



Est.1994

JCL

Journal of the College of Languages

Open Free Access, Peer Reviewed Research Journal

<http://jcolang.uobaghdad.edu.iq>

P-ISSN: 2074-9279
E-ISSN: 2520-3517
2021, No.(43)
Pg.64-101

Translating Food and Drink-Related Insults in Shakespeare's (Henry IV) into Arabic

Asst. Prof. Essam Tahir Muhammed

Email: essam.kassab@uomosul.edu.iq

University of Mosul, College of Arts, Department of Translation,
Mosul, Iraq.

(Received on 27/7/2020 - Accepted on 27/9/2020 - Published on 2/1/2021)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2021.0.43.0064>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract

This study highlights the problems of translating Shakespeare's food and drink-related insults (henceforth FDRIs) in (Henry IV, Parts I&II) into Arabic. It adopts (Vinay & Darbelnet's:1950s) model, namely (Direct& Oblique) to highlight the applicability of the different methods and procedures made by the two selected translators (Mashati:1990 & Habeeb:1905) .The present study tries to answer the following questions:(i) To what extent the FDRIs in Henry IV might pose a translational problem for the selected translators to find suitable cultural equivalents for them? (ii) Why do the translators, in many cases, resort to a literal procedure which is almost not workable with such expressions. (iii)What is the main reason behind the high percentage of inappropriateness in translating FDRIs from English into Arabic? As for

the main conclusions that the study has come up with, we can sum up them in the following points. (i) Most of the FDRIs are culturally bound expressions with cultural peculiarities making them very hard to be deciphered and translated even by experienced translators. (ii) Most of the FDRIs used by Shakespeare in his tragedy Henry IV, are very old and were his own inventions, a fact that makes them very difficult not only for the non-native speakers of English as the case with our translators (Mashati & Habeeb) but also for the native speakers. (iii) Finally, one can say that all the wrong and funny renditions were due to the wrong adopted procedures by (Mashati & Habeeb), while the other successful renderings were as a result of their well-selected procedures that consider the cultural difference between the two languages.

Keywords: *insults, linguistic context, procedures, source language, target language*

1. Introduction

Translating Shakespearean food and drink-related insults could be a thorny task for Arabic translators due to many reasons. First, FDRIs used by Shakespeare are almost of his invention that makes them very specific to English culture or more precisely to old English culture. Such expressions are rarely used nowadays. Thus, they are very difficult for native and nonnative speakers due to the considerable amount of culture laden connotations they hold and their nonappearance in the famous contemporary dictionaries of the English language. Secondly, the abundant use of figurative language, allegory, and wordplay by Shakespeare makes his works very difficult to translate and in many cases, the message conveyed

by the Arabic translators suffers from a big loss of SLT beauty and intentionality as a result of the heavy dependence on the denotative (explicit) meaning of the words and the unintentional ignorance of the connotative (implicit meaning) which is intended. Third, in many cases, the translators' poor attention to the cultural differences that exist between SL and TL results in very serious mistakes and clumsy renditions. The following are the main aims of the present study:

1. To highlight Vinay and Darbelnet's model so that the readers become more familiar with it.
2. To investigate the applicability and workability of Vinay and Darbelnet's methods and procedures in translating FDRIs in William Shakespeare's Henry IV.
3. To highlight the most applicable techniques in translating FDRIs.
4. To assess the translation of the selected translators through their performance in translating FDRIs in William Shakespeare's Henry IV.

2.Literature Review

2.1.Background to the Study

Henry IV is one of the greatest tragedies of Shakespeare which is based on historical facts. Henry IV consists of two parts and it is a part of a tetralogy that starts with Richard II and ends with Henry V. This historical drama is written in verse and prose by William Shakespeare. Each part of it consists of five acts. Henry IV represented in 1597-98 and published respectively in 1598 and 1600. In Henry IV, Shakespeare dramatizes several important events of life in English during the reign of several monarchs. This particular tetralogy is composed of works bases on the lives of the succession of the monarchs for 45 years from 1377 to 1422. The four works

of the tetralogy are: Richard II, Henry IV, Parts I&II, and Henry V. Although all parts of the tetralogy are connected by the sequence of historical events and the commonality of some characters, the plays about the reign of Henry IV stand out, forming an independent artistic whole, differing in content, spirit, and tone from the chronicles framing theatricality.

2.2. Insults in English Literature

An insult is a speech act that expresses- in a very general sense-the speaker's negative evaluation of the addressee(Jucker&Taavitsainen ,2013,p.105). It is a whole communicative act produced by a sender with the deliberate intent of offending a target entity and it does so by attributing a very negative property to the target to spoil that target's self-image (De'Errica et al,2015,p. 251). (Korostelina,2014,p.3) points out that insults are an inevitable aspect of the social relations that face each of us on a daily or almost daily basis. People may hurt each other by whole sentences, or discourses, single words uttered here and there, or by gestures, postures, and a gaze. What is hurt by these communicative weapons are not parts of our body but recesses of our souls. We are wounded by other's hate, contempt, and indifference, and what is wounded is our deepest self (De'Errica et al,2015,p.247).

According to (Mato&Yus , 200,p.1), insults are powerful devices of interaction through language that reinforce the intentional force of communication dramatically. Insults manifest our intentions, feelings, and very often our aggressive nature. They have a connotative nature, resort to metaphor and absurd analogies, and nonsensical images along with a strong creative drive.

For (Guerrin,2016,p.20) , words are insults when they are either delivered as insults or received as such since they are very context-bound expressions. Another interesting point worth commenting on is that insults are culture-bound expressions. (Mato&Yus,2000,p.2), point out that the efficiency of an insult might differ from one culture to another and what is considered very insulting in one culture might be of weak effect. For example, the English word "*bastard*" is used in English culture with a very strong insulting effect while when it is used in Spanish its effect is weakened, becoming almost a lenient insult. (Mato&Yus ,2000,p. 2) believe that the cognitive drive that impels people to insult is the same for everybody but the tools employed are different from one language to another. The word "*foxy*" for example is used in English to mean (very sexy, attractive, clever, or fascinating) while the Spanish equivalent "*Zorra*" is used to mean (bitch, whore, or wicked) . It is worth mentioning here that Shakespeare was the best insult writer of his age who made a great contribution in this field through the coinage of many insults that used on the lips of his characters in his literary works. Shakespeare's insults targeted the insultees' characteristics or physical appearance with aggressively focused intentionality and FDRIs are among the insults used by Shakespeare as derogatory notes.

