



IRAQI
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

Journal of Language Studies

Contents available at: <https://jls.tu.edu.iq/index.php/JLS>



A RELEVANCE-THEORETIC ASSESSMENT OF ARABIC TRANSLATION QUALITY OF SELECTED SHAKESPEAR'S *HAMLET'S* RIDDLES

ASST.PROF. JUMA'A QADIR HUSSEIN*

University Of Anbar College of Education for Humanities

ed.juma.qader@uoanbar.edu.iq

Received: 1\8\2024, Accepted: 16\9\2024, Online Published: 30 / 9/ 2024

Abstract

Translating riddles may be regarded as a problem that encounters a translator, especially in a literary text; then, the quality of the translation may hinder the reader's comprehension of the target text. The problem arises when the target text lacks a humorous effect on readers, hence it is less relevant to the target language. Therefore, this descriptive qualitative study aimed to assess the translation quality of riddles from English into Arabic from a relevance-theoretic perspective. According to relevance theory, translation quality is determined by searching for and achieving the optimal relevance between the target and the source text. Thus, the translation of riddles is considered a process for reaching optimal relevance of humour in the riddles between the source text and the target audience. To this end, five sample riddles were selected from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and two versions of Arabic translations of this play, Jabra Ibrahim Jabra and Khalil Mutran. The findings showed Jabra's translation achieves a more powerful communicative effect with less cognitive effort than Mutran's, meaning that it is more effective in maintaining explicit and implicit content. Mutran's translation, though creative, is less effective in understanding the meaning of the target text as the reader

* **Corresponding Author:** JUMA'A QADIR, Email: ed.juma.qader@uoanbar.edu.iq

Affiliation: Anbar University - Iraq

© This is an open access article under the CC by licenses <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



exerts more cognitive effort with less communicative effect. This means that trying to fit one's target language conventions to the source language conventions would decrease the relevance of the source text to the target one and would not maintain the explicit and implicit content of the source text.

Keywords: Cognitive Effort, Communicative Effect, Relevance Theory, Riddle, Translation Quality Assessment

تقويم جودة الترجمة العربية من منظور نظرية الصلة لأحاجي مختارة من مسرحية هاملت لشكسبير

ا.م.د. جمعة قادر حسين

جامعة الانبار

المستخلص

يمكن اعتبار ترجمة الأحاجي مشكلة تواجه المترجم ، خاصة في النص الأدبي. و لذلك ، قد تعيق جودة الترجمة فهم القارئ للنص المصدر. تبرز المشكلة عندما يفنقر النص المصدر إلى تأثير فكاهاي على القراء ، وبالتالي فهو أقل صلة باللغة المصدر. لذلك ، هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تقييم جودة ترجمة الأحاجي من الإنكليزية إلى العربية من منظور نظرية الصلة. وفقا لنظرية الصلة ، يتم تحديد جودة الترجمة من خلال البحث عن وتحقيق الصلة المثلى بين النص الهدف والنص المصدر. وبالتالي ، تعتبر ترجمة الأحاجي عملية للوصول إلى العلاقة المثلى للفكاهة في الأحاجي بين النص المصدر والجمهور المستهدف. وتحقيقا لهذه الغاية، تم اختيار عينة من خمسة أحاجي من مسرحية هاملت لشكسبير ونسختين من الترجمات العربية لهذه المسرحية، جبرا إبراهيم جبرا و خليل مطران. وأظهرت النتائج أن ترجمة جبرا تحقق تأثيرا تواصليا أقوى مع جهد معرفي أقل من ترجمة مطران، مما يعني أنها أكثر فعالية في الحفاظ على المحتوى الظاهر والضماني. اما ترجمة مطران ، على الرغم من أنها إبداعية ، إلا أنها أقل فعالية في فهم معنى النص المستهدف حيث يبذل القارئ المزيد من الجهد المعرفي مع تأثير تواصلية أقل. وهذا يعني أن محاولة ملاءمة اصطلاحات اللغة الهدف مع اصطلاحات اللغة المصدر ستؤدي إلى انخفاض في علاقة النص المصدر بالنص المستهدف ولن تحافظ على المحتوى الظاهر والضماني للنص المصدر.

الكلمات الدالة: التأثير التواصلي، الجهد المعرفي، الاحاجي، تقويم جودة الترجمة ، نظرية الصلة

1. INTRODUCTION

The presence of humour and its forms in the source text may be regarded as a problem in translation that encounters a translator, especially in a literary text (Daniela 1999, Vandafle 2002, Zabalbeascoa, 2005, Spanakaki 2007, Kostovčik 2009, Lutviana, & Subiyanto 2012). In translating a riddle, as a form of humour, the problem arises when readers cannot grasp the point of humour as the riddle is culture-specific for behind each riddle, there is a humorous effect that should appear when translated into another text (Zabalbeascoa 1996, Popa 2005, Low 2011). Thus, when the riddle is mistranslated, it will lose its humorous effect, and won't be funny for the target reader when the cultural side is neglected. In this regard, translation comprises a communication process, a decision-making procedure, and a communication act between language users (Hatim & Mason, 2014).

In this sense, translation is competence-oriented, following Gutt (2004), as it tries to explain what has already been expressed in another language. The right identification of the humorous effect the riddle implicates will determine the quality of its translation. Translation quality assessment is a main issue in translation studies. During the development of this subject different theories and approaches have been proposed to examine the quality of the translation output. House, 1997,2001, 2015 states three main approaches in translation quality assessment: Mentalist Views, Response-based Approaches, and Text and Discourse-based Approaches. Though this variety of approaches has been conducted on translation quality assessment, it seems that the subject has not yet been adequately attended to through a cognitive pragmatic lens. As each translation quality approach is connected with a translation theory, according to House 2001, 2015, there should be a suitable theory to assess the quality of a translation output in cognitive pragmatics. The most promising theory in cognitive pragmatics might be Relevance Theory (henceforth RT) in which translation is viewed as an expression and recognition of intention (Gutt 1991).

