulation, which are "assessed by literary sociology, pre-frame the appreciation of the foreign text and pre-determine the political effects of the language" (44). He attempts to preserve the values of the source

text and culture (Turkish culture in this case) in world literature (English language) since domesticating (translator's invisibility) the ST in accordance with "Western aesthetic criteria" obscures its contribution to the national history and culture (Turkish culture in this case), i.e. it conceals its foreignness (translator's visibility).

Translation of Religious Terms in *Coriolanus* into Arabic

As every reading of a text is a unique, unrepeatable act and thus a text is bound to evoke divergent responses in different receivers (Hatem and Mason 1990), both translators have approached the source text in different ways. Muhammad al-Sibā'ī (1881-1931) is one of the most famous reputable Arabic Egyptian translators and a teacher who was born to a Muslim family, renowned for religious knowledge. Although al-Sibā'ī rejected the British authority in Egypt, his approach to translate the English literature is characterized by a liberal secular thought in a way that "his work ultimately reoriented literary translation in Egypt toward English" (Tageldin, 2011). Alternatively, Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1920-1994), a Palestinian writer, painter, and translator, studied in Jerusalem and later at Cambridge and Harvard universities. Along with the translation of some Shakespearean works, he translated the works of other great Western authors like William Faulkner, Samuel Beckett and Oscar Wilde. The concept that his translation of *Coriolanus* mirrors the Elizabethan culture (Amin-Zaki 1995:225) signifies his visibility as a translator.

The researcher has examined the three texts for religious terms (praying and oath words) in the three texts. Then these terms have been categorized into two main groups. The first group includes the word god, with all its variations, and the names of the Roman gods that appeared in the source text (*Coriolanus*) along with their equivalents in the two target texts by Muhammad Al-Sibā'ī (1911) and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1974). The terms are god, gods, godded, goddess, Jove, Jupiter, Mars, Juno, Pluto, Neptune, and Diana's Temple. The word "heavens" has a special treatment. The second group includes all the religious terms that have appeared in the target texts by Muhammad Al-Sibā'ī (1911) and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1974) and do not have any religious equivalents in the source text. Yet there are terms that may not be regarded as praying or oath words in the target texts, but still they have religious connotations. More specifically are the terms that have 'Quranic tone'. Although they are very few, they still help in shaping the translator's strategy in processing translation. Terms that the first group have includes occurred 75 times and translated as follows (see Tables 1, 2, 3).

Table 1. The Word Gods in the ST and its Translations in the TTs

No.	Coriolanus	Al-Sibā'ī's Translation	Jabra's Translation	No.	Coriolanus	Al-Sibā'ī's Translation	Jabra's Translation
1	1:1:23	الله	الالهة	24	3:3:95	الالهة	الالهة
2	1:1:75	الله	الالهة	25	3:3:173	الله	الالهة
3	1:1:199	----	الالهة	26	4:1:45	الله	للالهة
4	1:1:225	لم تخلق	الالهة	27	4:1:66	----	الالهة
5	1:1:292	الالهة	الالهة	28	4:2:16	الله	الالهة
6	1:2:44	الله	الالهة	29	4:2:61	الالهة	الالهة
7	1:6:7	الهة الرومان	الهة روما	30	4:5:149	----	الالهة
8	1:6:29	الهة السموات	يا للالهة	31	4:6:23	الله	الالهة
9	1:8:7	الالهة	يا للالهة	32	4:6:32	الله	الالهة
10	1:9:9	الله	الالهة	33	4:6:45	الله	الالهة
11	1:9:87	الالهة	الالهة	34	4:6:193	الله	الالهة
12	2:1:125	الله	الالهة	35	5:2:74	الالهة	الالهة
13	2:1:146	الله	الالهة	36	5:2:82	الله	الالهة
14	2:1:177	الالهة	الالهة	37	5:3:31	الالهة	الالهة
15	2:1:190	الله	الالهة	38	5:3:55	الله	الهة
16	2:3:59	----	يا للالهة	39	5:3:123	الله	للالهة
17	2:3:121	الله	الالهة	40	5:3:172	----	الالهة
18	2:3:146	الله	الالهة	41	5:3:188	الله	الالهة
19	2:3:173	الله	الالهة	42	5:3:207	الالهة	الالهة
20	3:1:295	الله	الالهة	43	5:4:32	الله	الالهة
21	3:1:373	الله	الالهة	44	5:4:33	الالهة	الالهة
22	3:2:49	للالهة	الالهة	45	5:4:63	الله	الالهة
23	3:3:44	الله	الالهة	46	5:5:2	الله	الالهة