2.3. Taxonomy of Shakespearean Insults

William Shakespeare used a lot of attributes that belong to the material things that exist around us in our physical world besides the human and animalistic abstract attributes to sarcastically address abominable characters in his plays and novels. He was not only skillful in using plantation terms like vegetables and fruits and other plant terms but he did the same with different types of drinkable materials as well as animals products (meat, fat,

cheese, eggs, cheese, milk) to insult lowlife people on the lips of his characters in his works. Shakespeare's insults were not limited to food (i.e. fruits, vegetables, drinks, meat and animal meat, fat and other products) but he used a variety of life aspects such as those belonging to man (politicians, fishmongers, and pirates) or those belong to inanimate things (rag, stone, thimble). Shakespeare also used the attributes of animals as (pigs, birds, bulls, pigeons) to address some of his characters and he went further as he used human qualities (rogue, traitor, fool), body parts (guts, lips, eye, brain) and diseases (disease, pox, canker, boil) as insulting tools. The abovementioned types of Shakespearean insults are clearly shown by the following examples retrieved from:

“<https://www.sparknotes.com/shakespeare>” .

1. “His breath stinks with eating **toasted cheese**”.

“Henry VI, part II, Act IV, Scene VII”

2. “O, thou invisible **spirit of wine**”.

“Othello, Act II, Scene III”

3. “A goodly **apple rotten at the heart**.”

“Merchant of Venice, Act I, Scene III”

4. “And like a **scurvy politician** seems to see the things thou dost not.”

“King Lear, Act IV, Scene VI”

5. “No more brain than a **stone**.”

“Twelfth Night, Act I, Scene V”

6. “The wretched. Bloody and usurping boar that spoiled your summer.”

“Richard III, Act V, Scene 2”

7. “What a frosty-spirited **rogue** is this!”

“Henry IV, Act II, Scene III”

8. “He has not so much **brain** as ear-wax!”

“Troilus and Cressida, Act V, Scene I”

9. “Thou art a **boil**, a **plague-sore** or embossed **carbuncle** in my corrupted blood.”

“King Lear, Act 2, Scene 4”



(Diagram No.1: FDRs in Shakespeare's Henry IV , Parts I &II

In a nutshell, we agree with (Canning,1884,p.216) who sees Shakespeare as a privileged inheritance of Englishmen of all ages and of all times. Shakespeare's works alone, as (Medwell et al,2014,p.54) point out, had a huge impact on the lexicon(words)of the English language as he put in use many new words that were not in existence before and they have survived into modern English. Some of Shakespeare's derogatory expressions and insults were first used by him and some of them survived to modern English and they are used nowadays and understood by the majority of English people but we cannot deny their ability in posing a complete misunderstanding of the text if the foreign reader who is in the same time the translator does not have sufficient knowledge of Shakespearean neologisms and his way in playing on words. The situation gets worse when some insulting words and expressions used by Shakespeare in works cannot be found in ordinary dictionaries because they failed to pass into modern English and thus they need to be checked in special glossaries or dictionaries. It is worth mentioning here that literary texts translators' task is not easy at all but it is thorny and full of challenges. They should take into consideration time and cultural differences to decode the writer's message to arrive at the intended meaning of every insulting word and expression because time and cultural restrictions run powerfully in the insulting paradigm of any language.

3.Methodology

The present study falls into two parts:(i) the theoretical part, which consists of a short background of the topic of the study, i.e. (Henry IV), related literature of (FDRIs) concept, Vinay and Drbelnet's model, and finally a taxonomy of Shakespeare's insults (ii) the practical part, which

consists of nine tables with two Arabic translations of (FDRIs) by two Arab translators, namely (Mashati:1990) and(Habeeb:1905). The tables are followed by a detailed discussion of each text. After the discussion of the selected data, a frequency analysis comes to declare the findings and to highlight the frequent procedures used by each one of the selected translators. In the end, the study comes to its conclusions followed by a list of the consulted references.

3.1. Vinay & Darbelnet's Framework of Data Analysis:

In their book which is entitled "Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology of Translation", (Vinay and Darbelnet: 1995) proposed their contrastive stylistic analysis of translation and they set up their model according to three basic linguistic aspects, namely (vocabulary "lexicon", grammar "syntax", and composition "message") (El-Farahaty,2015,p.59). The following figure which is retrieved from (Vinay & Darbelnet,1995,p.30) can give an idea about the three-dimensional planes of utterance:

Planes:	I	II	III
METALINGUISTIC INFORMATION emphasis molecules Context	unit of thought monemes)(phrases and	tone, links
BORDERS			
MESSAGE STYLISTICS units of paragraph	STRUCTURE morphology & syntax	LEXICON sentence	OF translation

 MICROLINGUISTICS

composition

grammar

Vocabulary

(table no.1.the three planes of an utterance)

Vinay & Darbelnet (1995,p.84) (as cited in El-Farahaty,2015,p.60), claim that "certain stylistic effects cannot be transposed to TL without upsetting the syntactic order or even the lexis". To tackle this stylistic problem, they suggest two general translation methods and seven translation procedures to be followed by the translator according to the above planes. The different methods or procedures proposed by (Vinay & Darbelnet,1995,p.31) seemed at first to be countless, but they were condensed to two main methods (direct and oblique) and seven procedures (borrowing, claque, literal translation, transposition, modulation, equivalence, and adaptation); each one corresponding to a higher degree of complexity. In practice, they may be used either on their own or combined with one or more of the others. Broadly speaking, a translator can choose from these two methods. In some rendition tasks, it might be likely to transpose the SL message component by component into the TL. Vinay & Darbelnet (1995,p.31) state that " such transposition is based on either (i) parallel categories, in which case we can speak of structural parallelism, or (ii) on parallel concepts, which are the result of metalinguistic parallelisms". In other rendition tasks, as Vinay & Darbelnet point out, a translator should manage the gaps, or "lacunae" using corresponding elements so that the overall impression is the same for the two languages. It may, however, also happen that, because of structural or metalinguistic differences, certain stylistic effects cannot be transposed into TL without upsetting the syntactic order, or even the lexis and thus a translator has to choose a more complex

method of translation, namely (oblique method) to permit translators a strict control over the reliability of their work. Now, let us respectively view the two main methods and their related procedures in detail.