All approaches to translation quality assessment view equivalence as a main factor in deciding the quality of the translation (House 1997,2001, 2015). The

untranslatability of humour is attributed to searching for an appropriate equivalence to the source text. Equivalence is a controversial issue in translation studies. Though different studies from different perspectives have been conducted on equivalence, the status is still debatable and hard to evaluate. To solve this problem, it is argued that RT presents a promising solution. RT is a cognitive pragmatic theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995). According to RT, communication is an inferential process, and it is successful when the audience identifies the communicator's intentions. This recognition is based on sharing the cognitive environment between the communicator and the audience according to the relevance principle. RT was first applied to the translation by Gutt (1991). Translation according to Gutt is an "interlingual interpretive use" in which the translator's role is to ensure "optimal relevance". Optimal relevance, in this sense, is "an expectation on the part of the hearer that his attempt at interpretation will yield adequate contextual effects at minimal processing cost" (p.30). Based on the above argument, from RT's perspective, translating literature into another language may cause problems for target text readers as it may show low relevance to the source language. For example, available Arabic translations of plays such as Shakespeare's *Hamlet* may be difficult to understand due to their low relevance to the source language. There might be some cases where concepts of meaning in the translated text are irrelevant to the Arabic audience or not translated accurately. That is, there is no shared cognitive environment between the two parts, the target text audience, and the source text audience. Therefore, the availability of the shared cognitive knowledge between the two types of audiences determines the quality of the translation.

Accordingly, this study considers the problem of translating riddles in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* from English into Arabic to assess their translation quality assessment from a relevance-theoretic perspective. To this end, five sample translations of riddles were selected from two versions of Arabic translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Jabra Ibrahim Jabra and Khalil Mutran. It uncovers the factors connected with the two Arabic translations of riddles considering the different strategies or solutions adopted in riddles' translations based on RT. Though various studies have been conducted on humour translation from English into Arabic, there are almost no or few studies, Zabalbeascoa 1996, Popa 2005, Low 2011, on the translation of riddles from

English into Arabic based on a relevance-theoretic framework, to the researcher's best knowledge. The study investigates the influence of the context on the overall understanding of riddles. Further, it investigates whether the two translators of the riddles adhere to the pragmatic and or to the semantic meaning of the riddles. Considering the above factors, the study aims to answer the following questions:

1. How do the translation quality of Jabra and Mutran's Arabic translations of *Hamlet's* selected riddles compare based on Relevance Theory?
2. How much cognitive effort is required by readers to comprehend Jabra and Mutran's Arabic translations of *Hamlet's* selected riddles to convey explicit and implicit content, and cognitive effort and cognitive effect based on Relevance Theory?

2. HUMOR AND TRANSLATION

The translation of humor is an intercultural problem in that different cultures may be shaped in various ways creating different cognitive schemes, hence understanding the world differently causing difficulty translating humor properly (Newmark 1988). Difficulty translating humour is strongly connected with what translation is and what involves. One of the famous definitions coined by Larson (1989) is that translation "consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language text, analysing it to determine its meaning, and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context" p.3. In this sense, difficulty translating humour is not to be, Vandaele (2002) states, "articulated in the sense of conventionally coded linguistic units per se, a semantic meaning attached to a lexical linguistic form" p. 151.

This means that the actual semantic meaning in instances of verbal humour is secondary to their primary intention to be humorous. Therefore, the translator interprets the meaning of the text and has the target text audience evoked by the same or similar feelings practised by the source text audience. This process requires a high degree of poetic creativity in a similar way humour translation does a good sense of humour.

Humour, in this vein, has long been considered untranslatable and one of the most difficult types of translation (VanDael 2002; Chiaro 2005; Delabastita 1994). Therefore, translating riddles, as a form of humour, requires careful consideration as they need correct identification, analysis, categorisation, and translation. Consequently, the quality of translating riddles is determined by transferring the same humorous effect from the source text into the target text.

The main problem with riddles is that in the act of riddling the riddler is trying to mislead the riddlee (Pepicello & Green, 1984). As riddles comprise the social and cultural background information (Isbell & Roncalla 1977; Endstrasser 2000; Ishengoma 2005; Rejeibi 2023) the problem behind the difficulty of understanding riddles is that their rules are distinct from one language to another. Hence, in translating riddles, the translator should consider the cultural context. Translators will probably fail to translate riddles if they have insufficient background information about the relevant context and culture (Serpieri 2004). The problem that will most likely appear on the surface is in translating riddles from English into Arabic as in literature as in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the current study's data. Although Shakespeare's works have been translated into many languages for over 400 years, there is a sense that plays and poems were "lost" in translation (Hoenselaars, 2004: ix).

In translating Shakespeare, Delabastita (2004) mentioned some problems that may face the translator: Textual cruces, obscure cultural allusions archaisms and neologisms, the contrast of Anglo-Saxon and Latinate diction, imagery, mixed metaphors, deliberate repetition, personification, puns, ambiguities, and malapropism, elliptical grammar, compactness of expression and prosody. The translator should be aware of them as they do not only apply to Shakespeare. In line with Delabastita, Serpieri (2004) argued that translating Shakespeare is a difficult task in which the translator should have wide background knowledge of the historical period of Shakespearian features of theatre and its historical period.

In this regard, what makes translating Shakespeare a bit difficult, Deprates (2004) argues, is that Shakespeare's language is interpreted and portrayed as intense and confused language as it underwent a radical change resulting in new linguistic forms. Shakespeare is inclined to dramatise and parody the language, actions and stories. Critics

noted that Shakespeare tends to activate the different meanings of words he uses. Such a process is difficult to follow especially when words open up contrasting meanings. In this case, the translator is likely to mistranslate Shakespeare. The translator struggles to recreate new life in Shakespeare's plays. Introducing plays into a new language and a new world can give new reading to them or the original text. The translator, then, should bridge the gap between the public and the actors, on the one hand, and between the text and its readers, on the other hand. Therefore, to give the play a new life, the text must impress the reader that it was newly written by short-circuiting the historicity of the text.