The word “gods” is literally translated into Arabic as (الآلهة – gods) – which is mainly adopted by Jabra (1974) as literal visible translation. al-Sibā'ī however, used three strategies. The literal visible translation is used for 13 times only out of 46 times. In contrast, the invisible, non-offensive term of الله (literal translation of God)(Amin-Zaki 1995) is used 27 times which is almost twice the times. The words الآلهة(gods) and الله (God) are the two extremes: polytheism vs monotheism. The third strategy is avoidance or deletion, and it is used to the minimum, 6 times only. The tendency toward Islamization of polytheism terms as perceived by Amin-Zaki is quite evident in al-Sibā'ī's translation. Amin-Zaki (1995) justifies the Arab translator's use of Islamic terms in translating Shakespearean plays into Arabic as not to offend the audience by “a character's statements that its appreciation of the larger work might be compromised [and the literal translation of blasphemous oaths] would be highly offensive to any audience in the Islamic world.” (1995:224). This inclination has also been observed by Tageldin (2011) who regards it as an alignment between the “secular” English and Islam because al-Sibā'ī's aim is to reconcile Islam with European modernity.

Table 2. The Word God and its Variations in the ST and their Translations in the TTs

The Term	Coriolanus	Al-Sibā'ī's Translation	Jabra's Translation	The Term	Coriolanus	Al-Sibā'ī's Translation	Jabra's Translation
God	2:1:149	الله	الله	god	5:3:81	الاله	رب الجنود
god	2:1:239	إله	الاله	god	5:4:24	الالهة	الاله
God	2:3:148	الله	الله	god	5:6:120	الاله	الاله
god	3:1:107	كأنك آله	كأنك إله	godded	5:3:13	يعيدني	يوهني
god	4:6:115	أهم المعبود	انه الههم	goddess	1:5:23	-----	ربة الدهر

This discrepancy in translating “gods” between the two translators has almost disappeared in translating the word “god”. The contextual occurrences of “god” in the source text reveals the one god among others and not the single god. In other words, the literal translation of “one god” or “a god” is رب or إله; the plural form of these two semantically indefinite noun phrases is “gods” which is literally translated as الآلهة. Nonetheless, the single God in Islam is the only God, and it does not have a plural form, thus, the Arabic term of God is الله which is semantically definite noun phrase. The two translators are almost congruent in their translations of the word “god”. They fluctuate between the one god/ a god as إله or رب and the single God as الله. Both translate “God” as الله when it is capitalized in English. Moreover, in the ST (5:3:81-2), Coriolanus is addressing young Martius: “The god of soldiers, With the consent of supreme Jove, inform Thy thoughts”, while al-Sibā'ī has combined the two references to the religious terms—god and Jupiter—into one equivalent as حقق الاله اقوالك, Jabra—having total loyalty to the source text—is consistent in his visibility as a translator and fidelity to the source text in literally translating these two religious terms as رب الجنود and العلي جوبيتر!

Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1974) has not opted for the compromise of the other reverence by being a visible translator. Jabra's loyalty to the original text deepens his visibility as a translator who is willing to leave the writer in peace and bring the reader towards him/her. al-Sibā'ī, on the other hand, has chosen to leave the reader in peace and bring the writer toward him by utilizing different strategies. For example, he has provided a functional and dynamic equivalent to Martius' praying words: “Pluto and hell!” (1:4:48) as اين انت يا مالك واين جهنم لتبتلعهم (Amin-Zaki, 1995:229-30), an Islamic equivalent to Valeria's praying and sympathy words: “His bloody brow? O Jupiter, no blood!” (1:3:41) as اللهم رحمتك and sometimes literal equivalent to Martius praying words: “Now, Mars, I prithee,” (1:4:14) as واني ابتهل اليك ايها المريخ اله الحرب. Whereas Jabra has opted for the strategy of transliteration in translating almost all the names of the Roman gods as: (يا لبلوتو والجحيم) (يا لبلوتو، لا دم!) (جيبينه الدامي! أه جوبيتر، لا دم!) (يا لبلوتو والجحيم). (مارس، رجائي). This strategy is accompanied by a footnote (a strategy never used by al-Sibā'ī) such as مثل جونو* and the footnote explains the connotation of the use of this god زوجة رب الآلهة جوبيتر وهي شديدة الحقد في غضبها* (see Table 3).

Table 3. The Roman Gods in the ST and their Translations in the TTs

The term	Coriolanus	al-Sibā'ī's translation	Jabra's translation	The term	Coriolanus	al-Sibā'ī's translation	Jabra's translation
Jove	2:1:298	الاله الاعظم	جوبيتر	Mars	4:5:131	اله الحروب	و حق مارس
Jove	3:1:114	-----	و حق جوبيتر	Mars	4:5:212	ابن المريخ (اله الحرب)	ابن الاله مارس
Jove	3:1:139	الالهة	قسما بجوبيتر	Mars	5:6:119	اله الحرب	مارس
Jove	3:1:328	-----	جوبيتر	Pluto	1:4:48	ابن انت يا مالك وابن جهنم لتبتلعهم	يا ليلوتو والجحيم
Jove	3:1:376	-----	جوبيتر	Juno	2:1:104	بحق الالهة	حبا جونو
Jove	5:3:82	-----	جوبيتر	Juno	4:2:72	-----	مثل جونو*
Jupiter	1:3:41	اللهم رحمتك	اه جوبيتر				*زوجة رب الالهة جوبيتر وهي شديدة الحقد في غضبها
Jupiter	1:9:101	حق و الله	و حق جوبيتر	Queen of Heaven	5:3:53	الالهة	بملكة السماء* الغيرى الغضوب
Jupiter	2:1:108	لك اللهم	يا جوبيتر				* أي جونو، زوجة زيوس، حامية الزواج، والمنتقمة من أهل الخيانة الزوجية.
Jupiter	4:5:115	الاله	جوبيتر				
Dian's	5:3:77	هيكل الالهة	هيكل ديانا	modest moon	1:1:293	الهة العفة	حشمة القمر* ربة القمر- اله العفاف
Neptune	3:1:327	الالهة	نبتون				
Mars	1:4:14	ايها المريخ اله الحرب	يا مارس				

The second group includes all the praying and oath words that have appeared in the target texts by Muhammad Al-Sibā'ī (1911) and Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1974) and do not have any direct religious equivalents in the source text Table 4 summarizes their presence in the five acts.

Table 4. Religious terms Frequency in the TTs that have no Equivalents the ST

Coriolanus	al-Sibā'ī's Translation	Jabra's Translation
Act 1	38	5
Act 2	17	-----
Act 3	8	---
Act 4	14	1
Act 5	12	---
Total	89	6

The numbers per each translator are the occurrences of these religious terms: ربك، الالهة، الله، اللهم، in their translations. Whilst Jabra has used them to the minimum, al-Sibā'ī has used them to the most especially, the word الله (single God) which has appeared almost 71 times out of 89 compared to 2 times out

of 6 in Jabra's translation. al-Sibā'ī, for instance, would prefer to translate: "I leave your honours (1:2:40) as استودعكم الله ايها السادة الاشراف while Jabra would say : اني اترككم ايها السادة . Furthermore, al-Sibā'ī would translate " Farewell" (1:2:46 – 47-48) as نستودعك الله and في رعاية الله وعنايته , في ذمة الله الكريم وحفواته . Whereas Jabra would say وداعا مع السلامة , مع السلامة , مع السلامة . Repetition of الله only—though very high—is not enough unless it is accompanied by references from The Holy Quran, Sunna (statements by Prophet Muhammad—may peace be upon him) and religious books. These are fully demonstrated in Muhammad al-Sibā'ī's translation (1911). He does not spare any occasion where he could reverberate "the Qur'ānic tones" (Tageldin, 2001). The following are self-explanatory examples:

1.a. Coriolanus: Go, masters, get you home. Be not dismayed (4:6:189)

b. Jabra: هلموا يا سادة، الى بيوتكم. لا تفزعوا

c. al- Sibā'ī: اذهبوا يا سادة الى بيوتكم. و لا تقنطوا من رحمة الله :

d. Surat Al-Zumar (The Troops): 39:53

قُلْ يَا عِبَادِيَ الَّذِينَ أَسْرَفُوا عَلَىٰ أَنفُسِهِمْ لَا تَقْنَطُوا مِن رَّحْمَةِ اللَّهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَغْفِرُ الذُّنُوبَ جَمِيعًا إِنَّهُ هُوَ الْغَفُورُ الرَّحِيمُ (53)

Translation of meanings: Say, "O My servants who have transgressed against themselves [by sinning], do not despair of the mercy of Allah. Indeed, Allah forgives all sins. Indeed, it is He who is the Forgiving, the Merciful.

2.a. Coriolanus: I say to you, as I was said to, away! (5:2:113)

b. Jabra: ولكما أقول، ما قيل لي: انصرفا!

c. al- Sibā'ī: فاذهبا عليكما لعنة الله الى يوم الدين :

d. Surat Al-Hijr (The Rocky Tract): :15:34-35

قَالَ فَأَخْرِجْ مِنْهَا فَأَنَّكَ رَجِيمٌ (34) وَإِنَّ عَلَيْكَ اللَّعْنَةَ إِلَىٰ يَوْمِ الدِّينِ (35)

Translation of meanings: [Allah] said, "Then get out of it, for indeed, you are expelled. (34) And indeed, upon you is the curse until the Day of Recompense. (35)

3.a. Coriolanus: And affecting one sole throne, without assistance. (4:6:41)

b. Jabra: عاقد العزم على العرش بمفرده

c. al- Sibā'ī: وطامح الى الاستبداد بالسلطة والاستئثار بالملك يحكمه وحده لا شريك له :

d. Surat Al-An'am (The Cattle): 6:163

لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُ ۚ وَبِذَلِكَ أُمِرْتُ وَأَنَا أَوَّلُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ (163)

Translation of meanings: No partner has He. And this I have been commanded, and I am the first (among you) of the Muslims.

4.a. Coriolanus: The rabble should have first unroofed the city. (1:1:240)

b. Jabra: ان يطيحوا بأعلى المدينة

c. al- Sibā'ī: تركوها خاوية على عروشها

d. Surat Al-Baqarah (The Cow) 2:259

أَوْ كَالَّذِي مَرَّ عَلَى قَرْيَةٍ وَهِيَ خَاوِيَةٌ عَلَى عُرُوشِهَا... (259)

Translation of meanings: Or [consider such an example] as the one who passed by a township which had fallen into ruin.

5.a. Coriolanus: For the dearth, Gods, not the patricians, make it, (1:1:74)

b. Jabra: فالقحط من صنع الالهة لا الاشراف

c. al- Sibā'ī: علمتم ان الجذب محنة الله يصيب بها من يشاء وما هو من فعل الحكام

d. Surat Al-Ra'd (The Thunder) 13:13

وَيُسَبِّحُ الرَّعْدُ بِحَمْدِهِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ مِنْ خِيفَتِهِ وَيُرْسِلُ الصَّوَاعِقَ فَيُصِيبُ بِهَا مَنْ يَشَاءُ... (13)

Translation of meanings: And the thunder exalts [Allah] with praise of Him - and the angels [as well] from fear of Him - and He sends thunderbolts and strikes there with whom He wills....