3.1.1 Direct Method

This kind of method is employed only when the source language message can be transferred into the target language as a result of parallelism of structure and concepts between SL and TL. The following are the sub-categories (procedures) of the direct method of translation:

3.1.1.1. Borrowing

According to (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995, p.31), borrowing is the simplest of all translation methods. It is employed to overcome a lacuna, usually a metalinguistic one (e.g. a new technical process, an unknown concept). See the following examples that are taken from Arabic to English and vice versa:

مكة ، الجبر ، علي بابا

Alibaba, algebra, Mecca

واتس اب ، مسنجر ، راديو

Radio, Messenger, What's up

3.1.1.2. Calque

With regard to (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995, p.32), a calque is a special kind of borrowing whereby a language borrows an expression form of another, but then translates literally each of its elements. For (El-Farahaty, 2015, p.60), calque is clear in the translation of common collocations, names of organizations, the

components of compounds, and perhaps phrases in the famous English-Arabic pairs:

الرجل العنكبوت	الرجل الخارق	ناطحات السحاب
Spiderman	Superman	Skyscrapers

3.1.1.3. Literal Translation

According to (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995, p.33), literal, or word for word translation, is very applicable between the languages that belong to the same family like the Indo-European languages. For them, it is the direct transfer of an SL text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate TL text in which the translators' task is limited to observing the adherence to the linguistic servitudes of the TL. Based on Vinay & Darbelnet's view, (El-Farahaty, 2015, p.60) displays that literal translation is far-fetched between Arabic and English with some rare cases as in the following examples.

أنا أتحدث الانكليزية I speak English (TL) (Abdelaal, 2020, p.13)

أنا اشتريت فيلا I bought a villa (TL) (Abdelaal, 2020, p.14)

Vinay and Darbelnet (1995, p.34) discuss that if the translators after trying the first three procedures come up with a conclusion that literal translation is improper because it entails a mistaken meaning, or it is meaningless or impossible for structural or pragmatic ends, then they must turn to the procedures of oblique translation.

3.1.2. Oblique (Indirect) Translation

This kind of method is employed when source language message cannot be transferred directly into target language via literal translation due

to the absence of parallelism of structures and meta-linguistic concepts between SL and TL. This case happens when SL and TL belong to different language families as in the case between English and Arabic. Thus, the translators have to dispense with a literal translation and turn to oblique (indirect) translation method to produce an acceptable translation by TL receptors. The following are the subcategories (procedures) of the oblique method.

3.2.1. Transposition

Based on (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995, p.36), a transposition is the replacement of a word class with another without altering the propositional content of the message. In translation, there are two distinct types of transposition: (i) obligatory transposition, and (ii) optional transposition. Consider the following examples that are retrieved from (Nasser, 2020, p.78).

سيارة حمراء A **red** car ← (Obligatory Transposition)

قرع علينا الباب There was a **knock** at the door ← (Optional Transposition)

3.1.2.2. Modulation

In accordance with (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995, p.36), Modulation is a variation of the form of the message, obtained by a change in the point of view which is very similar to Newmark's modulation which is represented by the variation through a change of viewpoint of perspective and very often of thought category (Newmark, 1988, p.89). For Vinay & Darbelnet, this change can be justified when, although a literal, or even transposed, translation results in a grammatically correct utterance, it is considered unsuitable, unidiomatic or awkward in the TL. Modulation is of two types: (i) obligatory modulation, and (ii) optional modulation. In translation

between English and Arabic, modulation is widely used. For example, the Arabic translator tends to translate passive construction in English into Active in Arabic and this is an optional modulation. Consider the following examples retrieved from (Nasser,2020,p.78):

←The letter was written by John)Optional(←جون كتب الرسالة
 ← Weak argument ←(←حجة باردة Obligatory)
 ← It is not hard to learn)Optional(←من السهل أن نتعلم

3.1.2.3. Equivalence

With regard to (Vinay and Darbelnet,1995,p.38), this type of procedure is employed when the translators have to render the same situation by two texts using completely different stylistic and structural methods. For them , most equivalences are fixed and belong to a phraseological repertoire of idioms, clichés, proverbs, nominal or adjectival phrases, etc. In general, proverbs are perfect examples of equivalences. Consider the following examples:

←الطيور على اشكالها تقع ← Birds of a feather flock together
 (El-Farahaty,2015,p.62)

←وافق شئ طبقة ← The married couple is very suited to each other
 (Hajaj & Kharma, 1989, p.75)

3.1.2.4. Adaptation

According to (Vinay and Darbelnet ,1995,p.39), adaptation is used in those cases where the type of situation being referred to by the SL message

is unknown in the target culture. In such cases, translators have to create a new situation that can be considered as being equivalent. Adaptation can, therefore, be described as a special kind of equivalence, a situational equivalence. Adaptations are particularly frequent in the translation of book and film titles, culture-specific terms and expressions. Consider the following examples:

← أمن من حمام مكة As save as tortoise under its shell

(Mohammed,2018,p.8)

← السلام عليكم Hello

(Abdelaal,2020,p.15)

3.2. Data Analysis

The present study is quantitative and qualitative in nature. To come up with the desirable results and to answer the questions put forward by the researcher, nine English texts with literary insults were selected from different acts and scenes of Shakespeare's (Henry IV, part I&II) along with their Arabic translation to be the corpus of the study. To achieve the goal of the present study, the selected texts were carefully read and analyzed in terms of the cultural differences between SL &TL in what concerns FDRIs. Then a frequency analysis based on Vinay and Darbelnet's direct and oblique model of translation was carried out to shed light on the most appropriate procedure that should be adopted in translating literary FDRIs from English into Arabic.

4. Results and Discussion

The subjects' renditions of the selected insults are thoroughly displayed and discussed in the following section:

SL Text No.1

SLT	Falstaff: "Strike! Down with them! Cut the villains' throats! Ah, whoreson caterpillars, bacon-fed knaves , they hate us youth. Down with them! Fleece them!" <i>"Henry IV, Part 1, Act 2, Scene 2, p.43"</i>		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.	اكله الدهن البلهاء	Literal	القرويون البلهاء
Habeeb (1905,p.	الممثلون شحما"	Literal	

According to (Guerrin,2016,p.22), the word "bacon" is derived from old French, and it is etymologically related to the back "buttock" of the swine which is mainly consumed by the rural people in England in Shakespeare's days. The word was first used by Shakespeare on the lips of Falstaff in Henry IV as an intended insult through the use of the negative connotative meaning of the word "bacon" as a food image. Falstaff, as (Guerrin,2016,p.23), points out, used the expression "bacon-fed knaves" to let us know that the travelers were fat and more paradoxically, rustic, unsophisticated rural people because swine's flesh was the meat chiefly consumed by the rural population of England. The situation here is very

ironic as Falstaff gives to the travelers his characteristic features, his fatness and suggests they are poor men and at the same time he robs them.