In the romantic tradition, for example, finding an equivalence between the source and the target text was long considered a criterion in Shakespearean translation. The main problem with translation is to find a suitable equivalent to linguistic units; otherwise, translation is not precise and inaccurate, which Hatim (2001) derived the term "translationese" to describe bad translation. This process occurs when translators misunderstand the message behind the text as any text implicates two levels of understanding, the text and the meta-text. As each language is a complex reality and a separate sociocultural system with historical specificities, absolute equivalence is fiction (Bassnett, 2004; Hoenselaars, 2004; Najim, 2024; Saeed, 2024). As a result, difficulties in theatre translation evoked translators to search for a pragmatic approach rather than a more formal one (Bassnett 2004).

Most literary works are rich in humor originating from various fields of knowledge. Thus, developing cultural contact entails accurately translating forms of humour to help readers understand and enjoy the intended meaning of the riddle and achieve the humorous effect implicated in the source text. Shakespeare is known for adopting riddles for rhetorical purposes and eventually for humour purposes, *Hamlet* is a case in point. Many riddles have been used in the play making the play funnier and more impressive. Hence, the play is based on riddles to arouse humour and make the audience think about and get expectations about Hamlet's hesitation (Cantor 2004). Delabastita (2004) went a bit further to state that Shakespeare often plays with words in his plays. He gives Hamlet a distinct manner of speech such as puns and riddles to expose his melancholy and isolation.

The dramatic value of Hamlet's frequent use of witty puns and riddles is to be a way from other characters, to make the other characters off balance, to make himself sound crazy, and to provide a comic atmosphere to the audience. Such dramatic technique keeps other characters and the audience thinking about the real meaning of the words and other characters' motivations. The play is full of riddles whose role is crucial in adding fun, entertainment and humour to the play. This would cause difficulty understanding the play, especially for a foreigner who reads a translated version. Lepphalme (1997), and Pathong, S. (2019) believe that culture can be a barrier to understanding a riddle unless the receiver is familiar with the two cultures. Thus, the translator should consider the different cultures dealing with a universal phenomenon as a scientific one that should be translated accurately. As a popular literary work, the translation of this play especially riddles, is of considerable importance.

Based on the above argument, the translation of riddles should be guided by an appropriate theory; hence RT is assumed appropriate. This will make it easier for the target reader to understand the riddle in the same way as the original text reader does. To do this, the study compares two Arabic versions of *Hamlet*, Jabra Ibrahim Jabra and Khalil Mutran to determine the quality of the two translations from the RT perspective. Therefore, the following section will address the relationship between RT and translation.

3. RELEVANCE THEORY AND TRANSLATION

RT was originated and developed by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson (1986/1995) as a cognitive pragmatic theory. RT assumes that the addressee makes the effort to process an utterance assuming it to be relevant. Hence, the addressee can improve or modify his cognitive environment, and assumptions about the world. This idea is implicated cognitively by the principle of relevance. The concept of relevance is defined by Sperber and Wilson in terms of contextual effects and processing effort as "an assumption relevance in a context if and only if it has some contextual effect in the context" p.122.

According to the relevance principle, every act of utterance creates expectations of optimal relevance in the addressee. That is, both the addresser and the addressee are

searching for optimal relevance in the communication act. That is, the assumption behind each act of utterance is that the addresser intends to make the utterance relevant. In this act of utterance, the addresser assumes that the addressee can derive adequate cognitive effects and exclude unnecessary ones. The relevance principle, then, is the key concept of RT. The communication is successful when this principle is detected between the communicator and the addressee. Achieving optimal relevance requires obtaining adequate contextual effects with minimum processing effort, Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995).

RT is a unified theory of verbal communication that permits the study of intra- and inter-linguistic verbal communication instances. These instances are manifestations of the same underlying concepts. Thus, RT is successfully applicable to translation (Diaz-Perez, 2014), as many scholars pointed out, (Gutt,1990,1998, 2000, 2004; Zhonggang, 2006; Martinez-Sierra, 2010; Jing, 2010; Yus, 2012; Xu, Q., & Liu, L. 2022). From an RT perspective, translation is viewed under the interpretive use of language. It restates in one language what is said in another. Thus, it is comparable to intra-linguistic use (Gutt, 1998). In other words, translation, from the RT perspective, would be involved in the interpretive use across languages. If a text is translated, its meaning will be affected even when both contexts are in the same language. The translator should often decide what properties of the source text to preserve because of the problem of cross-linguistic differences.

To this end, what the translator would do is to ensure optimal relevance. Opposite to the translator's task, the addressee of the target text would interpret a text with adequate cognitive effects at minimal processing cost. The relationship between the source text and the translation process could be redefined based on the interpretive resemblance and not on the equivalence. In this regard, the translator adopts different strategies to recreate the cognitive effects of the author's intention with the lowest possible effort by the reader. This would occur after analysing the author's intent and evaluating the cognitive environment shared by both, the addresser and the addressee (Gutt, 2004).

As RT offers a cognitive-based interpretation for translation, the translator will provide a successful communicative translation output since no fixed standard of equivalence underlies "good" translation. Translation as a communication process is a triplod relationship between the translator, the source text writer, and the target text reader and not a traditional dichotomic relationship between the writer and the reader. The translator, first, identifies the writer's intention and, second, assesses the shared cognitive environment between the source writer and the target reader. Therefore, the translator can adopt various ways to produce the humorous effects of riddles intended by the riddler and present them to the reader with the lowest possible processing effort (Jing 2011).

This triangle relationship was recently supported and investigated in House's 2015 book *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*; she argued for the necessity of a multidisciplinary view of translation. This view combines the traditional text-based view of translation with the context-based view of translation. In its widest sense, the context reflects the ethical issues, the power relations, the conflict situations, and so on. The context also involves the translator, the author, and the reader in the translation process. House considers such relationships a basic criterion to establish and test the different approaches to Translation Quality Assessment. According to House (1997, 2001, and 2015), Translation Quality Assessment involves three trends: Mentalist Views, Response-based Approaches, and Text and Discourse-based Approaches. Mentalist judgments are views subjective intuitive and anecdotal. They are about how good and bad a translation is. Mentalist approaches highlight that translation quality largely depends on the subjective decisions of the translator. Response-based approaches govern the dynamic equivalence (Nida 1964) between the source and the target text. The translated text receptor responds to the text as the source text receptor does to the text. Text and Discourse-based approaches compare the source and the target text. Such approaches discover the regularities of transfer based on syntax, semantics, stylistics, and pragmatics.