6.a. Coriolanus: Th' honored gods keep Rome in safety (3:3:43)

b. Jabra: ألا حفظت الالهة الكريمة لروما أمنها

c. al- Sibā'ī: صان الله دولة روما و أمنها من خوف

d. Surat Quraysh (Quraysh) 106: 4

الَّذِي أَطْعَمَهُمْ مِّنْ جُوعٍ وَآمَنَهُمْ مِّنْ خَوْفٍ (4)

Translation of meanings: Who has fed them, [saving them] from hunger and made them safe, [saving them] from fear

'Th' honored gods keep Rome in safety' is translated as ألا حفظت الالهة without making any allusion to any of Qur'ānic terms by preserving the polytheistic content 'gods' as Arabic plural الالهة. The expression in Arabic و أمنها من خوف translated literally as 'keep it safe from fear' does not exist in the English text (ST) but it has been rather used by al-Sibā'ī to draw

the TT audience attention to the verses of the Holy Quran. These Qura'nic expressions and many others like those highlighted by Amin-Zaki (1995:229,234) undoubtedly reveal the invisible translator that Muhammad al-Sibā'ī has in mind, while translating religious terms in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*. Whether his aim is not to offend the audience as stated by Amin-Zaki, or to simply allow the reader to lavishly appreciate the aesthetic values and rhetoric of the source text to widen the room of interaction between the new text and the reader, Muhammad al-Sibā'ī left the readers in peace and brought the writer towards them. Such distortion of facts or manipulation of readers' thoughts may not serve the aim of translated literature to bridge the gap between cultures by mutual understanding and acceptance of the other. The invisibility of the translator in dealing with religious concepts is a sort of betrayal to one's doctrines and beliefs.

The invisibility of the translator in translating religious terms is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, religious terms echo the Pre-Islamic Period of polytheism, when people worship more than one god. By using monotheistic Islamic jargon to translate them, the translator will alienate the text, for the text will appear as if it has been written by a Muslim. Target text readers ought to consider this as an invasion to their beliefs and culture. On the other hand, the fluency of the text will reflect its transparency with an aim to make the readers identify with the text as if it has been written for them. As a result, they will be able to appreciate the aesthetic features of the masterpiece while emphasizing the sympathy and communality of mankind promoting Nida's dynamic equivalence that links the translator to the missionary (Venuti 2004:22) but this time, from different perspective leading to a total distortion of the religion and culture of the source text (English text).

Jabra, in contrast, "systematically sticks to the original key metaphors" (Ghazoul, 1998). Considering the above-mentioned examples, in *Coriolanus*' speech "away!" (5:2:113) is simply translated as "انصرفا" (literally "go away") and "without assistance" (4:6:41) as "بمفرده" (literally on his own). This is because his "translations were mostly attempting to open a window to the West and to modernism in Arabic letters and Arab arts," (Ballouta, 2001:222). The course of action of Jabra's visibility has positive and negative effects. By translating religious terms into polytheistic expressions, the translator will impose a sort of respect on some of the target culture readers who accept the other and accept the differences between religions and cultures. Hence, such a translation will provide them with an opportunity to interact and again sympathize with the other. By doing so, and as Schleiermacher states 'the translator leaves the author in peace and moves the reader towards him.... by sending [the reader] abroad'. Distinctly, Venuti's visibility strategy is formulated with an aim to scrutinize the translation of other languages and cultures texts

into English while considering some pro-examples of translation into German. By adopting the visibility of the translator, Venuti has defied the hegemony of Anglo-American canons on other languages and cultures. However, he did not pay much attention to the concept of visible translation as a rule to be applied to all texts regardless of the source and the target texts or cultures; although, his approach is ought to be drawn to all languages including Arabic.

Conclusion

Translation of religious terms in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* into Arabic has been examined pertaining to two translations. First of which has adopted invisible strategy by Muhammad al-Sibā'ī (1911) in the early twentieth century in a way that Islamized Shakespearean's oaths while the other by Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1974) has embraced the translator's visibility towards the end of the twentieth century.