Mashati (1990,p.44), and Habeeb (1905,p.79) were unlucky with this text as they chose the direct method of translation (literal translation procedure) to translate it into Arabic. In fact, their choice was inappropriate since literal translation is not fit for all contexts especially when there is no lexical parallelism between TL and SL. Consequently, the direct transfer of SL text into TL idiomatically failed. Both of the Arabic translators could not provide an equivalent image that corresponds to the SL image as well as the intended meaning of the speaker was not conveyed. Mashati (1990,p.44), provided the word "الدهن" as an equivalent to the English word "bacon" which is entirely different from SL food item and refers to an entirely different object. Habeeb (1905,p.79), on the other hand, wrongly provided "الممتلون شحما" ومالا as an equivalent to "bacon-fed knaves" . He provided " شحما " as an equivalent of the word "bacon" and thus he committed the same mistake of Mashati in providing a different object with different semantic features. The second mistake done by Habeeb is the use of the word " مالا " which indicates that the rural people are rich, and since there is no hint in Falstaff's words to the money that the travelers had with them, it is considered faulty and needless piece of information.

One can deduce from Falstaff's description that they were poor, rural, rustic people depending on the fact that bacon was mainly consumed by the poor rural population in Shakespeare. In a nutshell, the expression "bacon-fed knaves" was used by Shakespeare to refer to the rural people and he could convey that through the use of the compound word "bacon-fed" . At

the same time, he wanted to say that rural people are rustic or hick and disgusting as they consume bacon which very difficult to digest.

SLT No.2

SLT	Falstaff: "There's no more faith in thee than in a <u>stewed prune</u> ". " <i>Henry IV, Part 1, Act 3, Scene 3,p.94</i> "		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.107)	"أنواثق بأنك منافقة اكثر من أي كاذب "دجال"	Modulation	فبك من الوفاء اكثر مما "بنت ليل"
Habeeb (1905,p.162)	"ليس فيك من الوفاء اكثر مما في امرأة "عاهرة"	Adaptation	

According to (Guerrin,2016,p.384), stewed-prunes are dried plums which were a popular dish in brothels which were known as "stews". In Henry VI, Shakespeare uses this expression on the lips of Falstaff during his conversation with the hostess as he relates her to the world of the brothel by this scornful and figurative use of the language. The expression conveys the notion of deception and unfaithfulness as it is indirectly said. Stewed-prune is a euphemism of the word "whore" and both belong to a brothel. Bawdiness, as (Hardy,1979,p.180) points out, was compounded by Shakespeare through the proliferation of sexual references as "beast, otter, fish, stewed-prune, etc.". The food image of "stewed-prune" is a reference to

a whore, not something else. Falstaff makes a comparison between the hostess and a whore(stewed-prune) and the point of similarity is the concept of unfaithfulness. The whole comparison is carried out through the use of the food item "stewed-prune" that has a negative connotation, namely "a whore". The word "whore" in its turn has many negative connotations; the most common of which is unfaithfulness and it is the speaker's intended meaning in the given context. Mashati (1990,p.107), provided "كاذب دجال", a lying charlatan " as an equivalent for the figuratively used food item "stewed prune" which mainly refers to "a whore" and thus he has changed the object of the referring expression and the image to which the hostess is compared to, namely, "a whore". Mashati tried to modulate SL text for the sake of politeness. By using "كاذب دجال".

Mashati sought for a politer expression due to TL cultural norms. One cannot deny that he has succeeded in conveying the image politely or less directly as it is in English but at the same time he committed a mistake when he has changed the point of comparison between the hostess and "a stewed-prune". Mashati used "غير وفية، ليس فيك وفاء" instead of "منافقة" and thus he shifted the notion of "unfaithfulness" into the notion of "hypocrisy". In the same time, he shifted the sex of the image of comparison from feminine to masculine, as if in Arabic only men have such feature while he could use for example, "كاذبة محتالة", with a slight amendment to the other items in the text, i.e., changing "منافقة" with "ليس فيك من الوفاء" and thus his rendition can be more appropriate without any change in the propositional content of SL text. Another try to convey the intended meaning of Shakespeare's bawdy wordplay "stewed-prune" into Arabic was made by (Habeeb,1905,p.162). Habeeb provided "أمرأة عاهرة" as an equivalent for the

English food item "stewed-prune". Habeeb was luckier than Mashati in his attempt. He applied another procedure of translation, namely "adaptation".

Thus, he brought a concept in Arabic, "أمرأة عاهرة" that corresponds to the SL item "stewed-prune" in meaning. Habeeb succeeded to convey the intended meaning but at the same time he failed to keep the stylistic indirectness of the writer since he used the very direct expression "أمرأة عاهرة". Habeeb's rendition was not 100% correct due to the stylistic shift. Even if we attribute the decision made by him to the fact that Arabic does not have an indirect idiomatic food expression as English does as in this case as a result of an expected lexical gap between SL and TL, but still there are other choices with less amount of directness or dysphemism, for example, "بنت هوى، بنت ليل". See the proposed translation above.

SLT No.3

SLT	Falstaff: "All the other gifts appurtenant to man, as the malice of this age, shapes them, are not worth a <u>gooseberry</u> ." <i>"Henry IV, Part 2, Act 1, Scene 2,p.169"</i>		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.185)	لاتساوي شروى نقير	Equivalence	لاتساوي قشر بصلة
Habeeb (1905,p.272)	لايكادون يسااون حبة من خردل	Equivalence	(574:1971) Nasha'at