In a new treatment for translation quality assessment, House's 2015 book was designed to update her two previous versions (1977, 1997) of translation quality assessment., In House's updated version, translation is a cognitive procedure and a social,

cross-linguistic and cross-cultural practice as these two aspects must be considered by any valid translation theory. Further, any translation theory must consider translation quality assessment as a key concept in its framework. House's original model is a functional-pragmatic model based on pragmatic theories of language use. This model compares the linguistic situational features of both the source and the target text. The translated text should have a function equivalent to that of the source. To achieve this function, the translated text should exploit equivalent pragmatic means. But in cases where there are differences between the source text and the target text in the cultural presupposition the functional equivalence is more difficult. In this case, the translator may apply cultural filters in sets of cross-cultural dimensions.

Further and different from the above development, the translation quality is thoroughly investigated from the RT perspective. The first one who applied RT to translation was Gutt in 1991. According to Gutt (1992), miscommunication may result in communicating an informative intention or a "total breakdown of communication when the intended audience is not the one for whom the original work has been created" (p. 27). In a relevance-theoretic term, inference is not successful without an appropriate premise. Irrelevant or inappropriate premises will lead to unsuitable conclusions. This case might occur in translation as "the target text audience's background is different from the intended source text audience's totally or partially" (p.27). To fulfil successful communication, Gutt (1992) maintains, "an intended interpretation is recoverable not in just any context, but only in a context, where the requirements of optimal processing are fulfilled" (p.28). That is, in a "secondary communication situation" a term developed by Gutt like Arabic, translating an English play intended originally for the English audience will require a very high amount of processing effort to be interpreted properly; otherwise, misinterpretation will happen if the translator fails to find a shared cognitive environment between the source text audience and the target text audience or the appropriate premises. That is, the translator plays the role of mediator between the two (Hatim, 2014).

4. METHODOLOGY

This study is a qualitative analysis of two Arabic translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Jabra Ibrahim Jabra and Khalil Mutran. The corpus is a translation of text quoted from

Act IV, scene iii between Hamlet and King Claudius after Polonius's death. In this speech, Hamlet engages in word plays with Claudius to make fun of him by using riddles. The study analyses and evaluates the quality of the two Arabic translations of five riddles from the RT perspective to determine the degree of relevance to the source text and eventually to achieve the humorous effect implicated in riddles.

This play was selected because specific references to social, cultural, and religious issues prevailed in the Kingdom of Denmark between the late sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century. Translators may face such issues causing them problems in translating linguistic items and concepts which are totally or nearly different from Arabic and English as the play was written in Old English. Old English is almost completely different from modern English in different linguistic aspects. In other words, Old English is also difficult for native speakers of English to understand, hence native speakers of Arabic. Accordingly, it would be difficult for the translators to make the output relevant to the Arab audience. The riddles were analysed within the framework of RT based on two cognitive dichotomies: Explicit and implicit content, and Cognitive Effort and Communicative Effect. From the RT perspective, a text is rendered with minimum cognitive effort during translation. An Iraqi university lecturer specialist in drama validated the corpus of the study. These riddles fit the study objectives since they refer to the social, cultural, and religious factors. The five riddles were analysed separately; each riddle was tabulated and accompanied by the two Arabic translations for easy analysis and comparison. Finally, the findings of each riddle's analysis were interpreted and compared with the findings of related literature in a separate discussion section.

5. DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS, AND DISCUSSION

This section considers the findings of analysing five riddles selected randomly from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* analysed according to the framework of RT. The analysis was carried out according to two cognitive dichotomies derived from the RT framework: Explicit and implicit content, and Cognitive Effort and Communicative Effect.

ANALYSIS OF RIDDLE 1

Table 1. Translation of Riddle 1

Source text
Hamlet: <i>Not where he eats, but where he is eaten: a certain convocation of politic worms is e'en at him.</i> (Act 4, Scene 3, p.96)
Target text
لا حيث يأكل، بل حيث يؤكل. لقد عقد عليه اجتماعا عدد من الديدان السياسية (Jabra's translation, p.157)
عفوا انه في وليمة يتعشى به ولا يتعشى. بينه وبين مؤتمر من الديدان السياسية مسالة تفض الآن (Mutran's translation, p.67)

The Explicit Content in Jabra's translation is straightforward, where "Not where he eats, but where he is eaten" is directly translated into "لا حيث يأكل، بل حيث يؤكل". The original meaning is maintained when "لقد عقد عليه اجتماعا عدد من الديدان السياسية" translates to "a certain convocation of politic worms is e'en at him.". On the other hand, the Explicit Content in Mutran's Translation is more elaborate where "عفوا انه في وليمة يتعشى به ولا يتعشى" contains a politeness element and a metaphor, which the original text lacks. This translation might potentially confuse the reader comprehending the original meaning. In this way, Jabra, in his translation, preserves the Implicit Content of the original text such as the black humour and the irony. That is, the translation keeps close to the original text to enable the reader to infer the intended meaning. In Mutran's translation, the implicit content differs when a metaphor is added. This might distract the reader from the original irony and humour in the original text.

Accordingly, since Jabra's translation is close to the source text, it requires the reader less cognitive effort to understand the meaning and humour of the text as the communicative effect is strong. In the case of Mutran's Translation, understanding meaning requires more cognitive effort due to the added politeness and metaphor. The communicative effect could be weakened when the reader exerts more cognitive effort to understand the intended meaning. In comparison, from an RT perspective, Jabra's translation is more effective than Mutran's in preserving the explicit and implicit content

of the original text. Less cognitive effort is required to achieve a stronger communicative effect. Although Mutran's translation is creative as it contains a metaphor, it may add additional cognitive effort to understand the original meaning and humour.