Venuti considers the choice of the text to be translated as of a vital role in both strategies: invisibility and visibility. The writer and the translator are 'simpatico' if the translator is invisible. There should be an identity between them for fluent and transparent translation. As a result, translated texts are believed to enrich the target culture (English) by other cultures through the translation of elite literature; thus, it leads to global domination of Anglo-American culture. Conversely, the visibility of the translator is achieved if the writer and the translator are 'dissident'. The translator chooses a text that challenges the contemporary canons of foreign literature in the target language. Finally, the acceptability of the text transcends the languages and cultures to reach market. Publishers have their say in the choice of the source text, the strategy of translation and probably both the fluency and transparency of the target text.

Accordingly, if the translation role is to bridge the gap between cultures and not to widen it, both readers and writers ought to be left in peace. It is apparent that being visible to the text, the translator leaves writers in peace. Similarly, peacefulness of the readers' minds could also be obtained by the translator's visibility if it is perceived as an act of the free will that enables the reader to read, appreciate and evaluate the translated text without assuming any kind 'hegemony' from the culture of the source text. Therefore, the reader has the choice either to read "a visible translation" or "an invisible translation".

WORKS CITED

- Al-Ali, Kadhim and Mohammed Le'ibi. "Analytical Study of Schleiermacher's Essay 'On Different Methods of Translating.'" *Adab Al-Basrah Journal*. Iraq: Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 2018. (84): 1-35.
- Al-Mousawi, Nahrain. "Bourdieu in Translation Studies: The Sociocultural Dynamics of Shakespeare Translation in Egypt by Sameh Hanna." *Critical Survey and Berghahn Books*, 2016. (28) 187-191. doi.org/10.3167/cs.2016.280314.
- Amin-Zaki, Amel. "Religious and Cultural Considerations in Translating Shakespeare into Arabic." *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*. Eds. Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995. 223-243.
- Ballouta, Issa. "Living with the Tigress and Muses: An Essay on Jabrā Ibrahim Jabrā." *World Literature Today*, 2001. 75 (2): 214-223. doi.org/10.2307/40156520.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Casagrande, Joseph. "The Ends of Translation." *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1954. 20: 335-340.
- Cercel, Larisa, Radegundis Stolze, and John Stanley. "Hermeneutics as A Research Paradigm." *Translational Hermeneutics: The First Symposium*. Eds. Radegundis Stolze, John Stanley and Larisa Cercel. Bucharest: Zeta Books, 2015.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. "The Position of Translation Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004. 192-197
- Ghazoul, Ferial. "The Arabization of Othello." *Comparative Literature*. Duke University Press on behalf of the University of Oregon Stable URL: [http://www.jstor.org/1998.50\(1\):1-31](http://www.jstor.org/1998.50(1):1-31).
- Hanna, Sameh. "Decommercializing Shakespeare: Mutran's Translation of Othello." *Critical Survey*, 2007. 19 (3): 27-54. doi.org/10.3167/cs.2007.190303.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman, 1990.
- Holmes, James. 1954. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2012. 172-185.
- Larsen, Mildred. *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross Language Equivalence*. London: University Press of America, 1984.
- Lefevere, André. *Translation History Culture: A Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Mattar, Karim. "Orhan Pamuk and the Limits of Translation: Foreignizing the Black Book of World Literature." *Translation and Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014. (23): 42-67. doi.org/10.3366/tal.2014.0135.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.
- Nida, Eugene. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill, 1964. Quran.com
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 1813. "On the Different Methods of Translating." Trans. Susan Bernofsky. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2012. 43-63.

- Shakespeare, William. *Coriolanus*. <https://www.folgerdigitaltexts.org/html/Cor.html> (act, scene, line).
- Tageldin, Shaden. *Disarming Words: Empire and the Seductions of Translation in Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Works Cited (Arabic)

- Shakespeare, William. *Coriolanus*. Trans. Muhammad al-Sibā'ī. Cairo: al-Talif Press, 1911.
- Shakespeare, William. *Coriolanus Tragedy*. Trans. Jabra Ibrahim Jabra. Kuwait: Ministry of Information, 1974.

المراجع العربية

- شكسبير، وليام. *كوروليولانس*. ترجمة محمد السباعي. القاهرة: مكتبة التأليف، 1911.
- شكسبير، وليام. *مأساة كوروليولانس*. ترجمة جبرا ابراهيم جبرا. الكويت: وزارة الاعلام، 1974.