According to (Fairecloth and Thomas,2014,p.157), gooseberry refers to a spiny shrub of the currant family which was cultivated to produce larger slightly sweeter berries than those that were available in the wild. It was planted as a decorative shrub. The fruit of this plant was backed and served as a relish with meat. Gooseberry not only has a nutritious value in English culture but also a proverbial use. In Shakespeare's time, as Fairecloth and Thomas, point out, this plant was a symbol of anything that has very little value or dirty-cheap because of its abundance in that time. Shakespeare in Henry IV used this plant in its figurative meaning on the lips of Falstaff in his verbal duel with the chief justice complaining against the injustice that befell good men like him in the commercial age. Falstaff says: "all other gifts pertinent to a man, as the malice of this age shapes them are not worth a gooseberry". The intended meaning behind the use of Falstaff to such food items is to show the trivial value given to his and other men's talent. He did that through the use of the figurative analogy between the men's gifts and the food item "gooseberries". Both(Mashati,p.185 &Habeeb,p.272) succeeded in conveying the intended meaning of the speaker as they provided the Arabic idiomatic equivalent of the English food idiomatic expression "don't worth a gooseberry". But it is worth mentioning here that both translators were too classic. Both provided classic Arabic equivalent that can be understood by one class of readership and misunderstood by others. The stylistic choice of both was very high for a layman readership and it was intended for professional Arabic readers, while the original text was written in a very informal style; thus one should look for an equivalent in the Arabic language that shares the same stylistic features and diction of the original text as well as reading easy for all types of readership. Thus, one can replace (شروي نقير لاتساوي) or (لايكادون يساؤون حبة خردل) with (لاتساوي قشر)

بصلة) which is by and large known by every Arabic reader whether a layman, professional or specialist. See the proposed translation in the table above.

SLT No.4

SLT	Hotspur: "O, I could divide myself and go to buffets, for moving such a dish of skim milk with so honorable an action!" <i>Henry IV, Part 1, Act 2, Scene 3, p.46</i> "		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.48)	رعدید	Adaptation	Mashati's rendition is adopted here.
Habeeb (1905,p.82)	خائر الهممة	Adaptation	

Henry Percy, known as "Hotspur" is the son of the Earl of Northumberland. He has fought for king Henry IV in Scotland but now, in this scene, he is conspiring with the enemy Douglas against the king and attempts to launch a military attack against him (Blaisdell,2006,p.18). In this scene, Hotspur receives a letter from a friend who rejects to join him in his rebellion against the king. Hotspur's reaction to the refusal of the nobleman was sever so he described him as a dish of skim milk, i.e., a shallow cowardly hind . Shakespeare used the expression "a dish of skim milk" as an insult directed by Hotspur to the coward nobleman. It was first coined by Shakespeare and used as a symbol of a person with his or her courage removed as the milk with its fat or cream removed. The figurative use of

such expression extended to our modern time with a slight amendment on the expression which has become "a dish of skimmed milk" not "a dish of skim milk".

Mashati & Habeeb in their attempt to provide an appropriate translation for the food-related insult by Shakespeare they both adapted the oblique method of translation(adaptation). Both translators did their best to convey the intended meaning behind the use of such expression. Consequently, (Mashati,1990,p.48) provided "رعيد" while (Habeeb ,1905,p.82) provided "خائر الهممة" as Arabic equivalents of the English expression "a dish of skim milk". Mashati was more very close to the intended meaning by the speaker in comparison with Habeeb who provided "خائر الهممة" for the English expression. Here we can take back translation as a test for the most appropriate translation of both translators. For example, if we put "رعيد" back into English depending on Al-Ma'ani Arabic-Arabic dictionary & Lasan Al-Arab by Ibin Manthoor (1993, p.1669,vol.1 & p.473,vol.6), we can see that the most appropriate word in English for it is "coward" or "very coward" while if we put "خائر الهممة" back into English depending on the same criteria,i.e.(back translation and an Arabic-Arabic dictionary) then we will see that the expressions; "someone with weak determination" or "someone with weak will or personality" is the most appropriate equivalents in English and they are to some extent near to the intended meaning but not the exact meaning intended by the speaker i.e. "a coward person".Thus, Mashati's rendition "رعيد" is the most appropriate one. See the table above.

SLT No.5

SLT	Prince Henry: "Why dost thou converse with that trunk of humor, that bolting-hutch of beastliness, that swollen parcel of dropsies, <u>that huge bombard of sack</u> " "Henry IV, Part 1, Act 2, Scene 4,p.66"		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.75)	هذا الدن المملوء خمرة	Literal	Habeb's rendition is adopted here
Habeb (1905,p.116)	هذا الزق الضخم من النبيذ	Literal	

In this text, Hal directs an insult to Falstaff and accuses him of being drunkard. According to (Guerrin,2016,p.68) and (Irving & Marshall 1890,p.255), a bombard is a waxed leather vessel coated from outside with tar or pitch and used for holding liquor. Guerrin points out that in Henry IV, Shakespeare used the expression "a huge bombard of sack" as a metaphoric insult that transfers Falstaff into a vessel or container for liquor either for holding it or for drinking from. Guerrin, believes that Shakespeare used the word " bombard" to highlight some features of Falstaff, for example., to show us that Falstaff is as black as the vessel of a sack that is coated with tar from outside and he is as noisy as the bombard of war. To translate this text into Arabic, both translators have selected the direct method of translation, namely (literal procedure). Consequently, (Mashati ,1990,p.75) provided " هذا الدن المملوء بالخمير هذا " while (Habeb ,1905,p.116) provided " هذا الزق الضخم من النبيذ " as equivalentents for the English text. Both translators were successful in their attempt to show the scornful statement addressed to Falstaff by Hal as he attributed him to being drunkard with a big belly full of liquor. It is

worth mentioning here that the Arabic word "دن" is not the same as "زق" because the two objects are made of different materials and have different physical shapes even though both refer to liquor containers. According to Al-Ma'ani Arabic online dictionary; the Arabic word "دن" refers to the material object "barrel" while the Arabic word "زق" refers to the material object "bombard" i.e., a container made of leather". Thus, Habeeb could provide the most appropriate translation because his translation could not only keep the image of the comparison made by Shakespeare between Falstaff's belly and the bombard but also it kept the image of comparison between Falstaff's skin color and the color of the leather vessel which is coated with a pitch from outside.