ANALYSIS OF RIDDLE 2

Table 2. Translation of Riddle 2

Source text
Hamlet: <i>Your worm is your only emperor for diet: we fat all creatures else to fat us, and we fat ourselves for maggots: your fat king and your lean beggar is but variable service, two dishes, but to one table: that's the end.</i> (Act 4, Scene 3, p.96)
Target text
إن الدودة من حيث الغذاء هي السلطان الأوحده. فنحن نسمن المخلوقات الأخرى كلها لتسمننا، ونسمن أنفسنا البدين والمتسول الهزيل إنما هم طعام قليل التفاوت، أكلتان لمائدة واحدة. تلك الخاتمة. للديدان. والملك (Jabra's translation, p. 157)
وإنما هي الملكة التي ترأس مجلس النائبات. نحن نغذي الخلائق الآخر لتتغذى ومتى سمنا فإنما نسمن الهوام والحشرات. الملك، البطين والأجير الغث الهزيل إنما هما خادمان لمخدوم واحد إليه مصير كل شيء. (Mutran's translation, p. 67)

In this riddle, the Explicit Content in Jabra's Translation inclines to be close to the original text. It maintains the structure and explicit meaning of the text. For example, Jabra directly translates "Your worm is your only emperor for diet." into "إن الدودة من حيث الغذاء هي السلطان الأوحده". In this sense, the Explicit Content is direct, clear and easier for the reader to understand the intended meaning without additional cognitive effort. For Mutran's translation, the Explicit Content is often altered as Mutran tends to fit Arabic literary conventions in translating words. For instance, "It is the queen who presides over the council of deputies," is translated into "وإنما هي الملكة التي ترأس مجلس النائبات" which is a more interpretative adaptation than in Jabra's translation. Therefore, the Explicit Content might be easily available to readers familiar with Arabic idioms and expressions. However, it may cause the reader a Cognitive Effort to understand the original text.

Based on the Explicit Content of the two translations, the Implicit Content in Jabra's Translation preserves much of the implicit meanings of the original text as when the philosophical implications of life and death are preserved in "نسمن أنفسنا للديدان", a

translation of "we fat ourselves for maggots" (we fatten ourselves for the worms). Decoding these subtleties, the reader will experience more Cognitive Effects to gain a deeper understanding of the text. In comparison, Mutran, sometimes, keeps the implicit meaning more explicit; this could clarify and simplify some of the text's complexities as in "الملك, البطين والأجير الغث الهزيل إنما هما خادمان لمخدوم واحد" (the king, the fat one, and the thin servant are both servants to one master) in which the implicit comparison is more explicit.

Accordingly, Jabra's Translation requires higher Cognitive Effort as Jabra preserves the original structure and implicit meaning in the original text. This would make the reader engage with the text deeply to fully understand the riddle, higher cognitive effort can lead to more cognitive effect. On the other hand, as Mutran's Translation is adapted to be more explicit, it generally requires less cognitive effort to read and understand the text's intended meaning. This reduced Cognitive Effort might lead to a more immediate cognitive effect in which the reader can grasp the meaning easily though some of the deeper nuances might be missed. To sum up, both translations offer distinctive perspectives; Jabra maintains the original complexity and richness of the text which requires more cognitive effort offering a deeper cognitive effect. Mutran, in contrast, maintains the text more explicit and accessible, to reduce the cognitive effort in simplifying some of the original text's complexity.

ANALYSIS OF RIDDLE 3

Table 3. Translation of Riddle 3

Source text
Hamlet: <i>A man may fish with the worm that hath eat of a king, and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm.</i> (Act 4, Scene 3, p.96)
Target text
قد يصيد المرء سمكة بدودة اقتاتت على ملك، ثم يأكل السمكة التي تغذت على تلك الدودة. (Jabra's translation, 157)
المرء قد يتصيد بدودة من الديدان التي أكلت ملكا حوتا من الحيتان. إني أكل تلك الدودة. (Mutran's translation, p. 67)

In this riddle, Jabra's translation maintains the structure and explicit meaning of the translated text when "A man may fish with the worm that hath eat of a king." is directly translated into "قد يصيد المرء سمكة بدودة اقتاتت على ملك". Here, the Explicit Content is direct and clear, making the reader easily understand the literal meaning without additional cognitive effort. Mutran's translation tends to adapt the wording to fit Arabic literary conventions; this would sometimes change the explicit content as when "A man may fish with a worm from the worms that ate a king," is translated into "المرء قد يتصيد "بدودة من الديدان التي أكلت ملكا" which is a more interpretative adaptation. Therefore, the Explicit Content might be more available to readers familiar with Arabic expressions and idioms and it could require some cognitive effort to understand the original text.

As for the Implicit Content, Jabra retains much of the nuances and implicit meanings of the original text when the philosophy of life and death is preserved in "ثم يأكل "السمكة التي تغذت على تلك الدودة" that translates "and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm". Decoding these subtleties, the reader will experience more cognitive effects for deeply understanding the intended meaning of the target text. Sometimes, Mutran explicitly makes and simplifies implicit meanings as in the implicit comparison in "إني أكل تلك الدودة" (I eat that worm). This strategy can make the text more comprehensible providing a more immediate cognitive effect. Jabra's Translation, in this regard, entails higher cognitive effort as Jabra preserves the original structure and implicit meaning of the original text. This Cognitive Effort can lead to a more Cognitive Effect to gain a deeper understanding of the text. On the other hand, Mutran's translation requires less cognitive effort as it is more accessible and explicit making the text easier to read and understand. As for the Cognitive Effect, less Cognitive Effort can lead to less cognitive effect. The reader can rapidly access the meaning; however, some deeper nuances might be missed.

To conclude, both translations experience unique benefits. Jabra's translation maintains the original's complexity and richness, requiring more cognitive effort but offering a deeper Cognitive Effect. However, Mutran's translation is more explicit and accessible by reducing the Cognitive Effort by simplifying some of the complexities of the original text.