SLT No.6	Carrier: "As fat as butter" <i>"Henry IV, Part 1, Act 2, Scene 4, p.70"</i>		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.78)	سائق: أجل ضخم كانه محشو دهنًا"	Modulation	الجمال : أسمن من دب Al-Zamakhshary (1976:171)
Habeeb (1905,p.12)	الجمال: سمين كالزبدة	Literal	

In this text the Sheriff and the carrier visit prince Hal's stronghold seeking for Falstaff and his companions who robbed the carrier's money. Falstaff was hiding behind the curtain according to prince Hal's orders while the other thieves were asked to hide upstairs. Then the sheriff describes the shape of thieves to the prince then he informs him that there is one who is a

grossly fat man is known to him. The carrier, on the other hand, adds more details to the description made by the sheriff as he says "yes, he is as fat as butter". To translate this text into Arabic, Mashati adopted an oblique procedure(modulation) which is not applicable in this case. Mshati committed a serious mistake in his attempt to translate the intended insult because he modulated the text in a very bad manner instead of looking for an appropriate Arabic equivalent. Habeeb (1905:120), on the other hand, adopted a direct translation method (literal procedure). Since simile is a kind of figurative language use, one has to think of cultural filtering. In this text, we see the carrier uses the word "butter" to show how much fat Falstaff is! The speaker compared Falstaff to "butter" and it is quite acceptable in English culture; but is it acceptable the same in our culture? If yes, then his translation is 100% appropriate but if the reverse is true then his translation must be adapted to our culture and this is what happened in the proposed translation in the above table.

SLT No.7	Falstaff: "All? I know not what you call all, but if I fought not with five of them I am a bunch of radish " <i>"Henry IV, Part 1, Act 2, Scene 4,p.57"</i>		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.62)	ولكن إذا لم اقاتل خمسين أكون كباقة فجل	literal	ان لم اقاتل خمسين منهم فأنا جبان
Habeeb (1905,p.101)	الا أكن قد قاتلت خمسين رجلا" منهم فمأنا الاهزيل كعود الفجل	Modulation	

Walker (2019,p.84) illustrates that one of the things that makes Falstaff so funny is his ongoing hyperbole to expatiate on his heroic performance by the unconventional use of metaphor. In this scene, Falstaff claims that he and his accomplice could steal a thousand pounds in the Gadshill heist and he then tells prince Hal that a hundred other men stole it from them, but not before he had fought with dozens of them two hours together. But after that, Hal confronts him with a more accurate account of what happened, then Falstaff defended himself by his famous expression "but if I fought not with fifty of them I am a bunch of radishes".

According to (Weil&Weil ,1997,p.117) and (Tayler et al, 2016 ,p.1306), the FRI used by Falstaff in this scene exactly means excessive leanness or cowardice since radish was used in Shakespeare's time as a symbol of cowardice or coward people. It is red on the outside and the red color signifies power with positive color connotation while it is white from inside and the white color here signifies cowardice with a negative connotation. Mashati (1990,p.62) failed in his attempt because he provided a literal translation of the TL expression (a bunch of radishes) as he translated it into Arabic as (باقة فجل) which does not bear the figurative meaning of SL due to the cultural difference and the lack of such image in Arabic. As for (Habeeb ,1905,p.101), he also failed in his attempt to convey the exact meaning of the TL expression even he has followed a different procedure from that followed by Mashati. Habeeb provided the Arabic expression (هزيل كعود الفجل) as an equivalent to the English expression (a bunch of radishes) but he did not put in his consideration that such an image is not used in Arabic and the use of it makes it very strange to the Arabic reader to understand. The English expression can be appropriately translated into Arabic if one can find the equivalent object in Arabic that can convey the

same intended meaning otherwise one can give the intended meaning directly into Arabic especially in case of the cultural gap in what concerns the type of food used for the same insult. Consider the proposed translation in the table.

SLT No.8	Falstaff: "He a good wit? Hang him, baboon. His wit's as thick as Tewksbury mustard . There's no more conceit in him than is in a mallet" "Henry IV, Part 2, Act 2, Scene 4,p.201"		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.229)	أنه غليظ الفهم عديم الذوق مثل خردل "توكس بري"	literal	أن فطنته بثخن الحجر (Zangana,2000:38)
Habeeb (1905,p.329)	أن عقله أغبى من خردل "توكس بري"	Literal	

According to (Beisly ,1864,p.97), Tewkesbury mustard was sharp and biting. It was considered the best in Shakespeare's time. It is named after the town that produces it "Tewksbury"; the fair and large town and the place of the famous mustard makers in Yorkshire in England. In this scene, Falstaff directs an insult toward his friend Poin as he makes a kind of comparison between his friend's character and Tewkesbury mustard. Such comparison is based on an exact point of similarity intended by Falstaff which is the thickness of such kind of mustard and the wit or brain of his friend. Here, both (Mashati ,1990,p.229) and (Habeeb ,1905,p.329) could not provide the appropriate meaning of the SL expression in TLT. Their renditions seem very foreign and strange due to the adoption of a wrong

choice or procedure, i.e., (literal procedure). The literal procedure here can do nothing to convey the intended meaning of the author thus they had better follow another procedure that can fulfill the task. Consider the proposed rendition in the table in which we follow an appropriate procedure, i.e., (adaptation).

SLT No.9	<i>staff: "If manhood, good manhood, be not forgotten upon the face of the earth, then am I a shotten herring"</i> <i>"Henry IV, Part 1, Act 2, Scene 4,p.55"</i>		
Subjects	TLT	Adopted Procedure/s	Proposed Rendition
Mashati (1990,p.59)	فولستاف:وأذا لم تنقرض الرجولة الحقيقية عن وجه الارض،أكون أنا كالسمك المجفف المدخن	Literal	فولستاف:وأذا كانت الرجولة،الرجولة الحقة لم يخل منها وجه الارض ولم تنسى،فاني . أذن واهن وضعيف
Habeeb (1905,p.98)	فالسنتاف:وأذا كانت الرجولة،الرجولة الحقة لم يخل منها وجه الارض ولم تنسى،فاني أذن لمستضعف كسمكة واهنة	Literal	

In this scene as (Phipson,1883,p.374) points out, Falstaff contemptuously denounces the cowardice of the prince and his friend Poin. He says:" Go thy way, old Jack; die when thou wilt, if manhood, good manhood, be not forgotten upon the face of the earth, then am I a shotten herring".(Doran , 874,p.450) & (Phipson,1883,p.374) agree that the phrase (a shotten herring) was figuratively used to depict the state of the lean meager fellow, i.e.(Falstaff). Doran, on the other hand, excludes the literal meaning of the expression, i.e., (a gutted herring that is dried for keeping". For him, the phrase (a shotten herring) as applied to fish is unlikely to mean gutted and

dried as it is in its literal meaning but it means a shabby underfed fellow who is thrown out like rubbish or refuse. (Mashati ,1990,p.59) has failed in his attempt because he provided a literal translation of the TL expression (a shotten herring) as he translated it into Arabic as (كسمك مجفف مدخن) which does not bear the figurative meaning of SL due to the cultural difference and the lack of such an image in Arabic. As for (Habeeb ,1905,p.98), he also failed in his attempt to convey the exact meaning of the TL expression as he also has followed a literal procedure. Habeeb provided the Arabic expression (كسمكة واهنة) as an equivalent to the English expression (a shotten herring) and he did not put in his consideration that such an image is not used in Arabic and the use of it makes it very strange to the Arabic reader to understand. The English expression can be appropriately translated into Arabic if one finds the equivalent object in Arabic which conveys the same intended meaning; otherwise one can give the intended meaning directly into Arabic especially in the case of the cultural gap between the two languages in what concerns the type of food used for the same insult. Consider the proposed translation in the table.