ANALYSIS OF RIDDLE 4

Table 4. Translation of Riddle 4

Source text
<i>Hamlet: In heaven; send hither to see: if your messenger finds him not there, seek him i' the other place yourself. But indeed, if you find him not within this month, you shall nose him as you go up the stairs into the lobby.</i> (Act 4, Scene 3, p.96)
Target text
في السماء. أرسل وراءه هناك فان لم يجده رسولك، ابحث عنه بنفسك في المكان الآخر: ولكن إذا لم تجده في بحر هذا الشهر، سيلقاه انفك حيث تصعد الدرج إلى الردهة. (Jabra's translation, P.158)
في الجنة... أرسل إليها من يتفقده وان لم يجده رسولك في السماء فتفقده بنفسك في مكان الآخر. أما إذا لم تجدوه في شهر ينصرم فسوف تشمون ريحه من السلم المجاور للرواق. (Mutran's translation, p. 67)

In this riddle, the Explicit Content of Jabra's translation is closely related to the original text, maintaining the meaning and structure explicitly. For instance, "في السماء. أرسل وراءه هناك فان لم يجده رسولك" is a direct translation of "In heaven; send hither to see: if your messenger finds him not there.". Therefore, without much additional effort, the reader can easily understand the meaning of the source text. As for the Explicit Content Mutran adapts the words to fit Arabic literary conventions; these conventions can sometimes change the explicit content. For instance, "في الجنة... أرسل إليها من يتفقده" is a more interpretative adaptation to "In heaven... send someone to check on him,"

The explicit content is more accessible to readers familiar with Arabic idioms and conventions; however, it may require some cognitive effort to access the source text easily. Therefore, Jabra holds much of the nuances and implicit meanings of the original text. For example, the irony and black humour in "سيلقاه انفك حيث تصعد الدرج إلى الردهة" (you shall nose him as you go up the stairs into the lobby) are preserved. Readers, in this vein, who can understand these refinements will practice a richer cognitive effect, gaining a deeper understanding of the themes of the source text. Contrary to this strategy, Mutran sometimes makes implicit meanings explicitly to clarify and simplify the complexities of the text. For example, "فسوف تشمون ريحه من السلم المجاور للرواق" makes the implicit comparison more explicit (you will smell him from the stairs next to the lobby).

This strategy can offer an immediate cognitive effect to make the text more accessible to the reader. Jabra's translation needs higher cognitive effort because Jabra preserves the original structure and implicit meanings of the text requiring the reader to engage deeply with the source text to understand the riddle easily. Therefore, higher cognitive effort leads to easier Cognitive Effects. Generally, Mutran's Translation requires less cognitive effort because it is more accessible and explicit making the text easier to read and understand. When the Cognitive Effort is reduced, it can lead to a more immediate but potentially less profound cognitive effect though some deeper nuance might be missed.

In conclusion, Jabra's translation maintains the original complexity of the text as it requires more cognitive effort with a deeper cognitive effect. Mutran makes the text more accessible and explicit, reducing cognitive effort by simplifying some of the complexities of the text.

ANALYSIS OF RIDDLE 5

Table 5. Translation of Riddle 5

Source text
Hamlet: My mother: father and mother is man and wife; man and wife is one flesh; and so, my mother. Come, for England. (Act 4, Scene 3, p.97)
Target text
بل امي. فالاب والام زوج وزوجة، والزوج والزوجة جسد واحد. اذن، امي هيا، الى انكلترا. (Jabra's translation, p.158)
أبي وأمي، زوجان والزوجان إنما هما شفع في وتر. فبها والدتي لنذهب إلى انجلترا. (Mutran's translation, p. 680)

Translating this riddle, Jabra follows closely the original text to maintain its explicit meanings and structure as in “بل امي. فالاب والام زوج وزوجة، والزوج والزوجة جسد واحد”، a direct translation of “My mother: father and mother is man and wife; man and wife is one flesh.” Then the explicit content of the text is clear and direct; this makes the reader understand the intended meaning with no additional cognitive effort. For fitting Arabic literary conventions, Mutran adapts the similar wording of the source text. Fitting Arabic

literary conventions can sometimes alter the explicit content as in “أبي وأمي، زوجان والزوجان” “إنما هما شفع في وتر” that translates to “My father and mother, a pair, and the pair is like a single entity,” As for Jabra’s translation, he follows the implicit meanings and nuances of the original text as the unity of marriage is preserved in “والزوج والزوجة جسد واحد” (man and wife is one flesh). The reader who can decode these implications will experience a higher cognitive effect to understand a deeper comprehension of the text. Mutran, in contrast, makes the implicit meaning explicitly to clarify the text abridge some of its complexities as in “الزوجان إنما هما شفع في وتر” (the pair is like a single entity).

In this regard, Jabra’s translation requires higher cognitive effort, while Mutran’s translation requires less cognitive effort as the translation is adapted to be more accessible and explicit. To end, Jabra maintains the original complexity of the text requiring more Cognitive Effort with a deeper cognitive effect. Mutran keeps the text more explicit and accessible to reduce the Cognitive Effort simplifying some of the complexities of the text.

6. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the five riddles in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* translated by Jabra and Mutran reveals significant differences from the perspective of translation quality assessment in terms of the two dichotomies of explicit and implicit content, cognitive effort, and communicative effect. Jabra, in riddle 1, is more straightforward than the original text. Although Jabra translated *convocation* اجتماع with less processing effort, the fun brought by the riddle is preserved, succeeding in maintaining the writer's intended contextual effects. In contrast, Mutran adds extra elements such as politeness and metaphor that are not present in the original text.

This may confuse the reader in grasping the intended meaning excreting higher cognitive effort. For example, in translating the word *eat* يتعشى Mutran adopted a functional correspondence strategy sacrificing the original meaning of the word *eat*. The word يتعشى is not relevant to the cognitive environment of the reader which makes it difficult for the reader to comprehend the humorous intention of the text with more cognitive effort as the word *eat* is coincident with the word (supper). The same thing is

said about the adverb of place *where* which is translated as a noun phrase into Arabic *وليمة* to be in coincidence with the translation of the word *مؤتمر* as the word *وليمة* is one of the formalities of *convocation*. In this regard, the target reader would experience higher cognitive effort to retrieve from the lexical entry of his/her cognitive environment the exact meaning of the word *مؤتمر*. Findings of previous studies such as (Baker, 2018; Venuti, 2017) have highlighted the significance of preserving the explicit content in translating literary text to maintain the author's intended meaning. The explicit content is conveyed accurately as Jabra's translation strategy is consistent with these findings.

In riddle 2, *your worm* is translated by Mutran functionally into *الملكة* causing higher Cognitive Effort to the reader. Jabra translated *your worm* literally into *الدودة* without referring to the queen causing the reader less processing effort to access easily for the intention of the writer. The life circle between *creatures* and *ourselves* is translated and conveyed with more Cognitive Effort by Mutran's translation of the word *fat*, mentioned three times, into *ننغذي و نتغذى* respectively to coincide with the third word *fat* which was translated literally into *نسمن*. Though Jabra's translation of *fat* was literal *نسمن*, both versions are presented with less processing effort. The difference between the two translations is that Mutran's translation conveys extra humorous intention causing the reader higher Cognitive Effort.

Findings of previous studies such as (Lepphalme 1997; VanDael 2002; Chiaro 2005; Delabastita 2004) have shown the difficulty of translating humour in the literary text namely in translating Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (Delabastita 2004; Serpieri 2004). In this sense, translating the literary text does not convey the Explicit Content easily, especially in humour. Therefore, Jabra's translation is in line with these findings.

In riddle 3, the translation of the word *fish* into *سمكة*, though literally, Jabra achieved a coincidence between the cognitive environment of both the reader and writer with less processing effort. In the case of Mutran's translation, he over-translated the word *fish* into Arabic as *حوت* (whale) and the sentence *إني أكل تلك الدودة* has no source text reference resulting in extra-processing cognitive effort to the reader. Mutran sacrificed the cognitive processing of the reader in adopting a functional equivalence when translating the word *fish*. The image of the *whale* (*حوت*) in the cognitive environment of

the reader to be fished with a *worm* is contrary to the natural process image of hunting a small *fish* with a small *worm* and not vice versa. Findings of previous studies such as (Alrasheedi, 2016; Lahiani, 2008) have proved the role of RT theory in maintaining the explicit content in translation, hence, the author's intended meaning.

In the same vein, translating the word *heaven* into الجنة in riddle 4, Mutran intends to refer to the writer's intention in which Hamlet makes fun of the king. On the other hand, Jabra's literal translation of *nose him* into سيلفاه انفك that might be back-translated literally into *your nose will find him* cause the reader less cognitive processing effort to understand the writer's meaning. In Mutran's translation, *nose him* into ستشم ريحه, is not clear to the reader which would cause more Cognitive Effort to understand that Polonius is dead.

In riddle 5, Mutran over-translated one *flesh into* شفع في وتر in which not all readers have such equivalent in their cognitive environment resulting in higher Cognitive Effort in understanding the writer's intention. He tries to achieve the idea of unity between *man and wife* through the relationship between شفع and وتر. The two words complete each other to be two entities and not one as the word شفع completes the word وتر to get another meaning. Jabra saved the reader's cognitive processing effort causing the reader higher Cognitive Effect processing effort. In this regard, Mutran tries to fit Arabic cultural conventions; this can sometimes change the explicit content leading to higher cognitive effort with less cognitive effect. This is due to the cultural factors that cause difficulty in understanding the riddle as the findings of previous studies have highlighted (Lepphalme 1997; Larson 1979; Endstrasser 2000, Ishengoma 2005). Therefore, preserving the explicit content by considering the cultural factors of the source text in translating literary text is significant to maintaining the author's intended meaning. As a result, the explicit content is conveyed truthfully in Jabra's translation.

Consequently, although Jabra mostly maintains the original text in his literal translation, he also preserves the implicit content by using irony and black humour in the original text. This strategy helps the reader infer the intended meaning with less cognitive effort resulting in a strong communicative effect by easily appreciating the humor and irony. On the other hand, Mutran's translation is creative in adding extra cognitive effort

by adding politeness and metaphor. However, this strategy can weaken the communicative effect due to the reader's struggle to understand the intended meaning; hence higher cognitive effort is experienced by the reader. Effective translation, Gutt's (2000) emphasis, should enhance the communicative effect by minimising the cognitive effort, a strategy that Jabra closely adheres to more than Mutran. Previous research (Gutt,1990,1998, 2000, 2004; Hussein & Khuddro, 2016; Diaz-Perez, 2014; Zhonggang, 2006; Martinez-Sierra, 2010; Jing, 2010; Yus, 2012) emphasises the workability of RT in translation by minimising cognitive effort and maximising cognitive effect.

Finally, to compare the two translations from an RT perspective, Jabra's translation achieves a stronger communicative effect with less cognitive effort. It is more effective in maintaining explicit and implicit content. Mutran's translation, though creative, is less effective in understanding the original meaning as the reader exerts more cognitive effort with less communicative effect. These findings are in line with previous research on translation quality. In addition, previous studies such as (House, 2015; Pym, 2010) highlight the importance of the balance between preserving the original text and the communicative effect. Jabra's translation adheres more effectively to this balance than Mutran's enabling the reader to seek an authentic experience of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* through translation.

7. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that Jabra's translation is more powerful than Mutran's in keeping the explicit and implicit content; that is, the translation is carried out with a minimum cognitive effort achieving a strong communicative effect. These findings maintain reliability to the original text considering cognitive effort in literary translation. Mutran paid more attention to the target text as he tends to fit Arabic literary conventions to the target text, hence the Arabic translation. Both translators, Jabra and Mutran, proposed two different strategies for translating riddle correspondence: literal, and functional. Jabra's translation was source-text oriented as he adopted formal and semantic equivalence. Mutran, on the other hand, followed a target-text-oriented strategy showing more inclination to the reader.

Drawing on the target text, Mutran showed a more creative and transparent translation than Jabra's source text orientation. More attention was given to the intended writer's meaning in Mutran's translation to share the cognitive environment of the reader. This shows that RT represents a promising perspective for studying riddles and their translation showing communicative effect from cognitive pragmatic perspectives; this is due to viewing translation from RT as a triplod interaction among the source writer, the

translator and the target reader. Thus, the identification and translation of riddles, to a large extent, are determined by the translator's creativity and a careful assessment of the cognitive environment of both the writer and the reader. To achieve successful communication, the target reader is the one who decides on the appreciation of riddle translation, the identification of the humorous effect and the inferential process. Therefore, analysing a larger translation corpus could be explored for further future research considering other factors such as reader response and cultural context.