IV. Findings

The present study has come up with the following findings:

No.	SL Item	TL Item		Translation Procedure Adopted		Translation Method Adopted	
		T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2
1.	con-fed Kn	بلهء الدهن البلاء	ون شحما" وملة	Literal	Literal	Direct	Direct
2.	Stewed- prun	كاذب دجال	أمرأة عاهرة	Modulatio	Adaptatio	Oblique	Oblique
3.	Gooseberry	شروي نقير	حبة من خردل	Equivalenc	Equivalenc	Oblique	Oblique
4.	sh of skim r	ر عديد	خائر الهمة	Adaptatio	Adaptatio	Oblique	Oblique
5.	at huge bom	خمد المملوء	الزق الضخم	Literal	Literal	Direct	Direct
	of sack		النبيذ				
6.	As fat as but	دءه كانه محشو	سمين كالزبدة	Modulatio	Literal	Oblique	Direct
7.	unch of radis	كباقة فجل	بيل كعود الفجل	Literal	Modulatio	Direct	Oblique
8.	wksbury mu	"توكس" دل	دل "توكس بري"	Literal	Literal	Direct	Direct
		"بري"					
9.	hotten herr	المجفف المذ	عف كسمكة وء	Literal	Literal	Direct	Direct

(table no.2. frequency of different translation procedures and methods in the selected Arabic translations)

	Direct Method	Frequency	appropriateness	appropriateness	
	Borrowing	0	%0	0	%0 0
	Calque	0	%0	0	%0 0
	Literal	5	%0	0	%5 100
	Total (T1)	5	%0	0	%5 100
	Borrowing	0	%0	0	%0 0
	Calque	0	%0	0	%0 0
	Literal	5	%1	20	%4 80
	Total (T2)	5	%1	20	%4 80

(table no.3. applicability of direct method procedures in the TL texts by (Mashati, 1990) & (Habeeb, 1905)

	Oblique Method	Frequency	appropriateness	appropriateness	
	Transposition	0	%0	0	%0 0
	Modulation	1	%0	0	%1 100
	Equivalence	1	%1	100	%0 0
	Adaptation	2	%1	50	%1 50
	Total (T1)	4	%2	50	%2 50
	Transposition	0	%0	0	%0 0
	Modulation	1	%0	0	%1 100
	Equivalence	1	%1	100	%0 0
	Adaptation	2	%2	100	%0 0
	Total (T2)	4	%3	75	%1 25

(table no.4. applicability of oblique method procedures in TL texts by (Mashati ,1990) & (Habeeb ,1905)

	Direct Method	Frequency	SL Orientation
T1&T2	Borrowing	0	%55.6
	Calque	0	
	Literal	5	
	Total	5	
	Oblique Method	Frequency	TL Orientation
T1&T2	Transposition	0	%44.4
	Modulation	1	
	Equivalence	1	
	Adaptation	2	
	Total	4	

(table no.5. the orientation of T1&T2 according to the methods adopted)

V. Conclusions

The present study has come up with the conclusions:

1. Most of the FDRIs are culturally bound expressions with cultural peculiarities making them very hard to be deciphered and translated even by experienced translators.
2. Most of the FDRIs used by Shakespeare in his tragedy Henry IV, are very old and were his own inventions, a fact that makes them very difficult not only for the non-native speakers of English as the case with our translators (Mashati &Habeb) but also for the native speakers of it.

3. The wrong adopted procedures by (Mashati &Habeb) lead them in many cases to wrong and funny renditions.
4. The frequency of direct method followed by both translators is 55.6% while the frequency of the oblique one is 44.4%. This entails that they were SL oriented.
5. As for the appropriateness and inappropriateness criterion, Mashati (1990) used the direct method 0% appropriately and 100% inappropriately, while Habeb(1905) used it 20% appropriately and 80% inappropriately.
6. Mashati (1990) on the other hand, used the oblique method 50% appropriately and 50% inappropriately, while Habeb (1905) used it 75% appropriately and 25% inappropriately.
7. The translators of Shakespeare's works should put in their minds that their mission is not easy at all due to the abundant use of literary devices, and the implicit meaning. Thus, overlooking the cultural differences and the writer's intentionality would inevitably lead to a very award, senseless translation.

References

1. Abdelaal, N. (2020). *Translating between English and Arabic:A Textbook for Translation Students and Educators*. Oman: Nizwa Publishing.
2. Al-Ma'any. (2010). *Arabic Online Dictionary*. Retrieved from: <https://www.alma'any.com>

3. Al-Zamakhshary, Abu-alqasim., (1971). *Al-Mustaqsi fi Amthāl Al-'rab. Vol. I. 1st edition.* Beirut: Dar Al-kutob Al-almiya.
4. Beisly, S. (1864). *Shakespear's Garden: Or, The Plants and Flowers Named in His Works Described and Defined.* London: Longman.
5. Brewer, E. (2001). *The Wordsworth Dictionary of Phrase and Fable.* London: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
6. Canning, H. (1884). *Thoughts on Shakespear's Historical Plays.* London: Woodfall & Kinder Publishing.
7. D'Errico, F. et al. (2015). *Conflicts and Multimodal Communication: Social Research and Machine Intelligence.* Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
8. Doran, F.S.A. (1874). *Notes and Queries: A Medium of Intercommunication for Literary Men, General Readers, ETC. Vol. 1.* London: John Francis
9. Faircloth, N. & Thomas, V. (2014). *Shakespeare's Plants and Gardens: A Dictionary.* London & NY: Oxford University press.
10. El-Farahaty, H. (2015). *Arabic-English-Arabic Legal Translation.* London & New York: Routledge.
11. Guerrin, N. (2016). *Shakespear's Insults: A Pragmatic Dictionary.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing
12. Habeeb, M. (1905). *Henry IV, vol. I & II: Arabic Translation.* Cairo: Dār Al-Ma'aref for Publishing and Distribution.
13. Hardy, B. (1979). *Dramatic Quicklyisms: Metaphoric Wordplay Technique in Shakespear's Henriad.* Salzburg: Salzburge Press.