REFERENCES

- Alrasheedi, R. (2016). Strategies Used for Translating Explicit and Implicit Meanings in Shakespeare's Hamlet into Arabic: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 12(6), 1-16.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.
- Cantor, P. A. (2004). *Shakespeare: Hamlet*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chiaro, D. (2005). Foreword. Verbally Expressed Humour and Translation: An Overview of a Neglected Field. *Humor*, 18(2), 135-145
- Daniela, M. (1999). The Sitcom Revisited: The Translation of Humor in a Polysemiotic Text. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 1(4), 167-204.
- Delabastita, D. (1994). Focus on the pun: wordplay as a special problem in translation studies. *Target*, 6(2), 223-243.
- de Carvalho Homem, R. M. G., & Hoenselaars, A. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century* (Vol. 35). Rodopi.
- Delabastita, D. (1998). Shakespeare Translation. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 222-26.
- Endstrasser, V. (2000). The Riddle: An Example of Circulating Water. *Narodna umjetnost-Hrvatski časopis za etnologiju i folkloristiku*, (Vol. 37 No), 133-156.
- Gutt, E. A. (1990). A Theoretical Account of Translation Without a Translation Theory. *Target*, 2(2), 135-164.
- (1998). Pragmatic aspects of translation: Some relevance-theory observations *The Pragmatics of Translation*, 41-53.
- (2000). *Translation and relevance: Cognition and Context*. St. Jerome, Manchester.
- Gutt, E. A. (2004). Challenges of Meta-Representation to Translation Competence. *Translations kompetenz*.
- Hoenselaars, A. J. (2004). *Shakespeare's history plays: performance, translation and adaptation in Britain and abroad*. Cambridge University Press.
- Isbell, B. J., & Roncalla, F. A. (1977). The ontogenesis of metaphor: riddle games among Quechua speakers seen as cognitive discovery procedures. *Journal of Latin American Lore* 3:1 (1977), 19-49. 19.
- Ishengoma, J. M. (2005). African oral traditions: Riddles among the Haya of Northwestern Tanzania. *International review of education*, 51(2-3), 139-153.
- Kostovčík, L. (2009). The translation of verbally-expressed humour on screen in Slovakia: An outline of research problems. In *Language, Literature and Culture in a Changing Transatlantic World*. International conference proceedings. Prešov: Université de Prešov (pp. 175-180).

- Lahiani, R. (2024). Recreating relevance: translated Arabic idioms through a relevance theory lens. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1-10.
- Low, P. A. (2011). Translating jokes and puns. Perspectives: *Studies in Translatology*, 19(1), 59-70.
- Lutviana, R., & Subiyanto, A. (2012). The Failure in Translating Humor: A Case Study in The Indonesian Translation of Humor Graphic Novel. *The Diary of a Wimpy Kid*. SKRIPSI Jurusan Sastra Inggris-Fakultas Sastra UM.
- Najim, H. K. (2024). The Translation of Aporia in English Literary Texts into Arabic. *Journal of Language Studies*. Vol, 8(2), 8-36.
- Pathong, S. (2019). Saving the BFG: A relevance-theoretic approach to pun translation. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 27(2), 815-831.
- Popa, D. E. (2005). Jokes and Translation. Perspectives: *Studies in Translatology*, 13(1), 48-57.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (2014). *Discourse and the Translator*. Routledge.
- House, J. (1998). Quality of Translation. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 197-200.
- Hussain, A. E., & Khuddro, A. (2016). English Arabic Cultural Effect in Translation: A relevance theory perspective. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 4(1), 31-44.
- Jabra, I. J. (2000). *William Shakespeare: Great Tragedies, Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth*. (trans.) 2nd ed. (Ed.). A. Mola, (66-68).
- Jing, H. (2010). The translation of English and Chinese Puns from the Perspective of Relevance Theory. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 13, 81-99.
- Mutran, K. M. (2013). *Hamlet*. (trans.) Qairo: Hindawi Foundation for Education and Culture
- Sierra, J. J. M. (2010). Using Relevance as a Tool for the Analysis of the Translation of Humor. in Audiovisual Texts. In *Los caminos de la lengua estudios en homenaje an Enrique Alcáraz Varó* (pp. 189-205). Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation* (Vol. 1, p. 988). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Pepicello, W. J., & Green, T. A. (1984). *Language of Riddles: New Perspectives*. The Ohio State University Press.
- Rejeibi, R. (2023). *A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to Explicating Humour in Subtitling Sitcoms from English to Arabic* (Doctoral dissertation, SOAS University of London).
- Saeed, H. Q. (2024). Translation Challenges in Children's Literature: A Comparative Study of Story Narratives. *Journal of Language Studies*, 8(6), 183-199.
- Serpieri, A. (2004). Translating Shakespeare: A Brief Survey of Some Problematic Areas. *DQR Studies in Literature*, 35(1), 27-49.
- Spanakaki, K. (2007). Translating Humour for Subtitling. *Translation Journal*, 11(2), 1-24.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986/1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Blackwell
- Vandaele, J. (2002). Introduction: (Re-) Constructing Humor: Meanings and Means. *The Translator*, 8(2), 149-172.
- Venuti, L. (2017). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.

- Yus, F. (2010). Relevance, humor and translation. *Relevance Theory: More than understanding*, ISBN, 978-1.
- Zhonggang, S. (2006). A relevance theory perspective on translating the implicit information in literary texts. *Journal of Translation*, 2(2), 43-60.
- Zabalbeascoa, P. (1996). Translating jokes for dubbed television situation comedies. *The Translator*, 2(2), 235-257.
- Xu, Q., & Liu, L. (2022). The Application of Relevance Theory in the Practice of Chinese Translation of English News. *Studies in Social Science & Humanities*, 1(4), 79-83.