14. Halliwell, J. (2019). *Dictionary of Archaic Provincial Words, Obsolete Phrases, Proverbs, and Ancient Customs from the Fourteenth Century*. Vol. 2. London: Forgotten Books.
15. Ibin Manthūr, A. A. (1993). *Lisan Al- 'rab. Vols. 1 & 6*. Beirut: Dār Sāder.
16. Kharma, N. (1989). *Errors in English Among Arabic Speakers: Analysis and Remedy*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
17. Korostelina, K. (2014). *Political Insults: How Offenses Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
18. Mashati, R. (1990). *Henry IV , I & II: Arabic Translation*. Beirut: Natheer Aboud Publishing House.
19. Mateo, J. & Yus, F. (2000). *Insults: A Relevance-Theoretic Taxonomical Approach to Their Translation*. Retrieved January 31, 2014, from ResearchGate: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258697847>.
20. Medwell, E. (2014). *Primary English: Knowledge and Understanding*. London: SAGE Publication Ltd.
21. Mohammed, E. T. (2017). Simile As A Translation Problem. *Adab-Al-Farahidi Journal*, pp, 571, 573.
22. Nasser, L. A. (2020). *Translation : Strategies and Procedures*. Mosul: Noor Publishing House.
23. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
24. Phipson, E. (1883). *The Animal Lore of Shakespeare's Time Including Quadruped, Birds, Reptiles, Fish and Insects*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.
25. Shakespeare, W. (2006). *Shakespeare's Great Soliloquies*. Edited by Blaisdell, B. NY: Dover Publications INC.

26. Shakespeare,W.(1997). *The First Part of King Henry IV*. Edited by Weil,J. & Weil,H.London: Cambridge University Press.
27. Shakespeare,W.(1890). *The Works of William Shakespeare*. Edited by Irving,H.&Mrshall,F. London: Black & Son Limited.
28. Shakespeare,W.(1884). *Shakespeare's Works: Henry IV, Pt.1-2*.edited by Rolf,W.J. New York: Harper&Brothers Publishers.
29. Taavitsainen,I.(2013). *Historical Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
30. Tayler,G.et al.(2016). *The New Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*.Oxford: Oxford University Press.
31. Vinay, J.P.& Darbelnet.J.(1995).*Comparative Stylistics of English and French:A Methodology for Translation*.Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.
32. Walker,W.(2019).*Engagement With Shakespearean Drama*. NY: Routledge.
33. Was'sūf,N.(1971). *Al-Qamūs:Mujam Lughawy*. Beirut: Dār Al-kutob Al-elmiya.
34. Weil,J&Weil,H.(1997).*Engagement With Shakespe Drama*. NY. Routledge .
35. Zangana, H. (2000). *Mafatīh Madina: A Novel*. London: Darulhikma.

About the author

Essam T Muhammed is an assistant professor in linguistics and translation. He is a faculty member at Mosul University/ College of Arts.

Email: essam.kassab@uomosul.edu.iq

ترجمة عبارات التحقير المتعلقة بالطعام والشراب في مسرحية شكسبير (هنري

الرابع) الى اللغة العربية

ا.م. عصام ظاهر محمد

جامعة الموصل/ كلية الاداب /قسم الترجمة

خلاصة البحث

تسلط الدراسة الحالية الضوء على الاهانات المتعلقة بمفردات الطعام والشراب التي استعملها شكسبير في مسرحية هنري الرابع ومشكلات ترجمتها الى اللغة العربية. تتخذ الدراسة الحالية نظرية (فيني و داربلنت) التي ظهرت في خمسينيات القرن الحالي منهجا لها من اجل تسليط الضوء على امكانية استعمال ما جاءت به هذه النظرية من استراتيجيات وطرق يمكن اتباعها في الترجمة ما بين اللغات المختلفة. تهدف الدراسة الحالية الى معرفة مدى امكانية استعمال هذه الطرق والاساليب في ترجمة الاهانات في مسرحية شكسبير الى اللغة العربية وتطبيقها على ترجمتين عربيتين لكل من (مشاطي، 1990) و(حبيب، 1905) لمعرفة الى أي مدى يمكن الافادة من هذه الطرق والاستراتيجيات في ترجمة هذه المسرحية. تحاول الدراسة الحالية الاجابة على الاسئلة الاتية: اولاً، الى أي مدى يمكن ان تتسبب الاهانات الخاصة بالطعام والشراب في مسرحية هنري الرابع في خلق اشكالا في الترجمة لكل من المترجمين اللذين تم اختيارهما في هذه الدراسة؟ ثانياً، ما سبب لجوء المترجمان في العديد من الحالات الى الترجمة الحرفية التي غالباً ما تكون غير ناجحة مع هكذا تعبير؟ ثالثاً، ما السبب الرئيسي في الاخفاق في ترجمة الاهانات المتعلقة بالطعام والشراب من اللغة الانكليزية الى اللغة العربية؟ ولقد توصلت الدراسة الى ان غالبية الاهانات المتعلقة بالطعام والشراب لها معاني ثقافية خاصة مما يجعلها صعبة الترجمة حتى من قبل المحترفين في الترجمة كما أن اغلب الاهانات التي تتعلق بالطعام والشراب والتي استعملها شكبير في كتاباته كانت من بنات افكاره مما يزيد في صعوبة ترجمتها الى اللغات الاخرى حتى من قبل المتحدث الاصلي للغة الانكليزية فكيف هو الحال مع مترجمينا في هذه الدراسة (مشاطي وحبيب). أخيراً، يمكننا القول ان تبني الاستراتيجيات غير المناسبة من قبل المترجمين (مشاطي وحبيب) كان السبب الرئيس في الترجمات الخاطئة والضعيفة جداً، اما الترجمات الناجحة فكانت نتيجة لتبنيهم استراتيجيات جيدة وناجحة مع مراعاة الاختلاف الثقافي بين اللغتين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاهانات، السياق اللغوي، الاجراءات، اللغة المصدر، اللغة الهدف